

Energy burdens of carbon lock-in in household heating transitions

Jaime Garibay-Rodriguez,^{1,2,3,*} Morgan R. Edwards,^{1,2,*} Ann F. Fink¹, Zeyneb Magavi⁴

¹La Follette School of Public Affairs, University of Wisconsin–Madison

²Nelson Institute Center for Sustainability and the Global Environment, University of Wisconsin–Madison

³Office of Sustainability, University of Wisconsin–Madison

⁴HEET (Home Energy Efficiency Team), Cambridge, Massachusetts

*Corresponding author: morgan.edwards@wisc.edu, garibayrodri@wisc.edu

Abstract

Heating electrification presents opportunities and challenges for energy affordability. Without careful planning and policy, the costs of natural gas service will be borne by a shrinking customer base, driving up expenses for those who are left behind. This affordability issue is worsened by new fossil fuel investments, which risk locking communities into carbon-intensive infrastructure. Here, we introduce a framework to quantify the distributional effects of natural gas phasedown on energy affordability, integrating detailed household data with utility financial and planning documents. Applying our framework first to Massachusetts and then nationwide, we show that vulnerable communities face disproportionate affordability risks in building energy transitions. Households that do not electrify may bear up to 50% higher energy costs over the next decade. Targeted electrification may help to alleviate immediate energy burdens, but household heating transitions will ultimately require coordinated, neighborhood-scale strategies that consider the high fixed costs of legacy infrastructure.

Keywords: energy affordability, building electrification, natural gas, stranded assets, energy transitions, energy justice

Introduction

Simultaneously advancing energy affordability and emissions reduction goals is a core challenge for climate policy [1–3]. Across the U.S., over one in four households are energy insecure, with disproportionately higher rates for households of color [4–6]. Energy insecure households may forgo basic necessities to pay energy bills or keep their homes at unsafe temperatures to reduce costs [7]. For the 47% of households that heat their homes with natural gas (and 11% using other delivered fuels) [8], fuel poverty is a particular concern, especially in cold climates, where fuels make up 35% or more of home energy expenditures [9]. Residential energy use also contributes 20% of total greenhouse gas emissions, with close to one third coming from fuels burned directly in approximately one billion household appliances (e.g., furnaces, dryers, and stoves) [10]. Given the large number of distributed devices, and their important role in providing essential services including heating, it is essential that policies to reduce emissions also address affordability

challenges. However, many current policies may exacerbate these challenges because they emphasize new investments in natural gas infrastructure and individual adoption of new technologies through financial incentives.

There are a variety of policy levers to reduce the climate impacts of heating homes with natural gas. Over the past decade, many state and local governments have focused on repairing or replacing leaky distribution pipelines [11]. Natural gas is primarily methane, a potent greenhouse gas [12], and leaks throughout the supply chain contribute substantially to overall greenhouse gas emissions [13,14]. Fixing these leaks (especially so-called “super-emitters” [15,16]) can be a cost-effective climate solution and also provide local safety and economic benefits (e.g., via reductions in wasted gas and benefits to local tree cover and property values [17]). However, repairs may not be effective at permanently reducing leaks [18]. Replacing leak-prone pipelines, while effective [19], is expensive. Nevertheless, many states and utilities have planned or recently completed replacement programs. Even if methane emissions were completely eliminated, burning natural gas produces carbon dioxide (CO₂), and is thus incompatible with broader climate goals. While gas utilities have proposed a variety of strategies to reach net zero heating, including using biogas or hydrogen fuels and offsetting emissions [20], electrification via heat pumps (coupled with low-carbon electricity) is likely to be most effective [21].

There are signals that residential heating electrification is accelerating in the U.S. (and globally) [22]. The Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) has substantially expanded incentives for heat pump adoption, building on diverse existing state, local, and utility programs [23]. However, growing and uncoordinated electrification, especially when coupled with investments in new natural gas infrastructure, raises the risk of a *utility death spiral*. This feedback loop occurs when customers leave a utility and fixed costs must be spread over a smaller group of remaining customers, driving up costs and causing more customers to leave. The utility death spiral was discussed fifty years ago in the context of electric utilities when the oil embargo spurred reductions in electricity demand and higher utility costs [24], and more recently with the rise in distributed electricity generation [25,26]. While predictions of declining demand for electricity have not materialized [27,28], and studies now suggest future demand may increase (with electrification, computing, etc. [29,30]), declining demand for natural gas is expected under climate policies. Previous work has shown how historical natural gas utility costs have changed with the customer base [31]. However, studies have yet to explore whether a natural gas utility death spiral may occur in the future, or how it may be prevented.

Beyond the risk of a death spiral, home heating transitions highlight the broader need to design climate policies for the mid-transition [32], a period of time (likely decades) when both fossil fuel and low-carbon energy systems will coexist at a sufficient scale to impose meaningful constraints on one other [33–35]. Key challenges in the mid-transition include: (1) continuity of energy services [32,36] (e.g., access to both gas stations and electric vehicle charging), (2) stranded assets [37–39], and (3) social and worker transitions [40,41]. Many studies focus on the challenges of phasing in new technologies [23,42–44]. Previous work on phaseout largely focuses on transition pathways [45–47], stranded assets and carbon lock-in [48–50], and fossil fuel jobs, with a large focus on coal communities [40,51]. Inequities in these transitions are an important

concern and have been observed in exposures to harms from energy infrastructure [52–54] and access to the benefits of low-carbon technologies such as rooftop solar [43,55], heat pumps [42,56], energy efficiency [44,57], and electric vehicles and infrastructure [58,59]. These inequities motivate frameworks for just energy transitions that call for a deliberate approach to the decline of the fossil fuel regime that centers on distributional, procedural, and recognition justice [33,60].

Here we develop a modeling framework to assess the distributional affordability impacts of uncoordinated fossil fuel phaseout during the mid-transition and apply it to residential heating. Our approach captures the simultaneous effects of investments in legacy and new infrastructure on the costs of energy services. Specifically, we examine the effects of pipeline replacement and heating electrification on energy costs for households that have not electrified. We aim to address three questions with an energy justice lens:

1. How does the distribution of new pipeline infrastructure vary across communities?
2. How do the costs of natural gas services change throughout the heating transition?
3. What are the effects of these changing gas costs on household energy burdens?

We first apply our modeling framework to a case study in Massachusetts, a state with an active pipeline replacement program and ambitious long-term climate goals, and then extend this framework nationwide. We find that costs of natural gas service in Massachusetts could increase by 18-26% over the next decade without new pipeline replacements and 22-33% if replacements continue as planned. Nationwide, among utilities with leak-prone infrastructure, replacement programs could increase costs by 20-58% (compared to 19% without replacement). Targeted electrification for low-income households can avoid increasing energy burdens over the next decade but does not address the long-term risks of a utility death spiral.

Results

Natural gas transitions modeling framework

Our energy transitions framework includes four major components: (1) policies and actions, (2) cost components, (3) household characteristics, and (4) outcome metrics (see Fig. 1a). Decisions by households to adopt electric appliances (influenced by incentive programs and other policies) will reduce demand for natural gas. This change in demand will in turn affect different components of total natural gas system costs (to varying degrees, illustrated by the colored arrows). Investments in new pipeline infrastructure will further increase system costs. How these changes in system costs impact outcomes metrics such as utility bills and energy burdens over the coming decades will depend on the characteristics of households that do (and do not) electrify. Our framework represents these dynamics, focusing on outcomes until 2050, with particular attention on impacts in the mid-transition (i.e., 2039) and toward the end of the transition under large-scale household electrification. We apply our framework to natural gas utilities in Massachusetts and then extend it to the top 50 natural gas utilities in the U.S. in terms of leak-prone infrastructure.

Future work can expand this framework to incorporate feedbacks between the costs of natural gas service and demand for electrification.

Massachusetts presents a compelling case study for modeling energy burdens during household heating transitions and the effects of carbon lock-in from new natural gas infrastructure. It is a national leader in climate policy, with a target to reach net zero emissions economy-wide by 2050, and also has plans to fully replace its network of approximately 3,000 miles of aging pipeline [61] by 2039 through the Gas System Enhancement Program (GSEP). We first analyze spatial and sociodemographic patterns in gas leaks and planned pipeline replacements in Massachusetts, using annual utility leak reports [62] and plans filed under GSEP [63] as well as data from the American Community Survey (ACS; see ‘Pipeline replacement patterns’ in Methods) [64]. Next, we model potential increases in per customer costs under a current policies scenario (including pipeline replacement and climate goals) and assess the impacts on household energy burdens (see ‘Natural gas phasedown’ and ‘Energy burden impacts’ in Methods). We use data from the U.S. Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA), annual utility financial reports, and energy and demographic data from the Low Income Energy Affordability Data (LEAD) Tool (see Fig. 1b and 1d) [65].

Uncoordinated gas phasedown can also have impacts on energy bills nationwide. The IRA provides incentives for households to adopt efficient electric appliances (e.g., heat pumps) that replace natural gas and other delivered fuels [66]. Notably, 25 governors have committed to installing 20 million heat pumps by the end of the decade [67], while 24 states have set net-zero goals, collectively representing 40% of U.S. gross domestic product (GDP) [68]. We extend our modeling framework to consider the top 50 gas utilities nationwide in terms of miles of leak-prone pipelines (e.g., cast/wrought iron and bare steel; see ‘Natural gas phasedown’ in Methods). These utilities, which collectively account for 92% of all leak-prone distribution pipelines, could initiate or have already begun replacement programs [61]. Integrating data from PHMSA and LEAD with national utility cost estimates (see Fig. 1c and 1e) [31], we explore a hypothetical scenario where utilities replace pipelines at the same rate targeted in Massachusetts (i.e., complete replacement by 2039). Among the 28 states served by these utilities, 15 have net-zero or other climate targets [69]. Following the approach in the Massachusetts case, we quantify the potential impacts on utility costs and energy burdens.




Figure 1. Framework for modeling energy burdens from uncoordinated natural gas transitions. (a) Our modeling framework considers natural gas system cost response to new infrastructure under electrification and its impact on utility costs and energy burdens. Costs of replacing leak-prone pipelines (b) in Massachusetts and (c) nationally calculated using data from the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) [61]. Percentage of households that are energy burdened [70] (defined as spending at least 6% of household income on energy costs) (d) in Massachusetts and (e) nationally with and without natural gas for heating from the Low Income Energy Affordability Data (LEAD) Tool [65]. (Areas in gray shading in (c) are gas utility territories not considered in our top 50 utilities with leak-prone pipelines.)

Spatial patterns in pipeline replacements

Leaky pipelines are a challenge for many natural gas utilities. As of 2022, 43,000 miles (5.4%) of pipelines across the U.S. were classified as leak prone (i.e., cast/wrought iron and bare steel), with approximately 3,000 miles in Massachusetts [61]. While replacing these pipelines can provide near-term safety and environmental benefits, the financial burden is considerable, with costs ranging from \$0.77 to \$4.37 million per mile [63,71–74]. Many utilities are planning or have recently completed pipeline replacement programs. In Massachusetts, for example, an estimated investment of up to 20 billion USD is planned to replace leak-prone gas pipelines over the next 15 years [11,74]. Previous research shows that gas leaks are disproportionately concentrated in vulnerable communities – including areas with higher representation of people of color, low-income households, and energy burdened households – both in Massachusetts and in other cities with aging infrastructure [53,54]. This suggests that leak-prone pipelines are likely more common in these communities, and thus these communities may see larger investments in new fossil fuel infrastructure if pipelines are replaced. While replacing pipelines might have immediate benefits (e.g., improved safety), they may also present a risk of carbon lock in and could become stranded assets under net zero and other climate policies.

We analyze the spatial patterns in pipeline replacement plans across Massachusetts [63]. Fig. 2a shows the relative percentage difference of leaks per square kilometer across population subgroups. Vulnerable populations – including (in order of disparity) households or individuals who have limited English, Black, Hispanic, low income, low education, Asian, other minorities, renters, housing burdened, and disabled adults – currently experience 8-68% more leaks per area compared to the average population. Pipeline replacement density mirrors this disparity, with some vulnerable subgroups having 50% more replacements per unit area in both current (i.e., 2024) and near-term (i.e., 2025–2028) plans (see Fig. 2b and 2c). Specifically, Hispanic and renter subgroups have over 50% more pipeline replacements in both short and long term plans, while the white and adults over 64 subgroups have consistently fewer replacements (15-25%). The cost of these investments is distributed among all ratepayers and has the positive impact of reducing local gas leaks and gas system risks. At the same time, they present a risk of carbon-lock in and a lost opportunity to redirect investment to prioritize vulnerable communities for the benefits of decarbonization (see Discussion and Policy Implications).




Figure 2. Percentage difference of distribution of gas leaks and pipeline replacements for each subgroup with respect to the total population/households. Error bars show 95% confidence intervals using a Monte Carlo approach to quantify the uncertainty of the population/household estimates in each census tract (see Methods for details). (a) Area density of natural gas leaks, (b) near term area density of pipeline replacements (plans for 2024), and (c) long term area density of pipeline replacements (2025–2028).

Costs of natural gas rise during transitions

We next model the costs of natural gas service during the energy transition. There is a risk that costs may increase substantially in the absence of strategic action (i.e., an uncoordinated transition; see Fig. 3). Several states, including Massachusetts, have set ambitious climate goals to achieve net-zero emissions by 2050 [67,69]. For the residential building sector, these goals involve policies to increase household adoption of heat pumps and other electric appliances [23]. These policies may conflict with legacy business models for natural gas utilities, which rely on continued gas consumption to recover fixed costs associated with long-lived infrastructure (which can have lifetimes of 60 years or more). Variable costs, such as operation and maintenance, may also not decrease one-to-one when a customer leaves [31]. We show these dynamics for an electrification scenario in Massachusetts in Fig. 3. This scenario assumes that 80% of customers electrify and thus leave the gas utility customer base by 2050 (see Supplementary Fig. S1 and S2 for results under 65% and 90% electrification). Utility customer costs increase by 34–49% with electrification over the next 15 years (and by 150–218% in 2050). Costs vary across utilities due to differences in expenditures across cost categories, which lead to differences in proportional cost changes with customer exit.

Investments in new pipelines can exacerbate rising customer costs. We find the costs of natural gas service can increase by 42–62% over the next 15 years with pipeline replacements and up to 172–243% in 2050 (using straight-line depreciation and an asset life of 60 years; see Figure

3). Cost increases vary across utilities. For example, Utility 1 faces the largest cost increases due to a large number of leak-prone pipelines and high cost-per-mile of replacement, whereas Utility 5 experiences the smallest cost increases. Changes in costs over time also depend on the depreciation method (see ‘Natural gas phasedown’ in Methods for discussion of depreciation methods). Units-of-production depreciation, which pays off investments over their useful lifetime rather than a fixed time period, results in higher annual costs in the near term if utilities assume a shorter asset lifetime under electrification policies (see Figure 3). With straight-line depreciation, however, investments will not be completely paid off until 2099 (using 2039 as the last year of replacement), presenting a serious challenge for cost recovery. Escalation in pipeline costs can further increase costs of gas service (see ‘Sensitivity analyses’ in Methods and Supplementary Fig. S3 for a scenario with a 2% escalation rate).




Figure 3. Annual utility gas costs per customer with household heating transitions in all six major utilities in Massachusetts. Numbers in parenthesis indicate residential customers in each utility.

The blue line shows results for rising costs due electrification. The other lines show the increased costs with pipeline replacement programs using straight-line (green dotted line) and units-of-production (red dashed line) depreciation. The areas marked I and II show the time during (I) and after (II) the pipeline replacement program.

Higher costs exacerbate energy burdens

Higher utility costs will likely raise energy bills, impacting future energy affordability. One metric of affordability is the energy burden (i.e., the percentage of income spent on energy bills).

Households are classified as energy burdened if this percentage is above a fixed threshold (often 6%). Using these definitions, the average energy burden among households in Massachusetts that heat with gas is 5.7% (and 411,000 households are energy burdened). We calculate changes in energy burdens under gas system transitions using estimates of costs of gas service and detailed data on household income and energy bills (see 'Energy burden impacts' in Methods). Energy burdens depend on which customers disconnect from gas service first. We explore two illustrative scenarios: (1) customers leave in order of income, highest to lowest and (2) the reverse. (We also consider a scenario where customers exit in a random order; see Supplementary Fig. S4.) If high-income households electrify first, average energy burdens can increase to 6.7% in 2039 and 10.4% in 2050 without new pipeline replacements and 7.0% and 11.5% if replacements continue as scheduled. Using a 6% threshold, this corresponds to approximately 495,000 or 521,000 energy burdened households in 2039 and 672,000 or 712,000 in 2050 (see Fig. 4a and 4c).

Reversing the order of which households electrify first can address energy burdens in the short term but not the long term (see Fig. 4b and 4d). If low-income households electrify first (for example, through targeted incentives and other policies), average energy burdens in 2039 increase to 5.9% (with or without the addition of new pipelines), slightly higher than the current rate of 5.7%. This corresponds to 412,000 or 413,000 households being energy burdened. However, by 2050, average energy burdens increase to 7.8% without new pipeline replacements and 8.3% if replacements continue as scheduled (corresponding to approximately 647,000 or 686,000 energy burdened households). While lower than the levels of energy burden under a scenario where high-income households electrify first, these growing energy burdens highlight the potential for more moderate-income households to become energy burdened under rapidly increasing costs of natural gas services. These results may also underestimate (or overestimate) the full extent of energy burdens, which depend on cost of living (which varies throughout the state), other household expenses (e.g., healthcare, family care, etc.), and other factors (see [75] for a review of energy justice metrics and Supplementary Table S4 for details on our energy burden distributions). Nevertheless, these findings suggest that policies aimed at prioritizing low-income electrification at the household scale may become less effective over time at preventing increases in energy burdens from gas phasedown.




Figure 4. Energy burden distributions with natural gas phase down and with pipeline replacements in Massachusetts. Gray lines show the current energy burden distributions. We show energy burden distributions in 2039 and 2050 for the cases where (a and c, respectively) gas customers leave utilities in order of household income (high to low income) and (b and d respectively) they leave in order from low to high income.

National burdens of uncoordinated transitions

Uncoordinated gas phasedown poses challenges beyond Massachusetts, particularly for utilities with leak-prone distribution pipelines. To assess the risks of increasing energy burdens across the U.S., we apply our framework to the top 50 utilities in terms of miles of leak-prone pipeline, which represent 92% of all leak-prone pipelines in the U.S. (see ‘Natural gas phasedown’ in Methods) [61]. We focus on the potential variation in costs across utilities if they adopt a replacement program similar to Massachusetts and use average utility costs per customer (see Table 2 [31]) to estimate how costs may change as gas customers leave via electrification. Specifically, we model a scenario where all utilities replace their leak-prone pipelines by 2039. We determine an average cost-per-mile of pipeline replacement using an internet data search (see Supplementary Table S1) and also include a sensitivity analysis using the minimum and maximum cost values (see ‘Sensitivity Analyses’ in Methods and Supplementary Fig. S5). Without pipeline replacement, per customer costs increase by 35% over the next 15 years and 159% by 2050. With pipeline replacement, there is substantial variation in costs across utilities, with per customer costs increases ranging from 36% to 105% over the next 15 years and 36% to 187% when considering uncertainty in pipeline replacement costs.

Escalating costs of gas service can impact energy burdens for remaining customers across the 50 utilities. The average energy burden is 4.7% across the more than 37 million households serviced by these utilities today (with 7.7 million energy burdened households using a 6% threshold). We present results for future energy burden distributions under a scenario where households electrify in random order (see Fig. 5c) and also explore bounding cases where customers exit in order of income or the reverse (see Supplementary Fig. S6 and S7). If households electrify randomly, average energy burdens increase to 7.2% in 2050 without new pipeline replacements and 7.6% if replacements continue as scheduled (see Fig. 4c). Using a 6% threshold, this corresponds to 11.5 million or 12 million energy burdened households. As with the Massachusetts case, energy burdens can increase substantially in the near term (i.e., by 2039) if high-income customers electrify first (3.3-18.4% with pipeline replacements across utilities), and prioritizing low-income customers for electrification avoids increasing energy burdens over this timeframe but not by midcentury (see Supplementary Table S5). Energy burdens are most concentrated in the Northeast and Midwest due to a larger presence of utilities with leak-prone pipelines as well as high heating demand (see Fig. 4b and d).




Figure 5. (a) Utility cost increases for the top 50 utilities with leak-prone gas pipelines across the U.S. (b) Map of utility territories and modeled cost per customer increases in 2050, with utilities above the 95th percentile removed for visualization purposes (see Supplementary Fig. S5 for a version with all utilities). (c) Energy burden distributions with natural gas phase down and pipeline replacement in 2050. (d) Map of the percentage increase of energy burdens by 2050 (with customers exiting in a random order). Gray zones in maps represent all gas utilities in the U.S. and violet zones represent the territories of the 50 utilities with leak-prone gas pipelines. Bubble size is proportional to the number of residential customers.

Discussion and policy implications

Transitioning away from directly burning fossil fuels in buildings is crucial for achieving climate goals in the U.S. and internationally. However, ongoing investment in natural gas infrastructure,

coupled with electrification at the household level, could lead to substantial increases in energy costs for residential gas consumers. These dynamics raise concerns about energy affordability and equity during the mid-transition, an extended period where some households have electrified but others continue to rely on natural gas for heat and other essential energy services. Here we quantify the potential effects of uncoordinated building energy transitions on the costs of natural gas service and household energy bills. Our modeling framework integrates data on natural gas utility costs and pipeline replacement plans with electrification goals and household energy and sociodemographic data. Our analysis of Massachusetts highlights how leak-prone infrastructure and planned pipeline replacements are more likely to be located near vulnerable populations, including low-income, Black, Hispanic, Asian, limited English speakers, and renters. These groups may face a disproportionate risk of being locked into natural gas systems due to these investments and lower capacity to electrify their energy use [42].

An uncoordinated, *customer-by-customer* natural gas phasedown via electrification, whether driven by policy or market forces, may exacerbate energy burdens in Massachusetts and nationwide. However, who transitions first is also important. For a scenario where high-income households electrify first, and pipeline replacement follows current policies, the percentage of energy burdened households currently heated by gas in Massachusetts can increase from 26% to 33% by 2039. For the top 50 utilities nationally with the most leak-prone infrastructure, these percentages may increase from an average of 21% (and range of 9-49%) today to 23% (and range of 11-65%) across utility service areas. In contrast, a scenario that prioritizes early electrification for low-income households leads to a minimal increase (less than 0.1%) in energy burdens over the next 15 years. However, this household-level solution does not mitigate rising energy burdens under continued transitions. By 2050, per customer costs for gas utilities could reach 3.4 times current levels in Massachusetts (and 2.6-4.4 times across the 50 utilities we modeled nationally). These high costs present a risk of a utility death spiral, with high potential costs for investors and society, particularly with investments in new pipeline infrastructure.

Over the next decade, policies can reduce the risk of increasing energy burdens with electrification programs for low- to moderate-income households. The IRA currently offers an opportunity to support electrification for households most vulnerable to high gas costs, including point-of-sale rebates of up to \$8,000 for households (or landlords) to cover upfront heat pump installation costs. Many utilities and local governments have additional incentive programs. However, programs may vary by state, and many involve a voluntary application process and do not fully eliminate up front costs [76]. Well-designed rebate programs that minimize administrative burdens and actively seek applicants, as well as specialized training for auditors and contractors, can maximize enrollment in vulnerable communities. There are prospects for full or partial repeal of IRA, which would likely slow the pace of electrification. Moreover, the effects of a repeal would not be uniform across households, potentially exacerbating existing inequities as wealthier households with access to capital continue electrifying. Regardless of the near-term uncertainty in federal policies, the evolution of building energy technologies is underway, and the long-term risks and impacts of an unmanaged transition remain.

Continued investment in new natural gas pipelines, and other long-lived fossil fuel assets, presents a challenge for managing affordability during energy transitions. If gas utilities fail to

consider future affordability during the electrification transition when planning the depreciation of new infrastructure, they risk having artificially low customer costs. However, considering future transition scenarios and policies in depreciating investments in new fossil fuel assets (i.e., with the units-of-production method) may lead to higher customer costs and energy burdens in the short term. These burdens are compounded by continued pipeline replacements. These tradeoffs highlight the importance of understanding evolving energy burden dynamics (i.e., how gas system legacy costs are shifted to households with different characteristics) during electrification transitions to ensure that all households have access to the benefits of climate policy and no households are left behind. In the context of pipeline replacement, utilities can focus on strategically repairing high-volume leaks, which is more cost effective, rather than fully replacing pipelines. Methods to address leakage and safety that do not create affordability challenges should be identified and prioritized. However, repair failures can be common, indicating the importance of careful monitoring of repair outcomes.

There are several technology and policy solutions that may help accelerate beneficial electrification and alleviate the risks of the gas utility death spiral. At the household scale, reducing up front and operating cost of air source heat pumps (potential with addition of thermal energy storage systems [77]) may provide technological pathways that align well with climate goals and promote energy affordability. Utilities, utility commissions, state energy offices, and community-based organizations can also collaborate to create “one-stop shops” for customers seeking to apply for and receive available incentives and clean heating technologies. Whole home electrification upgrades or on-bill financing can address other cost barriers, particularly in colder climates and older, less efficient buildings. Focusing on electrifying all end uses can also help save customers on fixed charges associated with the use of the gas system. Neighborhood-scale solutions (e.g., neighborhood electrification via air source heat pumps or networked geothermal systems) can also enable strategic pruning of the natural gas network to reduce fixed infrastructure costs. Large-scale community and neighborhood electrification strategies may also help address the tension between safety and equity, mitigating gas leaks and hazards while preventing carbon lock-in and resulting affordability risks.

There are prospects for increased coordination of building energy transitions across the U.S. State policymakers, utility commissions, and utility companies will each serve important and unique roles in this process. Beyond our case study state of Massachusetts, other states are working to align gas utility regulations and policy with climate goals. For example, Nevada and Minnesota require gas utilities to submit integrated resource plans (IRPs) that ensure safe, reliable service in line with greenhouse gas emissions targets, while New York and Colorado utilities are addressing anticipated gas pipeline expansions by exploring demand reduction strategies [78]. Non-gas Pipeline Alternatives (NPAs), which encompass investments to reduce or avoid the need to build or upgrade gas delivery infrastructure, are required to be explored by utilities in several states, such as Rhode Island, California, New York, and Colorado [79]. State regulators might also consider requiring utilities to reform gas line extension allowances, which currently incentivize new gas connections at the expense of all ratepayers [80]. In addition, 15 states have enacted or are developing policies that encourage fuel-switching as a means to clean heating through customer incentives, either via utilities themselves, or state-funded programs like the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) [81].

Providing affordable heat for residential buildings is one piece of a much bigger policy puzzle to support energy justice. A common theme, emphasized in our results on energy burdens of carbon lock-in during natural gas transitions, is the importance of careful planning and coordination to support affordability for all households, including those that continue to rely on fossil fuels during the mid-transition. We quantify a risk that is a growing concern among policymakers and utility customers: continued investment in the natural gas system may impose high utility costs on those already spending a large portion of their income on energy. While pipeline replacement programs can mitigate methane leaks and safety risks in an aging distribution system [19], this benefit must be weighed against the potential for increased costs to consumers. Our framework can serve as a foundation for analyzing similar issues in other sectors undergoing electrification (e.g., personal transportation), especially where there may be tradeoffs between near- and long-term climate solutions. Future research might also address the extent and impact of the wealth transfer from gas to electric utilities as demand shifts toward electricity. Utilities and regulatory commissions in particular can be key actors in managing the energy system with an eye to addressing both traditional metrics (e.g., safety, affordability, and reliability) and broader societal issues, including health, employment, and quality of life.

Methods

Our modeling framework for assessing the equity impacts of building energy transitions consists of three steps: (1) investigate spatial patterns in natural gas pipeline replacement programs, (2) model natural gas phasedown in buildings under climate policy and the resulting changes in the costs of natural gas service, and (3) estimate the combined impacts of natural gas phasedown and pipeline replacements on energy burdens across households. For each of these steps, we first describe our data and methods for our application case in Massachusetts and then discuss how we extend our approach nationwide.

Pipeline replacement patterns

We first assess spatial patterns in natural gas leaks and pipeline replacement plans in Massachusetts using data compiled by HEET [53,63]. Replacement plans are reported by utilities annually for the upcoming year under the Gas System Enhancement Plan (GSEP) with details on the location, estimated cost, and prioritization of each pipeline segment. HEET extracts and geocodes replacement plans for each utility [63]. The approach uses automated report data extraction with data parsers and geocoding of each GSEP location. However, reports are not required to have a specific format. Due to data format inconsistencies, HEET performs an extensive manual verification of results to maximize accuracy. Results are published as an interactive map⁶³ with underlying data available upon request. The data we use in our analysis reflects data published by HEET as of August 15, 2024, which includes detailed near-term pipeline replacement plans for 2024 and gas leaks and repairs through the end of 2023. We also use data on potential locations for longer-term pipeline replacement plans (i.e., 2025-2028) communicated by utilities in their annual GSEP reports.

We aggregate leak and pipeline replacement data to the census tract scale to assess exposures across different populations. Sociodemographic variables (at the census tract level) are extracted from the American Community Survey (ACS) five-year estimates for 2018-2022 [64]. We use data on race, ethnicity, low income status (i.e., below two times the poverty line), adults over 64, children under five, adults with disabilities, adults without a high school diploma, renter status, English proficiency, and housing burdens (i.e., 30% or more of income spent on rent or mortgage). We focus on three metrics: (1) gas leak density (i.e., leaks per unit area, which has also been explored in prior work [52,53]), (2) near term replacement density (i.e., number of replacements per unit area), and (3) long term replacement density. We calculate population weighted means for each metric across different subgroups:

$$\overline{\text{Metric}}(\text{subgroup}) = \frac{\sum_{c=1}^C \text{Metric}_c * \text{Population}_c(\text{subgroup})}{\sum_{c=1}^C \text{Population}_c(\text{subgroup})}, \quad (1)$$

where C is the number of census tracts. We then calculate the percentage difference for each metric for all population subgroups to the total population:

$$\text{MetricPercentageDifference}(\text{subgroup}) = 100 \times \left(\frac{\overline{\text{Metric}}(\text{subgroup})}{\overline{\text{Metric}}(\text{total population})} - 1 \right). \quad (2)$$

Equation (2) returns a positive value if the phenomenon is overrepresented among the subgroup relative to the population as a whole (and vice versa). It is commonly used in studies mapping inequities in exposure to environmental burdens [53,82,83].

Data in ACS is estimated based on a rolling sample of responses (~3.5 million each year) and is subject to uncertainty. We use a Monte Carlo analysis to quantify this uncertainty by constructing random normal distributions with the ACS estimates and published margin of error (MOE) for each variable. We simulate 10,000 realizations with random samples of each population estimate distribution per census tract. Note that smaller units of analysis, such as census blocks or block groups, have larger MOEs. We perform our analysis at the census tract level as a compromise that balances geographic resolution and accuracy.

Natural gas phasedown

We model a simplified scenario for natural gas phasedown in buildings. Decarbonization goals can be met in multiple ways but will almost certainly involve electrification of energy end uses. In Massachusetts, utilities are required to submit plans to ensure compliance with state climate targets (including at least 85% decarbonization by 2050) through Order 20-80 starting in 2025 [84]. However, the exact dynamics of how this might unfold are uncertain. Plans could adopt a range of strategies at different scales, including hybrid and full electrification via air source heat pumps, networked geothermal, and decarbonized gas use with increased equipment efficiency (e.g., biogas and hydrogen) [85]. We focus on a baseline scenario where 80% of residential customers are disconnected from the network by 2050, following previous research [31], and explore other scenarios in our sensitivity analysis. We simulate this scenario by assuming that the rate at which customers leave the system is constant (~3% of current customers annually).

This simplified modeling choice is not meant to fully capture the complex, nonlinear dynamics of electrification, influenced by many technical, social, and economic factors [42,56,86].

We model the effects of natural gas phasedown on the costs of service, including natural gas purchases, depreciation, return on net utility plant, operation and maintenance (O&M), account and administrative expenses, and taxes. For Massachusetts, we use annual reports on costs, revenues, and customer numbers from the six major utilities [62]. Costs for each category are allocated to residential service based on the proportion of sales revenue from residential customers (60% on average across utilities). We convert revenue to expenditures using a cost recovery factor (i.e., funds a utility is allowed to collect after covering expenses):

$$\text{Expenditures} = \text{Revenues} \times \text{CostRecoveryFactor}. \quad (3)$$

Our approach implicitly assumes that the fraction of expenditures for residential customers remains constant over time, which might be reasonable if demand from residential and non-residential customers declines at similar rates. We then calculate the expenditures per customer by category by dividing each category by the number of customers. We do not model rate structures by customer type; instead, we estimate the average cost per customer. See Table 1 for our estimates for residential expenditures per customer by category.

We treat pipeline replacements as a separate utility expenditure category to highlight how an unplanned phasedown, combined with ongoing pipeline replacements, could affect utility finances and energy bills. Using PHMSA data, we estimate the miles of leak-prone pipelines (i.e., cast/wrought iron and bare steel) for each utility [61]. We model a scenario where all remaining leak-prone pipelines are replaced by 2039, the scheduled end of the Massachusetts replacement program, with a constant replacement rate each year (see Supplementary Note S1). Replacement costs per mile (and replacement plans, shown in Fig. 2) are sourced from HEET [63] (see Supplementary Table S2 for details). For our baseline scenario, we assume no cost escalation. We also consider a scenario with a 2% annual escalation rate (see Sensitivity Analysis) [85]. Total yearly costs are:

$$\text{TotalReplacementCost} = \text{Miles} * \text{CostPerMile}. \quad (4)$$

Note that because replacement costs are annualized (see description below), total annual payments for pipeline replacement increase over time until all pipelines are replaced, and payments continue even after the replacement period ends.

Utilities often choose different depreciation methods in their rate-making process to annualize the costs of capital investments (i.e., spread the cost of an asset over multiple accounting periods) [87]. There are three key regulatory principles for asset depreciation: (1) economic efficiency, (2) stability and intergenerational equity, and (3) administrative simplicity. The most common depreciation method, and the one used in previous studies, is straight-line depreciation (SLD in Equation 5), which estimates costs as a function of time [85,87,88]:

$$SLD_t = \frac{\text{TotalAssetCost} - \text{ResidualValue}}{T}, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T, \quad (5)$$

where T represents the asset lifetime. Another approach, units-of-production depreciation (UOP in Equation 6), depreciates an asset based on its usage over its lifetime:

$$UOP_t = \left(\frac{\text{TotalAssetCost} - \text{ResidualValue}}{U} \right) u_t, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T', \quad (6)$$

where U is the expected number of units produced over the asset's useful life T' (which may differ from the straight-line depreciation lifetime), and u_t is the units produced each year.

We calculate depreciation using both the straight-line and units-of-production methods. For the straight-line depreciation method, we use an asset life of $T = 60$ years [85]. Natural gas pipelines are typically designed for a service life exceeding 50 years (and can last up to 80 years or more) [89,90]. Note that, with this method, there is a substantial cost burden from pipeline replacements even after the gas system has been largely phased down. These costs may be difficult to recover. The units-of-production method can address this concern by allowing for accelerated depreciation of assets that are expected to be retired before the end of their useful life. (A straight-line depreciation method, in contrast, implicitly assumes that demand will remain stable.) For the units-of-production method, we use the modeled decline in gas demand to calculate units produced through 2050 and assume this trend continues until complete phaseout in 2057. We assume that the residual value of the system is zero. With assets subject to accelerated retirement, such as natural gas pipelines, the straight-line method leads to lower annual payments than units-of-production method through 2050.

We estimate expenditures for gas utilities in Massachusetts using (1) annual reports submitted by individual utilities and published on the Department of Public Utilities (DPU) website [91] which are broken up into several cost categories, and (2) estimates of the percentage change in cost with customer departure by cost category (see Table 1) [31]. For instance, we assume all gas purchase costs are eliminated when a customer leaves, but capital-related costs remain unchanged. We assume that only 10% of operation and maintenance (O&M) costs are eliminated, as most network maintenance continues, except for customer-specific activities (e.g., meter repair). Customer account expenses are mostly eliminated (90%), though some costs remain to account for fixed expenses and lost economies of scale (e.g., in physical meter readings). Half of administrative and general expenses are eliminated, with the rest attributed to fixed costs (e.g., pensions). We estimate 60% of tax costs are eliminated based on a weighted average of other categories. These percentages are estimates and may vary across utilities and over time. Higher fixed costs (and lower customer-dependent costs) would increase the costs of gas service for remaining customers as customers leave (and vice versa).

Table 1. Expenditure categories for natural gas utilities in Massachusetts (labeled 1-6) and fraction of costs eliminated when a customer exits. Expenditures are for 2024 and estimated

from individual utility reports extracted from the Massachusetts DPU website [91]. The fraction of costs leaving with customers are taken from previous research [31].

Category	2024 USD per customer						Fraction leaving with customer
	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Natural gas purchases	351	532	437	195	278	292	1
Depreciation	150	154	100	135	119	243	0
Return on net utility plant	183	130	205	165	159	271	0
Total operation and maintenance	106	95	60	92	269	79	0.1
Customer account expenses	164	99	50	51	72	187	0.9
Administrative and general expenses	121	105	84	66	99	148	0.5
Taxes	107	66	115	75	121	68	0.6
Pipeline replacements	4	5	8	6	2	46	0

For our national analysis, we model a hypothetical pipeline replacement scenario where utilities with leak-prone infrastructure follow the same replacement plans as in Massachusetts. To identify leak-prone infrastructure, we use 2022 PHMSA inventories of cast/wrought iron and bare steel pipelines [61], which is the most recent year with U.S. EIA form 176 data on residential gas customers (as of November 1, 2024) [92]. We focus on the top 50 utilities with the largest number of miles of leak-prone miles of pipelines (out of 174 utilities that report inventories to PHMSA). We manually match customers reported in EIA form 176 with utility names and serviced states and merge this data with spatial data on territory boundaries from the Homeland Infrastructure Foundation-Level Data (HIFLD) [93]. After merging utility territory boundaries, we exclude five utilities from our sample due to incorrect boundaries (after visual inspection from utility websites). These excluded utilities represent 4.8% of leak-prone pipelines. To compensate, we added the next five utilities in terms of leak-prone miles to our sample, resulting in a final sample representing 50 utilities and 92% of leak-prone pipelines.

We search for cost and mileage data to determine a cost-per-mile (in 2024 U.S. dollars) for utilities within our national sample with active pipeline replacement programs. Specifically, we use utility names and search terms such as “pipeline replacement program,” “cost,” and “mileage,” reviewing the first two pages of Google results. We only consider values reported by utility websites, state utility commissions, and news outlets that cite utility representatives or reports. Each utility is assigned one of six statuses (see Supplementary Table S1):

1. Government-funded replacement program
2. No evidence of active program
3. Potential inaccuracy in mileage or cost data
4. Found one-off replacement projects but no evidence of a replacement program

5. Confirmed active replacement program but missing either mileage or cost data
6. Confirmed active replacement program

Overall, we found evidence of active or previous replacement programs for 18 of the 50 utilities and cost and mileage data for 8 of these utilities. Given limited data, we focus on a scenario using an average cost-per-mile across our utilities (1.98 million USD). We also include sensitivity analyses for replacement costs using minimum, maximum, and Massachusetts cost-per-mile values. Average utility expenditures are based on data from the American Gas Association (AGA) (as referenced in previous research [31]; see Table 2).

Table 2. Expenditure categories for a typical natural gas utility in the U.S. Data are sourced from previous research and adjusted to 2024 USD [31]. The fraction of expenditures leaving with customers is the same as in our Massachusetts case (see Table 1). Pipeline replacement costs per customer vary per utility due to differences in the number of customers and miles of leak-prone pipelines (see Supplementary Table S3).

Category	2024 USD per customer
Natural gas purchases	349
Depreciation	71
Return on net utility plant	118
Total operation and maintenance	74
Customer account expenses	28
Admin and general expenses	95
Taxes	53

Energy burden impacts

We analyze the effects of changing costs of natural gas service on energy burdens using the Low Income Energy Affordability (LEAD) tool [65]. LEAD contains statistically representative household data at the census tract level including: (1) estimated number of households per census tract, (2) area median income, (3) household energy expenditures (natural gas, electricity, and other fuels), and (4) main heating fuel. In the contiguous U.S., LEAD includes approximately 16.7 million weighted data points representing 113 million households in 2018 (the most recent year of available data as of November 1, 2024). We filter the data to focus on households using natural gas for heating. Using census tract identifiers, we perform a spatial merge of our utility data with the LEAD data. We obtain the counties served by each utility from the Massachusetts DPU⁹⁴ (for the Massachusetts case) and the HIFLD [93] (for the nationwide case) and information census tracts from the U.S. Census Bureau [95].

There are discrepancies between utility-reported customer counts and the total number of households using gas reported by LEAD in the utility service territory. Several factors may

contribute to these discrepancies. First, the households in LEAD are based on estimates from the ACS 2018 5-year survey, whereas utility residential customer counts are based on more recent data from 2024. Second, multifamily buildings may be counted as a single gas customer by utilities if they share a gas meter but would appear as separate households in LEAD. Third, filtering households in the LEAD for gas heating excludes non-heating gas customers. (Nationally, approximately 68% of gas customers use gas for heating, with this Fig. rising to 76% in colder climates [96]) Finally, some census tracts are serviced by more than one utility, leading to ambiguity in the number of LEAD households connected to each utility. We follow an existing approach and assign a customer count to each census tract. We scale the total number of utility customers by the fraction of LEAD households in that tract [97]:

$$\text{Customers}_c = \text{TotalUtilityCustomers} \times \frac{\text{Households}_c}{\text{HouseholdsInServiceArea}} \quad c = 1, 2, \dots, C, \quad (7)$$

where Customers_c is the scaled utility customers in census tract c , Households_c is the number of LEAD households in census tract c that use gas for heating, and $\text{HouseholdsInServiceArea}$ is the sum of these households across the utility service territory. For cases where a utility territory crosses a census tract, we multiply by the fraction of area covered by the utility.

We next calculate energy burdens for each LEAD household:

$$\text{EnergyBurden} = \frac{\text{ElectricityExpenditures} + \text{GasExpenditures} + \text{OtherFuelExpenditures}}{\text{HouseholdIncome}}. \quad (8)$$

Our estimates of increased natural gas costs, expressed as percentages relative to the initial year of our analysis (2024), are then applied to gas expenditures for natural gas phasedown scenarios with and without additional costs due to new investments in pipeline replacements, taking into account our different pipeline replacement scenarios (see Section ‘Higher costs exacerbate energy burdens’). Note that increases in natural gas expenditures are applied only to remaining gas customers. Electricity and other fuel expenditures as well as income remain unchanged for remaining gas customers. We conservatively assume that total energy costs for customers who switch from gas to electricity experience no change in total energy costs (and thus energy burdens). While research suggests that the majority of customers who electrify via heat pumps would see a decline in energy costs, realized costs depend on a variety of factors such as climate, electricity and gas costs, and equipment costs [42]. We also assume that real (i.e., inflation adjusted) gross (i.e., before tax) household income remains constant over time.

A crucial aspect of how gas phasedown and pipeline replacements impact energy burdens is the composition of customers disconnecting from gas service. Current trends in heating electrification suggest a nonlinear relationship with household income moderated by variables such as local climate, energy prices, building age, and race/ethnicity [42,56,86,98]. However, other clean energy technologies like rooftop solar demonstrate adoption trends where income plays a significant role [43]. Future patterns in household electrification remain uncertain. If wealthier households electrify first, they may impose disproportionate burdens on low-income households during a gas phasedown. To assess the impact of the composition of departing customers on energy burdens, we explore two scenarios: (1) households depart in order of high to low income

and (2) vice versa. While these electrification patterns may be unlikely, our aim is to estimate the upper and lower bounds of energy burden impacts during an uncoordinated natural gas phasedown. For both scenarios, we measure (1) changes in average and median energy burdens and (2) changes in the number of households that become energy burdened, using a threshold of 6% to identify energy-burdened households.

Sensitivity analyses

We perform several sensitivity analyses for both our Massachusetts and national cases (see Supplementary Fig. S1-S7 and Tables S4 and S5 for more details):

- We model a case where 65% of customers electrify by 2050 in Massachusetts instead of 80%, which results in lower overall increases in the cost of gas service from 2024–2050 (88–124% compared to 172–243% in our main case, see Supplementary Fig. S1).
- We model a case where 90% of customers electrify by 2050 in Massachusetts instead of 80%, which results in higher overall increases in the cost of gas service from 2024–2050 (394–559%, compared to 172–243% in our main case, see Supplementary Fig. S2).
- We model a 2% annual escalation rate for the cost of pipeline replacements in Massachusetts, which results in an increase in the costs of gas service of 175–247% in 2050, compared to 172–243% without using the escalation rate (see Supplementary Fig. S3)
- We model the energy burden impacts of random customer exit in Massachusetts instead of based on income, which results in a 4.89% higher average energy burden and 15.27% more energy burdened households (see Supplementary Fig. S4 and Table S4 for further details on the energy burden distributions in Massachusetts).
- We model the increase in utility costs per customer in our national case using minimum, maximum, and average replacement costs per mile (see Supplementary Fig. S5).
- We model the energy burden impacts of income-based customer exit (from low to high income and vice versa) nationally (see Supplementary Fig. S6 and S7 and Supplementary Table S5 for further details on the energy burden distributions nationally).

Availability of data and materials

The code and publicly available data to reproduce the analysis of this paper will be made available via an open-access repository (Zenodo) following publication.

References

1. Carley, S. & Konisky, D. M. The justice and equity implications of the clean energy transition. *Nat. Energy* **5**, 569–577 (2020).
2. Heffron, R. J. Applying energy justice into the energy transition. *Renew. Sustain. Energy*

- Rev.* **156**, 111936 (2022).
3. Sovacool, B. K., Martiskainen, M., Hook, A. & Baker, L. Decarbonization and its discontents: a critical energy justice perspective on four low-carbon transitions. *Clim. Change* **155**, 581–619 (2019).
 4. Bednar, D. J. & Reames, T. G. Recognition of and response to energy poverty in the United States. *Nat. Energy* **5**, 432–439 (2020).
 5. U.S. Energy Information Administration. *Today in Energy*.
<https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=51979> (2022).
 6. U.S. Office of energy justice and equity. *Households of Color Continue to Experience Energy Insecurity at Disproportionately Higher Rates*.
<https://www.energy.gov/justice/articles/households-color-continue-experience-energy-insecurity-disproportionately-higher> (2023).
 7. Huang, L. & Nock, D. Estimating the income-related inequality aversion to energy limiting behavior in the United States. *Energy Econ.* **136**, 107716 (2024).
 8. United States Census Bureau. *American Community Survey 2022 5-Year Estimates. House Heating Fuel*.
<https://data.census.gov/table/ACSDT5Y2022.B25040?q=B25040:%20House%20Heating%20Fuel> (2022).
 9. U.S. Energy Information Administration. *RECS 2020: Annual Household Fuel Expenditures in the United States—Totals and Averages*.
<https://www.eia.gov/consumption/residential/data/2020/c&e/pdf/ce2.6.pdf> (2024).
 10. U.S. Energy Information Administration. *Today in Energy. U.S. CO₂ Emissions from Energy Consumption by Source and Sector, 2020*.
<https://www.eia.gov/todayinenergy/detail.php?id=48856> (2021).
 11. Seavey, D. *Leaked & Combusted: Strategies for Reducing the Hidden Costs of Methane Emissions & Transitioning off Gas*. <https://assets-global.website->

files.com/649aeb5aaa8188e00cea66bb/663a27270c0fa4fffcfe447d_Leaked-and-Combusted-May-2024.pdf (2024).

12. Edwards, M. R. & Trancik, J. E. Consequences of equivalency metric design for energy transitions and climate change. *Clim. Change* **175**, 4 (2022).
13. Alvarez, R. A. *et al.* Assessment of methane emissions from the U.S. oil and gas supply chain. *Science* **361**, 186–188 (2018).
14. Weller, Z. D., Hamburg, S. P. & von Fischer, J. C. A National Estimate of Methane Leakage from Pipeline Mains in Natural Gas Local Distribution Systems. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **54**, 8958–8967 (2020).
15. Brandt, A. R., Heath, G. A. & Cooley, D. Methane Leaks from Natural Gas Systems Follow Extreme Distributions. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **50**, 12512–12520 (2016).
16. Hendrick, M. F., Ackley, R., Sanaie-Movahed, B., Tang, X. & Phillips, N. G. Fugitive methane emissions from leak-prone natural gas distribution infrastructure in urban environments. *Environ. Pollut.* **213**, 710–716 (2016).
17. Shen, X., Edwards, M. R., Qiu, Y. (Lucy) & Liu, P. The economic consequences of local gas leaks with evidence from Massachusetts housing market. *iScience* **27**, (2024).
18. Edwards, M. R. *et al.* Repair Failures Call for New Policies to Tackle Leaky Natural Gas Distribution Systems. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **55**, 6561–6570 (2021).
19. Gallagher, M. E. *et al.* Natural Gas Pipeline Replacement Programs Reduce Methane Leaks and Improve Consumer Safety. *Environ. Sci. Technol. Lett.* **2**, 286–291 (2015).
20. American Gas Association. *Net-Zero Emissions Opportunities for Gas Utilities*. <https://www.aga.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/aga-net-zero-emissions-opportunities-for-gas-utilities.pdf> (2021).
21. Garimella, S. *et al.* Realistic pathways to decarbonization of building energy systems. *Joule* **6**, 956–971 (2022).
22. Rosenow, J., Gibb, D., Nowak, T. & Lowes, R. Heating up the global heat pump market.

- Nat. Energy* **7**, 901–904 (2022).
23. Wilson, E. J. H., Munankarmi, P., Less, B. D., Reyna, J. L. & Rothgeb, S. Heat pumps for all? Distributions of the costs and benefits of residential air-source heat pumps in the United States. *Joule* **8**, 1000–1035 (2024).
 24. Felder, F. A. & Athawale, R. The Life and Death of the Utility Death Spiral. *Electr. J.* **27**, 9–16 (2014).
 25. Laws, N. D., Epps, B. P., Peterson, S. O., Laser, M. S. & Wanjiru, G. K. On the utility death spiral and the impact of utility rate structures on the adoption of residential solar photovoltaics and energy storage. *Appl. Energy* **185**, 627–641 (2017).
 26. Costello, K. W. & Hemphill, R. C. Electric Utilities' 'Death Spiral': Hyperbole or Reality? *Electr. J.* **27**, 7–26 (2014).
 27. Muaafa, M. *et al.* Can adoption of rooftop solar panels trigger a utility death spiral? A tale of two U.S. cities. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* **34**, 154–162 (2017).
 28. Athawale, R. & Felder, F. A. Electric utility death spiral: Revisited in the context of tariff design. *Electr. J.* **35**, 107062 (2022).
 29. Bistline, J. E. T., Roney, C. W., McCollum, D. L. & Blanford, G. J. Deep decarbonization impacts on electric load shapes and peak demand. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **16**, 094054 (2021).
 30. O'Shaughnessy, E., Shah, M., Parra, D. & Ardani, K. The demand-side resource opportunity for deep grid decarbonization. *Joule* **6**, 972–983 (2022).
 31. Davis, L. W. & Hausman, C. Who Will Pay for Legacy Utility Costs? *J. Assoc. Environ. Resour. Econ.* **9**, 1047–1085 (2022).
 32. Grubert, E. & Hastings-Simon, S. Designing the mid-transition: A review of medium-term challenges for coordinated decarbonization in the United States. *WIREs Clim. Change* **13**, e768 (2022).
 33. Geels, F. W. Regime Resistance against Low-Carbon Transitions: Introducing Politics and Power into the Multi-Level Perspective. *Theory Cult. Soc.* **31**, 21–40 (2014).

34. Sovacool, B. K. Who are the victims of low-carbon transitions? Towards a political ecology of climate change mitigation. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* **73**, 101916 (2021).
35. Kanger, L. Rethinking the Multi-level Perspective for energy transitions: From regime life-cycle to explanatory typology of transition pathways. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* **71**, 101829 (2021).
36. Waite, M. & Modi, V. Electricity Load Implications of Space Heating Decarbonization Pathways. *Joule* **4**, 376–394 (2020).
37. Caldecott, Ben. *Stranded Assets and the Environment*. (Taylor & Francis, 2018).
38. Semieniuk, G. *et al.* Stranded fossil-fuel assets translate to major losses for investors in advanced economies. *Nat. Clim. Change* **12**, 532–538 (2022).
39. Edwards, M. R. *et al.* Quantifying the regional stranded asset risks from new coal plants under 1.5 °C. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **17**, 024029 (2022).
40. Raimi, D., Carley, S. & Konisky, D. Mapping county-level vulnerability to the energy transition in US fossil fuel communities. *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 15748 (2022).
41. Sovacool, B. K., Hess, D. J. & Cantoni, R. Energy transitions from the cradle to the grave: A *meta*-theoretical framework integrating responsible innovation, social practices, and energy justice. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* **75**, 102027 (2021).
42. Edwards, M. R. *et al.* Assessing inequities in electrification via heat pumps across the U.S. *Joule* **8**, 3290–3302 (2024).
43. Sunter, D. A., Castellanos, S. & Kammen, D. M. Disparities in rooftop photovoltaics deployment in the United States by race and ethnicity. *Nat. Sustain.* **2**, 71–76 (2019).
44. Forrester, S. P. & Reames, T. G. Understanding the residential energy efficiency financing coverage gap and market potential. *Appl. Energy* **260**, 114307 (2020).
45. Cui, R. Y. *et al.* Quantifying operational lifetimes for coal power plants under the Paris goals. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 4759 (2019).
46. Achakulwisut, P. *et al.* Global fossil fuel reduction pathways under different climate

- mitigation strategies and ambitions. *Nat. Commun.* **14**, 5425 (2023).
47. Grubert, E. Fossil electricity retirement deadlines for a just transition. *Science* **370**, 1171–1173 (2020).
 48. Seto, K. C. *et al.* Carbon Lock-In: Types, Causes, and Policy Implications. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **41**, 425–452 (2016).
 49. Erickson, P., Kartha, S., Lazarus, M. & Tempest, K. Assessing carbon lock-in. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **10**, 084023 (2015).
 50. Spurlock, C. A., Elmallah, S. & Reames, T. G. Equitable deep decarbonization: A framework to facilitate energy justice-based multidisciplinary modeling. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* **92**, 102808 (2022).
 51. Nacke, L., Vinichenko, V., Cherp, A., Jakhmola, A. & Jewell, J. Compensating affected parties necessary for rapid coal phase-out but expensive if extended to major emitters. *Nat. Commun.* **15**, 3742 (2024).
 52. Weller, Z. D., Im, S., Palacios, V., Stuchiner, E. & von Fischer, J. C. Environmental Injustices of Leaks from Urban Natural Gas Distribution Systems: Patterns among and within 13 U.S. Metro Areas. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **56**, 8599–8609 (2022).
 53. Luna, M. & Nicholas, D. An environmental justice analysis of distribution-level natural gas leaks in Massachusetts, USA. *Energy Policy* **162**, 112778 (2022).
 54. Kucheva, Y. & Etemadpour, R. Gas Leaks, Gas Shutoffs, and Environmental Justice in New York City. *Urban Aff. Rev.* **60**, 1699–1733 (2024).
 55. Reames, T. G. Distributional disparities in residential rooftop solar potential and penetration in four cities in the United States. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* **69**, 101612 (2020).
 56. Poblete-Cazenave, M. & Rao, N. D. Social and contextual determinants of heat pump adoption in the US: Implications for subsidy policy design. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* **104**, 103255 (2023).
 57. Goldstein, B., Reames, T. G. & Newell, J. P. Racial inequity in household energy efficiency

- and carbon emissions in the United States: An emissions paradox. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* **84**, 102365 (2022).
58. Dall-Orsoletta, A., Ferreira, P. & Gilson Dranka, G. Low-carbon technologies and just energy transition: Prospects for electric vehicles. *Energy Convers. Manag. X* **16**, 100271 (2022).
59. Vega-Perkins, J., Newell, J. P. & Keoleian, G. Mapping electric vehicle impacts: greenhouse gas emissions, fuel costs, and energy justice in the United States. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **18**, 014027 (2023).
60. Geels, F. W. The multi-level perspective on sustainability transitions: Responses to seven criticisms. *Environ. Innov. Soc. Transit.* **1**, 24–40 (2011).
61. Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA). Pipeline Replacement Background. <https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/data-and-statistics/pipeline-replacement/pipeline-replacement-background> (2024).
62. Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities. *2023 Annual Report*. <https://www.mass.gov/doc/dpu-annual-report-2023/download> (2024).
63. Home Energy Efficiency Team (HEET). Visualizing the Gas System Enhancement Program (GSEP). <https://heet.org/gsep/> (2024).
64. United States Census Bureau. *American Community Survey 2016-2020 5-Year Data Release*. <https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-kits/2021/acs-5-year.html> (2022).
65. Ma, O. *et al.* *Low-Income Energy Affordability Data (LEAD) Tool Methodology*. <https://www.osti.gov/biblio/1545589> (2019) doi:10.2172/1545589.
66. The White House. Investing in America - CleanEnergy.gov. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/cleanenergy/> (2024).
67. Budryk, Z. Coalition of governors announces goal of 20 million heat pump installations. *The Hill* <https://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/4216086-coalition-of-governors-announces-goal-of-20-million-heat-pump-installations/> (2023).

68. McKinsey Sustainability. *Net-Zero United States: A Business Guide*.
<https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/sustainability/our-insights/navigating-americas-net-zero-frontier-a-guide-for-business-leaders#/> (2022).
69. U.C. Berkeley California-China Climate Institute. States' Climate Action Map. *State's Climate Action Map* <https://ccci.berkeley.edu/states-climate-action-map> (2024).
70. Scheier, E. & Kittner, N. A measurement strategy to address disparities across household energy burdens. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 288 (2022).
71. Consumers Energy. Pipeline Upgrade. <https://www.consumersenergy.com/about-us/natural-gas-operations/pipeline-upgrade> (2024).
72. Peoples Gas. We're Replacing Pipelines to Reduce Methane. <https://www.peoples-gas.com/news/archive/2018/07/replacing-pipelines.php> (2018).
73. Dominion Energy. Approves Expansion of Dominion East Ohio's Pipeline Infrastructure Replacement Program; Authorizes Increase in Annual Program Investment to 200 Million by 2018. <https://news.dominionenergy.com/2016-09-14-PUCO-Approves-Expansion-of-Dominion-East-Ohios-Pipeline-Infrastructure-Replacement-Program-Authorizes-Increase-in-Annual-Program-Investment-to-200-Million-by-2018> (2016).
74. Seavey, D. *GSEP at the Six-Year Mark: A Review of the Massachusetts Gas System Enhancement Program*. <https://gasleaksallies.org/gsep> (2021).
75. Baker, E. *et al.* Metrics for Decision-Making in Energy Justice. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **48**, 737–760 (2023).
76. U.S. Office of State and Community Energy Programs. Home Energy Rebates Frequently Asked Questions For Consumers. *Energy.gov* <https://www.energy.gov/scep/home-energy-rebates-frequently-asked-questions-consumers> (2024).
77. Kishore, R. A., Mahvi, A., Singh, A. & Woods, J. Finned-tube-integrated modular thermal storage systems for HVAC load modulation in buildings. *Cell Rep. Phys. Sci.* **4**, (2023).
78. Rocky Mountain Institute (RMI). *Bringing Gas Utility Planning into the 21st Century*.

- <https://rmi.org/bringing-gas-utility-planning-into-the-21st-century/> (2024).
79. Strategen Consulting. *Non-Pipeline Alternatives to Natural Gas Utility Infrastructure: An Examination of Existing Regulatory Approaches*. https://eta-publications.lbl.gov/sites/default/files/non-pipeline_alternatives_to_natural_gas_utility_infrastructure_1_final.pdf (2023).
80. Rocky Mountain Institute (RMI). *Overextended: It's Time to Rethink Subsidized Gas Line Extensions*. <https://rmi.org/insight/its-time-to-rethink-subsidized-gas-line-extensions/> (2021).
81. American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE). *State Policies and Rules to Enable Beneficial Electrification in Buildings through Fuel Switching*. https://www.aceee.org/sites/default/files/pdfs/state_fuel-switching_policies_and_rules_7-21-22.pdf (2022).
82. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA). *EJSCREEN: Environmental Justice Screening and Mapping Tool*. <https://www.epa.gov/ejscreen> (2020).
83. Giang, A. & Castellani, K. Cumulative air pollution indicators highlight unique patterns of injustice in urban Canada. *Environ. Res. Lett.* **15**, 124063 (2020).
84. Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities. Department of Public Utilities Issues Order 20-80. <https://www.mass.gov/news/department-of-public-utilities-issues-order-20-80> (2023).
85. Energy and Environmental Economics (E3). *The Role of Gas Distribution Companies in Achieving the Commonwealth's Climate Goals*. <https://thefutureofgas.com/content/downloads/2022-03-21/3.18.22%20-%20Independent%20Consultant%20Report%20-%20Decarbonization%20Pathways.pdf> (2022).
86. Davis, L. W. The Economic Determinants of Heat Pump Adoption. *Environ. Energy Policy Econ.* **5**, 162–199 (2024).
87. National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC). *Tariff Toolkit - Depreciation Expense: A Primer for Utility Regulators*.

- <https://pubs.naruc.org/pub.cfm?id=6ADEB9EF-1866-DAAC-99FB-DBB28B7DF4FB> (2021).
88. Seavey, Dorie & et al. *The Future of Gas in Illinois*. <https://buildingdecarb.org/resource/the-future-of-gas-in-illinois> (2024).
89. Folga, S.M. *Natural Gas Pipeline Technology Overview*.
<https://publications.anl.gov/anlpubs/2008/02/61034.pdf> (2007).
90. Payne, H. The Natural Gas Paradox: Shutting Down a System Designed to Operate Forever. **80**, (2021).
91. Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities. Find a natural gas company annual return | Mass.gov. <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/find-a-natural-gas-company-annual-return> (2024).
92. U.S. Energy Information Administration. *Annual Report of Natural and Supplemental Gas Supply and Disposition (EIA-176)*. <https://www.eia.gov/naturalgas/annual/> (2022).
93. Homeland Infrastructure Foundation-Level Data (HIFLD). *Natural Gas Local Distribution Company Service Territories*. <https://hifld-geoplatform.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/geoplatform::natural-gas-local-distribution-company-service-territories/explore?location=38.637396%2C-112.428215%2C3.68> (2019).
94. Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities. Find My Electric, Gas, and Water Company | Mass.gov. <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/find-my-electric-gas-and-water-company> (2024).
95. U.S. Census Bureau. Census.gov. <https://www.census.gov/en.html> (2024).
96. U.S. Energy Information Administration. *RECS 2020: Annual Household Site End-Use Consumption by Fuel in the United States—Totals*.
<https://www.eia.gov/consumption/residential/data/2020/c&e/pdf/ce4.1.pdf> (2024).
97. Brelsford, C. *et al.* A dataset of recorded electricity outages by United States county 2014–2022. *Sci. Data* **11**, 271 (2024).
98. Hazboun, S., Stelmach, G. & Cox, P. M. Who will 'go electric'? American homeowners'

perceptions of home energy sources and home electrification. *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.* **113**, 103575 (2024).

Acknowledgments

JGR was supported by the University of Wisconsin–Madison Office of Sustainability's Postdoctoral Research funding. MRE acknowledges support from a University of Wisconsin–Madison Vilas Associates Award.

We acknowledge Katherine Fisher and other members of HEET (Home Energy Efficiency Team) for their support with data curation about gas leaks and pipeline replacements in Massachusetts. We also acknowledge Mark Kleinginna from HEET for helpful discussions to support our natural gas utility economic modeling.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: M.R.E. and Z.M.; methodology: M.R.E., J.G.-R., and A.F.F.; formal analysis: J.G.-R., M.R.E., and A.F.F.; resources: M.R.E. and Z.M.; data curation: J.G.-R., and A.F.F.; writing – original draft: J.G.-R., M.R.E., and A.F.F.; writing – review and editing: all authors; visualization: J.G.-R.; supervision, M.R.E.; project administration: M.R.E.; funding acquisition: M.R.E.

Ethics declarations

Competing interests

The author(s) declare no competing interests.

Additional information

See accompanying Supplementary Information.

Supplementary figures




Figure S1. Sensitivity analysis for annual utility gas costs per customer with household heating transitions in all six major utilities in Massachusetts with 65% of customers leaving by 2050 (compare to Fig. 3 in the main paper). Numbers in parenthesis indicate residential customers in each utility. The blue line shows results for rising costs due electrification. The other lines show the increased costs with pipeline replacement programs using straight-line (green dotted line) and units-of-production (red dashed line) depreciation. The areas marked I and II show the time during (I) and after (II) the pipeline replacement program.




Figure S2. Sensitivity analysis for annual utility gas costs per customer with household heating transitions in all six major utilities in Massachusetts with 90% of customers leaving by 2050 (compare to Fig. 3 in the main paper). Numbers in parentheses indicate residential customers in each utility. The blue line shows results for rising costs due electrification. The other lines show the increased costs with pipeline replacement programs using straight-line (green dotted line) and units-of-production (red dashed line) depreciation. The areas marked I and II show the time during (I) and after (II) the pipeline replacement program.




Figure S3. Sensitivity analysis for annual utility gas costs per customer with household heating transitions in all six major utilities in Massachusetts with a 2% annual cost escalation rate (compare to Fig. 3 in the main paper). Numbers in parentheses indicate residential customers in each utility. The blue line shows results for rising costs due to electrification. The other lines show the increased costs with pipeline replacement programs using straight-line (green dotted line) and units-of-production (red dashed line) depreciation. The areas marked I and II show the time during (I) and after (II) the pipeline replacement program.




Figure S4. Energy burden distributions with natural gas phase down and with pipeline replacements in Massachusetts for a case where customers leave in a random order rather than ordered by income (compare to Fig. 4 in the main paper) in (a) 2039 and (b) 2050. Gray lines show the 2024 energy burden distribution.





Figure S5. (a) Sensitivity analysis for utility costs per customer with natural gas phase down and pipeline replacement in 2050 using the minimum, average, and maximum cost-per-mile of pipeline replaced in our national data search (see Methods for details). (b) Map of utility cost increases per utility territory including all utilities (compare to Fig. 5b in the main paper).







Figure S6. Energy burden distributions with natural gas phase down and pipeline replacement nationally. Distributions in 2039 for the cases when (a) gas customers leave utilities in order of high to low income and (b) when they leave in order of low to high income. Distributions in 2050 for the cases when (c) gas customers leave utilities from high to low income and (d) when they leave from low to high income. (Compare to Fig. 5c in the main text)

a



○ Bubble size represents number of residential customers

b



Increase in average energy burden

Figure S7. Maps of the percentage increase of energy burdens by 2050 when (a) low-income customers exit first and (b) vice versa (compare to Fig. 5d in the main paper), with utilities above the 95th percentile removed for better visualization. Gray zones in maps represent all gas utilities in the U.S. and violet zones represent the territories of the 50 utilities with leak-prone gas pipelines. Bubble size is proportional to the number of residential customers.




Figure S8. Relationship between miles of leak-prone pipelines as of 2022 according to Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) inventories¹, increase in costs per customer, increase in average energy burden, and number of residential customers (as of 2022) for national utilities, with utilities above the 95th percentile removed for visualization purposes. Each bubble represents one utility, and the bubble size is proportional to the number of residential customers.

¹ For more information see: <https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/data-and-statistics/pipeline-replacement/pipeline-replacement-background>

Supplementary tables

Table S1. Pipeline replacement cost results from our national utility search. References are to utility websites or press releases according to (see Methods for details). Additional utility data we use to model our national case is shown in Table S3.

Utility	State(s) serviced	Pipeline replacement cost (2024 USD/mile)	Reference
1	NY	-	One-off projects (no evidence of replacement program) ¹
2	CA	-	One-off projects (no evidence of replacement program) ²
3	OH	1,083,742	Confirmed active program ³
4	NJ	2,370,852	Confirmed active program ⁴
5	MA	-	Confirmed active program (missing cost data) ⁵
6	TX	-	Confirmed active program (missing cost data) ⁶
7	PA, WV	1,480,485	Confirmed active program ⁷
8	OH	-	One-off projects (no evidence of replacement program) ⁸
9	NY	-	Confirmed active program (missing cost data) ⁹
10	MI	-	One-off projects (no evidence of replacement program) ¹⁰
11	WV	-	No evidence of active program ¹¹
12	NY	-	Potential inaccuracy in mileage and/or cost data ¹²
13	IL	-	Potential inaccuracy in mileage and/or cost data ¹³
14	MD	-	Confirmed active program (missing cost data) ¹⁴
15	PA	-	One-off projects (no evidence of replacement program) ¹⁵
16	RI	-	No evidence of active program ¹⁶
17	PA	-	Confirmed active program (missing cost data) ¹⁷
18	OK	-	Potential inaccuracy in mileage and/or cost data ¹⁸
19	MD, PA, PA	4,370,718	Confirmed active program ¹⁹
20	PA	1,480,485	Confirmed active program ²⁰
21	CT	-	No evidence of active program ²¹
22	AL	-	No evidence of active program ²²
23	DC, MD, VA	-	Potential inaccuracy in mileage and/or cost data ²³
24	MA	-	Confirmed active program ²⁴

25	MA	-	Confirmed active program ²⁵
26	MI	769,231	Confirmed active program ²⁶
27	FL	-	With government funded project(s) ²⁷
28	AR, CO, IA, KS, NE, WY	-	One-off projects (no evidence of replacement program) ²⁸
29	KY	-	One-off projects (no evidence of replacement program) ²⁹
30	AR, OK	-	No evidence of active program ³⁰
31	CT	-	No evidence of active program ³¹
32	MO	-	One-off projects (no evidence of replacement program) ³²
33	KS, OK	-	No evidence of active program ³³
34	CT	-	One-off projects (no evidence of replacement program) ³⁴
35	NJ, NJ, PA	-	No evidence of active program ³⁵
36	CO, KS	-	One-off projects (no evidence of replacement program) ³⁶
37	VA	-	With government funded project(s) ³⁷
38	NE	-	Confirmed active program (missing cost data) ³⁸
39	TX	-	No evidence of active program ³⁹
40	IN	-	Confirmed active program (missing cost data) ⁴⁰
41	VA, VA	-	No evidence of active program ⁴¹
42	IN	788,532	Confirmed active program ⁴²
43	NY	-	No evidence of active program ⁴³
44	OH	-	No evidence of active program ⁴⁴
45	MA	-	Confirmed active program ⁴⁵
46	NY	-	No evidence of active program ⁴⁶
47	KS	-	With government funded project(s) ⁴⁷
48	IN	788,532	Confirmed active program ⁴⁸
49	MN	-	No evidence of active program ⁴⁹
50	CA	-	No evidence of active program ⁵⁰

¹<https://www.nationalgridus.com/Long-Island-NY-Home/Natural-Gas-Safety/natural-gas-main-replacement>

²<https://www.socalgas.com/sustainability/pipeline-and-storage-safety/pipeline-replacement>

³<https://news.dominionenergy.com/2016-09-14-PUCO-Approves-Expansion-of-Dominion-East-Ohios-Pipeline-Infrastructure-Replacement-Program-Authorizes-Increase-in-Annual-Program-Investment-to-200-Million-by-2018>

⁴<https://nj.pseg.com/newsroom/newsrelease376>

⁵<https://www.nationalgridus.com/News/2023/11/National-Grid-Submits-Annual-Filing-for-Approval-of-Gas-Safety-Adjustment-Factors/#:~:text=Targeted%20electrification%20is%20a%20pillar,necessary%20to%20the%20electric%20infrastructure.>

⁶https://s201.q4cdn.com/158157484/files/doc_presentation/2023/12/Aanlyst-Update-December-2023.pdf

⁷<https://www.peoples-gas.com/news/archive/2018/07/replacing-pipelines.php>

⁸<https://www.columbiagasohio.com/services/work-in-your-neighborhood/replacement-projects>

⁹<https://investor.conedison.com/node/37026/pdf>

¹⁰https://www.dteenergy.com/us/en/quicklinks/search/gas_map.html

¹¹Unavailable website

¹²<https://www.nationalfuel.com/corporate/safety/>

¹³<https://www.peoplesgasdelivery.com/services/main-replacement#:~:text=In%20total%2C%20our%20crews%20will,thawing%20cycles%20of%20Chicago's%20weather.>

¹⁴<https://www.bge.com/smart-energy/innovation-technology/reliability-improvements/natural-gas-investments>

¹⁵<https://www.columbiagaspa.com/services/work-in-your-neighborhood/pipeline-replacement-projects>

¹⁶<https://rhodeislandcurrent.com/2023/04/03/puc-approves-new-rhode-island-energy-capital-infrastructure-rehab-plan/>

¹⁷<https://www.puc.pa.gov/press-release/2015/puc-approves-modified-long-term-infrastructure-improvement-plan-for-peco-gas-allowing-faster-replacement-of-at-risk-mains>

¹⁸https://s23.q4cdn.com/945657003/files/doc_financials/2024/sr/06/2024-sustainability-report-in-spreads-for-web-final.pdf

¹⁹<https://ugi.reportablenews.com/pr/ugi-utilities-announces-2023-infrastructure-replacement-and-betterment-projects>

²⁰<https://www.peoples-gas.com/news/archive/2018/07/replacing-pipelines.php>

²¹Unavailable website

²²Unavailable website

²³<https://www.washingtongas.com/-/media/f27bd5f1492b49da8234d123a9d6fd69.pdf>

²⁴<https://www.mass.gov/info-details/gseps-pursuant-to-2014-gas-leaks-act>

²⁵<https://www.mass.gov/info-details/gseps-pursuant-to-2014-gas-leaks-act>

²⁶<https://www.consumersenergy.com/about-us/natural-gas-operations/pipeline-upgrade>

²⁷<https://www.pensacolaenergy.com/community/news#:~:text=Pensacola%20Energy%20was%20awarded%20%2410,of%20Pensacola%20and%20Escambia%20County.>

²⁸<https://www.blackhillsenergy.com/AuburnNE>

²⁹<https://www.columbiagasky.com/services/work-in-your-neighborhood/pipeline-replacement-projects>

³⁰Unavailable website

³¹Unavailable website

³²<https://www.spireenergy.com/upgrades>

³³Unavailable website

³⁴<https://www.eversource.com/content/residential/safety/natural-gas-safety/system-management-maintenance/pipeline-integrity>

³⁵Unavailable website

³⁶<https://www.atmosenergy.com/pipeline-projects/colorado-service-territory/>

³⁷<https://www.worldpipelines.com/regulations-and-standards/18062024/biden-harris-administration-announces-us200-million-in-grants-to-fix-ageing-natural-gas-pipes/>

³⁸<https://www.mudomaha.com/news/infrastructure-replacement-program-2023-progress-report/>

³⁹Unavailable website

⁴⁰https://www.in.gov/oucc/natural-gas/key-cases-by-utility/nipsco-gas-infrastructure-plans/#2020_2025_Plan

⁴¹Unavailable website

⁴²<https://wibc.com/360312/centerpoint-energy-continues-statewide-gas-pipeline-replacement-project#:~:text=CenterPoint%20Energy's%20multi%2Dyear%20natural,wear%20and%20tear%20as%20quickly.>

⁴³Unavailable website

⁴⁴Unavailable website

⁴⁵<https://massachusetts.libertyutilities.com/blackstone/libertys-infrastructure-updates-continue-throughout-spring-and-summer.html>

⁴⁶Unavailable website

⁴⁷<https://www.mwenergy.com/news/view/midwest-energy-awarded-8.6-million-in-grants-for-natural-gas-pipeline-replacement-equipment>

⁴⁸<https://wibc.com/360312/centerpoint-energy-continues-statewide-gas-pipeline-replacement-project#:~:text=CenterPoint%20Energy's%20multi%2Dyear%20natural,wear%20and%20tear%20as%20quickly.>

⁴⁹Unavailable website

⁵⁰Unavailable website

Table S2. Utility data for the Massachusetts case. Residential customer counts are taken from annual utility reports.¹ Pipeline replacement costs are derived from HEET data extraction of submitted replacement plans for 2024.² Total leak-prone pipeline miles are taken from Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA) accessed November 1, 2024.³

Item	Utility 1	Utility 2	Utility 3	Utility 4	Utility 5	Utility 6
Residential customers	894,065	304,231	276,978	56,263	35,372	14,749
2024 replacement cost (MMUSD)	225.115	97.799	128.658	20.582	5.243	40.370
2024 pipeline replacements (miles)	67.074	48.488	61.689	13.108	2.453	20.787
2024 cost per mile (MMUSD)	3.356	2.017	2.086	1.570	2.138	1.942
Leak-prone pipelines (miles)	2093	443	364	76	42	30

Table S3. Estimates of pipeline replacement costs for utilities across the U.S. Utility ID, state(s) serviced, and leak-prone miles are taken from PHMSA accessed November 1, 2024. Residential customer counts are extracted from the Energy Information Administration (EIA) form 176. Total replacement costs are calculated using the average cost-per-mile across our national data search and Massachusetts data (1.98 MMUSD, see Figure S5).

Utility	State(s) serviced	Residential customers	Leak-prone pipelines (miles)	Total replacement costs (MMUSD)	Replacement cost per customer (USD)
1	NY	1,710,691	3,638	7,209	4,214
2	CA	5,711,670	3,369	6,675	1,169
3	OH	1,129,195	3,313	6,564	5,813
4	NJ	1,728,858	2,878	5,702	3,298
5	MA	877,015	2,201	4,361	4,972
6	TX	1,923,404	2,081	4,124	2,144
7	PA, WV	597,759	1,817	3,601	6,024
8	OH	1,376,619	1,564	3,098	2,250
9	NY	931,668	1,502	2,976	3,194
10	MI	1,225,639	1,452	2,876	2,347
11	WV	195,208	1,343	2,661	13,631
12	NY	505,863	1,180	2,339	4,624
13	IL	828,384	980	1,941	2,343
14	MD	655,373	945	1,872	2,856
15	PA	407,754	937	1,856	4,552
16	RI	247,508	731	1,448	5,851
17	PA	502,944	692	1,372	2,727
18	OK	834,915	677	1,342	1,607
19	MD, PA, PA	617,571	661	1,310	2,121
20	PA	58,603	643	1,274	21,732
21	CT	188,240	636	1,260	6,693
22	AL	79,483	590	1,168	14,700
23	DC, MD, VA	1,157,171	566	1,122	970
24	MA	301,577	482	956	3,169
25	MA	274,507	412	816	2,974

26	MI	1,679,546	351	696	415
27	FL	43,627	326	645	14,792
28	AR, CO, IA, KS, NE, WY	815,456	317	627	769
29	KY	123,979	292	579	4,670
30	AR, OK	50,728	269	533	10,504
31	CT	170,278	258	511	3,002
32	MO	1,125,735	252	499	443
33	KS, OK	591,987	241	477	805
34	CT	221,537	225	446	2,012
35	NJ, NJ, PA	283,501	186	368	1,296
36	CO, KS	244,825	133	263	1,074
37	VA	110,884	131	259	2,334
38	NE	223,456	128	253	1,132
39	TX	3,234	118	235	72,564
40	IN	786,344	106	210	267
41	VA, VA	263,114	104	206	784
42	IN	582,580	101	200	344
43	NY	128,682	90	179	1,390
44	OH	303,887	83	164	541
45	MA	56,197	82	162	2,888
46	NY	74,451	82	162	2,180
47	KS	32,986	80	159	4,809
48	IN	103,898	57	113	1,092
49	MN	829,979	53	104	126
50	CA	4,324,434	52	103	24

Table S4. Energy burden impacts in Massachusetts with natural gas phasedown and pipeline replacement in 2024, 2039, and 2050. The total number of households is 1,581,658.

Variable	High income leaves first	Low income leaves first	Random customer exit
Average energy burden (2024)	5.68%	5.68%	5.68%
Average energy burden with phasedown (2039)	6.65%	5.86%	6.23%
Average energy burden with replacements (2039)	7.02%	5.93%	6.45%
Average energy burden with phasedown (2050)	10.35%	7.81%	9.63%
Average energy burden with replacements (2050)	11.46%	8.34%	10.56%
Energy burdened households (2024)	411,214	411,214	411,214
Energy burdened households with phasedown (2039)	495,021	411,985	452,068
Energy burdened households with replacements (2039)	521,280	412,657	465,802
Energy burdened households with phasedown (2050)	671,822	646,569	619,611
Energy burdened households with replacements (2050)	711,972	685,873	652,781
% energy burdened households (2024)	26.00%	26.00%	26.00%
% of energy burdened households with phasedown (2039)	31.30%	26.05%	28.58%
% of energy burdened households with replacements (2039)	32.96%	26.09%	29.45%
% of energy burdened households with phasedown (2050)	42.48%	40.88%	39.17%
% of energy burdened households with replacements (2050)	45.01%	43.36%	41.27%

Table S5. Energy burden impacts for the top 50 utilities with leak-prone infrastructure in the U.S. with natural gas phasedown and pipeline replacement. The number of households is 37,238,689.

Variable	High income leaves first	Low income leaves first	Random customer exit
Average energy burden (2024)	4.74%	4.74%	4.74%
Average energy burden with phasedown (2039)	5.34%	4.85%	5.09%
Average energy burden with replacements (2039)	5.52%	4.88%	5.19%
Average energy burden with phasedown (2050)	7.63%	6.01%	7.17%
Average energy burden with replacements (2050)	8.17%	6.23%	7.61%
Energy burdened households (2024)	7,700,961	7,700,961	7,700,961
Energy burdened households with phasedown (2039)	8,978,686	7,718,187	8,330,605
Energy burdened households with replacements (2039)	9,296,276	7,728,085	8,494,290
Energy burdened households with phasedown (2050)	12,533,606	11,639,978	11,553,713
Energy burdened households with replacements (2050)	13,142,684	12,237,617	12,071,610
% energy burdened households (2024)	20.68%	20.68%	20.68%
% of energy burdened households with phasedown (2039)	24.11%	20.72%	22.37%
% of energy burdened households with replacements (2039)	24.96%	20.75%	22.81%
% of energy burdened households with phasedown (2050)	33.65%	31.25%	31.02%
% of energy burdened households with replacements (2050)	35.29%	32.86%	32.41%

Supplementary notes

Note S1. Note that the different sources provide different estimates of total pipeline replacements. For example, in our Massachusetts case, HEET data (collected from utility GSEP reports) estimates a total of 173 miles of pipelines were planned to be replaced in 2023, while PHMSA data indicates that 211 miles of leak-prone pipelines were replaced between 2022 and 2023.

References

1. Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities. Find a natural gas company annual return | Mass.gov. <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/find-a-natural-gas-company-annual-return> (2024).
2. Home Energy Efficiency Team (HEET). Visualizing the Gas System Enhancement Program (GSEP). <https://heet.org/gsep/> (2024).
3. Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration (PHMSA). Pipeline Replacement Background. <https://www.phmsa.dot.gov/data-and-statistics/pipeline-replacement/pipeline-replacement-background> (2024).