

APPLICATION OF

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY

CASE NO. PUR-2025-00042

For approval and certification of electric transmission facilities: 230 kV Technology Boulevard Lines, Bunker Substation, and Saltwood Switching Station

FINAL ORDER

On March 7, 2025, Virginia Electric and Power Company (“Dominion” or “Company”) filed with the State Corporation Commission (“Commission”) an application (“Application”) for approval and certification of electric transmission facilities in Henrico County, Virginia.¹

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.*

In its Application, the Company proposed to complete the following (collectively, “Project”):²

- Construct a new overhead 230 kilovolt (“kV”) double circuit transmission line originating at a cut-in location on the Company’s future 230 kV Chickahominy – White Oak Line #2294³ at Structure #2294/116⁴ near Technology Boulevard and extending approximately 4.6 miles within a new

¹ Ex. 2 (Application) at 1, 2.

² *Id.* at 2-3.

³ Dominion noted that the future 230 kV Chickahominy – White Oak Line #2294 was a component of the Company’s request for approval and a certificate of public convenience and necessity (“CPCN”) from the Commission in a prior proceeding. *Id.* at 2 n.2 (citing *Application of Virginia Electric and Power Company for approval and certification of electric transmission facilities: 230 kV Elmont-White Oak Line #2075, 230 kV Chickahominy-White Oak Line #2294, and White Oak Substation Expansion*, Case No. PUR-2023-00110, Doc. Con. Cen. No. 240350058, Final Order (Mar. 25, 2024)).

⁴ Dominion noted that the double circuit structure at the cut-in location also supports future Elmont – White Oak Line #2075 at Structure #2075/184 / #2294/116, but that only Line #2294 would be cut for purposes of the proposed double circuit transmission line. Ex. 2 (Application) at 2 n.3.

100-foot-wide right-of-way, interconnecting the proposed Bunker Substation and Saltwood Switching Station, before terminating at a cut-in location on the existing 230 kV Chickahominy – Portugee Line #2091 at Structure #2091/64 near the existing Elko Substation (“Technology Boulevard Lines”). The proposed Technology Boulevard Lines would be supported primarily by double circuit weathering steel monopoles and would utilize three-phase twin-bundled 768.2 Aluminum Conductor Steel Supported/Trapezoidal Wire/High Strength type conductor with a summer transfer capability of 1,573 megavolt amperes.

- Construct a new 230-34.5 kV substation (“Bunker Substation”) and a new 230 kV switching station (“Saltwood Switching Station”) in Henrico County, Virginia, on real estate rights to be obtained by the Company.

Dominion asserted that the Project is necessary to provide service requested by two data center customers (collectively, “Customers”) in Henrico County, and to maintain reliable electric service consistent with North American Electric Reliability Corporation (“NERC”) Reliability Standards for the overall growth in the load area surrounding the Company’s existing White Oak Substation (“Technology Boulevard Load Area”).⁵

Dominion represented that the Customers have requested that the Company serve two new data center developments in the eastern area of Henrico County, within White Oak Technology Park (“WOTP”): Data Center Development A, and Data Center Development B (collectively, “Developments”).⁶ Dominion further represented that to serve the Customers’ projected load identified in the delivery point requests (approximately 600 megawatts (“MW”)), the Company is proposing to construct the Bunker Substation to serve Data Center Development

⁵ *Id.* at 3. For purposes of its Application, Dominion defined the Technology Boulevard Load Area generally as “an area in Henrico County, Virginia, encompassing the industrial-zoned lands along Technology Boulevard and bounded by Meadow Road to the north, Elko Road to the east, the CSX Railroad to the south, and Interstate 95 to the west.” *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

A (300 MW), and the Saltwood Switching Station to serve Data Center Development B (300 MW).⁷

Dominion stated that the Company identified an approximately 4.6-mile overhead proposed route for the Technology Boulevard Lines (“Proposed Route”).⁸ According to the Company, “[n]o viable alternative routes were identified that similarly maximize collocation opportunities and feasibly interconnect the proposed substations located on the Customers’ Developments”⁹ Dominion further represented that it selected the Proposed Route because:

it meets the Project’s need, avoids residential areas by routing within the WOTP, minimizes impacts to sensitive environmental features such as the Canal Swamp, and is compatible with existing and future land use plans including the planned data center developments driving the need for additional future substations in the Project area.¹⁰

Dominion represented that the Bunker Substation initially would be constructed with four 230 kV breakers and two 230 kV lines, with six 230 kV breakers and four 230 kV lines at ultimate buildout.¹¹ The Company stated that the Bunker Substation would be built to 4,000 ampere (“A”) standards, and that the total area of the Bunker Substation within the fenceline would be approximately 5.7 acres.¹²

Dominion represented that the Company’s Saltwood Switching Station would be constructed with six 230 kV breakers and four 230 kV lines and would be built to 4,000 A

⁷ *Id.* at 3-4.

⁸ *Id.* at 4.

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Id.*

standards.¹³ Dominion stated that the total area of the Saltwood Switching Station within the fenceline would be approximately 2.6 acres.¹⁴

The Company's desired in-service target date for the Project is March 31, 2028.¹⁵ The Company estimated that it would take approximately 27 months after a final order from the Commission for detailed engineering, materials procurement, permitting, real estate, and construction of the Project.¹⁶ Dominion represented that the total estimated conceptual cost of the Project along the Proposed Route is approximately \$58.2 million, which includes approximately \$36.3 million for transmission-related work and approximately \$21.9 million for substation-related work (in 2024 dollars).¹⁷

On March 31, 2025, the Commission issued an Order for Notice and Hearing that, among other things: (i) docketed the Application; (ii) required the Company to provide notice of the Application; (iii) established a schedule for the filing of notices of participation, prefiled testimony, and written comments; (iv) scheduled a public hearing for September 16, 2025, with any public witness testimony to be received telephonically at the commencement of the hearing and evidentiary proceedings to follow; and (v) assigned this case to a Hearing Examiner to conduct all further proceedings on behalf of the Commission and to file a final report containing the Hearing Examiner's findings and recommendations.

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ *Id.* at 5.

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ *Id.* In addition to the desired in-service date of March 31, 2028, the Company requested that the Commission issue a final order approving an authorization sunset date of March 31, 2029, for energization of the Project. *Id.* at 6.

¹⁷ *Id.* at 6-7.

Commission Staff (“Staff”) requested that the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (“DEQ”) coordinate an environmental review of the proposed Project by the appropriate agencies and provide a report on the review.¹⁸ On May 30, 2025, DEQ filed its report on Dominion’s Application, which included a Wetlands Impacts Consultation provided by DEQ’s Office of Wetlands and Stream Protection.

The Company filed its proof of notice and service on May 21, 2025. No notices of participation were filed in this docket.

On August 4, 2025, Staff filed testimony with an attached Staff Report. On August 18, 2025, the Company filed its rebuttal testimony. The Commission also received two public comments on the Company’s Application.

The Hearing Examiner convened a public evidentiary hearing in the Commission’s courtroom on September 16, 2025. Counsel for Dominion and Staff were in attendance. No public witnesses testified at the hearing.¹⁹

On November 10, 2025, Hearing Examiner Kati Dean issued a report that analyzed the law, the evidence, and the arguments in this case and made detailed findings and recommendations (“Report”). In the Report, the Hearing Examiner made the following findings:²⁰

1. The Company established the need for the Project to (i) ensure that the Company can provide service requested by the Customers in Henrico County; and (ii) maintain and ensure reliable electric service consistent with mandatory NERC Reliability Standards for the overall growth in the load area surrounding the Company’s existing

¹⁸ Letter from Frederick D. Ochsenhirt, State Corporation Commission, dated March 11, 2025, to David L. Davis, Department of Environmental Quality, filed in Case No. PUR-2025-00042; Letter from Frederick D. Ochsenhirt, State Corporation Commission, dated March 11, 2025, to Bettina Rayfield, Department of Environmental Quality, filed in Case No. PUR-2025-00042.

¹⁹ Tr. 4.

²⁰ Report at 16-17.

- White Oak Substation;
2. Existing rights-of-way cannot adequately serve the identified need for the Project;
 3. The Proposed Route constitutes the preferred routing alternative for the transmission line component of the Project and should be approved by the Commission;
 4. The Company reasonably demonstrated the Project, using the Proposed Route, avoids or reasonably minimize[s] adverse impacts 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;
 5. The Project will assure reliable bulk electric power delivery and result in positive economic impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Customers' data center developments, thereby supporting economic development in the Project area;
 6. The uncontested recommendations in the DEQ Summary of Findings and Recommendations should be adopted by the Commission as conditions of the Project's approval;
 7. For any recommendations that Dominion sought to clarify in rebuttal, . . . the Commission [should] accept the clarifications and require the Company to comply with those recommendations accordingly;
 8. The Company should not be required to follow [the Department of Conservation and Recreation's Division of Natural Heritage's] recommendations relating to impacts to ecological cores;
 9. The Company should not be required to develop an invasive species management plan in addition to its already-existing [Integrated Vegetation Management Plan ("IVMP")];
 10. The Company should not be required to perform right-of-way restoration and maintenance beyond what is already required by its IVMP and standard maintenance practices;
 11. There is sufficient record evidence that the Project does not represent a hazard to public health or safety;
 12. The Company reasonably considered the requirements of the [Virginia Environmental Justice Act]²¹ in its Application; and

²¹ Code § 2.2-234 *et seq.*

13. The Commission should approve a Project in-service date of March 31, 2028, with an authorization sunset date of March 31, 2029.

The Hearing Examiner recommended that the Commission enter an order that:²²

1. **ADOPTS** the findings in this Report;
2. **AUTHORIZES** Dominion to construct and operate the proposed Project subject to the conditions recommended herein;
3. **ISSUES** the appropriate CPCN(s) for the Project;
4. **DIRECTS** the Project to be constructed and in service by March 31, 2028, with a CPCN sunset date of March 31, 2029; no later than ninety (90) days before the CPCN sunset date, for good cause shown, the Company should be granted leave to apply and provide the basis for any extension requested; and
5. **DISMISSES** this case from the Commission's docket of active cases.

Dominion filed comments on the Report on November 20, 2025. Staff filed comments on the Report on November 24, 2025. In their comments, Dominion and Staff supported the findings and recommendations set forth in the Report and requested that the Commission adopt them.²³ Staff also requested that the Commission consider all available alternatives to allocating the costs of the Project appropriately.²⁴

NOW THE COMMISSION, upon consideration of this matter, is of the opinion and finds that the Hearing Examiner's findings and recommendations as set forth in the Report are supported by law and evidence, have a rational basis, and should be adopted.²⁵

²² Report at 18.

²³ Dominion comments at 5; Staff comments at 1.

²⁴ Staff comments at 1.

²⁵ 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

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

- (1) The Report's findings and recommendations are adopted.
- (2) The Report's recommendations are ordered.
- (3) Dominion is authorized to construct and operate the Project as proposed in its Application, subject to the findings and recommendations 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-HCO-2026-B, which authorizes Virginia Electric and Power Company under the Utility Facilities Act to operate certificated transmission lines in Henrico County, all as shown on the map attached to the certificate, and to construct and operate facilities as authorized in Case No. PUR-2025-00042, and cancels Certificate No. ET-DEV-HCO-2026-A, issued to Virginia Electric and Power Company in Case No. PUR-2025-00077 on January 30, 2026.
- (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@sec.virginia.gov.

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).

(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 March 31, 2028. The Commission approves a CPCN sunset date of March 31, 2029, for energization of 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.