

STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION

AT RICHMOND, SEPTEMBER 10, 2026

*State Corporation Commission
Document Control Center
09/10/2026 - 10:21 PM*

APPLICATION OF

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY

CASE NO. PUR-2026-00009

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

FINAL ORDER

On January 28, 2026, 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 Goochland 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.*

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

- 1) Construct one new 230 kilovolt (“kV”) double circuit overhead transmission line (for a total of two circuits) extending approximately 6.5 miles on new primarily 100-foot-wide-right-of-way³ by cutting the existing 230 kV Line #2009 (Midlothian to Short Pump) and extending a new 230 kV double circuit loop in and out of West Creek Substation (the “West Creek 230 kV Loop”), resulting in new Line #2009 (Midlothian to West Creek) and Line #2510 (West Creek to Short Pump) (the “West Creek Lines”). The West Creek Lines will be constructed primarily with double circuit weathering steel monopoles utilizing three-phase twin-bundled 768.2 Aluminum Conductor Steel Supported/Trapezoidal Wire/High

¹ Ex. 2 (Application) at 1, 2.

² *Id.* at 2-3.

³ For the Proposed Route of the West Creek 230 kV Loop as defined in the Application, the Company is seeking approval to voluntarily acquire an additional 60 feet of right-of-way in order to accommodate future load growth in the area discussed in Section I.A of the Application’s Appendix. *Id.* at 2, n.1.

Strength type conductor with a summer transfer capability of 1,573 megavolt amperes; and

- 2) Construct a new 230 kV substation in Goochland County, Virginia, designed to accommodate an immediate four (4) 230 kV breaker ring-bus configuration, expandable to an ultimate of six (6) 230 kV breakers for potential future needs, on land provided by Eli Lilly (“Customer”) (“West Creek Substation”).

Dominion asserted in its Application that the proposed Project is necessary to ensure that the Company can adequately and reliably serve the Customer’s new manufacturing facilities in Goochland County, Virginia, and to maintain reliable service for the overall load growth in the Goochland Load Area in compliance with North American Electric Reliability Corporation Reliability Standards.⁴ Specifically, the Company is proposing the Project to serve the projected load identified in the delivery point request of approximately 37 megawatts for a new manufacturing facility and new warehouses in Goochland County, Virginia, as well as to support future load growth in the Goochland Load Area.⁵

The Company further represented that it anticipates that load growth, due to several large projects in the surrounding area, will necessitate a new substation to relieve load out of the Rockville, North Pole, Short Pump, and River Road Substations in Goochland County and Henrico County by 2029.⁶ The Company’s Distribution Planning group submitted a delivery point request to the Transmission Planning group for construction of a new substation with 230 kV service requested to serve significant residential and commercial load growth in the West

⁴ *Id.* at 3.

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ *Id.*

Creek Load Area, as well as future identified load growth in Goochland County and Henrico County, Virginia.⁷

Dominion identified an approximately 6.5-mile overhead proposed route for the West Creek Lines (the “Proposed Route” or “Route 3”); an approximately 5.9-mile overhead alternative route (“Alternative Route 2”); and an approximately 6.0-mile overhead alternative route (“Alternative Route 5”), all of which the Company proposed for Commission consideration and notice.⁸ The Company stated that it selected Route 3 as the Proposed Route because that route balances a variety of impacts along with keeping portions of the route farther from residential areas in Goochland County.⁹ Dominion stated that while the Proposed Route is longer than both Alternative Routes 2 and 5, Route 3 would: (i) cross the second fewest total wetland acres of the three routes; (ii) have the second fewest impacts to forested wetlands; (iii) cross the second fewest water bodies; and (iv) have the most collocation of any presented route.¹⁰

The Company stated in its Application that the desired in-service date for the proposed Project is July 26, 2028.¹¹ The Company represented that the estimated conceptual cost of the proposed Project utilizing the Proposed Route is approximately \$97.5 million (in 2025 dollars),

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ *Id.* at 5.

which includes approximately \$87.0 million for transmission-related work and approximately \$10.5 million for substation-related work.¹²

On February 24, 2026, the Commission issued an Order for Notice and Hearing that, among other things, docketed the Application; directed the Company to provide notice of the Application to interested persons and the public; established a procedural schedule for the filing of notices of participation, prefiled testimony, and written comments; scheduled public hearings for the purpose of receiving testimony and evidence on the Application; and 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.

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.¹³ On April 8, 2026, the DEQ filed its report on Dominion's Application ("DEQ Report"), which included a Wetlands Impacts Consultation provided by DEQ's Office of Wetlands and Stream Protection.

Notices of participation were filed by the following: Asgard Broad Street Properties I LLC ("Asgard Properties"); H2 Family, LLC ("H2 Family"); Rockville, LLC ("Rockville"); Tuckahoe Creek Partners LLC ("Tuckahoe Creek Partners"); and Keith A. Stanley Sr. & Son, Inc. d/b/a Gardener Nursery's ("Gardener Nursery").

On May 1, 2026, Asgard Properties, H2 Family, Rockville, and Tuckahoe Creek Partners filed testimony in this proceeding. On May 15, 2026, Staff filed testimony with an attached Staff

¹² *Id.* at 7.

¹³ See Letter from Simeon Brown, State Corporation Commission, dated February 4, 2026, to Bettina Rayfield, Department of Environmental Quality.

Report. On May 29, 2026, the Company filed its rebuttal testimony. The Commission also received six public comments on the Company's Application.

The Chief Hearing Examiner convened a public evidentiary hearing in the Commission's courtroom on June 16, 2026. Counsel for Dominion, Staff, Asgard Properties, H2 Family, Rockville, Tuckahoe Creek Partners, and Gardener Nursery appeared at the hearing. Two public witnesses testified at the hearing.¹⁴ On July 8, 2026, the parties and Staff filed post-hearing briefs.

On July 14, 2026, Chief Hearing Examiner D. Mathias Roussy, Jr. 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 Chief Hearing Examiner made the following findings:

- (1) The proposed Project, including the West Creek Loop and West Creek Substation, is needed to provide electric service to Eli Lilly, while also maintaining and ensuring system reliability more broadly in the Goochland Load Area.
- (2) Dominion's selection of a 230 kV double-circuit line originating at the proposed cut-in location of existing Line #2009 is supported by the record.
- (3) The record indicates that Dominion considered the feasibility of using existing right-of-way, but that existing right-of-way cannot adequately serve the identified need for the Project.
- (4) From milepost 2.0/2.2 to milepost 4.5/5.1, the east of VA-288 path of West Creek Loop Route 3 involves a modest and reasonable economic development investment with modest incremental environmental impacts and with no material negative impacts to existing residential or commercial properties. However, the Commission could weigh the evidence differently and reach a different conclusion.
- (5) From milepost 0.5 to mile 2.0/2.2, the greater negative environmental impacts associated with routes that would run west of the Bellview Gardens neighborhood and through the Tuckahoe Creek corridor instead support collocating this line segment with I-64 and VA-288 to the greatest extent feasible, as does West Creek

¹⁴ Tr. 12-22.

Loop Route 3. However, the Commission could weigh the evidence differently and reach a different conclusion.

- (6) Given the impacts of Route 3 to the Asgard LLC property, Commission approval of Route 3 should allow micrositing the West Creek Loop along the eastern border of this property, if feasible and agreeable to Dominion, Asgard LLC, and the Virginia Department of Transportation.
- (7) Route 3 of the West Creek Loop, including a potential variation along the eastern border of Asgard LLC's property, 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.
- (8) The unopposed recommendations in the DEQ Report should be adopted by the Commission as a condition of approval of the Project.
- (9) The proposed Project promotes economic development.
- (10) Dominion reasonably considered the requirements of the Virginia Environmental Justice Act¹⁵ in its Application, and the proposed Project does not appear to adversely impact the goals established by this law.
- (11) Dominion's request for a desired in-service target date of July 26, 2028, and an authorization sunset date of July 26, 2029, for energization of the Project, is not unreasonable.
- (12) A 100-foot-wide right-of-way is needed for the Project. 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 Project.¹⁶

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

- 1. **ADOPTS** the findings in [the] Report;
- 2. **AUTHORIZES** the Company to construct and operate the Project, subject to the findings and conditions recommended [in the Report];
- 3. **ISSUES** the appropriate certificate of public convenience and necessity ["CPCN"] for the Project; and

¹⁵ Code §§ 2.2-234 and 2.2-235.

¹⁶ Report at 67-68.

4. ***DISMISSES*** this case from the Commission’s docket of active cases.¹⁷

Comments on the Report were filed by Dominion, Staff, Asgard Properties, H2 Family and Rockville (collectively), Tuckahoe Creek Partners, and Gardener Nursery.

In its comments, Dominion supported the Report’s findings and recommendations, specifically the recommendations that the Commission approve the Application, the Company’s Proposed Route 3, and the Company’s request to obtain voluntary additional right-of-way width along the approved route.¹⁸ As to Finding (6) of the Report, the Company stated that it had provided a letter to Asgard Properties regarding all prerequisites that would need to be completed for the Company to adjust the Proposed Route 3 closer to the eastern edge of the Asgard property.¹⁹ Gardener Nursery, Tuckahoe Creek Partners, H2 Family, and Rockville also supported the findings and recommendations contained in the Report.²⁰ Staff did not oppose the findings and recommendations set forth in the Report.²¹ Asgard Properties opposed the Chief Hearing Examiner’s recommendation of Route 3 for the northern segment of the West Creek Loop from approximately milepost 0.5 to milepost 2.0/2.2, which it asserts would negatively affect its plan to develop a multiphase, multifamily community on its property.²² Instead, Asgard Properties seeks to have approved its proposed modification to Route 3, which “avoids

¹⁷ *Id.* at 68.

¹⁸ *See* Dominion comments at 3.

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *See* Tuckahoe Creek Partners comments at 2; Gardener Nursery comments at 1; H2 Family and Rockville collective comments at 1.

²¹ *See* Staff comments at 1.

²² *See* Asgard Properties comments at 1, 15.

Asgard Properties' property, is shorter, requires fewer structures, avoids the VA-288/Broad Street interchange, and is potentially less expensive than Route 3."²³

NOW THE COMMISSION, upon consideration of this matter, is of the opinion and finds that the Chief 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.²⁴ All participants are required to comply with such directives.

In making this determination, we note that Finding (6) of the Report, which we adopt, seeks to minimize adverse impacts to Asgard Properties' property by micrositing the West Creek Loop along the eastern border of this property, if feasible and agreeable to Dominion, Asgard Properties, and the Virginia Department of Transportation. We direct Dominion to work with Asgard Properties and other necessary parties to implement Finding (6), as feasible.

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.

²³ *Id.* at 15. In the alternative, Asgard Properties recommends approval of Route 2 for the northern segment from milepost 0.5 to milepost 2.0/2.2; or, if the Commission approves Route 3 for the northern segment, Asgard Properties recommends requiring Dominion "to negotiate meaningful mitigation measures with Asgard Properties, including but not limited to compensation for the diminution in value and loss of development potential" of the property. *Id.*

²⁴ 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).

(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-GOO-2026-A, which authorizes Virginia Electric and Power Company under the Utility Facilities Act to operate certificated transmission lines in Goochland County, all as shown on the map attached to the certificate, and to construct and operate facilities as authorized in Case No. PUR-2026-00009 and cancels Certificate No. ET-114f, issued to Virginia Electric and Power Company in Case No. PUE-2014-00047 on December 22, 2014.

(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 26, 2028. The Commission approves a CPCN sunset date of July 26, 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.