COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION

AT RICHMOND, JUNE 10, 2025

State Corporation Commission Document Control Center 6/10/25 – 2:27 PM

APPLICATION OF

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY

CASE NO. PUR-2024-00170

For approval and certification of electric transmission facilities: 230 kV Centreport Loop and Centreport Substation

FINAL ORDER

On September 19, 2024, Virginia Electric and Power Company ("Dominion" or the "Company") filed with the State Corporation Commission ("Commission") an application ("Application") for approval and certification of electric transmission facilities in Stafford County, Virginia. Dominion filed its Application pursuant to § 56-46.1 of the Code of Virginia ("Code"), and the Utility Facilities Act, Code § 56-265.1 et seq.

To serve a data center customer ("Customer"), the Company proposed to complete the following (collectively, the "Project"):²

(1) Construct a new double circuit overhead 230 kilovolt ("kV") transmission line on new right-of-way by cutting the Company's existing 230 kV Aquia Harbour-Cranes Corner Line #2104 at Structure #2104/5456, resulting in (i) 230 kV Centreport-Cranes Corner Line #2379 and (ii) 230 kV Centreport-Spartan Line #2104 ("Centreport Loop"). From the cut-in location on existing Line #2104, the Centreport Loop will extend approximately 2.5 miles to the proposed new 230-34.5 kV Centreport Substation located in Stafford County, Virginia. While the cut-in location is within existing right-of-way, the proposed Centreport Loop will be constructed on new 100-foot-wide right-of-way. The Centreport Loop will be supported primarily by double circuit weathering steel monopoles and will utilize three-phase twin-

¹ Ex. 2 (Application) at 1, 2. On March 26, 2025, Dominion filed an errata that included various corrections to its Application.

² Application at 2-3.

bundled 768.2 Aluminum Conductor Steel Supported/Trapezoidal Wire/High Strength type conductor with a summer transfer capability of 1,573 MVA.

(2) Construct a new 230-34.5 kV substation in Stafford County, Virginia, on property to be obtained by the Company ("Centreport Substation").

Additionally, the Company sought the grant of a certificate of public convenience and necessity ("CPCN") for the Project under the Utility Facilities Act, Code § 56-265.1 *et seq*.

Dominion noted that while the Project requires a 100-foot-wide new right-of-way, as noted in its Appendix, the Company is actually seeking to acquire a 160-foot-wide right-of-way to accommodate future projects. The Company stated that it would not condemn for permanent right-of-way at this time any more than the 100-foot area needed for the Project, but asked that the Commission not prohibit it from voluntarily obtaining the whole 160-foot area now and having it available for the future.³

In the Application, Dominion asserted that the proposed Project is necessary to provide requested service to the Customer's new data center in Stafford County, Virginia; maintain reliable electric service for overall load growth in the area; and comply with mandatory North American Electric Reliability Corporation Reliability Standards for the overall load growth in the Stafford County Load Area and the Company's mandatory planning criteria. Specifically, Dominion stated that the Company's Cranes Corner and Garrisonville Substations are the closest substations to the Customer's data center development, but they do not possess the adequate capacity to serve the Customer's total projected load identified in the Delivery Point

³ Id. at 2-3, n.3.

⁴ *Id*.

request.⁵ As a result, connecting the Customer's projected load to either the Cranes Corner Substation or the Garrisonville Substation would result in substation transformer overloads.⁶

Dominion identified an approximately 2.5-mile overhead proposed route for the Centreport Loop ("Route 2" or "Proposed Route")⁷. The Company stated that Route 2 was selected as the Proposed Route as it avoids or reasonably minimizes adverse impact to the greatest extent reasonably practicable on the scenic assets, historic and cultural resources, and environment of the area concerned.⁸

The Company stated that the desired in-service date for the proposed Project is

July 1, 2027. The Company represented that the estimated conceptual cost of the proposed

Project utilizing the Proposed Route is approximately \$50.5 million (in 2024 dollars), which
includes approximately \$34.1 million for transmission-related work and approximately \$16.4
million for substation-related work. 10

On October 31, 2024, the Commission issued an Order for Notice and Hearing ("Procedural Order") that, among other things, docketed the Application; directed the Company to provide notice of its Application; provided any interested person an opportunity to file comments on the Application or to participate in the case as a respondent by filing a notice of participation; scheduled a hearing for the receipt of testimony from public witnesses on the

⁵ *Id*. at 4.

⁶ *Id*.

⁷ *Id*.

⁸ *Id*.

⁹ Id. at 5.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 7.

Company's Application; scheduled a public evidentiary hearing to receive the testimony and evidence of the Company, any respondents, and the Staff of the Commission ("Staff"); and appointed a Hearing Examiner to conduct all further proceedings in this matter on behalf of the Commission, including filing a final report.

Staff requested that the Department of Environmental Quality ("DEQ") coordinate an environmental review of the proposed Project by the appropriate agencies and provide a report.¹¹ On December 12, 2024, DEQ filed its report on Dominion's Application ("DEQ Report"), which includes the Wetland Impact Consultation provided by DEQ's Office of Wetlands and Stream Protection.

On December 4, 2024, Dominion filed the proof of notice required in the Procedural Order. On March 12, 2025, Staff filed testimony on the Company's Application. Dominion filed rebuttal testimony on March 26, 2025. No notices of participation were filed in this docket, and the Commission received one public comment on Dominion's Application.

The hearing in this matter was convened as scheduled on April 16, 2025, with counsel for Dominion and Staff in attendance. No public witnesses signed up to testify.¹³

On April 24, 2025, the Chief Hearing Examiner issued the Report of D. Mathias Roussy, Jr., Hearing Examiner ("Report"). In the Report, the Chief Hearing Examiner found in part, "[b]ased on applicable law and the record in this proceeding," that:

¹¹ Letter from Andrew F. Major, State Corporation Commission, dated October 7, 2024, to David L. Davis. Department of Environmental Quality, filed in Case No. PUR-2024-00170; Letter from Andrew F. Major, State Corporation Commission, dated October 7, 2024, to Bettina Rayfield, Department of Environmental Quality, filed in Case No. PUR-2024-00170.

¹² Errata to Staff's testimony was filed on March 25, 2025.

¹³ Report at 2.

- (1) The proposed Project is needed to ensure reliable electric service to a planned data center development in Stafford County while also maintaining transmission system reliability in compliance with mandatory federal reliability standards;
- (2) The estimated cost of the Project ranges between \$46.4 million and \$57.0 million, depending on the route selected;
- (3) Existing rights-of-way cannot adequately serve the identified need for the Project, regardless of the route;
- (4) Proposed Route 2's more extensive collocation with planned and active development makes it preferable to alternative Routes 3 and 4. Proposed Route 2's lower cost, shorter length, proximity to fewer dwellings, and lesser fragmentation of forested habitat make it preferable to alternative Route 1;
- (5) Proposed Route 2 would avoid or reasonably minimize adverse impact, to the greatest extent reasonably practicable, on the scenic assets, historic and cultural resources recorded with [the Department of Historic Resources], cultural resources identified by federally recognized Tribal Nations in the Commonwealth, and environment of the area concerned;
- (6) The unopposed recommendations in the DEQ Report should be adopted by the Commission as conditions of approval;
- (7) Commission precedent supports declining to adopt [the Department of Conservation and Recreation Division of Natural Heritage's ("DCR-DNH")] recommendations for Dominion to: (i) develop an invasive species management plan; and (ii) implement right-of-way restoration and maintenance practices different than the Company's current practices;
- (8) The ecological core impacts of the Project, when considered and balanced with other environmental impacts and routing constraints, do not support DCR-DNH's recommendation to avoid such cores or locate the Project route along the edge of such cores;
- (9) Dominion should comply with the Endangered Species Act through the permitting process for the route approved by the Commission, rather than conducting small whorled pogonia surveys for all four routes presented by the Application;

- (10) Two petroleum release sites identified by DEQ had complaints that were closed in 1994 and 2017 and are not near the proposed Route 2;
- (11) Dominion should abide by all legal requirements for the management of materials during transport and while on the Project site;
- (12) The Project would support economic development;
- (13) Dominion reasonably considered the requirements of the Virginia Environmental Justice Act and the proposed Project does not appear to adversely impact any goals established by the Virginia Environmental Justice Act;
- (14) While Dominion's proposed in-service window approach does not appear unreasonable and has been adopted in two recent applicable Commission orders, the record could also support the Commission's typical approach of synchronizing the in-service and sunset dates; [and]
- (15) The Commission should not prohibit Dominion from voluntarily obtaining a 160-foot-wide right-of-way, subject to the condition that Dominion would not condemn for permanent right-of-way greater than the 100-foot width needed for the Project.¹⁴

On May 8, 2025, Staff and Dominion filed responses to the Report, in which both entities agreed with the Chief Hearing Examiner's findings and recommendations. 15

NOW THE COMMISSION, upon consideration of this matter, is of the opinion and finds as follows:¹⁶

¹⁵ Staff Response at 1; Dominion Response at 4.

¹⁴ Report at 32-33.

¹⁶ The Commission has fully considered the evidence and arguments in the record. *See also Board of Supervisors of Loudoun County v. State Corp. Comm'n*, 292 Va. 444, 454 n.10 (2016) ("We note that even in the absence of this representation by the Commission, pursuant to our governing standard of review, the Commission's decision comes to us with a presumption that it considered all of the evidence of record.") (citation omitted).

Hearing Examiner's Report

After analyzing the law and weighing the evidence – and providing a thorough and detailed analysis thereof – the Chief Hearing Examiner recommended that the Commission enter an order that: ¹⁷

- (1) ADOPTS the findings in [the] Report;
- (2) **AUTHORIZES** Dominion to construct and operate the Project, using Route 2, conditioned on compliance with the uncontested DEQ recommendations;
- (3) **ISSUES** an appropriate CPCN for the Project;
- (4) *DIRECTS* that the Project approved herein must be completed and in service by July 1, 2027, and approves a CPCN sunset date of July 1, 2028, for the Project. No later than 90 days before the CPCN sunset date approved herein, for good cause shown, the Company is granted leave to apply and provide the basis for any extension requested; or, alternatively, *DIRECTS* that the Project approved herein must be completed and in service by July 1, 2027, provided, however, that Dominion is granted leave to apply for an extension for good cause shown; [and]
- (5) **DISMISSES** this case from the Commission's docket of active cases.

Upon consideration of this matter, the Commission concludes that the Chief Hearing Examiner's findings and recommendations are supported by law and evidence, have a rational basis, and should be adopted. The Commission finds that the public convenience and necessity requires the construction of the Project and that a CPCN authorizing the Project should be issued subject to the recommended findings and conditions contained in the Report.

-

¹⁷ Report at 33-34.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) The Commission adopts the Chief Hearing Examiner's findings and recommendations.
 - (2) The Chief Hearing Examiner's recommendations, as set forth herein, are ordered.
- (3) Dominion is authorized to construct and operate the Project as proposed in its Application, identified in the Report and approved herein.
- (4) Pursuant to §§ 56-46.1, 56-265.2, and related provisions of Title 56 of the Code, the Company's request for approval of the necessary CPCN to construct and operate the Project is granted as provided for herein.
- (5) Pursuant to the Utility Facilities Act, § 56-265.1 *et seq.* of the Code, the Commission issues the following CPCN to Dominion:

Certificate No. ET-DEV-KGE/STA-2025-C, which authorizes Virginia Electric and Power Company under the Utility Facilities Act to operate certificated transmission lines and facilities in the Counties of King George and Stafford, all as shown on the map attached to the certificate, and to construct and operate facilities as authorized in Case No. PUR-2024-00170, cancels Certificate No. ET-DEV-KGE/STA-2025-B, issued to Virginia Electric and Power Company in Case No. PUR-2024-00142 on March 5, 2025.

- (6) Within thirty (30) days from the date of this Final Order, the Company shall provide to the Commission's Division of Public Utility Regulation electronic maps for the foregoing Certificate Number that show the routing of the transmission lines approved herein. Maps shall be submitted to Michael Cizenski, Deputy Director, Division of Public Utility Regulation, mike.cizenski@scc.virginia.gov.
- (7) Upon receiving the maps directed in Ordering Paragraph (6), the Commission's Division of Public Utility Regulation forthwith shall provide the Company copies of the CPCN issued in Ordering Paragraph (5) with the maps attached.

- (8) The Project approved herein must be constructed and in service by July 1, 2027. The Commission approves a CPCN sunset date of July 1, 2028, for the Project. No later than ninety (90) days before the CPCN sunset date approved herein, for good cause shown, the Company is granted leave to apply and to provide the basis for any extension requested.
 - (9) This case is dismissed.

A COPY hereof shall be sent electronically by the Clerk of the Commission to all persons on the official Service List in this matter. The Service List is available from the Clerk of the Commission.