

STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION

*State Corporation Commission*

AT RICHMOND, SEPTEMBER 26, 2025

*Document Control Center**09/26/25 - 11:57 AM*

## APPLICATION OF

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY

CASE NO. PUR-2024-00221

For approval and certification of electric transmission  
facilities: Carmel Church and Ruther Glen  
230 kV Transmission Line Projects

FINAL ORDER

On December 12, 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 Caroline County, Virginia.<sup>1</sup> To provide service requested by Rappahannock Electric Cooperative (“REC”) for REC to provide service to its two new load additions in Caroline County, the Company proposed to complete the following (collectively, the “Project”):<sup>2</sup>

- (1) Ruther Glen Loop: Cut the Company’s existing 230 kilovolt (“kV”) Line #256 (Ladysmith CT – Four Rivers) near St. John’s Substation between existing structures #256/180 and #256/181 and construct a new double circuit overhead 230 kV line approximately 4.0 miles in and out of a proposed new switching station, Ruther Glen Switching Station, resulting in (i) 230 kV Ladysmith CT – Ruther Glen Line #256 and (ii) 230 kV Ruther Glen – Carmel Church Line #2410 (the “Ruther Glen Loop”). From the proposed cut-in location within existing right-of-way, Lines #256 and #2410 will extend approximately 4.0 miles within a new 160-foot-wide right-of-way, supported by weathering steel double circuit monopoles and utilizing three-phase twin-bundled 768.2 Aluminum Conductor Steel Supported/Trapezoidal Wire/High Strength (“ACSS/TW/HS”) conductor with a summer transfer capability of 1,573 megavolt amperes (“MVA”).

---

<sup>1</sup> Ex. 2 (Application) at 1, 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 2-3.

- (2) Ruther Glen Switching Station: Construct a new 230 kV switching station in Caroline County, Virginia on property owned by the customer (the “Ruther Glen Switching Station”).<sup>3</sup>
- (3) Carmel Church Loop: From the proposed Ruther Glen Switching Station, extend a new double circuit overhead 230 kV transmission line approximately 2.5 miles in and out of the proposed new switching station, Carmel Church Switching Station, resulting in (i) 230 kV Ruther Glen – Carmel Church Line #2410 and (ii) 230 kV Carmel Church – Four Rivers Line #2422 (the “Carmel Church Loop”). As proposed, existing 230 kV Ladysmith CT – Four Rivers Line #256 will be cut at Structure #256/227, and to effectuate the cut-in location, the Company will remove one single circuit H-frame tangent structure and install one two-pole double dead-end structure within the existing right-of-way. From the proposed cut-in location within existing right-of-way, Lines #2410 and #2422 will extend approximately 2.5 miles within a new predominately 100-foot-wide right-of-way, supported by weathering steel double circuit monopoles and utilizing three-phase twin-bundled 768.2 ACSS/TW/HS conductor with a summer transfer capability of 1,573 MVA.
- (4) Carmel Church Switching Station: Construct a new 230 kV switching station in Caroline County, Virginia on property owned by the customer (the “Carmel Church Switching Station”).<sup>4</sup>

In the Application, Dominion asserted that the proposed Project is necessary to assure that the Company can provide requested service to REC for REC to provide service to two new data center developments in Caroline County, Virginia; to maintain reliable service for the overall growth in the Project area; and to comply with mandatory North American Electric Reliability Corporation Reliability Standards.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> The Ruther Glen Loop and the Ruther Glen Switching Station are collectively referred to as the “Ruther Glen Project.” *Id.* at 3.

<sup>4</sup> The Carmel Church Loop and the Carmel Church Switching Station are collectively referred to as the “Carmel Church Project.” *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

In its Application, the Company identified an approximately 4.0 mile overhead proposed route for the Ruther Glen Loop (“Ruther Glen Proposed Route” or “Ruther Glen Route 5”), as well as an approximately 3.7 mile overhead alternative route, Ruther Glen Alternative Route 4, and an approximately 3.9 mile overhead alternative route, Ruther Glen Alternative Route 6.<sup>6</sup> Dominion stated that the Company selected the Ruther Glen 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 the environment of the area concerned.<sup>7</sup> The Company further stated that the Ruther Glen Proposed Route would be collocated for a total of 1.3 miles with an existing 115 kV REC line that crosses the Ruther Glen delivery point site.<sup>8</sup>

In its Application, the Company identified an approximately 2.5 mile overhead proposed route for the Carmel Church Loop (“Carmel Church Proposed Route” or “Carmel Church Route 1”) and an approximately 2.8 mile overhead alternative route, Carmel Church Alternative Route 2.<sup>9</sup> Dominion stated that the Company chose the Carmel Church 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.<sup>10</sup> The Company further stated that the Carmel Church Proposed Route does not collocate with any existing utility easements or roadways.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Ex. 2 (Application) at 4.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* See also Ex. 2 (Application) Appendix at 3-4 and 65.

<sup>9</sup> Ex. 2 (Application) at 4.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* at 5.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

The Company stated that the desired in-service target date for the proposed Project is April 1, 2027.<sup>12</sup> The Company represented that the total estimated conceptual cost of the Ruther Glen Project as proposed is approximately \$44.7 million, which includes approximately \$31.4 million for transmission-related work and approximately \$13.3 million for substation-related work (2024 dollars).<sup>13</sup> Dominion represented that the total estimated conceptual cost of the Carmel Church Project as proposed is approximately \$35.9 million, which includes approximately \$22.9 million for transmission-related work and approximately \$13.0 million for substation-related work (2024 dollars).<sup>14</sup>

On January 24, 2025, the Commission issued an Order for Notice and Hearing, which, among other things: docketed the Company's Application; established a procedural schedule; directed Dominion to provide notice of its Application to interested persons and the public; scheduled a public witness hearing and an evidentiary hearing for the purpose of receiving testimony and evidence on the Application; provided interested persons an opportunity to file comments on the Application or participate as respondents; directed the Commission's Staff ("Staff") to investigate the Application and file testimony and exhibits containing its findings and recommendations; and appointed a Hearing Examiner to conduct all further proceedings in this matter on behalf of the Commission and file 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

---

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

<sup>13</sup> Ex. 2 (Application) at 6.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.*

on the review.<sup>15</sup> On February 18, 2025, 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.

The Commission received timely notices of participation from the following respondents: Matthew and Julia Yandura; Edward M. Gold, Jr. and Hunter W. Rothwell, Jr; and R207, LLC (“R207”). On April 24, 2025, Mr. Gold filed his testimony. On April 25, 2025, Matthew Yandura and Julia Yandura filed their testimony separately. Staff filed testimony on May 7, 2025. Dominion filed rebuttal testimony on May 21, 2025. The Commission received six public comments on Dominion’s Application.

The Chief Hearing Examiner convened a public evidentiary hearing in the Commission’s courtroom on June 11, 2025, to receive testimony and evidence offered on the Application. No public witness signed up to testify.<sup>16</sup> Post-hearing briefs were filed, pursuant to the direction of the Chief Hearing Examiner,<sup>17</sup> on July 2, 2025, by Julia Yandura, Matthew Yandura, Dominion, and Staff. R207 filed a letter in lieu of a post-hearing brief on July 2, 2025. Edward Gold, Jr. filed a post-hearing brief on July 3, 2025.

On July 11, 2025, the Chief Hearing Examiner issued the Report of D. Mathias Roussy, Jr., Hearing Examiner (“Report”). In the Report, the Hearing Examiner made the following findings:<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Letter from Andrew F. Major, State Corporation Commission, dated December 16, 2024, to David L. Davis, Department of Environmental Quality, filed in Case No. PUR-2024-00221; Letter from Andrew F. Major, State Corporation Commission, dated December 16, 2024, to Bettina Rayfield, Department of Environmental Quality, filed in Case No. PUR-2024-00221.

<sup>16</sup> Tr. 11-12.

<sup>17</sup> Tr. 277, 279.

<sup>18</sup> Report at 71-72.

*Ruther Glen Project*

- (1) The proposed Ruther Glen Project is needed to ensure reliable transmission service to Rappahannock Electric Cooperative, so the Cooperative may, in turn, reliably serve its retail customer developing a data center, while also maintaining the reliability of Dominion's transmission system;
- (2) To address this identified need, Dominion's focus on a double-circuit transmission line project originating at its closest existing 230 kV transmission line, Line #256, is supported by the record;
- (3) Dominion's estimated cost of the Ruther Glen Project ranges between \$42.2 million and \$46.2 million, depending on the route or route variation;
- (4) Existing rights-of-way cannot adequately serve the identified need for the Ruther Glen Project;
- (5) Route 6 of the Ruther Glen Loop would avoid or reasonably minimize adverse impact to the greatest extent reasonably practicable on the scenic assets, historic and cultural resources recorded with DHR,<sup>19</sup> cultural resources identified by federally recognized Tribal Nations in the Commonwealth, and environment of the area concerned. However, the Commission could weigh the record evidence differently and find it instead supports approval of Route 4 or Route 5 (as proposed by the Application, or one of the variations);
- (6) A 100-foot-wide right-of-way is needed for the Ruther Glen Loop. However, Dominion should not be prohibited from voluntarily obtaining additional right-of-way width along the approved route with the understanding that Dominion cannot condemn more than the proposed right-of-way needed for the Ruther Glen Loop;
- (7) The unopposed recommendations in the DEQ Report and VDH-ODW's<sup>20</sup> recommendation on material management should be adopted by the Commission as conditions of approval of the Ruther Glen Project (and the Carmel Church Project);
- (8) Dominion should inform DEQ of a mapping discrepancy the Company identified in this case so that the relevant petroleum release site can be accurately mapped;

---

<sup>19</sup> Department of Historic Resources.

<sup>20</sup> Virginia Department of Health's Office of Drinking Water.

- (9) The Ruther Glen Project does not appear to adversely impact any goals established by the Virginia Environmental Justice Act;<sup>21</sup>
- (10) The Ruther Glen Project would support economic development; and
- (11) Dominion's request for a desired in-service target date of April 1, 2027, and an authorization sunset date of April 1, 2028, for energization of the Ruther Glen Project (and the Carmel Church Project) is not unreasonable.

***Carmel Church Project***

- (1) The proposed Carmel Church Project is needed to ensure reliable transmission service to Rappahannock Electric Cooperative, so the Cooperative may, in turn, reliably serve its retail customer developing a data center, while also maintaining the reliability of Dominion's transmission system;
- (2) Dominion's estimated cost of the Carmel Church Project ranges between \$35.9 million and \$39.4 million, depending on the route or route variation;
- (3) Existing rights-of-way cannot adequately serve the identified need for the Carmel Church Project;
- (4) Modified Route 1 of the Carmel Church Loop<sup>22</sup> would avoid or reasonably minimize adverse impact to the greatest extent reasonably practicable on the scenic assets, historic and cultural resources recorded with DHR, cultural resources identified by federally recognized Tribal Nations in the Commonwealth, and environment of the area concerned. However, the Commission could weigh the record evidence differently and find it instead supports approval of Route 2 or Route 1 as proposed by the Application;
- (5) The unopposed recommendations in the DEQ Report and VDH-ODW's recommendation on material management should be adopted by the Commission as conditions of approval of the Carmel Church Project (and the Ruther Glen Project);
- (6) The Carmel Church Project does not appear to adversely impact any goals established by the Virginia Environmental Justice Act;
- (7) The Carmel Church Project would support economic development; and

---

<sup>21</sup> Code of Virginia ("Code") § 2.2-234.

<sup>22</sup> Company Witness Tippet presented a proposed modification to a segment of the Carmel Church Proposed Route that crosses property owned by Respondent R207, which replaces the alignment of the Carmel Church Proposed Route as presented in the Application. See Report at 34 (*citing* Ex. 21 (Tippet Rebuttal) at 8-10).

- (8) Dominion's request for a desired in-service target date of April 1, 2027, and an authorization sunset date of April 1, 2028, for energization of the Carmel Church Project (and the Ruther Glen Project) is not unreasonable.

On July 24, 2025, Staff filed a letter stating that Staff had reviewed the Report and supports the findings and recommendations therein. R207 filed a letter on July 24, 2025, requesting that the Commission enter an order adopting the findings and recommendations contained in the Report as such findings and recommendations pertain to approval of the Modified Route 1 of the Carmel Church Loop.

Also on July 24, 2025, Dominion filed comments ("Dominion Comments") on the Report. In its comments, Dominion stated that the Company generally supports the Chief Hearing Examiner's findings and recommendations as to the Carmel Church Project. Dominion requested that the Commission approve Modified Route 1 for the Carmel Church Loop and issue a final order approving the Application with respect to the Carmel Church Project.<sup>23</sup> In regards to the Ruther Glen Project, Dominion requested that the Commission adopt the Chief Hearing Examiner's Findings 1-4 and 6-11; weigh the evidence and determine whether Ruther Glen Route 5 with Western variation,<sup>24</sup> or Alternative Route 6, meets the statutory standard related to impacts; and issue a final order approving the Application with respect to the Ruther Glen Project and the Commission-approved route.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Dominion Comments at 6.

<sup>24</sup> See Report at 38 (*citing* Tr. 107-119).

<sup>25</sup> *Id.* at 8.



NOW THE COMMISSION, having considered this matter, is of the opinion and finds as follows.<sup>26</sup>

Chief 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:<sup>27</sup>

- (1) **ADOPTS** the findings in [the] Report;
- (2) **AUTHORIZES** the Company to construct and operate the Ruther Glen Project and the Carmel Church Project, subject to the findings and conditions recommended herein;
- (3) **ISSUES** appropriate certificates of public convenience and necessity for the Ruther Glen Project and the Carmel Church Project; and
- (4) **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. With regard to routing, the Commission finds that Route 6 for the Ruther Glen Loop would avoid or reasonably minimize adverse impact to the greatest extent reasonably practicable on the scenic assets, historic and cultural resources recorded with DHR, cultural resources identified by federally recognized Tribal Nations in the Commonwealth, and environment of the area concerned. Route 6 is also the lowest cost option, with a minimum

---

<sup>26</sup> 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).

<sup>27</sup> Report at 72.

impact on historic resources and residences among alternatives.<sup>28</sup> The Commission also finds that while Dominion is not prohibited from voluntarily obtaining additional right-of-way width along the approved route, the Company cannot condemn more than the 100-foot right-of-way needed for the Ruther Glen Loop. The Commission further finds that the public convenience and necessity requires the construction of the Project and that a certificate of public convenience and necessity (“CPCN”) authorizing the Project should be issued, subject to the recommended findings and conditions contained in the Report.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) The Commission adopts the Chief Hearing Examiner’s findings and recommendations in the Report, as set forth herein.
- (2) The Chief Hearing Examiner’s recommendations are ordered, as set forth herein.
- (3) Dominion is authorized to construct and operate the Project as proposed in its Application, subject to the recommended findings and conditions in the Report, as set forth 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-CLN-2025-B, which authorizes Virginia Electric and Power Company under the Utility Facilities Act to operate certificated transmission lines and facilities in Caroline County, all as shown on the map attached to the certificate, and to construct and operate facilities as authorized in Case No. PUR-2024-00221, cancels

---

<sup>28</sup> Chief Hearing Examiner’s Report at 53 and 71.

Certificate No. ET-DEV-CLN-2025-A, issued to Virginia Electric and Power Company in Case No. PUR-2024-00159 on May 28, 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](mailto: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 shall be constructed and in service by April 1, 2027. The Commission approves a CPCN sunset date of April 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 matter 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.