

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

1 (121 to 124)

<p>121</p> <p>1 COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA 2 STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION 3 CASE NO. PUR-2024-00184 4 5 IN RE: PETITION OF VIRGINIA ELECTRIC 6 AND POWER COMPANY 7 8 Integrated Resource Plan 9 filing pursuant to 10 Virginia Code Section 11 56-597 et seq. 12 13 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE 14 THE HONORABLE SAMUEL T. TOWELL 15 THE HONORABLE JEHMAL T. HUDSON 16 THE HONORABLE KELSEY A. BAGOT 17 DAY 2 18 Tuesday, April 15, 2025 19 10:00 a.m. to 4:44 p.m. 20 21 22 23 Job No: 559215 24 Pages: 121 - 395 25 Reported By: Scott D. Gregg, RPR</p>	<p>123</p> <p>1 A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D 2 3 Nathaniel H. Benforado, Esquire, 4 Rachel M. James, Esquire, 5 Josephus M. Allmond, Esquire, 6 Katherine King, Esquire, 7 and 8 Emma Clancy, Esquire, 9 Counsel to Appalachian Voices 10 11 Katherine Pollard, Esquire, 12 and 13 Gregory Habeeb, Esquire, 14 Counsel to Advance Energy 15 United 16 17 Evan D. Johns, Esquire, 18 Dorothy E. Jaffe, Esquire, 19 and 20 Claire M. Horan, Esquire, 21 Counsel to Sierra Club and 22 Natural Resources Defense 23 Council ("NRDC") 24 //// 25 ////</p>
<p>122</p> <p>1 A P P E A R A N C E S 2 3 Kiva Bland Pierce, Esquire, 4 Arlen Bolstad, Esquire, 5 and 6 Michael Zielinski, Esquire, 7 Counsel to the Commission 8 9 Vishwa B. Link, Esquire, 10 Sarah B. Nielsen, Esquire, 11 Nicholas A. Dantonio, Esquire, 12 and 13 Nicole M. Allaband, Esquire, 14 Counsel to the Applicant 15 16 John E. Farmer, Jr., Esquire, 17 and 18 Carew S. Bartley, Esquire, 19 Counsel to the Office 20 of Attorney General, 21 Division of Consumer Counsel 22 23 Cliona M. Robb, Esquire, 24 Counsel to Microsoft 25 Corporation ("Microsoft")</p>	<p>124</p> <p>1 A P P E A R A N C E S C O N T I N U E D 2 3 William T. Reisinger, Esquire, 4 Counsel to Clean Virginia 5 6 Cody T. Murphey, Esquire, 7 and 8 Cassidy C. Galindo, Esquire, 9 Counsel to Data Center 10 Coalition ("DCC") 11 12 Carrie H. Grundmann, Esquire, 13 Counsel to Walmart, Inc. 14 15 Cale Jaffe, Esquire, 16 Ryan Carp, 3L 17 and 18 Peter Grema, 3L 19 Counsel to Piedmont Environmental 20 Council ("PEC") 21 //// 22 //// 23 //// 24 //// 25 ////</p>

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

2 (125 to 128)

125	127
<p>1 APPEARANCES CONTINUED</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 Adam B. Winston, Esquire,</p> <p>4 Bryan P. MacAvoy, Esquire,</p> <p>5 and</p> <p>6 Kyle D. Eldridge, Esquire,</p> <p>7 Counsel to City of</p> <p>8 Alexandria</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>1 INDEX CONTINUED</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 COMPANY WITNESSES: Page</p> <p>4 H. Potter</p> <p>5 Direct Examination by Ms. Link..... 301</p> <p>6 Cross-Examination by Ms. Jaffe..... 303</p> <p>7</p> <p>8 T. Flowers</p> <p>9 Direct Examination by Mr. Dantonio..... 309</p> <p>10 Cross-Examination by Ms. Grundmann..... 312</p> <p>11 By Ms. Pierce..... 321</p> <p>12</p> <p>13 K. Sunkins</p> <p>14 Direct Examination by Ms. Nielsen..... 330</p> <p>15 Cross-Examination by Ms. Jaffe..... 332</p> <p>16 By Ms. Grundmann..... 336</p> <p>17</p> <p>18 K. McCormick</p> <p>19 Direct Examination by Ms. Nielsen..... 338</p> <p>20 Cross-Examination by Ms. James..... 340</p> <p>21 By Mr. Winston..... 378</p> <p>22 Redirect Examination by Ms. Nielsen..... 387</p> <p>23 ///</p> <p>24 ///</p> <p>25 ///</p>
126	128
<p>1 INDEX</p> <p>2</p> <p>3 COMPANY WITNESSES: Page</p> <p>4 S. Compton</p> <p>5 Direct Examination by Ms. Nielsen..... 140</p> <p>6 Cross-Examination by Mr. Benforado..... 142</p> <p>7 By Ms. Jaffe..... 153</p> <p>8 By Mr. Reisinger..... 176</p> <p>9 By Ms. Grundmann..... 199</p> <p>10 By Mr. Grema..... 227</p> <p>11 By Ms. Pierce..... 233</p> <p>12 Redirect Examination by Ms. Nielsen..... 234</p> <p>13</p> <p>14 M. Hubbard</p> <p>15 Direct Examination by Mr. Dantonio..... 242</p> <p>16 Cross-Examination by Mr. Reisinger..... 245</p> <p>17 By Ms. Grundmann..... 247</p> <p>18 By Mr. Winston..... 267</p> <p>19</p> <p>20 K. Vance</p> <p>21 Direct Examination by Ms. Link..... 279</p> <p>22 Cross-Examination by Ms. Grundmann..... 281</p> <p>23 By Mr. Zielinski..... 291</p> <p>24 ///</p> <p>25 ///</p>	<p>1 EXHIBITS</p> <p>2 No. Marked for ID Rec'd</p> <p>3 1 137 138</p> <p>4 2 138 138</p> <p>5 3 139 139</p> <p>6 4 142 142</p> <p>7 5 158 175</p> <p>8 6 202 227</p> <p>9 7 219 227</p> <p>10 8 231 233</p> <p>11 9 231 233</p> <p>12 10 231 233</p> <p>13 11 231 233</p> <p>14 12 242 242</p> <p>15 13 244 244</p> <p>16 14 280 281</p> <p>17 15 293 300</p> <p>18 16 302 302</p> <p>19 17 305 307</p> <p>20 18 309 309</p> <p>21 19 311 311</p> <p>22 20 326 329</p> <p>23 21 332 332</p> <p>24 22 339 340</p> <p>25 23 360 377</p>

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

3 (129 to 132)

<p>129</p> <p>1 EXHIBITS CONTINUED</p> <p>2 No. Marked for ID Rec'd</p> <p>3 24 363 --</p> <p>4 25 368 --</p> <p>5</p> <p>6</p> <p>7</p> <p>8</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p> <p>11</p> <p>12</p> <p>13</p> <p>14</p> <p>15</p> <p>16</p> <p>17</p> <p>18</p> <p>19</p> <p>20</p> <p>21</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>	<p>131</p> <p>1 In the latter capacity, the City and its</p> <p>2 city council are responsible for the public</p> <p>3 health, safety, and general welfare of its</p> <p>4 residents, the responsibility that includes the</p> <p>5 adoption and execution of policies that improve</p> <p>6 energy efficiency for city residents, thereby</p> <p>7 directly lowering the bills they pay for</p> <p>8 electricity and, ultimately, reducing</p> <p>9 environmental harm and impacts that result from</p> <p>10 unclean electrical generation.</p> <p>11 In pursuit of these goals, the city</p> <p>12 council adopted the City's Environmental Action</p> <p>13 Plan 2040 and the Energy and Climate Change Action</p> <p>14 Plan. These actions, and many similar actions</p> <p>15 taken by local governments all over the</p> <p>16 Commonwealth, took their cue from the General</p> <p>17 Assembly's adoption of the Virginia Clean Economy</p> <p>18 Act, which is meant to require that Dominion</p> <p>19 transition to 100 percent clean energy by 2045.</p> <p>20 The VCEA, the Commonwealth Clean Energy</p> <p>21 Policy, and local actions like the City's</p> <p>22 environmental action plan represent a vertically</p> <p>23 unified statement of policy that Virginia's energy</p> <p>24 future must be clean.</p> <p>25 And while the proliferation of data</p>
<p>130</p> <p>1 PROCEEDINGS</p> <p>2 THE BAILIFF: Today's docket consists of</p> <p>3 Case No. PUR-2024-00184, Commonwealth of Virginia,</p> <p>4 ex rel, State Corporation Commission, In re:</p> <p>5 Virginia Electric and Power Company's Integrated</p> <p>6 Resource Plan filing pursuant to Virginia Code</p> <p>7 Section 56-597, et seq.</p> <p>8 The Honorable Jehmal T. Hudson, presiding.</p> <p>9 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Good morning. Good</p> <p>10 morning everyone.</p> <p>11 All right. Before we begin with</p> <p>12 Dominion's direct case, I would like to take this</p> <p>13 time to allow the City of Alexandria to provide</p> <p>14 any opening statements that they would like.</p> <p>15 MR. WINSTON: Good morning.</p> <p>16 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Good morning.</p> <p>17 MR. WINSTON: May it please the</p> <p>18 Commission. My name is Adam Winston from the law</p> <p>19 firm Sands Anderson PC, and I'm here representing</p> <p>20 the City of Alexandria, Virginia, in these IRP</p> <p>21 proceedings.</p> <p>22 The City has joined these proceedings as a</p> <p>23 customer of Dominion and as a municipal</p> <p>24 corporation and body politic, representing more</p> <p>25 than 155,000 Virginians.</p>	<p>132</p> <p>1 centers in the pending load forecast may present</p> <p>2 challenges at the point of execution, that cannot</p> <p>3 absolve the Company of its statutory duty to</p> <p>4 submit an IRP that, at the very least, presents a</p> <p>5 pathway to compliance so that the Commission and</p> <p>6 the ratepayers of Virginia can see what their</p> <p>7 elected officials' policies would look like if</p> <p>8 dutifully planned.</p> <p>9 The City supports those respondents who</p> <p>10 have raised concerns about the Company's modeling</p> <p>11 of new natural gas generation facilities just</p> <p>12 before the VCEA calls for them to be</p> <p>13 decommissioned. But for its case in chief, the</p> <p>14 City focuses on the IRP filing shortcomings as</p> <p>15 they pertain to demand-side management and energy</p> <p>16 efficiency, aspects of the IRP that the City and</p> <p>17 other local governments are uniquely positioned to</p> <p>18 assist with.</p> <p>19 The City has submitted the prefiled</p> <p>20 testimony of climate action officer Ryan Freed, an</p> <p>21 experienced regulatory expert with years of</p> <p>22 experience working for the Kansas Corporation</p> <p>23 Commission and extensive energy efficiency</p> <p>24 regulatory experience in that state.</p> <p>25 Mr. Freed's testimony will explain that</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

4 (133 to 136)

<p style="text-align: right;">133</p> <p>1 Dominion's IRP overwhelmingly favors supply side 2 to demand-side resources. In fact, Dominion has 3 not modeled demand side or energy efficiency 4 options as selectable resources at all in direct 5 contravention of Virginia Code Section 56-599B-5. 6 It therefore necessarily admits any 7 proposed method to acquire demand resources 8 because none are modeled. These emissions are 9 unreasonable and not in the public interest. 10 Dominion's own energy efficiency potential 11 study identifies up to 17 percent economically 12 achievable energy efficiency savings when costs 13 compared to supply-side alternatives. 14 Under the IRP statutes and the VCEA, these 15 economically achievable savings should be 16 considered mandatory to pursue, especially at the 17 30,000-foot planning stage represented by the IRP. 18 Additionally, Mr. Freed's testimony will 19 further emphasize that Dominion's simplified 20 assumptions modeling their downward adjustment to 21 the load forecast, which include only existing 22 programs and forecasted growth to meet energy 23 efficiency targets to prove by the Commission, 24 signify that Dominion has delegated its statutory 25 energy efficiency responsibilities to third-party</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">135</p> <p>1 willingness by the adopting localities to enter 2 into these types of discussions with Dominion to 3 fulfill the spirit and letter of the IRP statutes 4 and the VCEA. 5 Dominion's spurning of demand-side options 6 also goes against the extensive stakeholder 7 interest in seeking diverse demand-side offerings 8 in Dominion's future IRPs. 9 Electrification and other granular data in 10 the possession of local governments, combined with 11 Dominion's energy consumption data, are the 12 perfect stuff for robust data analysis to develop 13 targeted, modelable, and selectable demand-side 14 resources in localities all over Virginia. 15 The City, therefore, respectfully requests 16 that the Commission order Dominion, prior to its 17 next IRP filing, to form a local government 18 stakeholder group to discuss how the sorts of 19 data-sharing programs and demand reduction 20 contracts described above can be executed and 21 modeled in future IRPs to bring those filings into 22 conformity with the IRP statutes and the VCEA. 23 While Mr. Freed's testimony proposes 24 language for an ordering paragraph to be included 25 in the Commission's final order, which details one</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">134</p> <p>1 vendors and organic customer participation growth. 2 These efforts fail to satisfy the 3 statutory requirement that Dominion's IRP, quote, 4 Reflect a diversity of electric generation supply 5 and cost-effective demand reduction contracts and 6 services. 7 The IRP does not include the necessary 8 diversity of demand reduction contracts with the 9 result that the IRP is not, quote, consistent with 10 the Commonwealth's energy policies as set forth in 11 Section 45.2-1706.1. 12 Mr. Freed will then propose that local 13 governments, like the City, are uniquely situated 14 to assist the Company in correcting some of these 15 emissions. Local governments have many legal 16 statutory and contractual touch points with the 17 Company that can and, with the Commission's 18 guidance, will lead to discovery and execution of 19 new and diverse demand reduction contracts. 20 Local governments are in possession of 21 building-specific data that can identify building 22 optimization projects that can be contracted for 23 and modeled in future IRPs. 24 Local energy efficiency policies like the 25 environmental action plan are public statements of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">136</p> <p>1 potential form that this stakeholder group could 2 take, the City would be grateful for any order 3 from the Commission that requires Dominion to 4 engage with interested localities in formulating 5 strategies for modeling demand-side options as 6 selectable resources and that begins the process 7 of incorporating local energy efficiency targets 8 and data into future IRPs. 9 Other localities, including Loudoun 10 County, Arlington County, and the City of 11 Charlottesville have submitted comments in these 12 proceedings, either expressly supporting the 13 City's proposal or suggesting similar levels of 14 engagement on the same issues. 15 Commission action here is appropriate 16 because the economic and business incentives do 17 not exist for Dominion to favor demand-side 18 options in meeting its load demand. 19 Ever since Alfred Kahn wrote the book on 20 economics and regulation, the purpose of 21 regulatory action in highly regulated industries 22 is to offset business incentives that threaten the 23 public interests. 24 But the size and scale of the load 25 forecast filed by Dominion in this case seeking</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

5 (137 to 140)

<p>137</p> <p>1 diverse ways to lower peak and overall demand is 2 not just an environmental issue. It's a national 3 security issue. It's an economic issue for 4 Virginia ratepayers, and it's a public safety 5 issue where brown and blackouts are the natural 6 result of insufficient energy supply. 7 The City has joined this case as a clarion 8 call for innovation in the way Dominion models its 9 demand-side options. And the City, for one, is 10 here to offer its assistance if the Commission 11 will facilitate. 12 Thank you. 13 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 14 I think we're ready to hear Dominion's 15 direct case. 16 MS. NIELSEN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 17 Sarah Nielsen, and I represent the Company. 18 First, I would ask that the Company's 19 proof of notice filed on January 10, 2025, be 20 marked for identification and admitted into the 21 record. 22 THE CLERK: The proof of service and 23 notice as described will be marked as Exhibit 1. 24 (Exhibit No. 1 was marked for 25 identification.)</p>	<p>139</p> <p>1 consisting of seven pages and appendices, which 2 was filed in public version only in this 3 proceeding on November 15, 2024, be marked for 4 identification and entered into the record. 5 THE BAILIFF: The SCC Directed IRP 6 Supplement will be marked as Exhibit 3. 7 (Exhibit No. 3 was marked for 8 identification.) 9 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: The SCC Directed IRP 10 Supplement is identified and marked as 11 Exhibit No. 3 and is admitted for the record. 12 (Exhibit No. 3 was admitted into 13 evidence.) 14 MS. NIELSEN: Thank you, Your Honor. 15 The Company also has two stipulated 16 witnesses in its direct case. Would the 17 Commission prefer that the Company enter that 18 direct testimony at this point in time or in the 19 order in which they appear on the order of 20 presentation? 21 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Let's do it in the 22 order of presentation. 23 MS. NIELSEN: Thank you, Your Honor. 24 At this time, the Company calls 25 Shane T. Compton.</p>
<p>138</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: The proof of notice 2 identified and marked as Exhibit 1 is entered into 3 the record. 4 (Exhibit No. 1 was admitted into 5 evidence.) 6 MS. NIELSEN: Next, I ask that the 7 Company's 2024 Integrated Resource Plan, 8 consisting of 81 pages and appendices, which was 9 filed in public version only in this proceeding on 10 October 15, 2024, and corrected on October 24, 11 November 26, and December 23rd, 2024, be marked 12 for identification and admitted into the record. 13 THE BAILIFF: The 2024 Integrated Resource 14 Plan with stated corrections will be marked as 15 Exhibit 2. 16 (Exhibit No. 2 was marked for 17 identification.) 18 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: The 2024 Integrated 19 Resource Plan with corrections is identified and 20 marked as Exhibit No. 2 and is admitted into the 21 record. 22 (Exhibit No. 2 was admitted into 23 evidence.) 24 MS. NIELSEN: Your Honor, I ask that the 25 Company's SCC Directed 2024 IRP Supplement,</p>	<p>140</p> <p>1 SHANE T. COMPTON, called as a witness, 2 having been first duly sworn, was examined and 3 testified as follows: 4 DIRECT EXAMINATION 5 BY MS. NIELSEN: 6 Q Good morning, Mr. Compton. 7 A Good morning. 8 Q Can you please state your name, position 9 of employment, and business address. 10 A My name is Shane T. Compton. I'm the 11 director of strategic planning for the Dominion 12 Energy Services, Inc., testifying on behalf of 13 Virginia Electric and Power Company. My business 14 address is 600 East Canal Street, Richmond, 15 Virginia 23219. 16 Q Thank you, Mr. Compton. 17 If you can pull the mic just a little bit 18 closer to you. 19 A Yep. 20 Q Perfect. Thank you. 21 Do you have with you a document entitled 22 Direct Testimony of Shane T. Compton, consisting 23 of a one-page summary, two typed pages of 24 questions and answers, and an Appendix A, which 25 was filed in public version only on December 6th,</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

6 (141 to 144)

<p>141</p> <p>1 2024?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Was that document prepared by you or under</p> <p>4 your supervision?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q Do you have any additions or corrections</p> <p>7 to those documents?</p> <p>8 A No.</p> <p>9 Q If you were asked those questions</p> <p>10 appearing in the documents today, would you</p> <p>11 provide the same or substantially -- sorry.</p> <p>12 Scratch that question.</p> <p>13 Are your answers and sponsored portions</p> <p>14 true and correct, to the best of your knowledge,</p> <p>15 for when the IRP snapshot was taken and based on</p> <p>16 the October 15, 2024, filing date?</p> <p>17 A Yes, subject to my rebuttal testimony.</p> <p>18 Q Do you wish to sponsor those documents as</p> <p>19 your direct testimony in this proceeding?</p> <p>20 A Yes.</p> <p>21 MS. NIELSEN: At this time I would ask</p> <p>22 that Mr. Compton's direct testimony be marked for</p> <p>23 identification and admitted into the record.</p> <p>24 THE BAILIFF: The direct testimony of</p> <p>25 Shane T. Compton will be marked as Exhibit 4.</p>	<p>143</p> <p>1 without, the Company forced a certain amount of</p> <p>2 solar resources into the model; is that right?</p> <p>3 A That's correct.</p> <p>4 Q And so what the Company forced in, is that</p> <p>5 based on the overall 16,100-megawatt petition</p> <p>6 requirement in the law; is that right?</p> <p>7 A That's correct.</p> <p>8 Q And so just to understand how you guys did</p> <p>9 that, that petition requirement also includes --</p> <p>10 as part of that 16,100, it includes</p> <p>11 1,100 megawatts of distributed solar resources; is</p> <p>12 that right?</p> <p>13 A Correct.</p> <p>14 Q And then there's also the 65 percent</p> <p>15 utility-owned versus 35 percent PPA; is that</p> <p>16 correct?</p> <p>17 A Correct.</p> <p>18 Q And then there's also a few benchmarks</p> <p>19 along the way in the law in terms of when those</p> <p>20 petition requirements kind of trigger, 2027, 2030,</p> <p>21 and 2035; is that right?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q So I just want to understand, kind of, how</p> <p>24 that forced part worked.</p> <p>25 So you backed out what had already been</p>
<p>142</p> <p>1 (Exhibit No. 4 was marked for</p> <p>2 identification.)</p> <p>3 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: The testimony</p> <p>4 identified and marked as Exhibit No. 4 is admitted</p> <p>5 into the record.</p> <p>6 (Exhibit No. 4 was admitted into</p> <p>7 evidence.)</p> <p>8 MS. NIELSEN: And the witness is available</p> <p>9 for cross-examination.</p> <p>10 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you.</p> <p>11 CROSS-EXAMINATION</p> <p>12 BY MR. BENFORADO:</p> <p>13 Q Good morning, Mr. Compton. Nate</p> <p>14 Benforado, representing Appalachian Voices.</p> <p>15 How are you this morning?</p> <p>16 A Good. How are you?</p> <p>17 Q Good.</p> <p>18 I just have a few areas I just want to</p> <p>19 clarify on direct about the Company's modeling.</p> <p>20 Now, in rebuttal, you actually offered</p> <p>21 some clarification on how the Company modeled some</p> <p>22 solar resources, and I think it would just be good</p> <p>23 to get it clear at the outset.</p> <p>24 So am I correct that in the two VCEA</p> <p>25 portfolios, the VCEA with EPA regulations and</p>	<p>144</p> <p>1 petitioned for in previous RPS dockets, right? So</p> <p>2 is that about, roughly, 3,600 megawatts that have</p> <p>3 already been petitioned for?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And so what's left is about</p> <p>6 12,000 megawatts, give or take?</p> <p>7 A Yeah.</p> <p>8 Q And then some of that is going to be --</p> <p>9 you know, some of the petition -- remaining</p> <p>10 petition requirement will be distributed solar,</p> <p>11 and then you also have the 65/35 percent split; is</p> <p>12 that right?</p> <p>13 A Yep.</p> <p>14 Q And the same process was also used in the</p> <p>15 Staff-directed supplement as well, for those VCEA</p> <p>16 portfolios?</p> <p>17 A That's correct.</p> <p>18 Q And just to kind of just clarify this</p> <p>19 point one more -- one more time, so they are in</p> <p>20 the VCEA portfolios with and without EPA. They</p> <p>21 are not in the REC RPS-only portfolios, correct?</p> <p>22 A That's correct.</p> <p>23 Q And is it accurate to say in those REC</p> <p>24 RPS-only portfolios no resources were forced into</p> <p>25 the model, correct?</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

7 (145 to 148)

<p>145</p> <p>1 A That's correct.</p> <p>2 Q Now, turning to storage for a second,</p> <p>3 there's also a petition requirement under the VCEA</p> <p>4 for storage; is that right?</p> <p>5 A That's correct.</p> <p>6 Q And I believe it's 2007 -- 700 megawatts</p> <p>7 by 2035; does that sound right?</p> <p>8 A It sounds right.</p> <p>9 Q Did the Company also force the model to</p> <p>10 select a certain amount of storage to reflect the</p> <p>11 VCEA's petition requirement for storage in the</p> <p>12 VCEA portfolios?</p> <p>13 A Are you referring to the -- like the base</p> <p>14 IRP plans or the supplemental filing?</p> <p>15 Q Back to the original IRP filing.</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. So the petition requirement for</p> <p>18 storage was also forced into the model?</p> <p>19 A That's correct.</p> <p>20 Q Now, turning to page 61 of the IRP, and I</p> <p>21 believe it's the -- I want to point you towards</p> <p>22 the second -- this is discussing one of the</p> <p>23 portfolios we were just talking about, the VCEA</p> <p>24 with the EPA portfolio; is that right?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>	<p>147</p> <p>1 65/35 percent split between Company-owned and</p> <p>2 PPAs.</p> <p>3 After we did that, we allowed the model to</p> <p>4 select additional solar and storage on a</p> <p>5 least-cost optimization basis by year. So</p> <p>6 starting in -- I think it started building in</p> <p>7 2029, solar -- additional solar and storage.</p> <p>8 Q Understood. Thank you for that</p> <p>9 clarification.</p> <p>10 A Uh-huh.</p> <p>11 Q And last question on this subject.</p> <p>12 Besides storage and solar in those VCEA</p> <p>13 portfolios, did the Company force the model to</p> <p>14 select any other resources in those portfolios</p> <p>15 besides solar and storage?</p> <p>16 A No, there were no other resources forced.</p> <p>17 Q Thank you, Mr. Compton.</p> <p>18 Next, I'd like to turn to page 31 of the</p> <p>19 IRP.</p> <p>20 And do you see the blue stakeholder</p> <p>21 process highlight box on that page?</p> <p>22 A Yes.</p> <p>23 Q And it says there:</p> <p>24 During the stakeholder process, we</p> <p>25 received input to include information on carbon</p>
<p>146</p> <p>1 Q So then turning -- focusing on the second</p> <p>2 sentence:</p> <p>3 Furthermore, this portfolio builds</p> <p>4 additional solar and storage resources in the form</p> <p>5 of PPAs beyond what is required in the VCEA,</p> <p>6 building a total of 12.2 gigawatts of solar and</p> <p>7 4.1 gigawatts of storage resources.</p> <p>8 Did I read that correctly?</p> <p>9 A Yes.</p> <p>10 Q So I just want to understand how the model</p> <p>11 was allowed to select the additional solar and</p> <p>12 storage resources.</p> <p>13 For example, you know, was the model</p> <p>14 allowed to select additional solar and storage on</p> <p>15 an economic basis in any year within the</p> <p>16 applicable build limits or was it only allowed to</p> <p>17 select them after the 2035 petition requirements?</p> <p>18 If you can just help me understand, kind of, how</p> <p>19 those additional resources were allowed to be</p> <p>20 selected by the model.</p> <p>21 A Sure. So, first, we forced in the VCEA</p> <p>22 development targets, the 16,100 megawatts of solar</p> <p>23 and 2,700 megawatts of storage. We forced those</p> <p>24 in to meet the interim targets as well as the</p> <p>25 cumulative target and forced those in at a</p>	<p>148</p> <p>1 emissions. As a result, the Company included more</p> <p>2 information on carbon emissions and carbon</p> <p>3 intensity in the 2024 IRP.</p> <p>4 Do you see that?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q Now, on this page and in this section, the</p> <p>7 Company -- for example, the figure is about carbon</p> <p>8 intensity; is that correct?</p> <p>9 A That's correct.</p> <p>10 Q And carbon intensity is a measure of sort</p> <p>11 of a, you know, weight or mass of CO2 emissions</p> <p>12 divided by the energy production so you get sort</p> <p>13 of a relative amount; is that right?</p> <p>14 A That's correct.</p> <p>15 Q And this chart, for example, is</p> <p>16 historical, it's looking back at actual customer</p> <p>17 CO2 intensity; is that right -- sorry -- actual</p> <p>18 Company CO2 intensity; is that right?</p> <p>19 A That's correct.</p> <p>20 Q And I want to flip forward to page 69 of</p> <p>21 the IRP -- no, I'm sorry -- 56, we'll start there.</p> <p>22 This is page 56. And this is a -- Table 5.1.2,</p> <p>23 Modeling Results Summary.</p> <p>24 And I believe there was an errata filed,</p> <p>25 and I marked it in red here, that there was a date</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

8 (149 to 152)

<p>149</p> <p>1 in 2029, and I think it was supposed to be 2039; 2 is that correct? 3 A That's correct. 4 Q And so this shows basically the 5 approximate CO2 emissions just on that -- in that 6 one year, 2039, across the four primary 7 portfolios; is that correct? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Now let's flip ahead to page 69 there. 10 And this is a Figure 5.3.1. This is a similar 11 chart again with the approximate CO2 emissions in 12 2039 looking at some of the plan sensitivities; is 13 that correct? 14 A Yes. 15 Q And so for both of those charts we just 16 looked at, the summary results for the primary 17 portfolios, the other summary chart for the 18 sensitivities, CO2 emissions, the actual sort of 19 tons or weight of emissions are only presented for 20 a single year; is that correct? 21 A That's correct. 22 Q And am I correct that the CO2 emissions 23 from the Company's four primary portfolios on an 24 annual basis, those aren't provided in the IRP or 25 in the IRP's appendices, are they?</p>	<p>151</p> <p>1 that the Company included more information on 2 carbon emissions and carbon intensity in the 2024 3 IRP? 4 A I do. 5 Q And could you explain the -- could you 6 explain your reasoning for that? 7 A Yes. So we had the table that we looked 8 at, the couple of tables we looked at earlier that 9 were filed this year, as well as, you know, when 10 we provided summaries of each of the plans and we 11 provided a CO2 intensity chart for each plan as 12 well. We also provided the same charts again in 13 the hydrogen blending analysis. 14 So, you know, I feel like we did have more 15 information on carbon and carbon intensity in this 16 plan, yeah. 17 Q And just to be clear, though, I think you 18 just agreed with me that this chart -- this 19 information was not provided in the 2024 IRP, this 20 chart being the actual CO2 output from the 21 Company's portfolios was not presented in the 2024 22 IRP, nor was this information included in the 23 appendices for the 2024 IRP; is that correct? 24 A I believe that's correct. 25 Q Okay. I just have one last set of</p>
<p>150</p> <p>1 A I don't believe so. 2 Q So I'm just going to put up a figure from 3 the 2023 IRP. So this is the Company's 2023 IRP 4 report, and I'm going to start on page 81. So 5 this is the customer impact CO2 intensity. 6 This is essentially the same chart that we 7 looked at a few moments ago, looking at carbon 8 intensity on a historical basis, with the 9 difference being there's a few more years added in 10 the 2024 version we just looked at; is that right? 11 A Yes. 12 Q And then going backwards, this is page 31 13 of the 2023 IRP, and this is a different chart, 14 correct, that I could not find in the 2024 IRP? 15 This is actual CO2 output, and it's 16 showing, for each of the five plans the Company 17 presented in 2023, it's showing the actual -- you 18 know, the approximate CO2 emissions for each of 19 the plans through every year of the entire study 20 period; is that accurate? 21 A Yes. 22 Q So comparing what we saw in the 2024 IRP, 23 which was a CO2 intensity chart on a historical 24 basis, versus what we saw -- what we just looked 25 at in the 2023 IRP, do you stand by your statement</p>	<p>152</p> <p>1 questions on the supplement that was filed this 2 year. So I'm going to turn to page 5 of the 3 supplement. 4 And this was a chart that provides some 5 comparisons among the four -- among several of the 6 primary portfolios, and you're comparing, you 7 know, with and without data center load; is that 8 accurate? 9 A Yes. 10 Q And so I just want to point to your 11 narrative description in the second paragraph 12 here. And in the second paragraph it says: 13 When compared with the 2024 IRP VCEA with 14 EPA portfolio, the VCEA with EPA sensitivity with 15 no data center load growth resulted in 16 significantly less nuclear and wind resources 17 being built. The same amount of solar was chosen 18 by the model in the 2024 IRP portfolio and the 19 sensitivity, and approximately 1,800 megawatts, or 20 44 percent, less storage resources were built. 21 The model still chose to build approximately 2,600 22 megawatts of gas-fired generation starting in 23 2030. 24 Did I read that paragraph correctly? 25 A You did.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

9 (153 to 156)

<p>153</p> <p>1 Q So the thing I just want to look at is the 2 differences for the gas build-out. And so I 3 believe that paragraph we were just talking about 4 was the -- comparing the VCEA with EPA with data 5 center load and the VCEA with EPA without data 6 center load; is that right? 7 A Yes. 8 Q And so for the gas with the data center 9 load, 5,934 megawatts, and then without, 2,580 10 megawatts; is that right? 11 A Yes. 12 Q And so the difference there was without 13 data center load roughly 3,300 megawatts or so of 14 less gas built without data center load; is that 15 right? 16 A Yes. 17 Q And would you agree that -- would you also 18 agree that that is significantly less gas being 19 built without data center load? 20 A I would. 21 MR. BENFORADO: No further questions. 22 Thank you. 23 CROSS-EXAMINATION 24 BY MS. JAFFE: 25 Q Good morning, Commissioners and</p>	<p>155</p> <p>1 of blending hydrogen; is that correct? 2 A Yes. 3 Q How long has Dominion been planning the 4 Chesterfield Energy Reliability Center? 5 A That might be a better question for 6 Witness Martin. 7 Q Okay. Would you know if or could you 8 confirm, subject to check, that Dominion filed for 9 an air permit for the Chesterfield reliability 10 center back in August of 2023? 11 A That might be better for Witness Martin as 12 well. 13 Q Okay. Would Witness Martin also be a 14 better witness to ask about whether or not an RFP 15 was issued in September of 2024 for baseload, 16 intermediate, peaking resources with respect to a 17 possible gas plant? 18 A I could answer that yes. 19 Q Okay. So, yes, an RFP was issued in 20 September of 2024? 21 And how long does it usually take to draft 22 and compile all the materials for an RFP of that 23 magnitude? 24 A That's going to be better for Witness -- 25 MS. NIELSEN: Objection, Your Honor. The</p>
<p>154</p> <p>1 Mr. Compton. My name is Dorothy Jaffe, on behalf 2 of Sierra Club and the NRDC. 3 How are you, Mr. Compton? 4 A Good. How are you? 5 Q Good. Thank you. 6 So let's start on page 40 of the IRP. And 7 in that second paragraph, it states that: 8 The Company is evaluating its sites and 9 equipment for the construction of new gas-fired 10 units that will be dual fuel capable with on-site 11 backup fuel as well as capable of blending 12 hydrogen; is that correct? 13 A Yes. 14 Q And all four of the modeling portfolios 15 have a 944-megawatt combustion turbine coming 16 online in 2030 or 2031; is that also correct? 17 That would be Figures 5.1.3 through 5.1.6. 18 A Yes. I just want to make sure I got the 19 year right. 20 Yes, all in 2030 or 2031. 21 Q And the Company also recently filed a CPCN 22 on March 4th in Docket PUR-2025-00037 for a 23 944-megawatt CT, which is called the Chesterfield 24 Energy Reliability Center, which will also be dual 25 fuel capable with on-site backup fuel and capable</p>	<p>156</p> <p>1 CPCN proceeding that's being discussed is part of 2 an entirely separate proceeding and would be 3 outside the scope of this IRP. 4 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Response? 5 MS. JAFFE: Well, we would disagree that 6 it's outside the scope simply because, as 7 Mr. Compton has just testified, that the exact 8 size and scope and scale of the Chesterfield 9 Energy Reliability Center gas plant is exactly the 10 same size and scope and scale of what was modeled 11 in all four of their portfolios. 12 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: So what I'll do is 13 I'll allow it, but I'll give it its proper due 14 weight. 15 BY MS. JAFFE: 16 Q So the question was -- is about how long 17 does it take to put together those materials to 18 issue an RFP? 19 A That's going to be better for Witness 20 Martin. 21 Q Mr. Martin. Okay. 22 So as you just testified, you believe that 23 the RFP was issued in September of 2024; is that 24 correct? 25 A Subject to check on the date, but last</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

10 (157 to 160)

<p>157</p> <p>1 half of 2024. 2 Q Okay. And this IRP was filed on 3 October 15th? 4 A Yes. 5 Q So give or take a month after the RFP was 6 issued? 7 A If September is correct. 8 Q Okay. So then the Company knew before it 9 filed the IRP that it issued this RFP for that 10 particular baseload, intermediate, or peaking 11 resource? 12 A If the dates are correct, I would agree 13 with that. 14 Q Okay. 15 A My focus is really on the IRP. 16 Q I'm sorry? 17 A My focus is really on the IRP, not as much 18 on the RFP. 19 Q Okay. That's fair. 20 MS. GRUNDMANN: Your Honor, could you ask 21 the witness to just pull the microphone a little 22 closer. He fades in and out for me, and I'm 23 having a little difficulty hearing. Thank you. 24 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 25 MS. JAFFE: Your Honor, we'd like to hand</p>	<p>159</p> <p>1 What was the Company's response? 2 A The response written here is: 3 The Company objects to this request as not 4 relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to the 5 discovery of admissible evidence. The Company is 6 not proposing or requesting approval of any 7 specific resource as part of this proceeding. 8 Q Okay. So the Company did not disclose 9 that it issued any sort of RFP back in September; 10 is that correct? 11 A I mean, I guess the question here is 12 asking about an RFP in connection with a 13 large-scale generation of a generic CT. That's 14 different than what we discussed earlier about 15 baseload. 16 Q Okay. And there's no mention in the 2024 17 IRP of any discussion of the issuance of that 18 September 2024 RFP; is that correct? 19 A I don't believe so. 20 Q Okay. And are you familiar at all with 21 the Senior Hearing Examiner's report in the 2023 22 IRP? 23 A Yes. 24 Q So just to put on the overhead for ease of 25 reference. That's just of the cover page</p>
<p>158</p> <p>1 out an exhibit, please. 2 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Counsel, are you 3 planning on marking this for identification 4 purposes at this time? 5 MS. JAFFE: Yes, I'd like to go ahead and 6 mark this as Sierra Club and NRDC Exhibit 1, 7 please. 8 THE BAILIFF: Okay. The Dominion response 9 to Sierra Club Interrogatory Request 106 will be 10 marked as Exhibit 5. 11 (Exhibit No. 5 was marked for 12 identification.) 13 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Please proceed. 14 BY MS. JAFFE: 15 Q So, Mr. Compton, you had just testified 16 that you believe the RFP for the baseload, 17 intermediate, peaking resource was issued, you 18 know, on or about September of 2024. This IRP, 19 the 2024 IRP, was filed on October 15th. And this 20 particular exhibit is the response to Staff's 21 3-106. 22 So three months after the Company issued 23 the RFP, Staff asked on December 10th about 24 whether an RFP had been issued for a generic 25 combustion turbine.</p>	<p>160</p> <p>1 indicating that this came from the report of the 2 Senior Hearing Examiner back on December 8, 2023. 3 And this is page 131. In the top 4 paragraph, the Senior Hearing Examiner had stated 5 that: 6 By way of example, the 2023 IRP lacks the 7 information reflecting that Dominion has fully 8 considered all in-state, regional resources as an 9 alternative to the CTs. 10 And then goes on to say: 11 The Company acknowledged it has not yet 12 conducted an evaluation to determine if there 13 could be third-party alternatives to the CTs, even 14 though it already intends to file for a CPCN. 15 Do you see that? 16 A I do. 17 Q So the information that the Hearing 18 Examiner was referring to in this 2023 IRP, the 19 Company has not provided that information about 20 third-party alternatives in the 2024 IRP; is that 21 correct? 22 MS. NIELSEN: Objection, Your Honor. The 23 2023 IRP Hearing Examiner's ruling was not adopted 24 by the Commission. 25 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Response?</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

11 (161 to 164)

<p>161</p> <p>1 MS. JAFFE: Well, the Hearing Examiner's 2 report can be taken at face value for what her 3 recommendations and findings were with regard to 4 the sufficiency of the IRP, and it is a matter of 5 public record for this Commission. 6 So if Dominion had reviewed any of this 7 information prior to filing its 2024 IRP, we're 8 curious as to whether they took this information 9 into consideration when drafting their current 10 pending IRP. 11 MS. NIELSEN: Your Honor, we would add 12 that to the extent that she is suggesting that 13 it's somehow binding on the Company, that that is 14 an incorrect premise on which to base her 15 question. 16 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: And I would agree. 17 So please continue. 18 If you're unable to answer the question, 19 you may say so. 20 THE WITNESS: Okay. I'm sorry, can you 21 repeat the question. 22 BY MS. JAFFE: 23 Q I was wondering if the Company had 24 considered the information that the Hearing 25 Examiner had included in the -- her findings and</p>	<p>163</p> <p>1 included all the rules and then plans that 2 included none of the rules to kind of give 3 bookends, nobody knowing where these rules would 4 end up. 5 Q Would you agree, then, that modeling 6 existing law could also serve as a proxy for other 7 future environmental regulations that could come 8 during the pendency of the planning period? 9 A I'm not sure I fully understand the 10 question. 11 Q So if you were to model, say, the current 12 Section 111 rule on greenhouse gases, would that 13 serve as a proxy for maybe a potential other type 14 of air regulation that might happen with the 15 change in administration? 16 A I guess I would answer that that, you 17 know, we would always model current law. If laws 18 are challenged, we would likely want to model that 19 as a sensitivity or an alternative. So we try 20 to -- you know, if the law is law and not being 21 challenged or anything, it's a lot more 22 straightforward for planning purposes. But when 23 they are challenged, we want to show those 24 different scenarios for all different outcomes. 25 Q Okay. And so speaking of Section 111</p>
<p>162</p> <p>1 recommendations regarding providing an evaluation 2 or even identification of third-party alternatives 3 to a combustion turbine that it intended to seek 4 for a CPCN. 5 Have you considered any of that 6 information when you were putting together your 7 current pending IRP? 8 A I don't recall that specifically. 9 Q Okay. Thank you. 10 Now, if I could have you turn to 11 Appendix 5A of the IRP. 12 A Okay. I'm there. 13 Q So Appendix 5A are a list of environmental 14 regulations; is that correct? 15 A Yes. 16 Q And would you agree with me that you 17 included the -- with EPA regulations in your 18 modeling because it's prudent to model existing 19 applicable laws, both state and federal? 20 A We always intend to model current law, so 21 that's why we modeled the EPA rules. At the time 22 that we were modeling, I believe all of the new 23 EPA rules that came out in April or May of last 24 year were all being challenged at some -- in some 25 fashion, so we elected to model plans that</p>	<p>164</p> <p>1 rule, so that very last -- that last row addresses 2 the Section 111(g) rule regarding impacts to 3 existing coal-fired generation plants; is that 4 right? 5 A Correct. 6 Q And that rule would impact Mt. Storm, 7 Clover, and VCHEC? 8 A Yes. 9 Q And under that regulation, there are four 10 compliance options: you can retire by January 11 of 2032; you can co-fire at 40 percent gas by 12 January 1 of 2030, and then retire the unit by the 13 beginning of 2039; if you want to operate beyond 14 2039, you would have to install carbon capture at 15 a 90 percent capture rate by January 2032; and 16 then, lastly, you could choose to convert the 17 entire coal plant to 100 percent gas by January 18 of 2030. 19 Are those accurate representations of your 20 compliance options? 21 A Yes. 22 Q Okay. And Dominion chose to model this 23 particular rule by converting all three coal 24 plants to a hundred percent gas; is that correct? 25 A That's correct.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

12 (165 to 168)

<p>165</p> <p>1 Q And on page 54 of the IRP, it states that 2 Dominion has made no official decision on how it 3 will comply with the 111 rule; is that right? 4 A That's correct. 5 Q And you will agree that this is a final 6 rule, and it was published almost a year ago in 7 May of 2024, correct? 8 A Yes. 9 Q So as of today, almost a year since the 10 rule became final, has the Company made a decision 11 as to how it's going to comply with this rule? 12 A It's probably a little bit outside of my 13 area of responsibility, I guess, but I know that 14 the rules are still being studied. 15 I believe, subject to check, that the 16 compliance deadline originally as filed was -- as 17 the rule is filed was, I believe, mid-2026. So 18 there are, you know, some time for utilities to 19 develop how they would comply with the rules. 20 Q Okay. But that being said, so if you do 21 decide to choose to move forward with a hundred 22 percent conversion to gas for all three coal 23 plants, that has to be completed and done by 24 January of 2030, right? 25 MS. NIELSEN: Objection; it's</p>	<p>167</p> <p>1 Q Roughly a couple of years, at least? 2 A I would think so. 3 Q Okay. And January 1 of 2030 is less than 4 five years away? 5 A Yes. 6 Q Okay. And I think you just mentioned this 7 also, you'd have to address fuel supply. 8 So that time it takes in order to come 9 into compliance with this rule by January 2030 10 would have to also include the time to build and 11 permit any necessary lateral gas pipelines? 12 A If one needed to be built. 13 Q Okay. So does the Company have any sort 14 of internal deadline as to when it's going to make 15 this decision? 16 A I would say we will comply with the law, 17 which I believe is currently written -- would be 18 mid-2026. 19 Q To make a final decision? 20 A I believe that's the date. 21 Q Okay. And do you happen to know how much 22 it will cost to convert all three of these gas 23 plants and run any potential lateral pipelines? 24 A I do not offhand. What we modeled was we 25 used the EPA's assumptions, the EPA-published</p>
<p>166</p> <p>1 hypothetical. 2 MS. JAFFE: Based on how they modeled this 3 in their current IRP, I think it's a clarifying 4 question that they would have to make those 5 conversions by a certain date. 6 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: So the witness, you 7 can answer the question, but if you can just 8 clarify a little bit more specific, that would be 9 helpful. 10 MS. JAFFE: Okay. Sure. 11 BY MS. JAFFE: 12 Q So if Dominion chooses the path that it's 13 already decided in its current modeling, which is 14 to convert all three coal plants to gas, hundred 15 percent gas, the compliance deadline to do so is 16 January 1 of 2030; is that right? 17 A That's my understanding. 18 Q Okay. So in order to complete that 19 conversion by January 1 of 2030, when would you 20 have to start? 21 A Again, that's a lot -- you know, a lot 22 that goes into that fuel supply, conversion of the 23 actual units involving multiple departments, so I 24 don't have an exact date of when you would have to 25 start.</p>	<p>168</p> <p>1 assumptions for gas conversion -- cost assumptions 2 for gas conversion as well as carbon capture. 3 So we -- you know, with the rules just 4 coming out in April, May of last year, when we 5 needed to start modeling, we elected to use the 6 EPA's assumptions. 7 Q Do you have a ballpark estimate of what 8 that would cost? Are we talking \$10,000 versus a 9 hundred million? 10 A I would say it would be closer to a 11 hundred million. 12 Q Okay. And so one of the other rules that 13 you took into consideration with your modeling is 14 on the second row, and it's the Mercury and Air 15 Toxics Rule that became effective May 7th, 2024; 16 is that correct? 17 A Yes. 18 Q And this requires a lower particulate 19 matter limit, and it has a compliance deadline of 20 July 8, 2027; is that correct? 21 A Yes, with a possible extension of 22 July 2028. 23 Q Okay. And there are only two compliance 24 pathways for the MATS Rule, you can either retire 25 or you can install the controls by July 2027 or,</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

13 (169 to 172)

<p>169</p> <p>1 with the one-year extension, July of 2028; is that 2 correct? 3 A Yes. 4 Q And which coal plants does this new MATS 5 Rule apply to? 6 A Incrementally, really just Mt. Storm. 7 Mt. Storm is the one coal station that would 8 require significant equipment upgrades. 9 Q Okay. But Clover and VCHEC are also 10 listed on here? 11 A Yes. Those, I believe with the current 12 equipment installed, are within compliance. 13 Q Okay. So they wouldn't require any 14 additional investments? 15 A Not significant that I'm -- that I'm aware 16 of. 17 Q Okay. And compliance with the MATS Rule 18 for Mt. Storm is going to cost approximately 19 \$1.5 billion; is that correct? 20 A That's what we estimated in the IRP. 21 Q Okay. And then also similar to the 22 111 rule on page 54 of the IRP, the Company has 23 said it's not yet made a decision on how it will 24 comply with the rule. 25 Is that still true today, no final</p>	<p>171</p> <p>1 details of the base rate case. 2 BY MS. JAFFE: 3 Q Okay. And one -- let's see. Well, maybe 4 not. Maybe two additional sections. 5 Looking at, let's see, Appendix 3B-4. So 6 Appendix 3B-4 identifies net capacity factors 7 between 2021 and 2039; is that correct? 8 A Yes. 9 Q Okay. And for the coal plants on this 10 appendix, does it assume that Clover, VCHEC, and 11 Mt. Storm are going to convert to gas in 2030? 12 A Yes, it does. 13 Q Okay. And as highlighted on the one that 14 I have on the screen, starting in the early 2030s, 15 the coal plants, which by 2030 will be converted 16 to gas, see a significant drop in how often they 17 are running. 18 So Mt. Storm is seeing capacity factors 19 under about 7 percent, VCHEC is holding steady at 20 around 8 percent, and Clover does run the most, at 21 about 24 percent capacity factor, but then kind of 22 drops off and hovers in the teens. 23 Is that an accurate summary of the 24 capacity factors? 25 A Yes.</p>
<p>170</p> <p>1 decision has been made? 2 A Not that I'm aware of. 3 Q Okay. And this one and a half billion 4 dollars that you would need to invest in Mt. Storm 5 to comply with the MATS Rule by either July of '27 6 or July of 2028, that would be in addition to any 7 ongoing operation and maintenance costs or capital 8 investment to keep Mt. Storm running? 9 A Yes. 10 Q And isn't it true that, in the pending 11 Company's base rate case, which was just recently 12 filed, that there are significant capital 13 investments that are going to have to be made to 14 Mt. Storm to keep it operating? 15 MS. NIELSEN: Objection, Your Honor; 16 outside the scope. 17 MS. JAFFE: It goes to the overall costs 18 that have been incorporated into this IRP for what 19 it would take to keep Mt. Storm operating at least 20 until 2039, as identified in the IRP. 21 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Again, I'll ask the 22 witness if you can answer the question, you can 23 answer it. If you're unable to, you may say so as 24 well. 25 THE WITNESS: I'm not as familiar with the</p>	<p>172</p> <p>1 Q And why is it that these particular coal 2 plants are dropping and dropping significantly? 3 A It's likely driven by change in the 4 dispatch economics between coal and gas. 5 Q Okay. And so as we just discussed for the 6 MATS Rule, you're estimating that customers will 7 have to pay about \$1.5 billion to retrofit 8 Mt. Storm to comply with that rule. And then by 9 the 2030s, its capacity factor is dropping 10 significantly. 11 So they're going to have to pay these 12 costs, and, yet, the coal plant is not going to be 13 running that often; is that correct? 14 A While the capacity factors are low, you 15 know, as part of this IRP, we also filed the 16 retirement analysis for existing fossil units. 17 And, you know, that analysis shows significant 18 value for all existing fossil units to the tune 19 of, you know, collectively 12, \$14 billion, 20 depending on which plan you're looking at. 21 So these resources, while capacity factors 22 are lower than historical, they are significantly 23 valuable as capacity resources. 24 Q Okay. So would it be safe to say that 25 you're keeping these coal plants open in order to</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

14 (173 to 176)

<p>173</p> <p>1 serve a capacity need to support the data center 2 load growth? 3 A I would not say that's accurate. 4 Q In order to support load growth in 5 general? 6 A Yes. 7 Q Okay. And then, lastly, if I could have 8 you look at Figure 3.1 on page 5 of the directed 9 supplement. 10 A Okay. I'm there. 11 Q That's not a great copy. Sorry about 12 that. 13 So for looking at this table, when you 14 remove the data center load growth, the net 15 present value of the two portfolios without data 16 centers decreases by about \$20 billion; is that 17 correct? 18 A Yes. 19 Q So if the load projections stay on course, 20 will that \$20 billion to serve data center load 21 growth be parsed out to just the data centers or 22 will it be subsidized across all customers? 23 MS. NIELSEN: Objection, Your Honor. The 24 cost allocation is not a part of the IRP. It's a 25 part of another proceeding. For that reason, we</p>	<p>175</p> <p>1 without data center load growth, does that impact 2 the residential ratepayer bill impact analysis? 3 A That's probably a better question for 4 Witness Sunkins. 5 Q Okay. Great. Thank you. 6 MS. JAFFE: No further questions. 7 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Counsel, for 8 Exhibit No. 5, would you like that to be entered 9 into the record? 10 MS. JAFFE: Yes, I would, please. 11 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Any objection? 12 THE BAILIFF: And, Your Honor, may I amend 13 it? Because I believe I misspoke when I gave the 14 description. It should be the Dominion Response 15 to Staff Request 3-106. 16 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Absolutely. So 17 Dominion's Response to Staff's Request, which was 18 identified and marked as Exhibit No. 5, is entered 19 into the record. 20 (Exhibit No. 5 was admitted into 21 evidence.) 22 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 23 MS. JAFFE: Thank you. 24 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: United? 25 MS. POLLARD: No questions.</p>
<p>174</p> <p>1 don't believe it's relevant here. 2 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: We do have the 3 biennial, and that's filed before us. 4 MS. JAFFE: That is correct, but I would 5 posit that due to the impact of the data centers 6 on the IRP and the portfolios it's choosing as 7 well as the impact to residential customers and 8 the ratepayer bill impact analysis, that it is 9 relevant to know how these costs or 10 whether that -- how these costs are going to be 11 attributed across all customer classes because it 12 would impact what type of portfolio would be 13 reasonable in the public interest. 14 MS. ROBB: Your Honor, I would join in the 15 objection. I believe that the amount of cost is 16 relevant; I don't believe that the cost to 17 allocation is relevant. That's going to be 18 decided in the biennial review proceeding. 19 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Yes. If you can 20 focus on the bill impacts, that's fine. Cost 21 allocation -- if you can rephrase that, that would 22 be helpful. 23 MS. JAFFE: Okay. 24 BY MS. JAFFE: 25 Q Would the \$20 billion difference in the --</p>	<p>176</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: I'm sorry, your 2 name? 3 MS. POLLARD: Katherine Pollard. 4 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Clean Virginia. 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION 6 BY MR. REISINGER: 7 Q Good morning, Mr. Compton. I'm Will 8 Reisinger, speaking on behalf of Clean Virginia. 9 A Good morning. 10 Q Mr. Compton, you serve as the director of 11 strategic planning for Dominion Energy Services, 12 Inc.; is that correct? 13 A That's correct. 14 Q And DES provides services to different 15 Dominion Energy operating companies; is that 16 correct? 17 A That's correct. 18 Q Okay. And in that role, you oversee 19 Dominion Energy Virginia's Integrated Resource 20 planning process; is that right? 21 A That's correct. 22 Q And I believe you have held that position 23 since 2023; is that right? 24 A Yes. 25 Q Mr. Compton, I want to ask you about a</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

15 (177 to 180)

<p>177</p> <p>1 statement that appears on page 4 of the IRP. And</p> <p>2 specifically, it says:</p> <p>3 This 2024 IRP is meant for use as a</p> <p>4 long-term planning document based on a snapshot of</p> <p>5 time of current technologies, market information,</p> <p>6 and projections.</p> <p>7 I want to ask you about that phrase</p> <p>8 "snapshot in time."</p> <p>9 What does that mean to you?</p> <p>10 A To me, it means, you know, the IRP process</p> <p>11 is a lengthy process, very -- lots of inputs. I</p> <p>12 mean, you can see through the filing how many</p> <p>13 pages and pages of literature is there, lots of</p> <p>14 modeling inputs. It would depend on a load</p> <p>15 forecast, a commodity forecast, environmental</p> <p>16 regulations and policy. All of these things go in</p> <p>17 and you have to get them right.</p> <p>18 So, you know, we file -- this IRP was</p> <p>19 filed on October 15th. Back up from there, you're</p> <p>20 putting the document -- the appendices together</p> <p>21 after you've modeled, after a lot of input and a</p> <p>22 stakeholder process.</p> <p>23 So what that means to me is really, like,</p> <p>24 that snapshot in time, like, there's some point in</p> <p>25 time throughout that process where you have to</p>	<p>179</p> <p>1 like with and without EPA rules, et cetera.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And how is this IRP used in</p> <p>3 connection with the Company's certificate filings</p> <p>4 for new generation facilities?</p> <p>5 A I would say in the most -- at the most</p> <p>6 basic level, you know, a picture of the need. So,</p> <p>7 you know, by 2028 or 2030, you know, based on the</p> <p>8 current IRP, what does that need look like.</p> <p>9 Because, obviously, it takes time to get resources</p> <p>10 in place to meet the need.</p> <p>11 Q Mr. Compton, next, I have some questions</p> <p>12 about the Company's five-year reliability plan on</p> <p>13 page 44 of the IRP.</p> <p>14 And the five-year reliability plan is</p> <p>15 described here as -- or the IRP states that:</p> <p>16 Dominion Energy plans to proactively</p> <p>17 position itself to meet its commitment to provide</p> <p>18 reliable, affordable, and increasingly clean</p> <p>19 energy for the benefit of all customers over the</p> <p>20 long term.</p> <p>21 The five-year reliability plan is a</p> <p>22 component of all of the modeled portfolios,</p> <p>23 correct?</p> <p>24 A That's correct.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. So the five-year reliability plan</p>
<p>178</p> <p>1 lock down all of your inputs and assumptions and</p> <p>2 move on and start modeling and putting together</p> <p>3 the filing and come back next year and you get to</p> <p>4 do it again.</p> <p>5 Q Okay. And the phrase "snapshot in time,"</p> <p>6 that doesn't appear in the statute anywhere, does</p> <p>7 it?</p> <p>8 A I'm not sure.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. In the next sentence on page 4,</p> <p>10 Mr. Compton says that IRPs are not a request to</p> <p>11 approve any specific resource or portfolio but,</p> <p>12 rather, to assess their reasonableness for</p> <p>13 long-term planning purposes.</p> <p>14 And I've heard your counsel say that this</p> <p>15 IRP is not a request for any particular resource.</p> <p>16 My question is: How does the Company use</p> <p>17 this IRP?</p> <p>18 A Sure. So the IRP will, you know, give us</p> <p>19 a look at a snapshot in time of the load growth,</p> <p>20 what are the demands, you know, 15 years out from</p> <p>21 now and 15 years out in the future based on</p> <p>22 current law, policy, regulations, based on current</p> <p>23 commodity forecasts, like what -- what does a</p> <p>24 reasonable plan look like. And, you know, we try</p> <p>25 to provide multiple views of what that could look</p>	<p>180</p> <p>1 is what the Company is actually doing now and</p> <p>2 planning to do over the next five years, correct?</p> <p>3 A Yes, yep.</p> <p>4 Q And when I say it's what the Company is</p> <p>5 actually doing now, I mean, you would agree that</p> <p>6 the Company is doing things like continuing the</p> <p>7 development of gas-fired generation, including,</p> <p>8 but not limited to, brownfield sites, to take</p> <p>9 advantage of capacity injection rights? The</p> <p>10 Company is doing those things, correct?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q And over on 45, page 45 of the IRP, you</p> <p>13 continued to describe some things that the Company</p> <p>14 is doing as part of this five-year reliability</p> <p>15 plan, which would include pursuing regulatory</p> <p>16 approvals for an LNG storage facility, correct?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q And the Company already did that and got</p> <p>19 Commission approval to pursue that storage</p> <p>20 facility, correct?</p> <p>21 A That's correct.</p> <p>22 Q And the Company is continuing to advance</p> <p>23 the development of SMRs; is that right?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q And the Company has already filed an</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

16 (181 to 184)

<p>181</p> <p>1 application for a Rider for SMR development costs, 2 correct? 3 A I believe that's correct. 4 Q So the Company is not waiting for 5 Commission approval of this IRP to continue 6 executing its five-year reliability plan; is that 7 fair to say? 8 A Yes. 9 Q So the five-year reliability plan is not 10 really a snapshot in time, it's what the Company 11 is actually doing right now, correct? 12 A Yes, I would say it is what the Company is 13 doing right now at this snapshot in time. 14 Q Okay. And you would agree that, if the 15 Commission determines that aspects of the 16 Company's five-year reliability plan were not 17 reasonable, the Commission should say so in this 18 case? 19 A Yes. 20 Q Okay. And, Mr. Compton, you testified in 21 the Company's 2023 IRP; is that correct? 22 A Yes. 23 Q And I believe in past IRPs, the Company 24 used a term called a "Short-Term Action Plan"; is 25 that correct?</p>	<p>183</p> <p>1 the associated expectation that the CTs will come 2 online in 2028. 3 Do you recall seeing that analysis in the 4 Hearing Examiner's report? 5 A Yes. 6 Q And do you recall that the Hearing 7 Examiner also stated that the Company forced its 8 model to choose gas generation in 2028 in its 9 alternative plans B and D? 10 A Yes. 11 Q And, Mr. Compton, are you familiar with 12 this Code section that the Hearing Examiner cited, 13 Code Section 56-585.1 A 5 of the Code of Virginia? 14 A Yes. 15 Q And the Hearing Examiner, in her 16 interpretation, this Code section established 17 additional requirements for the new -- for the 18 approval of new carbon-emitting generation. 19 You're generally familiar with that Code 20 section? 21 A I am. 22 MS. NIELSEN: And, Your Honor, I would 23 have to object again before we go too far down 24 this road that, to the extent that this is setting 25 up some sort of premise that the Company was</p>
<p>182</p> <p>1 A I believe so. 2 Q Okay. And the Short-Term Action Plan was 3 also a five-year plan of what the Company intended 4 to do; is that right? 5 A Yes. 6 Q Okay. But it was the same concept as the 7 five-year reliability plan? 8 A I would agree with that. 9 Q Okay. Mr. Compton, you had some 10 discussion earlier about the Senior Hearing 11 Examiner's reports in the Company's 2023 IRP, 12 which was Case No. PUR-2023-00066, and I believe 13 you just said you were a witness in that case, 14 correct? 15 A Correct. 16 Q So you reviewed this report? 17 A Yes. 18 Q Okay. And I want to ask you about a 19 statement that the Hearing Examiner makes on 20 page 130 of her report and recommendation. 21 And specifically, she says that she was 22 concerned regarding the 2023 IRP's legal 23 sufficiency relative to Dominion's inclusion of 24 960 megawatts of natural gas CTs in its Short-Term 25 Action Plan and in alternative plans B and D, with</p>	<p>184</p> <p>1 required to implement any of the recommendations 2 in the Hearing Examiner's report, we would object 3 to that line of questioning. 4 MR. REISINGER: Your Honor, that's not 5 going to be my question. 6 I would like to ask the witness if -- if 7 the witness is aware of this Code section, I would 8 ask -- like to ask the witness whether the Company 9 referenced or discussed this Code section in its 10 2024 IRP. 11 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Please proceed. 12 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you repeat 13 the question? 14 BY MR. REISINGER: 15 Q Yeah. Mr. Compton, you said you are aware 16 of this provision of the Code Section 585.1 A 5. 17 My question to you is, does the 2024 IRP 18 reference or discuss this Code section? 19 A Not that I'm aware of. My understanding 20 of this section of the Code -- and I'm not an 21 attorney, but that this is -- it reads to me more 22 like it's for CPCN filings rather than IRP 23 planning. 24 Q Okay. And, Mr. Compton, I wanted to ask 25 you one more question, if you are aware.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

17 (185 to 188)

<p>185</p> <p>1 You stated you are aware of Code Section 2 56-585.1 A 5. I want to ask you if you're aware 3 of another provision in the same statute, which is 4 56-585.1 A 6. And I'm going to read it for you. 5 That provision states that: 6 A utility seeking approval to construct or 7 purchase a generating facility that emits carbon 8 dioxide shall demonstrate that it has already met 9 the energy savings goals identified in 10 Section 56-596.2 and that the identified need 11 cannot be met more affordably through the 12 deployment or utilization of demand-side resources 13 or energy storage resources and that it has 14 considered and weighed alternative options, 15 including third-party market alternatives, in its 16 selection process. 17 Are you familiar with that provision of 18 the Code of Virginia? 19 A Yes. 20 Q Okay. And is this provision referenced or 21 discussed in the 2024 IRP? 22 A Not that I'm aware of. It reads to me 23 more like a CPCN filing than IRP does. We're not 24 seeking approval to construct or purchase a 25 facility in this case.</p>	<p>187</p> <p>1 your role as director of strategic planning? 2 A I was not -- I would say I did not oversee 3 it. I was very involved. 4 Q And you attended most or all of the 5 stakeholder meetings? 6 A Yes. 7 Q And you received and considered feedback 8 from different stakeholders in your role? 9 A Yes. 10 Q Okay. And the Company presented a 11 stakeholder input case as part of its IRP; is that 12 correct? 13 A That's correct. 14 Q And I will put it on the screen here, if I 15 can find it. The stakeholder process is discussed 16 at Appendix 1 of the IRP. 17 And on page 12 of Appendix 1, the Company 18 actually presents the stakeholder input case; is 19 that correct? 20 A That's correct. 21 Q And I understand the Company doesn't 22 believe that this presents a viable path forward, 23 so it's not a recommendation of the Company; is 24 that right? 25 A That's correct.</p>
<p>186</p> <p>1 Q Okay. So it's fair to say that the 2 Company did not consider and was not influenced by 3 this Code section when developing its 2024 IRP? 4 A I would say that it was. You know, the 5 IRP and the modeling really does this, you know, 6 looking at demand-side energy storage, different 7 alternatives. 8 Q Okay. This provision, you would agree, 9 the Company would have to satisfy this -- the 10 requirements of this provision in order to receive 11 approval for new carbon-emitting resources; is 12 that correct? 13 MS. NIELSEN: I would object, Your Honor. 14 It's asking for a legal conclusion, and 15 Mr. Compton has already testified twice that he's 16 not a lawyer. 17 MR. REISINGER: Your Honor, I can move on 18 here. 19 BY MR. REISINGER: 20 Q And, Mr. Compton, this IRP was developed 21 following a stakeholder process; is that correct? 22 A That's correct. 23 Q And were you a part of that process? 24 A I was. 25 Q Okay. Did you oversee that process in</p>	<p>188</p> <p>1 Q Okay. Now, were the stakeholders given an 2 opportunity to review and comment on the 3 stakeholder input case before it was filed? 4 A Are you asking the inputs or the outputs? 5 Q The outputs, the final Figure 1 6 Stakeholder Input Case, were the stakeholders 7 given an opportunity to review this and provide 8 feedback before the Company filed its IRP? 9 A I don't recall. We had a lot of meetings, 10 15, I believe, in total, with a couple right 11 around the time that we filed, so I don't recall. 12 Q Do you recall that -- or do you recall 13 whether stakeholders repeatedly asked the Company 14 to provide a draft of its final modeling results 15 so that they could provide specific feedback 16 before the filing? 17 A I do not recall that. 18 Q Going forward, would the Company agree to 19 allow stakeholders to review and provide comments 20 on the stakeholder input case before it is filed 21 with the Commission? 22 A I think we would make every best effort to 23 do so. 24 Q Did the stakeholders have access to the 25 same modeling software used by Dominion to prepare</p>

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

18 (189 to 192)

<p>189</p> <p>1 the Integrated Resource Plan?</p> <p>2 A I'm sure that some likely did. There were</p> <p>3 approximately 200 participants throughout the</p> <p>4 process. I don't know specifically -- I'm sure</p> <p>5 not all of them did, but I wouldn't be surprised</p> <p>6 if some did.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. Would the Company agree to provide</p> <p>8 stakeholders with access to the same modeling</p> <p>9 software used by the Company in future stakeholder</p> <p>10 processes?</p> <p>11 A That's probably outside of my</p> <p>12 decision-making capability, but it's very -- I</p> <p>13 would say that's a very complicated -- you know,</p> <p>14 we had 200 this year. It's hard to tell how many</p> <p>15 we'll have in the future.</p> <p>16 But I can tell you that PLEXOS, the</p> <p>17 modeling software we use, the licenses are quite</p> <p>18 expensive, and then, you know, that brings into</p> <p>19 question cost recovery of that. So that's a very</p> <p>20 complicated question.</p> <p>21 Q And PLEXOS is an expensive software, but</p> <p>22 it is a software that the Company itself has</p> <p>23 chosen, correct?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q Mr. Compton, I want to ask you if you are</p>	<p>191</p> <p>1 millions of dollars.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And, of course, the Company was</p> <p>3 able to and did comply with the South Carolina PSC</p> <p>4 order and negotiated a discounted licensing fee;</p> <p>5 is that correct?</p> <p>6 A I'm not aware of the negotiations or the</p> <p>7 cost of this arrangement. You know, I guess also</p> <p>8 this is a much -- DESC is a much smaller system.</p> <p>9 I'm not sure how many stakeholders participate in</p> <p>10 their process, but I imagine, you know, our system</p> <p>11 is four to five times the size of theirs. I would</p> <p>12 imagine we likely have quite a few more</p> <p>13 stakeholders, if I were just guessing.</p> <p>14 Q Okay. So do you have an estimate -- if</p> <p>15 Dominion Energy Virginia were to absorb these</p> <p>16 licensing fees, do you have any estimate of what</p> <p>17 that would mean in terms of cost recovery for</p> <p>18 customers?</p> <p>19 A I'm not sure how the cost recovery would</p> <p>20 work. You know, this to me reads that DESC</p> <p>21 absorbed the cost. I'm not sure if that</p> <p>22 ultimately was paid for by ratepayers, but, you</p> <p>23 know, at 200 -- theoretical -- 200 licenses, my</p> <p>24 guess would be in the millions of dollars.</p> <p>25 Q Okay.</p>
<p>190</p> <p>1 aware of an IRP -- a provision of an IRP that</p> <p>2 Dominion Energy South Carolina filed before the</p> <p>3 South Carolina Public Service Commission on</p> <p>4 August 4th of 2023.</p> <p>5 I want to ask you about one of the order</p> <p>6 requirements that Dominion Energy discusses on</p> <p>7 page 96 of that document.</p> <p>8 And, specifically, the Company is</p> <p>9 referencing the orders from the South Carolina</p> <p>10 PSC, and one of those orders was that Dominion</p> <p>11 Energy South Carolina shall negotiate a</p> <p>12 discounted, project-based licensing fee that</p> <p>13 permits intervenors the ability to perform their</p> <p>14 own modeling runs in the same software package as</p> <p>15 the utility and directs the utility to absorb the</p> <p>16 costs of these licensing fees.</p> <p>17 Are you aware of that requirement from the</p> <p>18 South Carolina Public Service Commission?</p> <p>19 A Generally, yes.</p> <p>20 Q So the Company could do the same thing in</p> <p>21 Virginia, correct?</p> <p>22 A Again, I mean, I think that would be</p> <p>23 possible. I'm concerned -- I would be concerned</p> <p>24 about the cost of such. I think 200-plus -- if</p> <p>25 that's 200-plus licenses, rough estimate, it's</p>	<p>192</p> <p>1 MR. REISINGER: And, Your Honor, I don't</p> <p>2 intend to move this into evidence, but for the</p> <p>3 record, I do just want to say, if I didn't</p> <p>4 already, that I'm referring to an August 4th -- an</p> <p>5 August 4th, 2023, filing before the South Carolina</p> <p>6 Public Service Commission in Docket No. 2023-9-E.</p> <p>7 BY MR. REISINGER:</p> <p>8 Q And one more question on the stakeholder</p> <p>9 process, Mr. Compton.</p> <p>10 You're familiar with House Bill 2413 that</p> <p>11 passed the House of Delegates in the Senate</p> <p>12 earlier this year?</p> <p>13 A Generally.</p> <p>14 Q And I believe you reference it in your</p> <p>15 rebuttal testimony; is that correct?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q I want to ask if you're familiar with an</p> <p>18 amendment to Code Section 56-599D that would have</p> <p>19 changed some of the requirements for the</p> <p>20 stakeholder process.</p> <p>21 And, specifically, a portion of that bill</p> <p>22 would have required that, as part of the</p> <p>23 stakeholder review process, the utility shall</p> <p>24 provide stakeholders with reasonable access to the</p> <p>25 same modeling software, modeling assumptions,</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

19 (193 to 196)

<p>193</p> <p>1 modeling inputs, and data used by the utility to 2 evaluate supply and demand resources in its 3 Integrated Resource Plan and that such access 4 shall enable stakeholders to create modeling 5 scenarios for the utility's consideration during 6 the development of its Integrated Resource Plan. 7 Do you recall seeing that aspect of the 8 legislation? 9 MS. NIELSEN: Objection, Your Honor. This 10 is a similar objection as to the premise of the 11 question. The bill that's being discussed was 12 vetoed by the governor, and in the notes, he 13 stated that the State Corporation Commission has 14 the expertise and authority to make requirements 15 and changes to the IRP process. 16 So to the extent that there's a suggestion 17 here that this is a requirement of the existing 18 law, we would object. 19 MS. GRUNDMANN: May I please be heard? 20 With respect to the question as asked, 21 there was no question that said, did you comply 22 with this requirement? The question was simply, 23 were you aware of the existence of this 24 legislation? 25 So there is no question for the Commission</p>	<p>195</p> <p>1 Q Okay. And if the General Assembly 2 directed the Company to do this, to provide access 3 to the same modeling software, the Company could 4 do that, correct? 5 A We would make every reasonable effort to 6 comply with the law. 7 Q Okay. The Company would make a reasonable 8 effort to comply with the law or you would comply 9 with the law? 10 A We would. 11 Q Okay. And, Mr. Compton, your counsel 12 referenced the governor's veto message. So even 13 though the bill passed both houses of the General 14 Assembly, it was not signed by the governor. 15 As your counsel stated, though, that the 16 State Corporation Commission -- the governor 17 concluded that the State Corporation Commission 18 has the expertise and the authority to make 19 requirements and changes to the Integrated 20 Resource Plan process. 21 Do you agree with that? 22 A I see that. 23 Q And do you see also that the governor, in 24 his veto message, cited the Virginia Clean Economy 25 Act? He expressed his opinion that the Virginia</p>
<p>194</p> <p>1 to which an objection would be proper because he 2 wasn't asking if this witness was going to comply 3 with the requirement. It was simply, were you 4 aware that this passed the house? He didn't 5 represent that it became law. He didn't represent 6 that it was a requirement that they must comply. 7 So, overall, Your Honor, I think -- my 8 issue is there's been multiple objections before 9 any question is asked that is objectionable. And 10 so I think it's creating an issue in terms of the 11 questions and answers between intervenor parties 12 and the witnesses. 13 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you, Counsel. 14 MR. REISINGER: I'll just state, 15 Your Honor, I haven't asked my question yet. I 16 think, if I asked my question, I don't know that 17 there will be an objection. 18 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Please proceed. 19 BY MR. REISINGER: 20 Q Okay. Mr. Compton, you said earlier that 21 you are generally familiar with this legislation 22 you cited in your rebuttal testimony, and are you 23 generally familiar with this proposed amendment to 24 the Code? 25 A Generally.</p>	<p>196</p> <p>1 Clean Economy Act is failing Virginia and those 2 that champion it should stop trying to buttress 3 this failing policy. 4 Do you see that statement? 5 A I do. 6 Q So did the governor, in your opinion, veto 7 this bill because he thinks the Virginia Clean 8 Economy Act is not good policy? 9 MS. NIELSEN: Objection, Your Honor. The 10 witness has absolutely no understanding of why the 11 governor did or did not veto this bill. He's not 12 in the governor's mind. 13 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 14 MR. REISINGER: Your Honor, I'll move on. 15 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 16 BY MR. REISINGER: 17 Q Mr. Compton, a couple more questions about 18 the stakeholder process. 19 Isn't it true that the stakeholders 20 recommended that the Company include long-duration 21 energy storage in the stakeholder input case? 22 A Some did. As I mentioned earlier, I think 23 there were approximately 200 participants, a very 24 diverse group, lots of opinions. 25 I believe at least one party recommended</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

20 (197 to 200)

<p>197</p> <p>1 modeling long-duration storage, but part of the 2 process is we couldn't have 200 different 3 stakeholder input plans like that. It would just 4 take forever to model. So what we did was we 5 tried to take a majority or, like, where we heard 6 the same thing a lot and build that into the 7 stakeholder input case. 8 Q And isn't it also true that stakeholders 9 suggested that the Company should model various 10 energy efficiency scenarios, including greater 11 deployments of demand-side resources? 12 A They did, and we did. So as maybe a 13 clarifying point, we had the stakeholder input 14 case, which had a lot of-- things that we heard 15 a lot, you know, no new gas units, things like 16 that. 17 But we took other -- we took some of the 18 other feedback, like the energy efficiency 19 feedback that you mentioned, and actually built 20 those into some of the primary portfolios. So 21 some of that feedback is in the primary 22 portfolios, not necessarily just in the 23 stakeholder input case. 24 Q The primary portfolios, do the primary 25 portfolios assume that the Company complies with</p>	<p>199</p> <p>1 A There were multiple requests. I don't 2 recall how many, but there were a few. 3 Q Okay. And a carbon cost or a dispatch 4 adder for carbon was not included in the 5 stakeholder input case or in any of the modeled 6 scenarios? 7 A That's correct. 8 MR. REISINGER: Thank you, sir. That's 9 all the questions I have. 10 THE WITNESS: All right. Thank you. 11 MR. MURPHEY: DCC has no questions, 12 Your Honor. 13 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 14 Ms. Grundmann, would you like to go now or 15 maybe take a ten-minute break? 16 MS. GRUNDMANN: Your Honor, I would love 17 to take a ten-minute break. 18 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: I thought so. 19 Let's reconvene at 11:40. We are now in 20 recess. 21 (A recess was taken.) 22 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: You may proceed. 23 MS. GRUNDMANN: Thank you. 24 CROSS-EXAMINATION 25 BY MS. GRUNDMANN:</p>
<p>198</p> <p>1 the Virginia Clean Economy Act energy savings 2 targets? 3 A Yes. 4 Q And isn't it true that the stakeholders 5 asked the Company to incorporate higher levels of 6 energy efficiency, even higher -- above and beyond 7 the Virginia Clean Economy Act minimum 8 requirements? 9 A That's correct. And the way that we did 10 that was through the sensitivities labeled as 11 high- and low-load forecast. So in those 12 sensitivities for, like, the high-load forecast, 13 it assumed stakeholder feedback on data center 14 growth, higher data center growth, and lower 15 energy efficiency targets. 16 The low-load sensitivity did the opposite. 17 So you had lower data center growth and higher 18 energy efficiency. So we tried to capture all of 19 that feedback on data center load growth and 20 energy efficiency savings through those 21 sensitivities. 22 Q Okay. Mr. Compton, isn't it true that the 23 Company received multiple requests from 24 stakeholders to include a social cost of carbon in 25 its modeling?</p>	<p>200</p> <p>1 Q Welcome back, Mr. Compton. My name is 2 Carrie Grundmann. I'm an attorney here on behalf 3 of Walmart. 4 I want to start by going back over a 5 couple questions that I had based upon some 6 questions you got from some other intervener 7 parties because I want to make sure that I 8 understand. 9 So in response to some questions from 10 Mr. Benforado, you-all discussed some of the 11 resources, specifically solar and storage, that 12 were forced into the model. 13 Do you recall that discussion? 14 A Yes. 15 Q Okay. And I think that the sort of 16 question was, once you forced in the requirements 17 of the VCEA, what happened next? 18 And according to my notes, you sort of 19 indicated that, at that point, the model was 20 allowed to optimize, I think, additional solar or 21 storage on a least-cost basis; is that correct? 22 A Yes. 23 Q But that ability to optimize was subject 24 to a ceiling based upon build limits that the 25 Company imposed on the model; is that correct?</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

21 (201 to 204)

<p>201</p> <p>1 A That's correct.</p> <p>2 MS. GRUNDMANN: Your Honor, I'd like to</p> <p>3 mark an exhibit. And I will represent for the</p> <p>4 record where it came from.</p> <p>5 I will represent to the record that the</p> <p>6 document reflects an "extraordinarily sensitive"</p> <p>7 marking on the top, but in consultation with the</p> <p>8 Company, we have agreed that the document being</p> <p>9 mentioned can be shared publicly on the record.</p> <p>10 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you.</p> <p>11 MS. GRUNDMANN: And for reference -- once</p> <p>12 Mr. Robinson comes back, I will describe the</p> <p>13 document.</p> <p>14 For purposes of the record, I'm going to</p> <p>15 describe where this document comes from, and then</p> <p>16 I will separately provide a description of the</p> <p>17 exhibit. But this comes from attachment Sierra</p> <p>18 Club, Set 1-2, parens, confidential, underscore,</p> <p>19 ES, comma, PLEXOS inputs, parens, confidential,</p> <p>20 underscore, ES, comma, green sheets, parens, CJR,</p> <p>21 end parens, ES.</p> <p>22 For purposes of the record, I'd like to</p> <p>23 mark this as an exhibit and describe it as the IRP</p> <p>24 Build Limits.</p> <p>25 THE BAILIFF: The IRP Build Limits as</p>	<p>203</p> <p>1 is the full panoply of resources that the Company</p> <p>2 started with for purposes of consideration in the</p> <p>3 IRP; is that correct?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And then if we go over to the far column</p> <p>6 on the right that says Comment, where it reflects</p> <p>7 "not modeled," that reflects that that resource</p> <p>8 was not available for selection by the model; is</p> <p>9 that correct?</p> <p>10 A That's correct.</p> <p>11 Q And I would note -- I apologize to jump</p> <p>12 back and forth, but going back to that Asset</p> <p>13 column, you have listed there under Nuclear</p> <p>14 Technologies, you have two entries for SMR; is</p> <p>15 that correct?</p> <p>16 A Yes.</p> <p>17 Q But you do not have any entry to consider</p> <p>18 what I would call traditional large-scale nuclear</p> <p>19 or AP1000?</p> <p>20 A That's correct.</p> <p>21 Q So did the Company assess large-scale</p> <p>22 nuclear in any way as part of this IRP?</p> <p>23 A That would probably be best answered by</p> <p>24 Company Witness Flowers.</p> <p>25 Q Flowers. Okay.</p>
<p>202</p> <p>1 described will be marked as Exhibit 6.</p> <p>2 (Exhibit No. 6 was marked for</p> <p>3 identification.)</p> <p>4 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. Please</p> <p>5 proceed.</p> <p>6 BY MS. GRUNDMANN:</p> <p>7 Q And, Mr. Compton, are you familiar with</p> <p>8 the document?</p> <p>9 MS. NIELSEN: Ms. Grundmann, I'm sorry. I</p> <p>10 don't mean to interrupt your cross. We would just</p> <p>11 ask that the "extraordinarily sensitive"</p> <p>12 designation be stricken before it gets admitted</p> <p>13 into the record.</p> <p>14 MS. GRUNDMANN: That's fine by me. I</p> <p>15 didn't mark it, so I'm happy to strike it. I just</p> <p>16 didn't want to take anything off of their original</p> <p>17 Excel file.</p> <p>18 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you.</p> <p>19 BY MS. GRUNDMANN:</p> <p>20 Q Mr. Compton, are you familiar with this</p> <p>21 data here that I have pulled out of the green</p> <p>22 sheets tab?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q And this reflects -- first, starting in</p> <p>25 the far left column under the column Asset, that</p>	<p>204</p> <p>1 All right. So then going back to this</p> <p>2 question and the back-and-forth that you had with</p> <p>3 Mr. Benforado, when you say that you forced into</p> <p>4 the model the limits set forth under the VCEA for</p> <p>5 solar and storage and allowed it to then select</p> <p>6 additional megawatts of those resources on a</p> <p>7 least-cost basis, that selection of additional</p> <p>8 megawatts would be limited by the annual limits</p> <p>9 set forth in Column 2 for those various resources;</p> <p>10 is that correct?</p> <p>11 A That's correct.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. So let's just use an example to</p> <p>13 make sure the record is clear.</p> <p>14 Let's use battery storage eight-hour,</p> <p>15 which the Company elected to impose a 300-megawatt</p> <p>16 total annual limit; is that correct?</p> <p>17 A Yes.</p> <p>18 Q When you ran PLEXOS, you never ran an</p> <p>19 unconstrained scenario whereby the model could</p> <p>20 optimally select the total number of megawatts of</p> <p>21 storage, whether it's the four or eight or any</p> <p>22 other number of hours of storage, that the model</p> <p>23 would have selected on a full least-cost basis?</p> <p>24 A So the model was allowed to build up to</p> <p>25 the annual limits shown in Column 2.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

22 (205 to 208)

<p style="text-align: right;">205</p> <p>1 Q All right. Then I'd like to go back -- I 2 want to clarify the discussion that you had about 3 the Commission-directed supplement on page 6. I 4 think it's page 6. Give me a second. It may be 5 page 5. 6 It's page 5. 7 And I apologize for the glare on the 8 center of this. 9 Specifically, I'm looking here at the VCEA 10 with EPA scenario here in the purple column, the 11 2,250, and then, on the far right, the 2,250. 12 That number is less than the 2,700 13 megawatts of storage required by the VCEA, 14 correct? 15 A That's correct. 16 Q When you determine these numbers, are you 17 including or excluding the megawatts of storage 18 that have previously been proposed to the 19 Commission for approval? 20 A So as reflected in this table, it would be 21 incremental to proposed or approved projects. 22 Q Thank you for that clarification. 23 Now, in response to some questions from 24 Mr. Reisinger, you discussed providing PLEXOS 25 licenses to interested parties.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">207</p> <p>1 significantly less between a license for staff 2 versus 200 stakeholders, correct? 3 A I would think so. 4 Q And as part of your position as the 5 director of strategic planning, you are required, 6 as a result of having some load in the eastern 7 part of North Carolina, to also interact with 8 public staff in North Carolina; is that correct? 9 A Yes. 10 Q And so are you aware as to whether or not 11 public staff in North Carolina performs its own 12 modeling in IRP-type proceedings? 13 A My understanding is that they do some. 14 Q And what -- how do you have that 15 understanding? 16 A Through discussions with the public staff. 17 Q And do some of those discussions involve 18 what it is that they do as a result of Duke Energy 19 Carolinas and Duke Energy Progress in North 20 Carolina? 21 A No, not specifically. 22 Q And do you, as a result of your position 23 as the director of resource planning, do you level 24 set with your colleagues in other jurisdictions 25 about IRP planning and best practices?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">206</p> <p>1 Do you recall that discussion? 2 A Yes. 3 Q Based on that back and forth, it was sort 4 of my understanding that in the event the 5 Commission were to order you to make those 6 licenses available, that the Company's default 7 position would be to seek cost recovery of those 8 licenses from ratepayers; is that correct? 9 A I'm not sure that I could answer that from 10 the Company's perspective, but, yeah, I'm sure 11 that would be an issue for debate. 12 Q I'd like to put forward another proposal 13 for your consideration with respect to the PLEXOS 14 licenses. 15 In contrast to the concept of providing 16 any stakeholder a PLEXOS license, in the event the 17 Commission did not order you to undertake some 18 sort of an open-source-type program, does the 19 Company have any objection to making available 20 licenses to the Commission -- to the public's 21 Commission staff in the event that Commission 22 staff wanted to perform its own modeling? 23 A We would follow a Commission order on 24 that. I mean, similar cost concerns. 25 Q But, obviously, the costs are</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">208</p> <p>1 A We do. 2 Q Does that include the team at Duke Energy 3 in North Carolina? 4 A Not the team. I would say, you know, 5 personally, I have one contact at Duke. We -- you 6 know, my team does attend conferences, IRP 7 conferences. So besides that, you know, I only 8 have one contact at Duke. 9 Q Do you follow the proceedings before the 10 North Carolina Utilities Commission as it relates 11 to Duke Energy's carbon plan proceedings in North 12 Carolina? 13 A Not closely. 14 Q But you do follow them some? 15 A I don't really follow the proceedings as 16 much as, you know, I'm more familiar with their 17 IRP document. 18 Q With Duke's IRP document? 19 A Uh-huh. 20 Q Are you aware -- and I'm just going to put 21 it up on the screen for you. 22 Are you aware that the North Carolina 23 Utilities Commission has published Commission 24 rules that govern certain filings before the 25 Commission?</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

23 (209 to 212)

<p style="text-align: right;">209</p> <p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q And there are sometimes different rules</p> <p>3 for Dominion versus Duke Energy.</p> <p>4 Are you aware of that as well?</p> <p>5 A Yes.</p> <p>6 Q So I'm going to put up on the screen what</p> <p>7 is referred to by the North Carolina Utilities</p> <p>8 Commission as Rule R8-60A. And I'll represent</p> <p>9 that this rule applies specifically to Duke</p> <p>10 Energy, but I just want to ask if you have any</p> <p>11 familiarity with this provision.</p> <p>12 So I'm looking at here at the bottom of</p> <p>13 the page, and it deals with -- this has to do with</p> <p>14 the filing of the carbon plan. And I'm going to</p> <p>15 try to get it here so you can read it.</p> <p>16 Just here on the bottom of Subsection E1,</p> <p>17 it just talks about by September 1st, 2023, and</p> <p>18 every two years thereafter, they will file -- and</p> <p>19 I really want to get to what's on the next page,</p> <p>20 specifically the language that's up here at the</p> <p>21 top.</p> <p>22 Now, under the North Carolina Commission's</p> <p>23 rules, do you see here that the utility is</p> <p>24 required to make available all modeling input and</p> <p>25 output data files as well as the method underlying</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">211</p> <p>1 you know, I don't see a huge objection to that.</p> <p>2 You know, we do very similar already in --</p> <p>3 throughout the discovery process, usually in the</p> <p>4 first set of discovery questions that we get, will</p> <p>5 be for all input, output files. So that doesn't</p> <p>6 concern me too much.</p> <p>7 You know, the part that probably concerns</p> <p>8 me more when we're talking about like PLEXOS</p> <p>9 licenses outside of the Company is that, you know,</p> <p>10 I think it was mentioned in that paragraph about,</p> <p>11 you know, like you have your inputs and</p> <p>12 assumptions, but there's -- the model is super</p> <p>13 complicated, PLEXOS is, lots of dials, I would</p> <p>14 say -- call them, that you turn.</p> <p>15 I think the part about method underlying</p> <p>16 the use, it's a very complicated model. There's</p> <p>17 a lot of dials that you put in. If, then,</p> <p>18 statements -- if the model does this, then do</p> <p>19 that. Like, that doesn't really come across like</p> <p>20 an input or an output file. I guess it's like the</p> <p>21 proprietary portions of the model.</p> <p>22 You know, even within my team, two</p> <p>23 different people can run the same model, get a</p> <p>24 different result, run it on a different server,</p> <p>25 get a different result.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">210</p> <p>1 the use of all modeling software and process steps</p> <p>2 utilized in what they call -- it's called the</p> <p>3 Carbon Plan IRP -- and to make that available to</p> <p>4 public staff, interveners, subject to appropriate</p> <p>5 confidentiality?</p> <p>6 Do you see that language?</p> <p>7 A I do.</p> <p>8 Q And so reading that, do you agree with me</p> <p>9 that what this provision says is that,</p> <p>10 essentially, Duke has to make available,</p> <p>11 contemporaneous with its filing, the</p> <p>12 modeling -- the raw modeling data for parties who</p> <p>13 have signed appropriate confidentiality</p> <p>14 protections?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q Does the Company have any objection to</p> <p>17 undertaking similar contemporaneous disclosure of</p> <p>18 input and output data to parties and</p> <p>19 proceedings -- IRP proceedings before this</p> <p>20 Commission?</p> <p>21 A I guess sort of a loaded question.</p> <p>22 You know, taking into account all of the</p> <p>23 input, output files, confidentiality, it -- you</p> <p>24 know, I think if all those things were in -- all</p> <p>25 the correct confidentiality things were in place,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">212</p> <p>1 So I think, you know, we're talking about</p> <p>2 PLEXOS licenses. I'm not sure that I understand</p> <p>3 the value of that. You know, we've also had</p> <p>4 parties in this case model using different</p> <p>5 software, and, you know, like on the base plans,</p> <p>6 coming fairly close.</p> <p>7 So I don't know that I understand the</p> <p>8 value of providing PLEXOS licenses and all of the</p> <p>9 input, output because it will never be exactly the</p> <p>10 same.</p> <p>11 Q Did you read the testimony from Ap Voices'</p> <p>12 witness with the idea Smith proposed methodology?</p> <p>13 A I did.</p> <p>14 Q And did you see in that testimony where</p> <p>15 they discussed how difficult and time consuming it</p> <p>16 was for them to recreate your underlying modeling</p> <p>17 to allow them to perform that modeling?</p> <p>18 A I did.</p> <p>19 Q And you're aware that this docket is</p> <p>20 subject to a statutory nine-month timeline from</p> <p>21 filing to decision from this Commission; is that</p> <p>22 correct?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q And so would you agree that in not</p> <p>25 providing modeling files, requiring parties to</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

24 (213 to 216)

<p style="text-align: right;">213</p> <p>1 take time to issue discovery, to wait for weeks 2 for them to receive your responses, assuming they 3 get everything, that that decreases the amount of 4 time the intervenor parties may have to assess 5 whether or not they'd like to put forward some 6 sort of an alternative model for the Commission's 7 consideration? 8 A I would. I would just caution the parties 9 outside of the Company, even within the Company, 10 having PLEXOS licenses running the same model are 11 going to get different -- very likely going to get 12 different results anyway, so I question the value 13 of that. 14 Q And you could certainly, as a result of 15 the ongoing obligations that you have providing 16 service in North Carolina, you could certainly 17 touch base with public staff in North Carolina to 18 understand how public staff has been able to take 19 advantage of having access to that raw data and 20 the ability to use it as part of their modeling 21 efforts; isn't that true? 22 A I would think so. I'm not sure exactly 23 which modeling software Duke uses, but I know the 24 staff uses EnCompass, which is different software. 25 So, you know, I cannot imagine having to be an</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">215</p> <p>1 specific resource. What I want to explore with 2 you is the statement that I think you made, which 3 is that you believe that you took into account the 4 concepts set forth in this language here at the 5 bottom of the page as part of this IRP; is that 6 correct? 7 A Yes. 8 Q Now, let's go back to what's been marked 9 as Exhibit 6. 10 Now, these, again, are the -- what I'll 11 call -- do you agree these are sort of the 12 supply-side resources that could have been 13 selected by the model? 14 A Yes. 15 Q Do you see any mention of "energy 16 efficiency" or "demand response" in any of these 17 assets on the far left column? 18 A I do not. 19 Q And that's because you-all did not model 20 energy efficiency or demand response as a 21 selectable resource, correct? 22 A We also call this build limits, and you 23 don't typically build energy efficiency. 24 Q Okay. Well, then let's disregard the 25 build limits.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">214</p> <p>1 expert on two different modeling softwares. It's 2 hard enough to be -- become an expert on one -- 3 Q Well, without being -- sorry. I 4 apologize. 5 But without being a specific expert, in 6 terms of your concerns about there being 7 proprietary information, you could certainly 8 discuss or the Commission could order you to 9 discuss with the North Carolina public staff how 10 they have been able to resolve any of those 11 concerns or issues with Duke as part of the Carbon 12 Plan IRP process, which I agree uses the EnCompass 13 software? 14 A Yeah, again, I don't know EnCompass. I 15 just know that PLEXOS is very complicated. You 16 know, we consider it the best in class, that's why 17 we use it. 18 Q So then I want to go back to another 19 discussion that you had with Mr. Reisinger. And 20 I'm going to put back up Subsection A6 of 21 56-585.1. And you discuss this language, and it's 22 very similar to the language that was cited in the 23 Hearing Examiner's report from the 2023 IRP. 24 And, again, I'm not attempting to ask you 25 any questions about a CPCN or approval of a</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">216</p> <p>1 Did you allow PLEXOS -- when selecting 2 what to build or do in order to meet the 3 15-year planning horizon, was PLEXOS allowed to 4 select energy efficiency or demand response? 5 A It was not. 6 Q Because you used it to reduce load? 7 A That's correct. 8 Q So going back to this statutory provision 9 here, in terms of assessing whether the natural 10 gas that was selected in your plan, where can the 11 Commission go in the IRP to determine whether 12 demand response or energy efficiency was or was 13 not a better option than the natural gas that you 14 have proposed for approval in this proceeding? 15 A The -- I would say the demand-side energy 16 efficiency analysis is done outside of the model, 17 and that's probably a better question for Witness 18 Hubbard. 19 Q I'm certainly happy to discuss what 20 Witness Hubbard did with respect to the 21 out-of-the-model energy efficiency DSM demand 22 response. 23 What I'm trying to understand is, from 24 your perspective, in putting together the plan, of 25 what resources the Commission should find as</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

25 (217 to 220)

<p style="text-align: right;">217</p> <p>1 reasonable and in the public interest. 2 There is no comparison in any of the four 3 plans that you've put forward as to whether or not 4 demand response or energy efficiency would have 5 been a resource that could be selected and been 6 economic as compared to some of the thousands of 7 megawatts of natural gas that are proposed? 8 A Again, I think Witness Hubbard can speak 9 much more eloquently to the DSM process. 10 Q Can Mr. Hubbard speak about the modeling 11 that was done? 12 A No. That would be me. 13 Q Okay. So my question is purely modeling. 14 So the answer to my question, from a 15 modeling perspective is, it does not exist in the 16 IRP; is that correct? 17 A It's not a selectable resource. 18 Q Give me just one second. 19 Can we go to -- I'm hoping I'm going to 20 get to the right place. Give me just a second to 21 find the page. It's the table that reflects the 22 3,300 megawatts of import that was considered over 23 the plans. It's page 55 of the IRP. 24 There is a fairly large project involving 25 multiple utilities to upgrade transmission to the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">219</p> <p>1 Appendix 2D, so understand that I'm not asking you 2 to become an expert on it. I believe Witness 3 Vance sponsored that, but I just want to take a 4 look at it real quick. 5 And I apologize, it will take me a minute 6 to get there because of the way that they are 7 numbered, so... 8 Now, with respect to it being in the 9 evidentiary record, if you see here at the bottom 10 of page 3 of Appendix 2D, Dominion's IRP indicates 11 that: The increased import capability was not 12 implemented in the alternative portfolios until 13 2033. 14 Do you see that? 15 A Yes. 16 MS. GRUNDMANN: Your Honor, can we mark 17 Walmart 4-15 as Exhibit 7? 18 THE BAILIFF: Dominion's response to 19 Walmart request 4-15 will be marked as Exhibit 7. 20 (Exhibit No. 7 was marked for 21 identification.) 22 MS. NIELSEN: Your Honor, the Company 23 would note for the record that Walmart 4-15 is a 24 transmission question, and just to acknowledge, 25 Mr. Compton did not sponsor the response or the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">218</p> <p>1 benefit of Dominion, isn't there? 2 A There is. 3 Q And you have some assumptions in your IRP 4 about the impact of that particular project; is 5 that correct? 6 A That specific project -- I know there are 7 multiple projects. I'm not sure about that 8 specific project, but Witness Vance is our 9 transmission expert. 10 Q Let me just ask a quick question. 11 Is it also Witness Vance that I would ask 12 about the date upon which you assumed in your 13 modeling that that project would be -- that that 14 transmission upgrade would be available for 15 selection by the model to select energy imports? 16 MS. NIELSEN: Your Honor, I would object. 17 That's assuming facts that are not in evidence. 18 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Response, Counsel? 19 MS. GRUNDMANN: Sure. Let's mark for the 20 record the Company's response to Walmart 4-15. 21 BY MS. GRUNDMANN: 22 Q Just real briefly, before we turn to that 23 exhibit, can we look at page 3 of Appendix 2D to 24 the IRP. 25 I don't believe that you have sponsored</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">220</p> <p>1 Appendix 2D of the IRP. 2 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 3 BY MS. GRUNDMANN: 4 Q So looking there, you see the question at 5 subpart B, it references that page 3 of Appendix D 6 about the assumption about making it available in 7 2033, and it asks: Why did you do that when the 8 projects are expected to be online by no later 9 than June 1st, 2030? 10 Do you see that? 11 A Yes. 12 MS. GRUNDMANN: And then there's a 13 demonstrative response, and I would note, just for 14 the record, Your Honor, that throughout this case 15 and in multiple responses, there is some level of 16 confusion created because the Company often has 17 parties answer discovery who then do not appear as 18 witnesses. And they don't identify a witness who 19 has sponsored testimony in the record to make it 20 easy to determine who you might cross at a hearing 21 on a given subject matter. 22 So totally happy to ask these questions of 23 Mr. Vance, but Nathaniel Rice is not a witness in 24 this proceeding where it would have been easy to 25 deduce that he would have been the person to have</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

26 (221 to 224)

<p style="text-align: right;">221</p> <p>1 asked this question to. 2 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Duly noted. 3 BY MS. GRUNDMANN: 4 Q But in purposes of my question, did you 5 have any role in the decision as to when to make 6 these increased import capabilities available to 7 the model for selection? 8 A Could you restate that? 9 Q I can. 10 So for purposes of the model -- and I'm 11 going to flip back and forth here -- and I'm never 12 going to put my notebook back together again -- 13 but you see here that, for purposes of the various 14 portfolios, the Company assumed 3,300 megawatts of 15 import. 16 And I hope you can read that. I can see 17 that it's small. 18 A Yes. 19 Q Do you see that? 20 A Uh-huh. 21 Q And in my understanding as part of this is 22 that there was an assumption about these increased 23 import capabilities, but they weren't made 24 available to the model until 2033. 25 But the data, including what's up here,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">223</p> <p>1 on these import capabilities. 2 And I should have read the sentence before 3 that: 4 This approach accounts for potential 5 delays and ensures that the grid can operate 6 reliably even if the projects are not completed on 7 time. 8 Do you see that sentence there? 9 A Yes. 10 Q And so what I'm trying to understand is 11 how the decision was made to delay the project 12 36 months as opposed to 24 or 12. 13 MS. NIELSEN: Your Honor, the Company 14 would stipulate to have a transmission witness 15 appear and answer these questions for 16 Ms. Grundmann. 17 MS. GRUNDMANN: Your Honor, my questions 18 are modeling questions, and ultimately, these are 19 foundational to the IRP because, ultimately, when 20 you assume build limits, what you assume they are, 21 and when you assume they are available has a 22 direct impact on the outputs that come out for the 23 various IRPs that have -- plans that have been 24 produced here. 25 And so I'm happy for this witness to say,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">222</p> <p>1 which is a slide from PJM and their TEAC process, 2 all reflects projected in-service dates of 2030. 3 And I'm just trying to understand what, if 4 any, role you or your team played in determining 5 whether to make these import capabilities 6 available in 2030, 2031, 2032, or 2033 as you did 7 in the IRP? 8 A Really no role. This was a transmission 9 planning decision, which is outside of my 10 expertise. 11 Q So is it your testimony that someone from 12 another team in Dominion told you that we 13 shouldn't assume this is available until 2033? 14 A My recollection of this is similar to the 15 response here in subpart B about the -- 16 Q Okay. Let's look at that. 17 A -- 80 percent derate factor from 2028 18 through 2033 based on engineering judgment. 19 Q And "derate" means, for purposes of this 20 answer, essentially a delay? 21 A I'm not sure. 22 Q If you look at the final sentence, it 23 says: 24 By assuming a later availability date, the 25 Company aims to mitigate the risk of overreliance</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">224</p> <p>1 I am not the right witness and I do not 2 understand. But that is not what has happened; he 3 has answered all of my questions. And I think I'm 4 entitled to pursue with this witness any questions 5 I have until I have exhausted his knowledge, and 6 then I'm happy to then cover any of those issues 7 with Witness Vance. 8 MS. NIELSEN: Your Honor, if I may, I do 9 believe Mr. Compton was clear that the import 10 limits came from transmission. 11 MS. GRUNDMANN: We'll let the record speak 12 for itself because I think there's a difference 13 between the 3,300-megawatt import limits and the 14 date. 15 BY MS. GRUNDMANN: 16 Q So my question to you again is: Did you 17 play any role in determining whether the date upon 18 which the increased import would be available was 19 2033 or some other date? 20 A No. 21 Q Who would I ask those questions? 22 A Again, Witness Vance. 23 Q You agree with me, do you not, that had 24 the model been told that that increased import 25 capability was available earlier than 2033, it</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

27 (225 to 228)

<p style="text-align: right;">225</p> <p>1 could have impacted the model results?</p> <p>2 A Could have.</p> <p>3 Q Final question that I have for you goes</p> <p>4 back to a concept of DSM.</p> <p>5 When modeling DSM -- and, again, if this</p> <p>6 is Mr. Hubbard, please let me know. But, again,</p> <p>7 I'm trying to focus on the actual modeling</p> <p>8 assumption.</p> <p>9 You're aware under the Virginia Clean</p> <p>10 Economy Act that the Company is obligated to</p> <p>11 retire RECs in proportion to total electric energy</p> <p>12 as calculated for the prior calendar year.</p> <p>13 Are you aware of that?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q And so the more energy that ratepayers</p> <p>16 use, the more RECs that need to be retired</p> <p>17 regardless of the percentage year of compliance.</p> <p>18 Do you agree with that?</p> <p>19 A All else equal, yes.</p> <p>20 Q And so when modeling DSM broadly, energy</p> <p>21 efficiency, or demand response, is there anything</p> <p>22 in the calculation that reflects the secondary</p> <p>23 benefit that less energy usage has on the</p> <p>24 requirements under the VCEA?</p> <p>25 A I'm sorry. Can you restate that?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">227</p> <p>1 THE WITNESS: Thank you.</p> <p>2 MS. GRUNDMANN: I don't have any other</p> <p>3 questions.</p> <p>4 Your Honor, I would ask that Exhibits 6</p> <p>5 and 7 be admitted into the record.</p> <p>6 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: So the IRP Build</p> <p>7 Limits document identified and marked as Exhibit</p> <p>8 No. 6 is entered into the record.</p> <p>9 And the Company's response to Walmart's</p> <p>10 request identified and marked as Exhibit No. 7 is</p> <p>11 admitted into the record.</p> <p>12 MS. GRUNDMANN: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>13 (Exhibits No. 6 and 7 were admitted into</p> <p>14 evidence.)</p> <p>15 MS. GRUNDMANN: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>16 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you.</p> <p>17 Piedmont.</p> <p>18 CROSS-EXAMINATION</p> <p>19 BY MR. GREMA:</p> <p>20 Q Good morning --</p> <p>21 A Good morning.</p> <p>22 Q -- Mr. Compton. I'm Peter Grema,</p> <p>23 representing Piedmont Environmental Council.</p> <p>24 MR. GREMA: Your Honor, we just have some</p> <p>25 documents we'd like to get authenticated and moved</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">226</p> <p>1 Q Yeah. Let me try to ask it a different</p> <p>2 way.</p> <p>3 If you build 944 megawatts of gas to serve</p> <p>4 peaking energy needs, if customers then use that</p> <p>5 energy, you then also have to procure RECs that</p> <p>6 relate to that energy usage, correct?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q By contrast, if customers were to use</p> <p>9 944 megawatts clean -- I understand it's a little</p> <p>10 different, but if they were to use less energy,</p> <p>11 then not only does that decrease what you might</p> <p>12 have to spend on another unit, but it also has the</p> <p>13 benefit of avoiding potentially the need for the</p> <p>14 Company to procure some RECs.</p> <p>15 Do you agree with that?</p> <p>16 A Generally, I think so.</p> <p>17 Q Do you know if anywhere in the Company's</p> <p>18 analysis that trade-off sort of -- is there</p> <p>19 anywhere that I can look to, to your knowledge --</p> <p>20 or should I speak to Mr. Hubbard about that? --</p> <p>21 sort of what I would call the secondary benefit as</p> <p>22 to compliance under the VCEA, a discussion of that</p> <p>23 can be found?</p> <p>24 A That might be best for Witness Hubbard.</p> <p>25 MS. GRUNDMANN: Thank you, Mr. Compton.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">228</p> <p>1 as evidence.</p> <p>2 BY MR. GREMA:</p> <p>3 Q So the first one, I take it, Mr. Compton,</p> <p>4 that you're familiar with the JLARC data center</p> <p>5 report?</p> <p>6 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Counsel, you have an</p> <p>7 objection?</p> <p>8 MS. ROBB: Not to this one, but to the</p> <p>9 other, so I'll stand at the appropriate time.</p> <p>10 CHAIRMAN TOWELL: And before we go any</p> <p>11 further, for the record, Mr. Grema, you're</p> <p>12 participating in this hearing under your</p> <p>13 third-year practice certificate under the auspices</p> <p>14 of Mr. Jaffe at the University of Virginia; is</p> <p>15 that correct?</p> <p>16 MR. GREMA: That's correct, I am.</p> <p>17 CHAIRMAN TOWELL: Thank you.</p> <p>18 Welcome.</p> <p>19 MR. GREMA: Thank you. I appreciate it.</p> <p>20 BY MR. GREMA:</p> <p>21 Q Are you familiar with the report,</p> <p>22 Mr. Compton?</p> <p>23 A Generally.</p> <p>24 Q Got it.</p> <p>25 Does the document I've placed before you</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

28 (229 to 232)

<p style="text-align: right;">229</p> <p>1 look to be a true and accurate copy?</p> <p>2 A To the best of my knowledge.</p> <p>3 Q Got it. Thank you.</p> <p>4 MR. GREMA: Your Honor, I'd like to have</p> <p>5 the report marked as an exhibit titled JLARC</p> <p>6 Report on Data Centers, Exhibit 8.</p> <p>7 THE BAILIFF: Thank you.</p> <p>8 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Please proceed.</p> <p>9 MR. GREMA: Thank you.</p> <p>10 BY MR. GREMA:</p> <p>11 Q Mr. Compton, I have right here Set 3,</p> <p>12 Question 25 of Appalachian Power. It is</p> <p>13 referencing the substation engineering letters of</p> <p>14 authorization.</p> <p>15 Does this look to be an accurate copy of</p> <p>16 that?</p> <p>17 A To the best of my knowledge.</p> <p>18 Q Got it. Thank you.</p> <p>19 MR. GREMA: I'd like to do the same, so I</p> <p>20 move this as evidence. And I'll mark it an</p> <p>21 exhibit titled Substation --</p> <p>22 BY MR. GREMA:</p> <p>23 Q And, Mr. Compton, I have Appalachian</p> <p>24 Voices, third set, number question 26, referencing</p> <p>25 the construction letters of authorization.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">231</p> <p>1 exhibit.</p> <p>2 THE BAILIFF: The JLARC Report on Data</p> <p>3 Centers will be marked as Exhibit 8.</p> <p>4 (Exhibit No. 8 was marked for</p> <p>5 identification.)</p> <p>6 THE BAILIFF: Dominion's Response to</p> <p>7 Appalachian Voices' Request 3-25 will be marked as</p> <p>8 Exhibit 9.</p> <p>9 (Exhibit No. 9 was marked for</p> <p>10 identification.)</p> <p>11 THE BAILIFF: And the Dominion Response to</p> <p>12 Appalachian Voices' Request 3-26 will be marked as</p> <p>13 Exhibit 10.</p> <p>14 (Exhibit No. 10 was marked for</p> <p>15 identification.)</p> <p>16 MR. GREMA: One more.</p> <p>17 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you.</p> <p>18 MR. GREMA: I'd like to move the admission</p> <p>19 of all those documents, so 8, 9, 10, and 11.</p> <p>20 THE BAILIFF: And the Dominion's Response</p> <p>21 to Appalachian Voices' Request -- excuse me --</p> <p>22 3-27 will be marked as Exhibit 11.</p> <p>23 (Exhibit No. 11 was marked for</p> <p>24 identification.)</p> <p>25 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Counsel, did you say</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">230</p> <p>1 Does this look to be an accurate copy to</p> <p>2 you?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 MR. GREMA: I'd like to do the same and</p> <p>5 have the report marked as an exhibit.</p> <p>6 MS. GRUNDMANN: Your Honor, did we mark</p> <p>7 the JLARC as Exhibit 8?</p> <p>8 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: I'm sorry?</p> <p>9 MS. GRUNDMANN: Did you mark these?</p> <p>10 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: We haven't marked</p> <p>11 it, not as of yet. We're going to mark it and</p> <p>12 identify all the documents once the bailiff is</p> <p>13 finished --</p> <p>14 MS. GRUNDMANN: Okay.</p> <p>15 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: -- getting all the</p> <p>16 documents.</p> <p>17 BY MR. GREMA:</p> <p>18 Q Likewise, Mr. Compton, this is Appalachian</p> <p>19 Voices, third set, number question 27, referencing</p> <p>20 the electric service agreements.</p> <p>21 Does this seem to be an accurate copy of</p> <p>22 the electric service agreement to you?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Thank you.</p> <p>25 MR. GREMA: I'd like to mark this as an</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">232</p> <p>1 you wanted to admit these into the record at this</p> <p>2 time?</p> <p>3 MR. GREMA: That's correct.</p> <p>4 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Any objection?</p> <p>5 MS. NIELSEN: Your Honor, no objection</p> <p>6 from the Company, but we would note that the</p> <p>7 exhibits marked 9, 10, and 11 are sponsored by</p> <p>8 Company Witness Blackwell, who will be available</p> <p>9 as a rebuttal witness and would be the appropriate</p> <p>10 witness to answer any questions about those</p> <p>11 responses.</p> <p>12 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. Duly</p> <p>13 noted.</p> <p>14 Let me just admit these into the record.</p> <p>15 MR. GREMA: Thanks.</p> <p>16 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: All right. So the</p> <p>17 JLARC report identified and marked as Exhibit</p> <p>18 No. 8 is admitted into the record.</p> <p>19 The document marked and identified as</p> <p>20 Exhibit No. 9 is admitted into the record.</p> <p>21 The document that is marked and described</p> <p>22 as Exhibit No. 10 is admitted into the record.</p> <p>23 And the last one, the document marked and</p> <p>24 described as Exhibit No. 11, is admitted into the</p> <p>25 record.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

29 (233 to 236)

<p style="text-align: right;">233</p> <p>1 (Exhibits No. 8 - 11 were admitted into 2 evidence.) 3 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Please proceed. 4 MR. GREMA: Thank you. No further 5 questions. Thank you. 6 MR. JAFFE: Thank you, Your Honor. No 7 questions. 8 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Microsoft? 9 MS. ROBB: No questions, Your Honor. 10 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 11 City of Alexandria? 12 MR. WINSTON: No questions, Your Honor. 13 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Consumer Counsel? 14 MR. FARMER: No questions, Your Honor. 15 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Commission Staff? 16 MS. PIERCE: Just briefly, Your Honor. 17 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 18 CROSS-EXAMINATION 19 BY MS. PIERCE: 20 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Compton. Kiva Pierce, 21 on behalf of Commission Staff. 22 When you were having a conversation with 23 Mr. Reisinger and you were talking about the 24 snapshot in time, you indicated that, you know, at 25 some point in the process you lock it down, you</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">235</p> <p>1 BY MS. NIELSEN: 2 Q Hello, Mr. Compton. How are you? 3 A Good. Good. 4 Q Good. I just have a few questions for 5 you. 6 Do you recall when Mr. Benforado was 7 asking you about the 2023 IRP, specifically page 8 81, and there was a chart related to carbon? Do 9 you remember that? 10 A Yes. 11 Q Okay. And if you would flip to the 2024 12 IRP before -- if you have a copy in front of you, 13 would you, please, do that? 14 A Yes. 15 Q Okay. Can you -- you sponsored Chapter 5 16 of the 2025 -- 2024 IRP, correct? 17 A Correct. 18 Q Okay. So that includes all of the charts 19 and figures that are included in that section? 20 A That's correct. 21 Q Okay. If you could flip to page 58 for 22 me. And I'm going to try to get this balanced and 23 speak at the same time here. 24 Okay. Are you with me on this chart? 25 A Yes.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">234</p> <p>1 move on, and you do it again the next year. 2 Do you recall that conversation? 3 A Yes. 4 Q I just want to clarify for the record, in 5 Virginia, what will be filed later this year is 6 just an update to the IRP; is that correct? Is 7 that your understanding? 8 A Uh-huh. 9 Q And that will not be a litigated case like 10 we are in right now; is that correct? 11 A That's correct. 12 Q So the next litigated IRP will be two 13 years after this one was filed in 2026; is that 14 your understanding? 15 A Yes. 16 Q All right. Thank you. 17 MS. PIERCE: No further questions, 18 Your Honor. 19 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 20 Dominion, any redirect? 21 MS. NIELSEN: Briefly, Your Honor. 22 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: I'm sorry. Please 23 proceed. 24 MS. NIELSEN: Thank you. 25 REDIRECT EXAMINATION</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">236</p> <p>1 Q Okay. On this page -- can you explain to 2 me what appears on this page? 3 A Yes. We call these dashboards. They're 4 meant to be a high-level overview of each of the 5 portfolios, trying to put it more in pictures 6 rather than words. 7 So, first, we have the energy mix for 2025 8 and every five years after. And then below that, 9 capacity mix. Bottom left is how that plan meets 10 the RPS requirement. And the bottom right is the 11 CO2 intensity of that plan. 12 Q Okay. And that's the CO2 intensity of 13 that plan by year; is that correct? 14 A Correct. 15 Q Okay. And if we were to flip to page 60 16 of the 2024 IRP, does that same CO2 intensity 17 chart by year appear for the REC RPS only without 18 EPA portfolio dashboard? 19 A Yes. 20 Q And if you would flip to page 62. 21 This is the VCEA with EPA portfolio 22 dashboard, and we see the same charts, including 23 the CO2 intensity by year here as well -- 24 A Correct. 25 Q -- is that right?</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

30 (237 to 240)

<p>237</p> <p>1 Okay. And last one, page 64, VCEA without 2 EPA portfolio dashboard, same charts, also CO2 3 intensity by year for that portfolio; is that 4 correct? 5 A Yes. 6 Q Okay. So would you say, then, that 7 between the four portfolios, each portfolio 8 includes the CO2 intensity by year? 9 A Yes. 10 Q Okay. So if you were to combine these 11 charts into one chart, would it then appear 12 similar to the type of chart that was shown to you 13 in relation to the 2023 IRP? 14 A Yes. 15 Q Mr. Compton, there was also some questions 16 about providing inputs and outputs, and I think 17 you received that from several different 18 respondents. 19 Do you recall those discussions? 20 A Yes. 21 Q Okay. So in one instance, there was some 22 discussion about the PLEXOS inputs and outputs and 23 the date on which they were provided in this case. 24 Does that sound familiar? 25 A Yes.</p>	<p>239</p> <p>1 Q -- correct again. 2 A Yes. 3 Q Sierra Club Set 01-02 confidential ES, 4 which includes inputs and outputs PLEXOS 5 subfolders? 6 A Yes. 7 Q Okay. Subject to check, would you agree 8 that the PLEXOS output files for all portfolios 9 provided CO2 emissions by a generator by year? 10 A Yes. 11 Q Final line of questioning, Mr. Compton. 12 Would you agree that, subject to check, 13 the Company has applied for a presidential 14 exemption for Mt. Storm for a MATS extension? 15 A Yes. 16 Q And subject to check, would you agree that 17 that was granted -- that extension was granted on 18 April 14th, 2025? 19 A Yes. 20 MS. NIELSEN: No further questions. 21 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 22 You're now excused. 23 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 24 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: So it's now around 25 12:30. Counsel, would you like to break for lunch</p>
<p>238</p> <p>1 Q Okay. Can you tell me what date the 2 Company filed its 2024 IRP? 3 A October 15th. 4 Q Okay. I'm going to show you what is 5 Sierra Club Set 1-2, which is attached to Witness 6 Roumpani's testimony in rebuttal. So I will not 7 mark it. 8 Are you familiar with this question and 9 response? 10 A Yes. 11 Q Okay. And it asks for all PLEXOS inputs 12 and outputs in electronic spreadsheet format; is 13 that correct? 14 A It does. 15 Q And can you tell me the date that the 16 Company received this request? 17 A October 21st, 2024. 18 Q So that would be six days after the filing 19 of the IRP. 20 Does that sound right? 21 A Yes. 22 Q Okay. Are you familiar with the 23 attachment Sierra Club Set 02-0 -- I mean 0 -- 24 excuse me -- Sierra Club Set 02 -- 25 A Vaguely.</p>	<p>240</p> <p>1 and then come back and take care of the stipulated 2 testimony and call your next witness? 3 MS. LINK: After lunch, Your Honor? 4 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: If that works for 5 you. 6 MS. LINK: Yes, thank you. 7 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Any objection? 8 Okay. So what we'll do is we'll recess 9 until 1:30 and reconvene in courtroom C. 10 We're now in recess. 11 (A luncheon recess was taken.) 12 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Dominion, before we 13 begin, I just want to take care of one preliminary 14 matter regarding the remote testimony request. 15 So we are mindful of the request from 16 Appalachian Voices concerning Mr. Wilson, who you 17 have represented is available in person on 18 Thursday only, I believe. 19 So we'll remind all participants that, in 20 cases before the Commission, your witnesses should 21 be available to testify in person for the 22 scheduled hearing days. 23 While we will entertain requests to 24 testify remotely on a case-by-case basis, 25 participants should not rely upon the availability</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

31 (241 to 244)

<p style="text-align: right;">241</p> <p>1 of remote testimony. Participants should also be 2 mindful that the Commission will always afford due 3 process any opportunity for cross-examination of 4 testimony. 5 So if there is a technical malfunction and 6 a witness is scheduled to testify remotely becomes 7 unavailable, there is a risk that the prefiled 8 testimony will be stricken. 9 So with that in mind, we will allow 10 Mr. Wilson to testify remotely as necessary for 11 the purposes of this case. 12 Thank you. 13 MR. BENFORADO: Thank you, Your Honor. 14 And I do apologize for that scheduling issue, but 15 thank you very much for that request. 16 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 17 Dominion, please proceed. 18 MS. LINK: Thank you, Your Honor. Our 19 next witness, the testimony of Abhijit Rajan as 20 adopted by Joseph Bocanegra, is stipulated, so we 21 would ask that the document entitled, Direct 22 Testimony of Abhijit Rajan as adopted by 23 Joseph L. Bocanegra, consisting of a one-page 24 summary, one page of typed pages of questions and 25 answers, and an Appendix A filed in public version</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">243</p> <p>1 Q Good afternoon. 2 A Good afternoon. 3 Q What is your name, position of employment, 4 and business address? 5 A My name is Michael Hubbard. I'm the 6 manager of energy conservation at Dominion Energy. 7 My business address is 600 East Canal Street, 8 Richmond, Virginia 23219. 9 Q Do you have with you a document entitled 10 Direct Testimony of Michael T. Hubbard, consisting 11 of a one-page summary, one typed page of questions 12 and answers, and an Appendix A, which was filed in 13 public version only in the proceeding on 14 December 6, 2024? 15 A Yes. 16 Q Was that document prepared by you or under 17 your supervision? 18 A Yes. 19 Q Do you have any additions or corrections 20 to those documents? 21 A No. 22 Q Are your answers and sponsored portions 23 true and correct to the best of your knowledge for 24 when the IRP snapshot was taken and based on the 25 October 15th, 2024, filing date?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">242</p> <p>1 only in this proceeding on December 6, 2024, be 2 marked for identification and admitted into the 3 record. 4 THE BAILIFF: The Direct Testimony of 5 Abhijit Rajan as adopted by Joseph Bocanegra will 6 be marked as Exhibit 12. 7 (Exhibit No. 12 was marked for 8 identification.) 9 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: The document marked 10 and described as Exhibit No. 12 is admitted into 11 the record. 12 (Exhibit No. 12 was admitted into 13 evidence.) 14 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 15 MS. LINK: Thank you. 16 MR. DANTONIO: Good afternoon, 17 Your Honors. Nick Dantonio on behalf of the 18 Company. 19 The Company would call witness Michael 20 Hubbard to the stand. 21 MICHAEL T. HUBBARD, called as a witness, 22 having been first duly sworn, was examined and 23 testified as follows: 24 DIRECT EXAMINATION 25 BY MR. DANTONIO:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">244</p> <p>1 A Yes, and subject to my rebuttal testimony. 2 Q Do you wish to sponsor those documents as 3 your direct testimony in your proceeding? 4 A I do. 5 MR. DANTONIO: At this time, I would ask 6 that Mr. Hubbard's direct testimony be marked for 7 identification and admitted into the record. 8 THE BAILIFF: The Direct Testimony of 9 Michael T. Hubbard will be marked as Exhibit 13. 10 (Exhibit No. 13 was marked for 11 identification.) 12 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: The document, which 13 is Mr. Hubbard's testimony, identified and marked 14 as Exhibit No. 13, is admitted into the record. 15 (Exhibit No. 13 was admitted into 16 evidence.) 17 MR. DANTONIO: Thank you. The witness is 18 available for cross-examination. 19 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 20 MR. BENFORADO: No questions, Your Honor. 21 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: NRDC? 22 MS. JAFFE: No questions, Your Honor. 23 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: United? 24 MS. POLLARD: No questions, Your Honor. 25 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Clean Virginia?</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

32 (245 to 248)

<p>245</p> <p>1 MR. REISINGER: Thank you, Your Honor. 2 CROSS-EXAMINATION 3 BY MR. REISINGER: 4 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Hubbard. 5 A Good afternoon. 6 Q I want to ask you a question about the 7 summary page that appears on page 55 of the IRP, 8 and that's a summary of the primary portfolios 9 sensitivities for the NCUC and stakeholder input 10 case. 11 And I have a question about the very 12 bottom. The row labeled EE says that with regard 13 to EE: That is aligned with goals established in 14 the SCC's pending target-setting proceeding. 15 Do you see that statement in very small 16 letters? 17 A I do see that. 18 Q So can you tell me what that means? 19 A I would take that to mean there's a 20 target-setting proceeding that the Commission just 21 went through and just issued a final order here 22 very recently. 23 Q Okay. So does the amounts of EE that was 24 assumed in all of these portfolios and in the 25 stakeholder input case, those EE amounts were</p>	<p>247</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Walmart? 2 MS. GRUNDMANN: Yes, Your Honor. 3 CROSS-EXAMINATION 4 BY MS. GRUNDMANN: 5 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Hubbard. How are you? 6 A Good afternoon. I'm doing well. 7 Q Good. My name is Carrie Grundmann. I'm 8 counsel on behalf of Walmart. 9 I want to kind of start with -- were you 10 in the room when I was asking questions of Company 11 Witness Compton? 12 A I believe I was in the room most of the 13 time. 14 Q Okay. And you agree that, for purposes of 15 this IRP, the Company modeled both demand response 16 and energy efficiency as load reducers before 17 going into the PLEXOS model; is that correct? 18 A That's my understanding, yes, that's 19 correct. 20 Q Well, when you say it's your 21 understanding, were you the person responsible for 22 calculating and determining -- or your team for 23 calculating and determining what level of energy 24 efficiency and demand response would be used as 25 load reducers?</p>
<p>246</p> <p>1 based on what the Company proposed in this 2 target-setting proceeding? 3 A As it pertains to each of those modeling 4 scenarios, that's part of the IRP group. And 5 Witness Joseph Bocanegra would be most appropriate 6 to speak to. 7 Q And you are familiar with that 8 target-setting proceeding, correct? 9 A Yes, I am. 10 Q And the Company proposed certain EE 11 targets in that case? 12 A We did, which were based on potential 13 study and actual surveyed information of our 14 residential and commercial customers. 15 Q And the Commission ultimately approved 16 higher targets for the Company; is that correct? 17 A They seem to have listened to, yes, the 18 Hearing Examiner's recommendation, but seems to be 19 kind of an in-between between the other parties 20 and the Company's position, setting 3, 4, and 21 5 percent, 26 through 28, respectively. 22 Q Okay. Thank you, sir. 23 MR. REISINGER: That's all I have. 24 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: DCC? 25 MR. MURPHEY: No questions, Your Honor.</p>	<p>248</p> <p>1 A Myself and my team are part of that chain. 2 We work in a stakeholder process that is 3 identified in the Code which collects programmatic 4 ideas. My team takes those ideas and goes to the 5 market to see if they can be delivered. We get 6 back very specific information in a specific 7 format of measures, by load shape, energy, demand, 8 and cost information, which we work with the 9 demand-side planning group, which is a subpart of 10 the IRP team. And that team models the cost 11 effectiveness of those programs. 12 And, ultimately, under today's standard, 13 if it passes three of the four tests, we bring 14 those before the Commission for approval. 15 Q Okay. Well, I want to make sure that you 16 and I are distinguishing between the IRP planning 17 process and the approval of individual, specific 18 programs. Okay? 19 So let me make sure I clarify. 20 The process that you just described to me, 21 is that the process that you go through to select 22 specific energy efficiency or demand response 23 programs that then are put before the Commission 24 for approval? 25 A That's correct, what you just said, yes.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

33 (249 to 252)

<p style="text-align: right;">249</p> <p>1 Q Okay. Do you view that program-specific 2 process as the same thing that gets assessed as 3 part of the IRP or different? 4 A Well, again, you can speak to Witness 5 Joseph Bocanegra, but at the end of the day, the 6 information that we file and is used to reduce the 7 load ends up in the IRP plan, both the approved 8 and our proposed program. 9 So that information that is found in the 10 appendix of the IRP regarding the DSM programs 11 comes directly from input from those bids and what 12 we take to the Commission for approval. 13 Q So is there anything in the IRP that 14 includes aspirational savings from demand response 15 or energy efficiency? 16 A Again, I know there's been variations 17 through the years of various filings. I think 18 it's probably -- as it's -- I know there were 19 things called generic in the past to get towards 20 the VCEA targets and so forth. But I think those 21 questions are best for the modelers that take care 22 of the load forecast. 23 Q Well, it shouldn't surprise you if you 24 were in the room when I was questioning 25 Mr. Compton that one of the reasons I've deferred</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">251</p> <p>1 forecast and model, Witness Joseph Bocanegra as 2 well as Shane Compton explain the modeling, so 3 they can handle those questions. 4 Q Okay. So in terms of cadence for 5 proposing DSM programs, on what cadence does the 6 Company propose DSM programs for approval by this 7 Commission? 8 A It is my understanding -- I'm not a 9 lawyer, but one time per year we can change the 10 rider that's associated with that. So there is a 11 process where we work with stakeholders, get 12 input, have an RFP process, analyze what we've 13 gotten back from the market, work with the 14 demand-side planning IRP group to model those 15 programs. We determine what's cost effective, we 16 develop our filing, keep the stakeholders 17 up-to-date as to what will be filed, we prepare 18 anything that's cost effective under the current 19 standards, meeting three of the four cost 20 effectiveness tests, we file with the Commission 21 for approval. 22 Q I appreciate that very long response, 23 Mr. Hubbard, but it sounds like the answer is, 24 once every year, you're able to update and 25 potentially propose new programs; is that correct?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">250</p> <p>1 some of these very specific energy efficiency and 2 demand response questions to you is because that 3 was both what was represented by questions from 4 Mr. Compton. 5 So are you saying that those questions 6 were best directed for Mr. Compton and I should 7 address them with him on rebuttal, or is there 8 some other witness I should ask those questions 9 of? 10 A No. I think I just stated that there is a 11 modeling team who is responsible for that process, 12 and we are a part of inputs into that process. 13 Q Okay. So the inputs are what I want to 14 understand. 15 So when you provide inputs on demand 16 response and energy efficiency, are those inputs 17 only based on current programs or are they based 18 on this is what we hope to achieve over the 19 15 years of the planning horizon? 20 A I think I also answered they are also 21 based on proposed programs. For instance, we have 22 a portfolio of programs in our current DSM case 23 that are before the Commission, so it includes 24 current programs as well as proposed programs. 25 But, again, how those are put into the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">252</p> <p>1 A We can go in, my understanding, to change 2 the rider one time. 3 Q So, hypothetically, over the 15-year 4 planning horizon, you could propose a suite of new 5 demand response or energy efficiency programs 15 6 times? 7 A I don't follow your question. 8 Q Well, if you're able to change the rider 9 every year and the IRP is a 15-year 10 forward-looking planning process, that means it 11 covers a 15-year period. 12 So if you can make a filing once every 13 year for 15 years, hypothetically, you can propose 14 new programs 15 times over the course of the 15 planning horizon for the IRP. 16 Does that make sense? 17 A I guess hypothetically you can do 18 anything. But I think we take it very serious 19 going to the market and actually seeing what can 20 be delivered. 21 Q And have you done anything in terms of 22 what can be delivered and assessed, whether there 23 are any barriers to approval of programs in terms 24 of whether it's the Commission's approval process, 25 the cost effectiveness test that those programs</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

34 (253 to 256)

<p style="text-align: right;">253</p> <p>1 are subjected to?</p> <p>2 Have you done anything to assess what</p> <p>3 could be done, whether at a statutory level or in</p> <p>4 front of the Commission, to enable greater amounts</p> <p>5 of demand response or energy efficiency?</p> <p>6 A Yes, there's been multiple things. I</p> <p>7 mean, number one, the stakeholder process where we</p> <p>8 receive input -- which also, by the way, has</p> <p>9 subgroups that focus on different specialty areas</p> <p>10 like commercial programs, income-qualifying</p> <p>11 programs.</p> <p>12 But we also undertook a long-term plan a</p> <p>13 number of years ago to look at the targets and how</p> <p>14 to achieve those targets. And part of that plan</p> <p>15 was greater communications and presentment to</p> <p>16 customers.</p> <p>17 Q And so when you say a number of years ago,</p> <p>18 what does that mean?</p> <p>19 A Subject to check, it was in the 2021</p> <p>20 time frame-ish. We looked at how we might be able</p> <p>21 to pursue the VCEA target goals.</p> <p>22 And then Cadmus, who was the entity that</p> <p>23 was retained to do that study with us, put forth</p> <p>24 short-term, mid-term, and longer-term</p> <p>25 recommendations in that report.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">255</p> <p>1 BY MS. GRUNDMANN:</p> <p>2 Q Mr. Hubbard, just so that we're clear, my</p> <p>3 first question was: When did you do that?</p> <p>4 Your answer was: 2021.</p> <p>5 My follow-up question would have been:</p> <p>6 Was this done after passage of the VCEA?</p> <p>7 And I believe, based upon the longer</p> <p>8 answer that you provided, that the answer is yes;</p> <p>9 is that correct?</p> <p>10 A That's correct.</p> <p>11 Q So since 2021, have you done anything --</p> <p>12 have you updated the study that was done in</p> <p>13 approximately 2021 in conjunction with Cadmus?</p> <p>14 A Yes. As I just mentioned a second ago,</p> <p>15 we're updating each of those recommendations, the</p> <p>16 status of those, as part of our annual DSM filing.</p> <p>17 Q And so will that updated filing, is that</p> <p>18 presently pending before the Commission?</p> <p>19 A That's correct.</p> <p>20 Q Is this the market potential study, or is</p> <p>21 this something else?</p> <p>22 A That's something else. The market</p> <p>23 potential study is a more lengthy process where we</p> <p>24 assess the measures in the market and what is the</p> <p>25 potential possibility if a utility incentive is</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">254</p> <p>1 And then in our DSM case, we provide</p> <p>2 updates on each one of those recommendations.</p> <p>3 Q Thank you for that, Mr. Hubbard.</p> <p>4 MS. GRUNDMANN: Your Honor, it would be</p> <p>5 helpful -- I am trying to move somewhat quickly,</p> <p>6 and I'm asking fairly direct questions, like do</p> <p>7 you know what year that was done. I didn't ask</p> <p>8 anything about the context or who was involved.</p> <p>9 And I think it would be a little bit more</p> <p>10 helpful for purposes of my cross if you could</p> <p>11 direct the witness to answer the questions asked</p> <p>12 and allow them to do any responses to those</p> <p>13 questions on cross from their own counsel once all</p> <p>14 intervenors have had a chance to ask their</p> <p>15 questions.</p> <p>16 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you.</p> <p>17 MR. DANTONIO: Your Honor, if I may, I</p> <p>18 think the witness is entitled to respond to the</p> <p>19 questions however he chooses, and I think he is</p> <p>20 being very responsive.</p> <p>21 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Well, my response is</p> <p>22 the witness may answer the question to the best of</p> <p>23 your ability. And if you're unable to answer --</p> <p>24 THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.</p> <p>25 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">256</p> <p>1 applied, so that's different than the long-term</p> <p>2 plan.</p> <p>3 Q But market potential study is confined to</p> <p>4 energy efficiency. It does not address demand</p> <p>5 response; is that correct?</p> <p>6 A Yeah. The potential study that we</p> <p>7 conducted, that's correct.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. So all your team does is provide</p> <p>9 information to the modeling team for purposes of</p> <p>10 the IRP about current programs in existence, both</p> <p>11 energy efficiency and demand response, and those</p> <p>12 that are currently pending in this year's DSM</p> <p>13 filing with the Commission?</p> <p>14 A I wouldn't agree with that.</p> <p>15 Q Okay. Well, what role do you play in how</p> <p>16 they model DSM and EE over the 15-year planning</p> <p>17 horizon other than providing them information</p> <p>18 about current programs and those proposed in the</p> <p>19 current DSM filing before the Commission?</p> <p>20 A Well, if there's questions about</p> <p>21 submittals in any of the proposals on load shape</p> <p>22 information or different things of that nature, my</p> <p>23 team interfaces with the bidders, the vendors.</p> <p>24 There's also ongoing requirements of</p> <p>25 reporting as well as cost effectiveness tests on</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

35 (257 to 260)

<p>257</p> <p>1 existing programs that have to be submitted each 2 year and the annual update and the EM&V filing. 3 Q But my question had to do with the IRP 4 modeling, not with EM&V. 5 A Yes. 6 Q So -- 7 A That's right. So I would maintain that 8 inputs, along the way, you know, we're constantly 9 working with the demand-side planning group. They 10 are responsible for the modeling, but inputs, 11 potential program improvements, and things of that 12 nature, we work closely with that group and stay 13 in constant communication. 14 Q But for purposes of what this Commission 15 is faced with, it is a snapshot-in-time IRP, 16 correct? 17 A That's my understanding, yes. 18 Q So what I'm trying to now understand -- 19 because earlier I was deferred to you for certain 20 issues, and now I'm being deferred back to the 21 modeling team. So I'm trying to walk away from 22 this podium with a very, very clear understanding 23 as to what questions fall within your and your 24 team and what I probably need to address with the 25 modeling team on rebuttal. So that's -- that's</p>	<p>259</p> <p>1 A Again, I think the demand-side planning 2 group works with those assumptions and how that 3 impacts the future forecast. Witness 4 Joseph Bocanegra would be the best witness to 5 speak to that. 6 Q Okay. So just to clarify the record, when 7 you bring up the demand-side planning, that is not 8 your team? 9 A That's not correct. I sponsored sections 10 within the IRP that are -- give verbiage on what 11 the Company has done. It talks about the process 12 I laid out on obtaining input information and how 13 that flows into modeling. 14 So there are sections within that report 15 that I sponsored that we have direct input on. 16 And, again, as part of the inputs in this process, 17 we work very closely with the IRP team. 18 Q Again, by inputs, you mean 19 currently-approved programs and currently-proposed 20 programs? 21 MR. DANTONIO: Objection. This has been 22 asked and answered several times. I understand 23 Ms. Grundmann is trying to get clarity on which 24 witness's cover different scopes. 25 The direct testimony lines out the</p>
<p>258</p> <p>1 what I'm trying to understand. 2 So for purposes of putting together this 3 IRP, what did your team provide to the modeling 4 team? 5 A Again, I would classify in the most simple 6 words, inputs, so that they could model programs. 7 Those inputs, if cost effective, get filed, 8 approved, and are reflected in the forward-looking 9 tables for DSM programs, both current and 10 proposed. 11 Q Okay. But proposed are proposed as of 12 2025. It does not include anything that could be 13 proposed in 2026 or 2027 or 2028 or any other -- 14 through the 2039 of this IRP. 15 When you say "proposed," you mean not yet 16 approved but currently pending before the 17 Commission? 18 A That's correct. The ones that are 19 currently on file we filed that December of '24. 20 Q And other than in-existence approved or 21 in-existence proposed demand response and energy 22 efficiency programs, what role did you play in 23 assumptions regarding future opportunities for 24 demand response or energy efficiency over the 25 remaining planning period of the IRP?</p>	<p>260</p> <p>1 specific sections that each witness covers or 2 sponsors in the IRP document itself. Mr. Hubbard 3 has explained what his team is providing to the 4 IRP modeling team, and I'm not sure if he can say 5 it in a different way. 6 MS. GRUNDMANN: Your Honor, that's 7 precisely the problem. As counsel just said, he 8 said he explains what was provided to the modeling 9 team, the IRP modeling team. 10 But then I said, well, are you not a 11 member of the demand response modeling? 12 And he says, no, no, no, that's not 13 accurate. 14 I'm not creating confusion. I'm 15 responding to confusion in the questions because 16 I'm literally just -- I'm trying to understand how 17 did they extrapolate demand response and energy 18 efficiency over the planning period. And I cannot 19 figure out who to ask that question to because I 20 feel like I'm getting different answers about what 21 the inputs are and what the forward-looking 22 process is and who is responsible for doing those 23 calculations and that information. 24 COMMISSIONER BAGOT: I have a clarifying 25 question which may or may not make the issue</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

36 (261 to 264)

<p style="text-align: right;">261</p> <p>1 better or worse. But I think there may be a 2 little bit of confusion between the word "program" 3 and "input." 4 So can I -- I'm going to ask a question to 5 see if I can understand what you're saying 6 correctly. 7 So your team provides inputs to the 8 modeling team, which uses those inputs to model 9 existing and pending energy efficiency in DSM 10 programs and extrapolate what those programs -- 11 what efficiencies may be gained in terms of load 12 forecasting through the entire IRP study period? 13 THE WITNESS: Yes. Just one slight 14 clarification to that. 15 So when bidders bid on programs, the 16 inputs within each of those programs are many. 17 There are energy and demand savings, cost 18 information. But also, if it's a multimeasure 19 program, such as an audit program where you've got 20 insulation or door seals or heat pumps and things 21 of that nature, there will be with each of those 22 measures energy demand and load shape information 23 to show when we're going to get the benefits. 24 We get that information back in a very 25 specific format from bidders, and that input</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">263</p> <p>1 file those tests with the Commission for approval. 2 COMMISSIONER BAGOT: Okay. 3 THE WITNESS: Yeah. 4 BY MS. GRUNDMANN: 5 Q So my question follows on top of that. 6 What I'm trying to understand is whether the plan 7 incorporates any assumptions about potential 8 savings from programs that have not yet been 9 approved or proposed. 10 A And that's outside the scope of my 11 testimony. 12 Q Who would I ask those questions to? 13 A Again, I've indicated that forecasting and 14 modeling, Witness Joseph Bocanegra and 15 Shane Compton would be the best witnesses on that, 16 yeah. 17 Q So that is not within the subject of 18 anything that you have sponsored here in your 19 testimony? 20 A Other than the input information and our 21 play in that process. 22 Q I don't want us to get hung back up on 23 this input piece. I feel like I understand 24 through your questions with the Commissioner that 25 the input you're focusing on are existing and</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">262</p> <p>1 information is what's sent to the modeling team. 2 COMMISSIONER BAGOT: Okay. So that input 3 information, going back to the snapshot of time, 4 for purposes of this IRP and projecting out during 5 the IRP period, you're using the information that 6 you currently have with respect to that bid 7 information, right? You're not updating -- it 8 doesn't -- you're using existing, current 9 information. You're not projecting what you think 10 that bid information will be for each year going 11 forward and then providing those projections as 12 inputs to the modeling team? 13 THE WITNESS: I will say that those bids 14 are multiyear bids, so it does go out into the 15 future. And a lot of times the individual 16 measures within a program. For instance, a 17 lighting measure may have an 8 or 10-year life 18 versus another measure that might have a 10 or 19 15-year life. 20 So that's the type of information that the 21 load-forecasting modelers are looking at and when 22 those associated benefits are hitting the system. 23 If it passes three of the four tests -- 24 and I won't get into the details of those tests 25 right now unless people are interested, but we</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">264</p> <p>1 proposed and all of the input pieces that go into 2 that. 3 I'm trying to differentiate between that 4 and the future. And so it sounds like it's a 5 question to ask on rebuttal. 6 A Yes, and particularly with the 7 requirements that have changed through the years 8 on modeling. 9 Q And to go back, you indicated briefly -- 10 and I do not want a summary of the four cost 11 effectiveness tests or what would be necessary to 12 pass them, but do you believe that greater demand 13 response and energy efficiency, that more programs 14 would pass if, for example, the Commission were to 15 determine that it was only necessary that they 16 pass two of the four tests or one specific test? 17 A No, I do not. Because one of the 18 primary -- there's so many factors that go into 19 cost effectiveness, changing market conditions 20 every year. 21 And, you know, when the law changed in 22 2018 to require that three of the four tests pass, 23 it was really aimed at -- many of the programs 24 were failing the RIM test, the rate impact measure 25 test, which rarely passes.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

37 (265 to 268)

<p style="text-align: right;">265</p> <p>1 And so, yes, I think -- you know, ever 2 since 2018, we've had a hundred percent approval 3 of the programs we brought forth before the 4 Commission because of the clarity the law offered. 5 Q Does that hundred percent approval not 6 reflect that there's a real need for demand-side 7 management programs in Virginia, particularly in 8 2025, as we face such exponential load growth? 9 A I think we understand the need because we 10 have brought forward all possible programs that 11 are cost effective. I mean, just as an example, 12 in 2017 before changing the law, we had seven, 13 roughly, programs. 14 You know, we're up between 40 to 50 15 approved programs, depending on timing, how we've 16 looked at it. So we've brought everything 17 possible cost effective. 18 Q And of those 40 to 50, can you just high 19 level give me a breakdown between how many are 20 energy efficiency and how many are demand 21 response? 22 A Yeah, I would say the bulk of them are 23 energy efficiency; namely, because the value of 24 capacity that we value off of the PJM-based 25 residual auction was suppressed for so many years.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">267</p> <p>1 again, we just went back to the market. We were 2 able to bring two programs: one, an expansion of 3 our current, Nonresidential Distributed Generation 4 Program, over five years that's going to be 5 slightly over 60 additional megawatts; and a 6 curtailment program on the nonresidential, over 7 five years will be about another 60-plus 8 megawatts. 9 Q But you're aware -- and we can address it 10 more on rebuttal, but you're aware that a number 11 of parties have indicated that they think that far 12 more is possible with DSM? 13 A I've heard that. And we also are going to 14 the market to see what they think is -- able to be 15 brought. 16 MS. GRUNDMANN: Thank you. 17 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 18 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: PEC? 19 MR. GREMA: No questions, Your Honor. 20 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Microsoft? 21 MS. ROBB: No questions, Your Honor. 22 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: City of Alexandria? 23 MR. WINSTON: Thank you, Your Honor. 24 CROSS-EXAMINATION 25 BY MR. WINSTON:</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">266</p> <p>1 Just as a way, as an example, the annual RFP 2 process I mentioned, when we were in the middle of 3 the RFP process and we issued a supplemental RFP 4 because of the change in the bid prices just to 5 see what more we could get from the market. 6 So we have a handful of DR programs, 7 demand response programs, right now. Actually, 8 those are typically filed under the peak shaving, 9 which is a little bit different delineation under 10 Virginia law, the definition of that. 11 But we do have -- because of the price 12 changes with the auction, we do have a number of 13 demand response programs on file with the 14 Commission. 15 Q You mean that are proposed currently? 16 A That are proposed right now, that's 17 correct. 18 Q And you agree, like, that demand response 19 does -- generally can be used to peak shave, 20 correct? 21 A Most of them, yes. 22 Q And that can have the effect of 23 potentially reducing or eliminating the need for a 24 peaking resource in some circumstances? 25 A In some circumstances. We -- you know,</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">268</p> <p>1 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Hubbard. 2 A Good afternoon. 3 Q I'm going to try to avoid some of the land 4 mines that have been triggered heretofore. 5 A Thank you. 6 Q I'm putting up here -- this is from page 8 7 of the IRP. 8 And here, if you read the highlighted 9 language, would you agree that this corroborates 10 some of the responses that you gave a moment ago, 11 that the energy efficiency downward adjustment to 12 the load forecast is comprised, in general, of two 13 categories of inputs: one is the previously 14 SCC-approved programs that are -- remain effective 15 and are currently providing savings; and the 16 second category is forecasted savings growth, 17 which is geared towards meeting the targets that 18 are mandated by the Commission? 19 A Yes, that's what that says, yes. 20 Thank you. 21 Q Just turning the page to page 9 of the 22 IRP. 23 And at the top of the page, the IRP admits 24 that the approach is a simplifying assumption used 25 for modeling purposes and that the actual costs</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

38 (269 to 272)

<p>269</p> <p>1 and benefits of future energy efficiency will be 2 dependent upon factors, including the ability of 3 vendors to deliver the program savings at the 4 fixed price, rate of customer participation and 5 penetration, and the effectiveness of the 6 programs. 7 Do you agree with that? 8 MR. DANTONIO: Mr. Winston, if I may, did 9 you say this was in the IRP document, page 9, the 10 October 15th? 11 MR. WINSTON: It's -- I admit I'm looking 12 at a segment. It's section -- oh, it's 13 Appendix 2.5, yeah, that's right. I apologize. 14 Thank you. 15 So it's page 8 of Appendix 2. Thank you. 16 MR. DANTONIO: And this appendix is not 17 sponsored by Mr. Hubbard, just for clarity. 18 MR. WINSTON: Thank you. 19 BY MR. WINSTON: 20 Q But would you agree in general, 21 Mr. Hubbard, that the effectiveness of energy 22 efficiency in DSM programs does depend on these 23 other factors, including customer participation 24 rates and penetration rates? 25 A I would agree they're definitely voluntary</p>	<p>271</p> <p>1 commercial-distributed cooperation program? 2 A The very first one is the 3 commercial-distributed generation -- 4 Q Generation program, okay. So we'll skip 5 that one. 6 If you go to No. 2, nonresidential EE 7 products, in 2024, it says that there are 200 8 either 82 or 32 penetrations; is that correct? 9 A That's what the projections were, that's 10 correct. 11 Q And then in 2025, it says 564. And then 12 it says 564 again all the way through with 2028; 13 is that correct? 14 A That's correct. 15 Q And if you go one down to the 16 nonresidential multifamily program; is that right? 17 In 2025, it has 3,242 or seven 18 penetrations; is that correct? 19 And the same is true going all the way 20 forward until 2033 when it drops to zero; is that 21 correct? 22 A That's correct. 23 Q And if you go down one more, you see a 24 similar phenomenon. The number of penetrations is 25 150, and that 150 stays constant throughout the</p>
<p>270</p> <p>1 in nature, yes. 2 Q So I have here Appendix 3E-4. And I 3 apologize, Mr. Hubbard, for the size, but this is 4 your filing. 5 And, Mr. Hubbard, in the category -- 6 MR. WINSTON: And just for the record's 7 clarity, Mr. Hubbard did, I believe, sponsor this 8 appendix. 9 So 2-5, he did not sponsor, but this one 10 he did? 11 MR. DANTONIO: That's correct. 12 BY MR. WINSTON: 13 Q Mr. Hubbard, do you see the list of 14 programs on the left side of the screen? 15 A Yes. 16 Q And is it correct -- is it a correct 17 description of what this table is depicting, that 18 in each year that is depicted, this is the number 19 of penetrations, i.e., the number of customers 20 that are adopting the listed program by year? 21 A Yes. 22 Q Okay. And I'm just going to take a couple 23 examples of some of the programs. 24 So the first program -- and I apologize, 25 it actually is quite difficult to read --</p>	<p>272</p> <p>1 study period; is that correct? 2 A That's right. 3 Are you talking about the Nonresidential 4 New Construction Program -- 5 Q Yes, sir. 6 A -- on about the fourth line? 7 Q Yes, sir. 8 A That's correct. 9 Q Okay. And if you go down one more, you 10 see some fluctuation in the first few years. And 11 then in 2027, it says 2,739 penetrations, and that 12 number largely remains constant; is that correct? 13 A That's right. It gets up to a certain 14 level and then it stays there. 15 Q So can you describe for us what -- what 16 the phenomenon that we're seeing here is, that the 17 number and level of penetrations for these 18 programs seems to remain static in many, many of 19 the -- especially the nonresidential programs? 20 A It grows to -- some of these programs are, 21 you know, continuations and improved in different 22 phases. But the phenomenon is you're getting to 23 the max penetration anticipated in the program, 24 and then those participants are still reflected 25 going forward.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

39 (273 to 276)

<p style="text-align: right;">273</p> <p>1 Q So when you said -- you say that this 2 represents the maximum penetration level for the 3 program? 4 A I didn't -- we -- some instances we may go 5 beyond or some instances it may be less. I think 6 these are the anticipated as-modeled projections 7 that we originally got back from vendors in the 8 bid. 9 And when you take that with the other 10 tables that are in there, the energy and demand, 11 you know, sometimes different measure mixes are 12 realized than what was originally anticipated. 13 But these are the best projections from the vendor 14 that ended up into the filings. 15 Q So it's your testimony that the best 16 estimates for the penetration levels for all of 17 the programs that I mentioned and other programs 18 that we haven't mentioned, like the residential 19 Smart Thermostat program, the nonresidential small 20 business improvement enhanced program, all of 21 these -- the nonresidential building automation 22 program, the nonresidential building optimization 23 program, all of which level off fairly early in 24 the study period, is it your testimony that there 25 is no anticipated increase in the level of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">275</p> <p>1 A I think we're modeling these through their 2 approval periods right now. And you can get 3 additional clarification from the load forecaster. 4 Q Mr. Hubbard, in your professional 5 experience, are -- what are some of the factors 6 that go into maximizing performance when it comes 7 to customer participation and penetration? 8 A It's going to be awareness is critical. 9 We've, you know, recently done a survey that has 10 shown that our general awareness has gone up 11 substantially. That was one of the items 12 identified in the long-term plan. So that's a 13 criticality. 14 You know, the size of rebates, but that's 15 also influenced by, you know, different factors 16 such as rates and a whole bunch of other things 17 that come into play when running the cost 18 effectiveness test. 19 But I would say, for these voluntary 20 programs, awareness of the programs, and realizing 21 customers oftentimes, unless it's an income-based 22 program, have some out-of-pocket expenditures as 23 well. 24 Q So essentially what you're saying is that 25 marketing is the touchstone, the bedrock of</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">274</p> <p>1 penetration for any of these programs throughout 2 the study period? And if so, why is that? 3 A Yeah, I would, again, ask, from a modeling 4 perspective, how it was entered with the load 5 forecast witness Joseph Bocanegra. 6 But I will say, like, for instance, that 7 residential Smart Thermostat, the first one you 8 just noted, right now that program is, you know, 9 right there projected to hit about 38,000. We do 10 have a replacement program on file right now 11 before the Commission for approval. 12 So that, if approved, will continue to 13 grow. 14 Q You're referring to the DR program and I 15 was referencing the energy efficiency program two 16 lines below that. 17 A Okay. 18 Q But your point is taken. 19 A Sure. 20 Q But you would agree that for these various 21 programs that seem to have no expected increase in 22 the level of penetration, that either the program 23 has maxed out its penetration or the model is not 24 capturing efforts to increase the level of 25 penetration; is that correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">276</p> <p>1 customer participation, correct? 2 A I think it's -- that's key. And then how 3 much a customer -- a residential customer or a 4 business is willing to take action from 5 expenditures from their own pocket, you know, 6 often it depends on the measure and the payback 7 period. Lighting measures have a shorter payback 8 period and often are more prone to be undertaken. 9 Q And who handles the marketing for the 10 energy efficiency programs that the Company 11 offers? 12 A So we have an individual on my team who is 13 a lead communication consultant, we also work very 14 closely with our corporate communications 15 department at Dominion Energy. We have an 16 overarching awareness vendor that we work with 17 specifically on programs, and they help all 18 coordinate a similar feel and touch that includes 19 on the web as well as printed materials. 20 And we also have, with over 10-plus 21 implementation vendors, we have very specific 22 targeted program communications from those 23 implementation vendors as well. 24 Q And your efforts to increase market 25 penetration, are those exerted to support all of</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

40 (277 to 280)

<p style="text-align: right;">277</p> <p>1 the DSM and energy efficiency programs that the 2 Company offers? 3 A That's correct. And, you know, that can 4 vary by program, I mean, the way that's 5 administered. For instance, low-income programs 6 working with the social service agencies and the 7 intake agencies and word of mouth within these 8 communities is often the more effective versus 9 other mechanisms that may be effective in the 10 other residential programs. 11 Q And so it sounds -- I get the impression 12 that you -- your opinion is that the marketing 13 team that you work with does good work that does 14 increase awareness. 15 So would you agree with the statement, if 16 that's the case, that all of those programs that 17 show flat-lined penetration are simply not 18 capturing the Company's marketing efforts in the 19 model? 20 A No, I wouldn't agree that that's what that 21 chart shows. It just shows that if a program -- 22 life, those are the number of penetrations that we 23 expect to get in that program approval period. We 24 have demonstrated repeatedly, if a program remains 25 cost effective, we'll bring the next generation of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">279</p> <p>1 redirect? 2 MR. DANTONIO: No redirect. 3 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 4 Mr. Hubbard, you're now excused. 5 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 6 MS. LINK: The Company calls Dr. Katelynn 7 Vance. 8 KATELYNN A. VANCE, called as a witness, 9 having been first duly sworn, was examined and 10 testified as follows: 11 DIRECT EXAMINATION 12 BY MS. LINK: 13 Q Good afternoon, Dr. Vance. What is your 14 name, position of employment, and business 15 address? 16 A My name is Katelynn A. Vance, and I am a 17 manager of electric transmission planning and 18 strategic initiatives for Virginia Electric and 19 Power Company. My business address is 20 5000 Dominion Boulevard, Glen Allen, 21 Virginia 23060. 22 Q Do you have with you a document entitled 23 Direct Testimony of Katelynn A. Vance, consisting 24 of a one-page summary, one typed page of questions 25 and answers, and an Appendix A, which was filed in</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">278</p> <p>1 program. 2 For instance, right now we've got an 3 enhanced small business improvement program as 4 well as a significantly growing data center 5 energy efficiency program. 6 Q Do you or your team have any input on 7 whether the DSM and EE programs are modeled as 8 selectable resources or only as a downward 9 adjustment outside the load forecast? 10 A Yeah, my understanding is it's not as a 11 selectable resource, yes. 12 Q Sorry, maybe I wasn't clear or I didn't 13 articulate well enough. 14 Does your team or you have any set part in 15 the decision not to model these programs as 16 selectable resources? 17 A Yeah, that's outside the scope of our 18 responsibilities. 19 MR. WINSTON: Okay. No further questions, 20 Your Honor. 21 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Consumer Counsel? 22 MR. FARMER: No questions, Your Honor. 23 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Commission Staff? 24 MS. PIERCE: No questions, Your Honor. 25 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Dominion, any</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">280</p> <p>1 public version only in this proceeding on 2 December 6th, 2024? 3 A Yes. 4 Q Was that document prepared by you or under 5 your supervision? 6 A Yes. 7 Q Do you have any additions or corrections 8 to that document? 9 A No. 10 Q Are your answers and sponsored portions 11 true and correct to the best of your knowledge for 12 when the IRP snapshot was taken and based on the 13 October 15th, 2024, filing date? 14 A Yes, subject to my rebuttal testimony. 15 Q And do you wish to sponsor those documents 16 as your direct testimony in this proceeding? 17 A Yes. 18 MS. LINK: Your Honor, at this time, I'd 19 ask that Dr. Vance's direct testimony be marked 20 for identification and admitted into the record. 21 THE BAILIFF: Direct testimony of 22 Dr. Katelynn Vance will be marked as Exhibit 14. 23 (Exhibit No. 14 was marked for 24 identification.) 25 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: The testimony</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

41 (281 to 284)

<p>281</p> <p>1 described and marked as Exhibit No. 14 is admitted 2 into the record. 3 (Exhibit No. 14 was admitted into 4 evidence.) 5 MS. LINK: Thank you, Your Honor. And the 6 witness is available for cross-examination. 7 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 8 MR. BENFORADO: No questions, Your Honor. 9 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: NRDC? 10 MS. JAFFE: No questions. 11 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: United? 12 MS. POLLARD: No questions, Your Honor. 13 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Clean Virginia? 14 MR. REISINGER: No questions, Your Honor. 15 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: DCC? 16 MR. MURPHEY: No questions, Your Honor. 17 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Walmart? 18 MS. GRUNDMANN: Very briefly, Your Honor. 19 CROSS-EXAMINATION 20 BY MS. GRUNDMANN: 21 Q Good afternoon, Dr. Vance. How are you? 22 A Good. How are you? 23 Q I'm doing well. 24 Carrie Grundmann from Walmart. Please 25 keep me honest if I don't say Dr. Vance. I'll do</p>	<p>283</p> <p>1 model -- for the model to select import 2 capabilities? 3 A Yes. 4 Q Okay. So can you walk me through -- you 5 know, as is reflected here on this TEAC 6 presentation, it reflects a projected in-service 7 date of June 1, 2030. But as I understand the 8 model, it wasn't made available until 2033. 9 So help me understand why the decision was 10 made to delay the availability of that import 11 capability by three years. 12 A Yes. So the import capability was delayed 13 partially because we wanted to make sure that with 14 the amount of uncertainty surrounding the -- with 15 the amount of uncertainty surrounding such a large 16 project and large set of projects, because the 17 increase and import capability was due to several 18 major 500 kV build-outs in both our system and 19 adjacent systems, by both us and NextEra, and so 20 we really wanted to make sure that we safeguarded 21 against assuming that those projects would be done 22 in light of an understanding of what permitting 23 risks there are and supply chain risks that there 24 are associated with that type of equipment. 25 Q I totally understand.</p>
<p>282</p> <p>1 my very best to give you your title. 2 A Thank you. 3 Q I've just been saying "Vance" because 4 Witness Compton referred a few items to you that I 5 just wanted to address with you. 6 Do you have in front of you what's been 7 marked as Exhibit 7? It's the Company's response 8 to Walmart 4-15? 9 MS. LINK: I don't believe she does, 10 Counsel. 11 BY MS. GRUNDMANN: 12 Q I think all of my copies have been passed 13 out, so I'll put it up here on the thing. 14 It really is the discussion about when the 15 increased build limits were assumed for purposes 16 of the modeling. 17 MS. LINK: And, Your Honor, may I approach 18 the witness with a copy? 19 MS. GRUNDMANN: If you have a copy, 20 absolutely. 21 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Please do. 22 BY MS. GRUNDMANN: 23 Q Dr. Vance, were you involved in the 24 decision as to when these increased build limits 25 were assumed to be available for purposes of</p>	<p>284</p> <p>1 What I'm trying to understand is why was 2 three years selected as opposed to one or two 3 years or some lesser period of time or larger 4 period of time. Why three years, in particular? 5 A So, first, let me clarify that we did -- 6 and to go back to what -- you had asked Shane 7 about the derate. 8 So what we meant by derate there was we 9 scaled from the amount that we had calculated with 10 the case that we had to 80 percent of that that we 11 started to apply in 2028. 12 So we did still increase the amount that 13 we expected to be able to import between 2028 14 and -- well, starting in 2029, January 1st, 2029, 15 to 2033. And so that does account for some amount 16 of these builds to occur. 17 Q So is it fair to say that you sort of -- 18 taking what you just said, you sort of phased in 19 the increased import capabilities as a result of 20 the total project? 21 A Yes, and set of projects. There are 22 multiple. 23 Q Right. 24 And so -- but then help me understand -- 25 because was it 80 percent -- well, let's put it</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

42 (285 to 288)

<p>285</p> <p>1 back up.</p> <p>2 When you say "80 percent," was the</p> <p>3 80 percent held firm for the time period of 2028</p> <p>4 to 2033?</p> <p>5 A Yes, it was held firm between 2020 --</p> <p>6 January 1st, 2029, and 2033.</p> <p>7 Q Is it January 1st, 2033, or December --</p> <p>8 like, what's the date on the 2033?</p> <p>9 A I believe, subject to check, it is</p> <p>10 December 31st, 2033.</p> <p>11 Q Okay. So you assumed 80 percent. You</p> <p>12 didn't ratchet it up any. So go -- why not</p> <p>13 ratchet up beginning from the projected in-service</p> <p>14 date through 2033?</p> <p>15 Why hold firm at 80 percent?</p> <p>16 A So in addition to the 500 kV projects that</p> <p>17 are necessary for the import limit to be able to</p> <p>18 increase as expected once those are in service,</p> <p>19 you also have a slew of 230 kV projects which also</p> <p>20 have to be completed to be able to allow for those</p> <p>21 ratings to be -- to be able to be used.</p> <p>22 And so at a certain point, you just have</p> <p>23 a lot of uncertainty surrounding what you will --</p> <p>24 what you would expect to be done or not to be done</p> <p>25 in that period of time.</p>	<p>287</p> <p>1 line is 160 miles approximately and crosses four</p> <p>2 states. And so that is a lot of uncertainty</p> <p>3 across a large number of constituents across a</p> <p>4 large number of permits that need to be acquired.</p> <p>5 And so it made sense for us to want to take some</p> <p>6 conservatism there.</p> <p>7 Q I'm just trying to understand. So the</p> <p>8 decision about the conservatism, it sounds like it</p> <p>9 was just your best guess based upon judgment, not</p> <p>10 based on any sort of specific test or anything</p> <p>11 like that. You could have easily determined, you</p> <p>12 know what, we're going to do two years instead of</p> <p>13 three.</p> <p>14 A There are instances where projects have</p> <p>15 been delayed very significantly. And so it made</p> <p>16 sense to us that, in the interest of</p> <p>17 understanding, like, what reliability should look</p> <p>18 like for the Company across that period of time,</p> <p>19 that it made sense to be conservative.</p> <p>20 Q That's fair. I understand.</p> <p>21 But you also agree with me that maybe now</p> <p>22 more than ever PJM is pretty focused on</p> <p>23 reliability issues on its system; wouldn't you</p> <p>24 agree?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>
<p>286</p> <p>1 And we felt that in order to help</p> <p>2 ourselves ensure that we don't consider short-term</p> <p>3 reliability, that we -- it would be the safe</p> <p>4 assumption, based on engineering judgment, to</p> <p>5 leave it at 80 percent for that period of time and</p> <p>6 then implement the full ratings after 2033.</p> <p>7 Q So did the Company undertake any sort of a</p> <p>8 study of other transmission projects that had been</p> <p>9 delayed or any sort of a formal process to assess</p> <p>10 how much of a delay to impose from the projected</p> <p>11 in-service date at PJM through the 2033</p> <p>12 assumption?</p> <p>13 A So from the time that the NextEra project</p> <p>14 was actually filed with PJM to the time that --</p> <p>15 the final -- I will go ahead and say that there</p> <p>16 are -- these projects, from the time they are</p> <p>17 proposed to the time that they are actually</p> <p>18 executed, have some fluidity.</p> <p>19 And so with that in mind -- like, from the</p> <p>20 time that the project was originally proposed in</p> <p>21 May of 2023, the NextEra line, to the time that</p> <p>22 the TEAC slides were published in December</p> <p>23 of 2023, the routing for that line had already</p> <p>24 changed more than once.</p> <p>25 And so we had -- the line -- the NextEra</p>	<p>288</p> <p>1 Q And that they have been taking steps to</p> <p>2 focus on baseload reliability and shovel-ready</p> <p>3 projects as well, correct?</p> <p>4 A Yes.</p> <p>5 Q And you understand that -- did you hear</p> <p>6 Mr. Compton say that delaying until 2033 the full</p> <p>7 availability of that import capability could have</p> <p>8 had an effect on the modeling?</p> <p>9 A I did hear Mr. -- or Witness Compton say</p> <p>10 that.</p> <p>11 Q And you -- are you aware of sort of</p> <p>12 approximately how much time it takes to bring a</p> <p>13 large sort of baseload, like a CT or a CC, how</p> <p>14 long it takes to bring one of those resources</p> <p>15 online?</p> <p>16 A That is not my area of expertise.</p> <p>17 Q Would you agree, subject to check, that</p> <p>18 it's several years?</p> <p>19 A Yes.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. I want -- I have a question, and I</p> <p>21 just want to make sure that I understand it as</p> <p>22 we're going on.</p> <p>23 There's a number of discovery responses in</p> <p>24 this case from Nathaniel Rice, supervisor,</p> <p>25 electric transmission strategic initiatives.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

43 (289 to 292)

<p style="text-align: right;">289</p> <p>1 A Yes. 2 Q Does that individual report to you? 3 A Yes. 4 Q So if I had any questions about discovery 5 that he authored, those questions would be best 6 directed -- 7 A Yes. 8 Q -- to you? 9 Okay. Are you aware that in the context 10 of this IRP, that the Company has made certain 11 statements about looking -- I'm probably going to 12 get this wrong in the phraseology, but within all 13 the LSEs within the DOM Zone, not just 14 Dominion-specific load obligations to meet the 15 growing electric demand? Are you aware of that 16 sort of statement? 17 A Could you please rephrase that? 18 Q Well, let me just try to put up a 19 discovery request. It does reference a Staff 20 discovery request, but what I'm concerned about 21 here is that there's a statement about how the 22 Company is looking at strategies, projects, and 23 pathways with other LSEs within the DOM Zone to 24 meet the growing electric demand. 25 Are you familiar with those sort of what I</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">291</p> <p>1 not happening. 2 MS. GRUNDMANN: Okay. Thank you. Those 3 are all the questions that I have. 4 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: PEC? 5 MR. GREMA: No questions, Your Honor. 6 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Microsoft? 7 MS. ROBB: No questions, Your Honor. 8 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: City of Alexandria? 9 MR. WINSTON: No questions, Your Honor. 10 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Consumer Counsel? 11 MR. FARMER: No questions, Your Honor. 12 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Commission Staff? 13 MS. PIERCE: Yes, Your Honor. 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION 15 BY MR. ZIELINSKI: 16 Q Hi, Dr. Vance. I'm Mike Zielinski, for 17 Commission Staff. I just have a few questions for 18 you. 19 I'm correct that you sponsor Section 2.3 20 of the IRP, transmission considerations? 21 A Yes. 22 Q And Chapter 2 of the IRP is titled Current 23 Challenges to Reliability; is that correct? 24 A Subject to check. I can't find my page 25 right now, but I think so.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">290</p> <p>1 assume are discussions with other LSEs within the 2 DOM Zone? 3 A Yes. I have been tangentially a part of 4 some of that. 5 Q Now -- and you see in the response -- and 6 again, this is from Mr. Rice, but you see here 7 that those discussions are limited to the 8 transmission function of the Company and occur 9 through the PJM RTEP process? 10 A Yes. 11 Q Okay. And so in that context, when it 12 comes to discussing sort of meeting the growing 13 electric demand and it occurring within the PJM 14 RTEP, does that mean that those potential 15 discussions are limited to transmission solutions 16 since it's PJM's planning process? 17 A Could you please rephrase? 18 Q What I'm trying to understand is, are you 19 talking about other LSEs about generation 20 solutions that might exist, or are those 21 discussions limited to transmission solutions? 22 A I'm personally not speaking with them 23 about generation. 24 Q Do you know anybody who is? 25 A I do not, but that does not mean that it's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">292</p> <p>1 Q Okay. You also sponsor Appendix 2D, 2 Transmission System Reliability Analyses, correct? 3 A Yes. 4 Q Okay. So I wanted to ask you something 5 about -- that relates to reliability challenges. 6 MR. ZIELINSKI: Your Honors, if I could 7 have an exhibit marked. This is Incident 8 Review -- a document entitled Incident Review 9 Considerations, Simultaneous Voltage-Sensitive 10 Load Reductions, which was posted by North 11 American Electric Reliability Corporation on 12 January 8, 2025. 13 BY MR. ZIELINSKI: 14 Q Dr. Vance, are you familiar with this 15 document? 16 A Yes. 17 Q Are you familiar with the event that NERC 18 discusses throughout this document that occurred 19 around 7:00 p.m. on July 10, 2024? 20 A Yes. 21 MS. LINK: Mr. Zielinski, apologies for 22 the interruption. Is that -- are there copies? 23 MR. ZIELINSKI: I'm so sorry. Yes. 24 They're right here. 25 MS. LINK: That would be great.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

44 (293 to 296)

<p style="text-align: right;">293</p> <p>1 Thank you.</p> <p>2 If we can get one to the witness, that</p> <p>3 would be great. Thank you.</p> <p>4 BY MR. ZIELINSKI:</p> <p>5 Q Dr. Vance, feel free to fill in any</p> <p>6 details you think are necessary, but essentially,</p> <p>7 there's a fault on a 230 -- sorry.</p> <p>8 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Counsel, would you</p> <p>9 like to mark this for identification purposes now?</p> <p>10 MR. ZIELINSKI: If we could, please.</p> <p>11 THE BAILIFF: The NERC Incident Review</p> <p>12 document will be marked as Exhibit 15.</p> <p>13 (Exhibit No. 15 was marked for</p> <p>14 identification.)</p> <p>15 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Please proceed.</p> <p>16 BY MR. ZIELINSKI:</p> <p>17 Q Okay. Dr. Vance, so, again, feel free to</p> <p>18 correct, fill in as necessary. But essentially,</p> <p>19 with this incident, there was a 230 kV</p> <p>20 transmission line somewhere in the Company's</p> <p>21 service territory, and the Company's equipment</p> <p>22 cleared the fault, as would be expected, correct?</p> <p>23 A Yes.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. And then subsequent to the fault</p> <p>25 event, the Company and the grid operator observed</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">295</p> <p>1 they set the voltage of the system.</p> <p>2 And so in this incident what happened was</p> <p>3 we had 1,500 megawatts of load transferred to</p> <p>4 their backup power. And that looks like -- to the</p> <p>5 system, that looks like a load loss. And the</p> <p>6 voltage in the area increased significantly.</p> <p>7 Operators took action to remove reactive devices</p> <p>8 that help support the system voltage across all</p> <p>9 different kV levels and maintain -- moving back</p> <p>10 towards their nominal values and allowing for --</p> <p>11 so that equipment isn't damaged and so the system</p> <p>12 is operated at its intended state.</p> <p>13 Additionally, the frequency changes as a</p> <p>14 result of load or generation loss of this size --</p> <p>15 Q Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>16 A -- before returning to a steady state.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>18 Was the Company's transmission team</p> <p>19 previously aware that what would otherwise be a</p> <p>20 normal fault event could create this 1500-megawatt</p> <p>21 customer load shed?</p> <p>22 A Subject to check, I would say no.</p> <p>23 Q Okay. Is this the only type of situation</p> <p>24 where the Company has observed this kind of load</p> <p>25 shedding event?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">294</p> <p>1 approximately 1,500 megawatts worth of data center</p> <p>2 customers drop off the system, yes?</p> <p>3 A Yes. The grid operator being PJM.</p> <p>4 Q Yes.</p> <p>5 And my understanding is that those data</p> <p>6 centers switched to their backup generation; is</p> <p>7 that correct?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. And for the nonengineers in the</p> <p>10 room, can you explain what happens to the</p> <p>11 Company's transmission system when this amount of</p> <p>12 load drops off the grid unexpectedly?</p> <p>13 A Yes. So at any given point in time, load</p> <p>14 and generation are balanced. The amount of</p> <p>15 generation -- and they have to be to maintain the</p> <p>16 frequency of the power system.</p> <p>17 And so as a result of the load dropping</p> <p>18 off, there are two main things that change: One,</p> <p>19 the voltage profile of the system across all</p> <p>20 different kV levels is maintained in what is</p> <p>21 commonly called a per-unit voltage. That voltage</p> <p>22 then ends up going quite high when you end up</p> <p>23 losing load like this.</p> <p>24 Similarly, if a generator were to trip off</p> <p>25 of-- offline, the voltage would go low because</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">296</p> <p>1 A No. There was an event on the morning of</p> <p>2 February 17th where we also had a load transfer</p> <p>3 event.</p> <p>4 I should clarify that we in no way</p> <p>5 service -- electrical service to our customers was</p> <p>6 not impacted by either of these events. They</p> <p>7 chose to take themselves offline.</p> <p>8 Q This is February 17th of this year?</p> <p>9 A 2025, yes.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>11 From a transmission-planning perspective,</p> <p>12 would this type of situation be considered a risk</p> <p>13 to system reliability?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 Q Can you explain how so?</p> <p>16 A Yes. So, as I said, the power system</p> <p>17 generally operates in what we would consider a</p> <p>18 steady state. It moves slowly. Events like this</p> <p>19 are kind of like a hammer knocking on a gong, if</p> <p>20 you could think about it that way.</p> <p>21 And so they are not -- the events of this</p> <p>22 size, when you think about them in the context of</p> <p>23 the stability studies that are run via normal PJM</p> <p>24 processes, are not necessarily so far off base</p> <p>25 that they're not kind of covered in, like, what</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

45 (297 to 300)

<p style="text-align: right;">297</p> <p>1 would happen if you lost a generator of a similar 2 size. So that you can kind of think about it 3 equivalently. 4 But, yes, they are a concern. We are 5 working with PJM and we worked with NERC on this, 6 on understanding how load models -- we're also 7 meeting with customers to understand better their 8 systems and needs, but then on our end, to make 9 sure that we, like, do our due diligence in some 10 of the modeling and understanding of what the 11 equipment would do. 12 Especially because that's such a large 13 scale, it really has a much greater impact on the 14 system than it would if it was just, I don't know, 15 a paper factory somewhere and there were no other 16 paper factories nearby. Like it's a much more 17 aggregated space. 18 Q Okay. And even though this event occurred 19 last July and even though the Company has done all 20 this work with PJM and other stakeholders, there's 21 no mention of this type of reliability risk 22 anywhere in Chapter 2, is there, in the IRP? 23 A No. 24 Q Okay. You didn't analyze these types of 25 events as part of Appendix 2D either, correct?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">299</p> <p>1 stop. It's what NERC recommended, and it requires 2 information about what types of loads are in -- or 3 at a particular facility, what motor loads, what 4 their ramp rates are, what their low voltage set 5 points are for tripping offline, the number of 6 instances where you'd have to hit them to be able 7 to trip them offline, what their ramp rate return 8 is after an event. And so that is like one of the 9 most material things that we've done since then. 10 We've also implemented a delivery point 11 exchange for customers of any kind to be able to 12 place requests for interconnection service. And 13 so that allows for us to do that in a more orderly 14 and trackable fashion. 15 Q And all of these steps are currently 16 implemented or they've already been implemented, 17 there's nothing still on the horizon that is yet 18 to happen? 19 A No. The facility interconnection 20 requirements went live later last year, so that is 21 in there. Any new customers that are being signed 22 up since then are having to require -- or are 23 being required to give us that information. 24 And the delivery point system went live in 25 October of 2024.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">298</p> <p>1 A Correct. 2 Q Okay. Do you know if the Commission or 3 the Commission Staff was notified that these 4 events had occurred? 5 A I do not. 6 Q Okay. Are you aware that the Company 7 projects that it will interconnect thousands of 8 megawatts worth of data center load over the next 9 15 years? 10 A Yes. 11 Q Okay. What steps is the Company taking -- 12 well, you've kind of described that -- in light of 13 these events to protect the reliability of 14 customers. 15 Is there anything in addition to what -- 16 A Yes. I realize I forgot one of the major 17 pieces is that NERC actually released, I'd say, 18 somewhere in Q2 of 2024, subject to check, a 19 reliability at -- a large load interconnect -- so 20 not specific to data centers, but just any large 21 load -- interconnection form that we then 22 incorporated as a part of our facility 23 interconnection requirements for any new load that 24 is interconnecting into our system. 25 And so we integrated that, like, full</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">300</p> <p>1 Q Okay. 2 A We will continue to evaluate the needs of 3 our -- the needed information from large-load 4 customers in our facility interconnection 5 requirements to move forward as well. 6 Q Okay. And do you plan on updating the 7 current challenges reliability chapter or the 8 Appendix 2B in the next IRP to reflect everything 9 that this Company is doing in light of these 10 events? 11 A I don't -- yes, we can include information 12 on this. 13 MR. ZIELINSKI: Okay. No further 14 questions. 15 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: And, Counsel, for 16 Exhibit No. 15, would you like that to be entered 17 into the record? 18 MR. ZIELINSKI: Yes, please. 19 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: So Exhibit No. 15 20 marked and described is admitted into the record. 21 (Exhibit No. 15 was admitted into 22 evidence.) 23 MR. ZIELINSKI: Thank you. 24 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Dominion, any 25 redirect?</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

46 (301 to 304)

<p>301</p> <p>1 MS. LINK: No redirect for Dr. Vance. 2 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Dr. Vance, you're 3 now excused. 4 MS. LINK: The Company calls Harrison 5 Potter. 6 HARRISON S. POTTER, called as a witness, 7 having been first duly sworn, was examined and 8 testified as follows: 9 DIRECT EXAMINATION 10 BY MS. LINK: 11 Q What is your name, position of employment, 12 and business address? 13 A My name is Harrison S. Potter. I'm the 14 manager of electric transmission planning and 15 strategic initiatives at Virginia Electric and 16 Power Company. My business address is 17 5000 Dominion Boulevard, Glen Allen, 18 Virginia 23060. 19 Q Do you have with you a document entitled 20 Direct Testimony of Harrison S. Potter, consisting 21 of a one-page summary, one typed page of questions 22 and answers, and an Appendix A, which was filed in 23 public version only in this proceeding on 24 December 6th, 2024? 25 A Yes.</p>	<p>303</p> <p>1 evidence.) 2 MS. LINK: Thank you, Your Honor. And 3 Mr. Potter is available for cross-examination. 4 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 5 MR. BENFORADO: No questions, Your Honor. 6 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: The City? 7 CROSS-EXAMINATION 8 BY MS. JAFFE: 9 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Potter. My name is 10 Dorothy Jaffe, on behalf of Sierra Club and NRDC. 11 If I could direct your attention to Supplemental 12 Appendix 2C-2. 13 Are you ready? 14 A Uh-huh. 15 Q And so Supplemental Appendix 2C-2 is a 16 list of plan transmission projects during the 17 planning period, is what the title says. 18 Is this a list of all the projects for the 19 entire planning period, so through 2039? Because 20 I only see projects listed through 2031. 21 A These are all the projects that have gone 22 through the PJM process and been assigned a 23 supplemental or a baseline number. 24 Q I'm sorry, could you speak up? 25 A Sorry. They are all the projects that</p>
<p>302</p> <p>1 Q Was that document prepared by you or under 2 your supervision? 3 A Yes. 4 Q Do you have any additions or corrections 5 to that document? 6 A No. 7 Q Are your answers and sponsored portions 8 true and correct to the best of your knowledge for 9 when the IRP snapshot was taken and based on the 10 October 15th, 2024, filing date? 11 A Yes. 12 Q Do you wish to sponsor those documents as 13 your direct testimony in this proceeding? 14 A Yes. 15 MS. LINK: Your Honor, at this time, I'd 16 ask that Mr. Potter's direct testimony be marked 17 for identification and admitted into the record. 18 THE BAILIFF: The direct testimony of 19 Harrison S. Potter will be marked as Exhibit 16. 20 (Exhibit No. 16 was marked for 21 identification.) 22 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: The testimony 23 described and marked as Exhibit No. 16 is entered 24 into the record, subject to cross-examination. 25 (Exhibit No. 16 was admitted into</p>	<p>304</p> <p>1 have gone through the PJM process and we have an 2 assigned supplemental or baseline number. So all 3 open window projects and/or supplemental projects 4 that the Company takes to PJM. 5 Q Okay. Thank you. And so the far right 6 column, which is highlighted on the screen, says 7 data center Y, N, or M. And it's my understanding 8 that the Y stands for yes, the project is needed 9 for data centers; the N is for no, it is not 10 needed for data centers; and the M is a mixed-use 11 project, meaning some of it might be needed for 12 data centers. 13 Is that accurate? 14 A Yes. 15 Q Okay. So if the column has a Y in it, 16 would I understand that to mean that you would not 17 need to build that project but for the data 18 center? 19 A That's correct. It's a supplemental 20 project directly related to that data center 21 facility or that data center campus. 22 Q Okay. Thank you. 23 MS. JAFFE: And I'd like to go ahead and 24 hand out an exhibit, please. And I'd like to have 25 this marked as an exhibit.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

47 (305 to 308)

<p>305</p> <p>1 THE BAILIFF: Dominion's Response to the 2 Sierra Club and NRDC's Interrogatory Request 7-7 3 will be marked as Exhibit 17. 4 (Exhibit No. 17 was marked for 5 identification.) 6 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 7 Please proceed. 8 BY MS. JAFFE: 9 Q And do you recognize this discovery 10 response, Mr. Potter? 11 A Yes. 12 Q And so the question that we were asking 13 was whether the projects that were identified as 14 data center driven, or the ones that were 15 identified with a Y in the far right column, who 16 pays, you know, for those projects and what 17 mechanism does Dominion use to recover. 18 What was Dominion's response? 19 A Rider T1. 20 Q Rider T1 applies to all customers? 21 A Yes, I think so. 22 Q Yes? 23 A I'm no expert on the Rider T1. 24 Q To the best of your knowledge? 25 A Yes.</p>	<p>307</p> <p>1 Q Well, I'm also an engineer, so hopefully 2 my math is okay. 3 Let's see. And do you know how many 4 additional data center-driven projects have been 5 filed with the Commission since the filing of this 6 particular supplemental appendix? 7 A Off the top of my head, no. 8 Q Okay. 9 A There's been several, I'm assuming, but... 10 Q So maybe half a dozen or so? 11 A I don't know -- 12 Q Okay. 13 A -- to answer that. 14 Q Thank you. 15 MS. JAFFE: No further questions. 16 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 17 Counsel, I guess before we -- Counsel, do 18 we want Exhibit No. 17 admitted into the record? 19 MS. JAFFE: Yes. 20 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Any objection? 21 So the Dominion response marked and 22 described as Exhibit No. 17 is admitted into the 23 record. 24 (Exhibit No. 17 was admitted into 25 evidence.)</p>
<p>306</p> <p>1 Q Okay. And would the same be true of the 2 projects that were either a no or a mixed use? 3 A Yes. 4 Q Yes? Okay. 5 And going back to the Supplemental 6 Appendix 2C-2, am I correct that there's no -- let 7 me see. Very last page on page 4. There's no 8 final total for how much these projects cost -- 9 well, I'm going to repeat myself. 10 There is no compilation of how much these 11 projects cost, correct, in this -- 12 A Not in this -- 13 Q -- table? 14 A -- table. 15 Q Okay. Would you agree with me that the 16 total for all of the projects identified in this 17 table is approximately \$7.595 billion? 18 Does that sound right? 19 A Subject to check, but, yes, I believe 20 that's the number. 21 Q And I believe the data center-driven 22 projects, the ones with the Y, added up to 23 approximately \$2.435 billion? 24 A Subject to check your math, I believe 25 that's right.</p>	<p>308</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: United? 2 MS. POLLARD: No questions, Your Honor. 3 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Clean Virginia? 4 MR. REISINGER: No questions, Your Honor. 5 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: DCC? 6 MR. MURPHEY: No questions, Your Honor. 7 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Walmart? 8 MS. GRUNDMANN: No questions. 9 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: PEC? 10 MR. GREMA: No questions, Your Honor. 11 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Microsoft? 12 MS. ROBB: No questions, Your Honor. 13 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: City of Alexandria? 14 MR. WINSTON: No questions, Your Honor. 15 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Consumer Counsel? 16 MR. FARMER: No questions, Your Honor. 17 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Commission Staff? 18 MS. PIERCE: No questions, Your Honor. 19 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: I assume Dominion 20 has no redirect? 21 MS. LINK: Correct, Your Honor. 22 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you very much. 23 You're now excused. 24 MS. LINK: Your Honor, I'm pleased to 25 report our next witness is stipulated. We would</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

48 (309 to 312)

<p style="text-align: right;">309</p> <p>1 ask that the document entitled Direct Testimony of 2 Mohammed Alfayyoumi, consisting of a one-page 3 summary, one typed page of questions and answers, 4 and Appendix A, filed in public version only in 5 this proceeding on December 6th, 2024, be marked 6 for identification and admitted into the record. 7 THE BAILIFF: The direct testimony of 8 Mohammed Alfayyoumi will be marked as Exhibit 18. 9 (Exhibit No. 18 was marked for 10 identification.) 11 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: The direct testimony 12 marked and described as Exhibit No. 18 is admitted 13 into the record. 14 (Exhibit No. 18 was admitted into 15 evidence.) 16 MS. LINK: Thank you. 17 MR. DANTONIO: The Company calls Todd 18 Flowers. 19 TODD FLOWERS, called as a witness, having 20 been first duly sworn, was examined and testified 21 as follows: 22 DIRECT EXAMINATION 23 BY MR. DANTONIO: 24 Q Good afternoon. 25 A Good afternoon.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">311</p> <p>1 Q Do you wish to sponsor those documents as 2 your direct testimony in this proceeding? 3 A Yes, I do. 4 MR. DANTONIO: At this time, I would ask 5 that Mr. Flowers' direct testimony be marked for 6 identification and admitted into the record. 7 THE BAILIFF: The direct testimony of Todd 8 Flowers will be marked as Exhibit 19. 9 (Exhibit No. 19 was marked for 10 identification.) 11 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Mr. Flowers' 12 testimony marked and described as Exhibit 19 is 13 admitted into the record. 14 (Exhibit No. 19 was admitted into 15 evidence.) 16 MR. DANTONIO: Thank you. 17 The witness is available for 18 cross-examination. 19 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 20 MR. BENFORADO: No questions, Your Honor. 21 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: NRDC? 22 MS. JAFFE: No questions. 23 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: United? 24 MS. POLLARD: No questions, Your Honor. 25 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Clean Virginia?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">310</p> <p>1 Q What is your name, position of employment, 2 and business address? 3 A My name is Todd Flowers, and I am the 4 director of power generation business development 5 for Virginia Electric and Power Company. My 6 business address is 600 East Canal Street in 7 Richmond, Virginia 23219. 8 Q Do you have with you a document entitled 9 Direct Testimony of Todd Flowers, consisting of a 10 one-page summary, one typed page of questions and 11 answers, and an Appendix A, which was filed in 12 public version only in the proceeding on 13 December 6, 2024? 14 A Yes, I do. 15 Q Was that document prepared by you or under 16 your supervision? 17 A Yes. 18 Q Do you have any additions or corrections 19 to those documents? 20 A No. 21 Q Are your answers and sponsored portions 22 true and correct to the best of your knowledge for 23 when the IRP snapshot was taken and based on the 24 October 15th, 2024, filing date? 25 A Yes, subject to my rebuttal testimony.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">312</p> <p>1 MR. REISINGER: No questions, Your Honor. 2 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: DCC? 3 MR. MURPHEY: No questions, Your Honor. 4 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Walmart? 5 MS. GRUNDMANN: Yes, Your Honor. 6 CROSS-EXAMINATION 7 BY MS. GRUNDMANN: 8 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Flowers. My name is 9 Carrie Grundmann. I'm here on behalf of Walmart. 10 Can I have you turn to page 37 of the IRP, 11 the discussion at 3.5 in Nuclear. 12 You agree with me that the Company has 13 responsibly operated what I'm referring to as 14 large-scale nuclear plants like those at 15 North Anna for multiple decades? 16 A Yes, for more than half a century. Our 17 Surry Nuclear plant just hit its 53rd birthday, I 18 believe. 19 Q And you note there on the bottom of 20 page 37 that, for over half a century, nuclear has 21 provided reliable, affordable, and zero carbon 22 electricity? 23 A Yes. 24 Q Despite that, the Company did not seek to 25 model additional large-scale nuclear in the IRP;</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

49 (313 to 316)

<p>313</p> <p>1 is that correct?</p> <p>2 A That's correct. For a myriad of reasons,</p> <p>3 we did not select -- or have as a modeling option</p> <p>4 as a supply-side resource traditional scale</p> <p>5 nuclear. But we do evaluate the potential</p> <p>6 inclusion of that resource every year we put</p> <p>7 together those modeling inputs.</p> <p>8 Q But did you see the build limits that were</p> <p>9 there, and did you hear my questions to</p> <p>10 Mr. Compton earlier?</p> <p>11 A I saw the -- generally the build limits in</p> <p>12 your questions to Mr. Compton.</p> <p>13 Q And did you see that in that particular</p> <p>14 exhibit that it listed a number of resource, some</p> <p>15 of which were identified as not modeled?</p> <p>16 A Correct.</p> <p>17 Q And that nowhere in that list was</p> <p>18 large-scale nuclear?</p> <p>19 A I agreed with you that we did not include</p> <p>20 nuclear as a modeling option in this year's IRP.</p> <p>21 But what I stated was every year we evaluate</p> <p>22 various supply-side resources. One of those that</p> <p>23 we consider including is traditional scale</p> <p>24 nuclear, but we did not include that as a modeling</p> <p>25 option for a myriad of reasons.</p>	<p>315</p> <p>1 plant proceeding to be filed later this year?</p> <p>2 A I don't track every regulatory action at</p> <p>3 Duke Energy. It's my understanding they were</p> <p>4 required to submit a report. On traditional-scale</p> <p>5 nuclear, I do not know whether or not they were</p> <p>6 directed to include it as a modeling option.</p> <p>7 Q So Senate Bill 454 is a law that</p> <p>8 guarantees the Company recovery of up-front costs</p> <p>9 for the development of SMRs; is that correct?</p> <p>10 A No, I do not agree with that presumption.</p> <p>11 It does not guarantee cost recovery. It permits</p> <p>12 the Company to petition the State Corporation</p> <p>13 Commission for early development costs associated</p> <p>14 with small modular reactors at one site. That one</p> <p>15 site could include one or more SMRs, and there are</p> <p>16 customer protections that were enacted as part of</p> <p>17 Senate Bill 454.</p> <p>18 Q But it allows you to recover those costs</p> <p>19 prior to the asset being placed in service and</p> <p>20 useful?</p> <p>21 A It allows the Company to recover a portion</p> <p>22 of those costs. It's 80 percent of the eligible</p> <p>23 costs could be recovered as part of that</p> <p>24 legislation --</p> <p>25 Q And so --</p>
<p>314</p> <p>1 Q But just because I know you were in the</p> <p>2 room, but you see here that there are a number of</p> <p>3 resources, probably 15 to 20, listed here in</p> <p>4 Exhibit 6, and that over here in this column,</p> <p>5 there are six resources that were not modeled at</p> <p>6 all?</p> <p>7 A Correct.</p> <p>8 Q And -- but you notice that nowhere even in</p> <p>9 the list of potential assets that were considered</p> <p>10 is large-scale nuclear? It's not even included</p> <p>11 within a comment that says, not modeled?</p> <p>12 A It's not included in that row as with</p> <p>13 other power generation resources that we evaluate.</p> <p>14 Q And as part of explaining why you have</p> <p>15 elected to only look at SMRs as the only nuclear</p> <p>16 option, you mention the 2024 Virginia General</p> <p>17 Assembly-enacted Senate Bill 454?</p> <p>18 A Yeah. And I did say we -- we keep a pulse</p> <p>19 on the nuclear industry and track</p> <p>20 traditional-scale nuclear, so we do evaluate it.</p> <p>21 We did not include it as a modeling option.</p> <p>22 Q So then you're aware that the</p> <p>23 North Carolina Utility's Commission, I believe,</p> <p>24 ordered Duke Energy to specifically model</p> <p>25 large-scale nuclear as part of its next carbon</p>	<p>316</p> <p>1 A -- should it be approved by the</p> <p>2 Commission.</p> <p>3 Q And so by contrast, if you were to propose</p> <p>4 to build a large-scale nuclear, Senate Bill 454</p> <p>5 would not authorize you to seek any up-front</p> <p>6 recovery of costs, would it?</p> <p>7 A The legislation defines small modular</p> <p>8 reactor, and traditional-scale nuclear is not</p> <p>9 included in that definition of the legislation.</p> <p>10 Q Is there any SMR actively providing power</p> <p>11 to the grid in the United States?</p> <p>12 A There are no commercial or civilian small</p> <p>13 modular reactors in operation today in the</p> <p>14 United States, but there are some that are under</p> <p>15 construction.</p> <p>16 Q And so -- but you felt like the SMR</p> <p>17 technology was sufficiently developed enough to</p> <p>18 include it as a resource with a plan for it to be</p> <p>19 available to provide power to customers in the --</p> <p>20 is it mid-2030s?</p> <p>21 A Yes, by the end of 2033. And I absolutely</p> <p>22 stand by that.</p> <p>23 The data we've been working with, small</p> <p>24 modular reactor vendors, for over five years,</p> <p>25 we've been tracking the industry. There are a</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

50 (317 to 320)

<p style="text-align: right;">317</p> <p>1 couple of facilities under construction today. I 2 deem that that technology is a viable resource to 3 model as a supply-side resource in the IRP. 4 Q But you don't think that over the course 5 of the next decade, that long-duration energy 6 storage is going to also be a viable resource for 7 potential selection? 8 A Small modular reactors are a derivative of 9 existing technology. As I mentioned, our Surry 10 Nuclear plant has been operating for over half a 11 century. 12 Even some of the advanced SMRs, there is a 13 tremendous amount of data. Advanced designs have 14 been operating since the 1960s. They do not 15 involve new chemistries that have not been 16 demonstrated. 17 We spend a great deal of time evaluating 18 the supply chain of SMRs, the nuclear industry, 19 the regulatory licensing associated with SMRs. 20 We issued an RFP last July to the leading 21 SMR vendors and are well in that process. So I 22 feel very confident in the data we have collected 23 across the industry and reviewing the supply 24 chain. 25 Energy storage does not fall under my</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">319</p> <p>1 up through him. And he's a rebuttal witness. 2 Q Okay. 3 A Like, I sponsor that entire section of 4 supply -- you know, future supply-side resources, 5 even though those specific teams may not report up 6 through me. 7 Q So you don't have any independent 8 knowledge other than what you've been told by 9 others as to the potential viability of 10 long-duration energy storage by the 2030s? 11 A I have -- I'm an engineer. I have studied 12 energy storage for nearly a decade. So I do think 13 I'm pretty knowledgeable on the subject, but that 14 team does not report up through me. 15 Q Okay. So based upon your -- your research 16 of energy storage and your role as an engineer, is 17 it your opinion that long-duration energy storage 18 won't be viable in the mid-2030s? 19 A That is not my opinion. My opinion is we 20 don't have information today sufficient to model 21 it as a resource that's available. So we don't 22 have operational data; we don't have sufficient 23 information to rely upon the supply chain. 24 There are new chemistries that have not 25 been tested. So based on the information today,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">318</p> <p>1 division, but it's my understanding that a lot of 2 those new chemistries have not been tested. We 3 don't have operational data. The supply chain is 4 not mature. 5 And that's one of the reasons why we 6 petition the Commission for a pilot project at our 7 Darbytown Station is to get that kind of data to 8 understand how they operate. And then, you know, 9 we look forward to that project being constructed, 10 and we look forward to, at some point in the 11 future, being able to model long-duration energy 12 storage, because I believe it would add a valuable 13 resource to our system. 14 Q Mr. Flowers, I'm a little confused. My 15 notes reflect that you sponsored Section 3.7 of 16 the IRP, which includes the discussion of 17 long-duration energy storage at page 41. 18 A I do sponsor that section. As I 19 mentioned, that team does not report up to me, but 20 I'm familiar with long-duration energy storage and 21 sponsor that paragraph in the IRP. 22 Q Is there -- is there anybody else that's 23 either here or sponsoring testimony that sort of 24 is the expert in long-duration energy storage? 25 A Yeah. Brandon Martin, that division falls</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">320</p> <p>1 we don't have enough detail to include it as a 2 viable resource that's commercially available. 3 That perception could change next year 4 when additional information is available. When 5 our Darbytown project becomes operational, 6 certainly it could be an available supply-side 7 option, you know, by the end of this decade. 8 Q Are you aware of other long-duration 9 energy storage other than Darbytown that are being 10 piloted or in use around the country? 11 A There are other utilities that have 12 similar pilot projects. 13 Q And are those actively providing power to 14 the grid? 15 A I do not know the status of them. 16 Q Do you think that Mr. Martin would know 17 the status of those? 18 A He likely does. 19 MS. GRUNDMANN: Thank you, sir. 20 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: PEC? 21 MR. GREMA: No questions, Your Honor. 22 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Microsoft? 23 MS. ROBB: No questions, Your Honor. 24 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: City of Alexandria? 25 MR. WINSTON: No questions, Your Honor.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

51 (321 to 324)

<p>321</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Consumer Counsel? 2 MR. FARMER: No questions, Your Honor. 3 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Commission Staff. 4 MS. PIERCE: Yes, Your Honor. 5 CROSS-EXAMINATION 6 BY MS. PIERCE: 7 Q Good afternoon, Mr. Flowers. Kiva Pierce 8 with the Commission Staff. 9 How are you doing? 10 A I'm well. Good afternoon. 11 Q All right. I have got a couple of 12 questions for you today. 13 And as your summary indicates, you 14 cosponsor Appendix 2E with Dr. Vance; is that 15 correct? 16 A That's correct. 17 Q All right. Thank you. 18 So I am going to place -- this is 19 Appendix 2E, page 1 on the screen. 20 Can you see that? 21 A I do. 22 Q All right. So looking at page 1 -- and if 23 we look to paren 1, transmission integration 24 costs, it says: 25 These costs represent physical</p>	<p>323</p> <p>1 Q So just trying to get an understanding of 2 the math on this, and I'm not an engineer, so 3 subject to check always, but if we -- if there was 4 a hundred-megawatt solar project, it would be -- 5 which would be approximately 100,000 kilowatts, 6 and you would multiply that, say, times 108, then 7 would that be approximately \$10.8 million for that 8 solar facility to interconnect with the system? 9 A Can you repeat that? I'm not intimately 10 familiar with this figure. I just want to make 11 sure I understand. 12 Q Okay. Well, this figure purports to be 13 the total solar integration cost on a solar 14 megawatt, and I'm trying to -- well, solar 15 megawatts here and the total cost per kilowatt. 16 So I'm trying to -- if you have a hundred-megawatt 17 solar system, and I'm trying to figure out what 18 the interconnection costs would be on that, would 19 that be roughly \$10.8 million? 20 A Subject to check, that's my general 21 understanding, but Dr. Vance may be in a better 22 position to explain that data. 23 Q Okay. Fair enough. 24 Is it your understanding that Figure 1 25 represents a blended national average based on</p>
<p>322</p> <p>1 enhancements to the transmission system needed to 2 resolve low voltage and thermal conditions caused 3 by integrating significant volumes of solar 4 generation. 5 Is that correct? 6 A That's correct. 7 Q Does this essentially mean that, due to 8 the nature of solar generation, there can be 9 additional cost considerations when you add solar 10 to the grid or when you connect it to the grid? 11 A And I'm not a transmission engineer. 12 Based on my knowledge, it's stating that there 13 could be other system costs that are required when 14 you introduce large amounts of intermittent 15 resources into the transmission system to maintain 16 things like system voltage. 17 Q Okay. And I'm going to flip to page 2. 18 At the top is Figure 1, Total Solar Integration 19 Costs. 20 Do you see that? 21 A I do. 22 Q And Figure 1, it shows that the total cost 23 calculated per solar megawatt is between \$105.66 24 and \$108.68 per kilowatt; is that correct? 25 A That's correct.</p>	<p>324</p> <p>1 interconnection, location, sizes, and behaviors of 2 the solar developers? 3 A I don't know the -- whether it's national 4 or within our system. That would be a question 5 better answered by Dr. Vance. 6 Q Okay. Do you know if it's essentially a 7 blended number, though, an average? 8 A I believe it's a blended number based on 9 impacts to the system. 10 Q And what that means, essentially, is that 11 for any particular project, the actual cost -- 12 integration cost could be more or less depending 13 on -- more or less than what's displayed here 14 depending on where that is actually located; is 15 that fair to say? 16 A That's my understanding. 17 Q Okay. All right. I'll put the first page 18 back on. Apologies, I'm jumping around a bit. 19 All right. In the middle of the first 20 paragraph, do you see "as increasing" right there? 21 That language is: 22 As increasing volumes of renewable energy 23 generation are interconnected to the grid, 24 additional system-level upgrades must be made by 25 the Company to integrate new resources and address</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

52 (325 to 328)

<p>325</p> <p>1 grid stability and reliability issues caused by 2 the intermittent nature of these resources. 3 Do you see that? 4 A Yes, I do. 5 Q And it goes on to say: 6 All of these costs are incorporated into 7 the NPV for a total system costs as shown on 8 Table 5.2.2 in the 2024 IRP. 9 Can you see that? 10 A I do. 11 Q Okay. Is it your understanding that the 12 way the IRP works, that these total system costs 13 are added after the resources are selected by the 14 model? 15 A I don't -- I don't know the answer to 16 that. 17 Q Okay. So can you tell me if these costs 18 were incorporated into the model so that it was 19 part of what the model selected? 20 A I'm not the modeling expert. 21 Q Okay. 22 A I supply a lot of inputs on technologies 23 and inputs to the model, but I don't -- I'm not 24 involved in the modeling itself. 25 Q Okay. And would that be Dr. Vance or</p>	<p>327</p> <p>1 Q Okay. And I'll direct your attention to 2 Question A. And the question asks -- says: 3 Please confirm or deny the additional 4 total system costs associated with inverter-based 5 intermittent resources are calculated based on the 6 new resources selected in the model and do not 7 affect the model choices. 8 Do you see that? 9 A I do. 10 Q And can you read the Company's response to 11 that question? 12 A Confirm the total system costs associated 13 with the inverter-based resources are added after 14 the model selects those resources, and the costs 15 do not affect the model selection. 16 Q All right. And we were just -- this is 17 what we were just talking about, right, those 18 integration costs? 19 A Yes. 20 Q Okay. All right. Now I'm going to put up 21 page 61 of the IRP. And this shows the Company's 22 build plan for the VCEA with EPA portfolio. 23 Do you see that? 24 A I do. 25 Q And if you look under Wind, which is this</p>
<p>326</p> <p>1 would that -- 2 A Either Dr. Vance or perhaps Mr. Compton. 3 Q Okay. 4 MR. DANTONIO: Dr. Vance would be a great 5 witness for some of these questions. 6 MS. PIERCE: Okay. I guess they did 7 cosponsor it, so I -- I just picked the wrong 8 cosponsor. 9 All right. Let me see if this helps. 10 Actually, Your Honor, I am going to hand 11 out a document. And, Your Honor, I would ask that 12 this be marked as an exhibit. 13 It is the Company's response to the 14 Staff's 12th set, Question No. 219. 15 THE BAILIFF: Dominion's Response to Staff 16 Request 12-219 will be marked as Exhibit 20. 17 Exhibit 20. 18 (Exhibit No. 20 was marked for 19 identification.) 20 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. Please 21 proceed. 22 BY MS. PIERCE: 23 Q All right. Mr. Flowers, do you see this 24 discovery response? 25 A I do.</p>	<p>328</p> <p>1 column, it shows a 60-megawatt onshore wind 2 facility and 800-megawatt offshore wind facility 3 and a 2,600-megawatt offshore wind facility. 4 Do you see that? 5 A I do. 6 Q Can you walk us through how the Company 7 calculated interconnection -- incremental 8 interconnection costs for wind facilities? 9 A I wasn't involved in that process. 10 Q Were you involved -- you were involved 11 with it on the solar, which we were just 12 discussing; is that right? 13 A No. That - I'm not -- I know I sponsored 14 that section, but I'm -- that's not an area of 15 expertise that I'm involved in. 16 Q Okay. Can you explain, since you 17 cosponsored that area -- 18 A Dr. Vance is likely a better witness for 19 that section. 20 Q Okay. All right. Will you agree with me, 21 though, that Appendix 2A goes on and talks quite a 22 bit about solar, but wind isn't referenced in that 23 particular section; is that right? 24 A I do not recall wind being referenced in 25 Appendix 2E, but it's an intermittent resource</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

53 (329 to 332)

<p style="text-align: right;">329</p> <p>1 similar to solar.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. So because it's an intermittent</p> <p>3 resource like solar, would you anticipate that</p> <p>4 there could be those intermittent -- that</p> <p>5 interconnection costs with wind as there is in</p> <p>6 solar?</p> <p>7 A I think it would be -- that would be a</p> <p>8 reasonable assumption to make.</p> <p>9 Q Okay. All right. And Dr. Vance would be</p> <p>10 the better person to ask about the wind -- the</p> <p>11 interconnection charges?</p> <p>12 A About the system integration costs, yes.</p> <p>13 Q Okay.</p> <p>14 MS. PIERCE: I have no further questions.</p> <p>15 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: And, Counsel, would</p> <p>16 you like exhibit --</p> <p>17 MS. PIERCE: Yes, yes, Your Honor, I</p> <p>18 would like --</p> <p>19 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: The document marked</p> <p>20 and described as Exhibit 20 is admitted into the</p> <p>21 record.</p> <p>22 (Exhibit No. 20 was admitted into</p> <p>23 evidence.)</p> <p>24 MS. PIERCE: Thank you.</p> <p>25 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Any redirect?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">331</p> <p>1 Q Thank you.</p> <p>2 Do you have with you a document entitled</p> <p>3 Direct Testimony of Kourtne E. Sunkins,</p> <p>4 consisting of a one-page summary, one typed page</p> <p>5 of questions and answers, and an Appendix A, which</p> <p>6 was filed in public version only in this</p> <p>7 proceeding on December 6, 2024?</p> <p>8 A Yes.</p> <p>9 Q Was that document prepared by you or under</p> <p>10 your supervision?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Do you have any additions or corrections</p> <p>13 to those documents?</p> <p>14 A No, I do not.</p> <p>15 Q Are your answers and sponsored portions</p> <p>16 true and correct to the best of your knowledge for</p> <p>17 when the IRP snapshot was taken and based on the</p> <p>18 October 15, 2024, filing date?</p> <p>19 A Yes, subject to my rebuttal testimony.</p> <p>20 Q Do you wish to sponsor those documents as</p> <p>21 your direct testimony in this proceeding?</p> <p>22 A Yes, I do.</p> <p>23 MS. NIELSEN: At this time, I would ask</p> <p>24 Your Honor that Ms. Sunkins' direct testimony be</p> <p>25 marked for identification and admitted into the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">330</p> <p>1 MR. DANTONIO: No redirect.</p> <p>2 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: The witness is now</p> <p>3 excused.</p> <p>4 THE WITNESS: Thank you.</p> <p>5 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Let's take a</p> <p>6 15-minute break and come back at 3:30. So we'll</p> <p>7 reconvene at 3:30.</p> <p>8 We are now in recess.</p> <p>9 (A recess was taken.)</p> <p>10 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Dominion, whenever</p> <p>11 you're ready.</p> <p>12 MS. NIELSEN: Thank you, Your Honor. The</p> <p>13 Company calls Kourtne E. Sunkins.</p> <p>14 KOURTNIE E. SUNKINS, called as a witness,</p> <p>15 having been first duly sworn, was examined and</p> <p>16 testified as follows:</p> <p>17 DIRECT EXAMINATION</p> <p>18 BY MS. NIELSEN:</p> <p>19 Q Good afternoon. Can you please state your</p> <p>20 name, position of employment, and business</p> <p>21 address?</p> <p>22 A Yes. My name is Kourtne E. Sunkins, and</p> <p>23 I am a Regulatory Analyst 3 with Virginia Electric</p> <p>24 and Power Company. My address -- business address</p> <p>25 is 120 Tredegar Street, Richmond, Virginia 23219.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">332</p> <p>1 record.</p> <p>2 THE BAILIFF: The Direct Testimony of</p> <p>3 Kourtne E. Sunkins will be marked as Exhibit 21.</p> <p>4 (Exhibit No. 21 was marked for</p> <p>5 identification.)</p> <p>6 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Ms. Sunkins'</p> <p>7 testimony marked and described as Exhibit No. 21</p> <p>8 is admitted into the record.</p> <p>9 (Exhibit No. 21 was admitted into</p> <p>10 evidence.)</p> <p>11 MS. NIELSEN: And the witness is available</p> <p>12 for cross-examination.</p> <p>13 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you.</p> <p>14 Appalachian Voices?</p> <p>15 MS. JAMES: No questions, Your Honor.</p> <p>16 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: NRDC?</p> <p>17 CROSS-EXAMINATION</p> <p>18 BY MS. JAFFE:</p> <p>19 Q Good afternoon, Ms. Sunkins. My name is</p> <p>20 Dorothy Jaffe, on behalf of Sierra Club and the</p> <p>21 NRDC.</p> <p>22 How are you?</p> <p>23 A I'm doing well. How are you?</p> <p>24 Q I'm good, thank you.</p> <p>25 So one of my questions was punted to you</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

54 (333 to 336)

<p>333</p> <p>1 that I had for Mr. Compton, so I'm going to direct 2 you to, let's see, the Directed 2024 IRP 3 Supplement, Figure 3.1. 4 And so the question that I had asked for 5 him, so just to kind of set the stage a little 6 bit. So the two portfolios in the middle that are 7 purple indicate that when you remove the data 8 center load growth, that the net present value of 9 those portfolios decreases by about \$20 billion. 10 Do you see that? 11 A I do. 12 Q Okay. Now, if that \$20 billion was -- 13 let's hypothetically say apportioned to the 14 large-load customers or the data centers as this 15 portfolio indicates, would that have an impact on 16 the residential bill analysis? 17 A Yes, it would have an impact on the 18 residential bill analysis. But keep in mind, it's 19 a hypothetical analysis, and any cost difference 20 that was done in that analysis will have an impact 21 on all the classes. 22 You had a price change which also changed 23 the sales, which in turn changed your allocations, 24 which was allocations across all the classes. And 25 so all of them would have a price impact due to</p>	<p>335</p> <p>1 the data centers, would that change of 2 2.43 billion have an impact -- by removing it, 3 would it have an impact on the residential bill 4 analysis? 5 A That analysis hasn't been done, at least 6 not by me. We -- the Company has cost allocations 7 pertaining to high-load customers in which the 8 data centers are a part of. 9 The Company has recently presented a 10 proposal in the biennial review which was recently 11 filed, but that wouldn't be part of this case and 12 I believe would be better discussed there. 13 Q Right. I don't disagree with that. 14 I'm just saying that for purposes of your 15 analysis for the residential bill impacts, if you 16 were to take out almost \$2.5 billion worth of 17 costs, does that have an impact on a residential 18 customer's monthly bill if they are not paying for 19 those costs? 20 A Well, as I stated before, if you change 21 the cost out -- if you change the costs that I 22 receive -- so I receive the inputs, you know, the 23 revenue requirements. If you change those revenue 24 requirements, it's going to change the costs for 25 all of the classes, including the residential</p>
<p>334</p> <p>1 the no data center hypothetical analysis. 2 Q Okay. And then one more question. If I 3 could refer you to -- let's see. This is 4 Supplemental Appendix 2C-2, which I was just 5 talking to Mr. Potter about. 6 And he had agreed with me that the costs 7 for the projects listed on here that were data 8 center-specific, so the ones that show up with a 9 Y, that the total for those projects was about 10 2.43 billion. 11 Did you hear him testify to that? 12 A Yes, I did hear that. 13 Q Okay. And he also testified that those 14 costs are currently recovered through Rider T1. 15 Did you hear that also? 16 A Yes, I heard that. 17 Q Okay. So if those costs were not 18 recovered through Rider T1 and they were recovered 19 through another mechanism that does not apply to 20 residential customers, would that impact the 21 residential bill analysis? 22 A Say that again? State it again? 23 Q So if the 2.43 billion was collected 24 through another mechanism that does not impact 25 residential customers, let's say it just impacts</p>	<p>336</p> <p>1 class. 2 MS. JAFFE: Okay. Thank you. No further 3 questions. 4 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: United? 5 MS. POLLARD: No questions, Your Honor. 6 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Clean Virginia? 7 MR. REISINGER: No questions, Your Honor. 8 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: DCC? 9 MR. MURPHEY: No questions, Your Honor. 10 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Walmart? 11 MS. GRUNDMANN: I have one question. Can 12 I ask it from here? 13 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Sure. 14 CROSS-EXAMINATION 15 BY MS. GRUNDMANN: 16 Q Good afternoon, Ms. Sunkins. My name is 17 Carrie Grundmann. 18 You said there at the very end in response 19 to with Ms. Jaffe's question that changing the 20 inputs would have an impact on all rate classes. 21 For purposes of this IRP, did you do an 22 estimated bill impact for the GS-2 and GS-3 rate 23 classes? 24 A No, I did not. 25 Q Does the Company oppose providing bill</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

55 (337 to 340)

<p>337</p> <p>1 impacts for those rate classes in a future IRP?</p> <p>2 A We don't oppose it. If we're ordered to</p> <p>3 do one for those classes, we would do so.</p> <p>4 Q And then when it came to the inputs that</p> <p>5 you received that included data center load, would</p> <p>6 I be correct in assuming that you would have been</p> <p>7 allocating costs as if those data center customers</p> <p>8 were a member of GS-4?</p> <p>9 A Or it could be GS-3 or GS-4, yes.</p> <p>10 MS. GRUNDMANN: Thank you. Those are all</p> <p>11 the questions.</p> <p>12 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: PEC?</p> <p>13 MR. GREMA: No questions, Your Honor.</p> <p>14 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Microsoft?</p> <p>15 MS. ROBB: No questions, Your Honor.</p> <p>16 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: City of Alexandria?</p> <p>17 MR. WINSTON: No questions, Your Honor.</p> <p>18 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Consumer Counsel?</p> <p>19 MR. BARTLEY: No questions, Your Honor.</p> <p>20 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Commission Staff?</p> <p>21 MS. PIERCE: No questions, Your Honor.</p> <p>22 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: I'm assuming no</p> <p>23 direct from Dominion?</p> <p>24 MS. NIELSEN: That's correct, Your Honor.</p> <p>25 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you very much.</p>	<p>339</p> <p>1 Q Was that document prepared by you or under</p> <p>2 your supervision?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q Do you have any additions or corrections</p> <p>5 to those documents?</p> <p>6 A I do not.</p> <p>7 Q Are your answers and sponsored portions</p> <p>8 true and correct to the best of your knowledge for</p> <p>9 when the IRP snapshot was taken and based on the</p> <p>10 October 15th, 2024, filing date?</p> <p>11 A Yes.</p> <p>12 Q Do you wish to sponsor those documents as</p> <p>13 your direct testimony in this proceeding?</p> <p>14 A Yes.</p> <p>15 MS. NIELSEN: At this time, I would ask</p> <p>16 that Ms. MacCormick's direct testimony be marked</p> <p>17 for identification and admitted into the record.</p> <p>18 THE BAILIFF: The direct testimony of</p> <p>19 Kathryn E. MacCormick will be marked as</p> <p>20 Exhibit 22.</p> <p>21 (Exhibit No. 22 was marked for</p> <p>22 identification.)</p> <p>23 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: The testimony marked</p> <p>24 and described as Exhibit No. 22 is entered into</p> <p>25 the record.</p>
<p>338</p> <p>1 You're now excused.</p> <p>2 MS. NIELSEN: The Company now calls</p> <p>3 Kathryn E. MacCormick.</p> <p>4 KATHRYN E. MacCORMICK, called as a</p> <p>5 witness, having been first duly sworn, was</p> <p>6 examined and testified as follows:</p> <p>7 DIRECT EXAMINATION</p> <p>8 BY MS. NIELSEN:</p> <p>9 Q Good afternoon.</p> <p>10 A Hello.</p> <p>11 Q Please state your name, position of</p> <p>12 employment, and business address.</p> <p>13 A My name is Kathryn E. MacCormick. I am a</p> <p>14 manager of environmental for Dominion Energy</p> <p>15 Services. And I'm here testifying on behalf of</p> <p>16 Virginia Electric and Power Company. My business</p> <p>17 address is 120 Tredegar Street, Richmond,</p> <p>18 Virginia 23219.</p> <p>19 Q Do you have with you a document entitled</p> <p>20 Direct Testimony of Kathryn E. MacCormick,</p> <p>21 consisting of a one-page summary, two typed pages</p> <p>22 of questions and answers, and Appendix A, which</p> <p>23 was filed in public version only in this</p> <p>24 proceeding on December 6th, 2024?</p> <p>25 A Yes.</p>	<p>340</p> <p>1 (Exhibit No. 22 was admitted into</p> <p>2 evidence.)</p> <p>3 MS. NIELSEN: And the witness is available</p> <p>4 for cross-examination.</p> <p>5 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you.</p> <p>6 Appalachian Voices?</p> <p>7 MS. JAMES: Yes, Your Honor.</p> <p>8 CROSS-EXAMINATION</p> <p>9 BY MS. JAMES:</p> <p>10 Q Good afternoon, Ms. MacCormick. My name</p> <p>11 is Rachel James, on behalf of Appalachian Voices.</p> <p>12 How are you?</p> <p>13 A Good. Good to see you.</p> <p>14 Q Good to see you as well. Thank you.</p> <p>15 I have a few questions, and I'd like to</p> <p>16 get started just understanding your current</p> <p>17 position here at the Company.</p> <p>18 So here in Exhibit 22, your current</p> <p>19 position is as manager of environmental; is that</p> <p>20 correct?</p> <p>21 A Yes.</p> <p>22 Q Okay. And it looks like you've been in</p> <p>23 this role since about 2024; is that correct?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. And when -- excuse me.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

56 (341 to 344)

<p>341</p> <p>1 It looks like you also started at the 2 Company in 2019; is that correct? 3 A Yes. 4 Q Okay. And from then to now, how many of 5 the Company's IRP filings have you contributed to? 6 A I believe this is the second. 7 Q Okay. And so the 2024 IRP looks like it's 8 the first IRP to which you've contributed as a 9 manager; is that correct? 10 A Well, I took the manager role in 11 September 1st of 2024, which was really right in 12 the midst of preparing the IRP, so I guess the 13 technically accurate statement would be I worked 14 on it on both ends of that role change. 15 Q Okay. Are there any differences in the 16 level of access or opportunities for input in the 17 development of the IRP that are associated with 18 your change of position? 19 A No. 20 Q Okay. And here also on this page there's 21 an identification in your qualifications, and it 22 notes that you are a citizen member of the 23 Virginia Council of Environmental Justice from 24 July 2020 through June 2022; is that correct? 25 A Yes.</p>	<p>343</p> <p>1 just projects? 2 A Our team is the dedicated environmental 3 justice resource for the whole company. So like I 4 just said, we do work on projects. That's not the 5 only thing we do. Working on the IRP is another 6 example of things that we do that would be more 7 broad. 8 Q I see. Okay. Well, we'll jump into the 9 IRP itself. 10 Do you have that available? 11 A I'm not holding a printed copy, but I'm 12 sure I can work with you on the screen. 13 Q Okay. Sounds good. 14 This is page -- it's listed as page 7 of 15 9. It's in the beginning of the IRP. It's where 16 all the requirements are listed. 17 It's quite small, but hopefully you can 18 see it. 19 Can you read what's there? 20 A Yep. 21 Q So you're familiar with the requirements 22 section of the IRP. That includes a list of 23 orders or guideline requirements and identifies 24 where in the IRP the requirement is addressed; is 25 that correct?</p>
<p>342</p> <p>1 Q And the inclusion here, is that to 2 indicate that your participation in that council 3 also informs the work that you're doing here at 4 the Company in this position as manager of 5 environmental? 6 A Sure, yeah, absolutely. 7 Q Okay. And I note here there's also some 8 identification of the project-specific nature of 9 your responsibilities here in the second sentence: 10 In this role, she, Ms. MacCormick, is 11 responsible for overseeing staff who complete 12 environmental justice reviews for projects and 13 working on certain projects. 14 Is the bulk of your responsibilities 15 focused on projects in this manager position? 16 A Yeah, I would say that the bulk of the 17 work that I do as well as the entire -- the staff 18 that I oversee, the other two members of the 19 Environmental Justice team, is focused on 20 screening projects. It's not the absolute 21 entirety of all that we do, but that is the 22 majority. 23 Q Okay. And is there a person responsible 24 for overseeing environmental justice analysis in a 25 more broad or comprehensive context outside of</p>	<p>344</p> <p>1 A I am. 2 Q And here on page 7, under the Order Or 3 Guidance section, the Company identifies the final 4 order from Case No. PUR-2020-0035 and it lists the 5 following under the requirement column: 6 The Commission finds that the Company 7 should address environmental justice in future 8 IRPs and updates, as appropriate. As one example, 9 the Company may consider the impact of unit 10 retirement decisions on environmental justice 11 communities or fence-line communities. 12 And then the Company offers that this 13 requirement was fulfilled by Chapter 6.1 in that 14 far right column. 15 Is that correct? 16 A Yes. 17 Q Okay. And did you conduct or supervise 18 the development of any other sections of the IRP, 19 or is it just the Section 6.1? 20 A Just 6.1. 21 Q Okay. I believe -- I believe Exhibit 22 22 also noted that there's an appendix that you 23 sponsored as well; is that right? 24 A Yes, pardon, and I was just about to jump 25 in and say 6.1 and the appendices.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

57 (345 to 348)

<p>345</p> <p>1 Q Okay. And that's Appendix 6A; is that 2 correct?</p> <p>3 A That's correct.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. But would it be correct to say that 5 you're familiar with the full IRP filing?</p> <p>6 A Yes, generally.</p> <p>7 Q Okay. And then here in Chapter 6.1, there 8 are four sections that span about four pages. I'm 9 just showing the first here. But those sections 10 include Dominion Energy's EJ Policy, The Virginia 11 Environmental Justice Act, Considering 12 Environmental Justice, and A Just Transition to 13 Clean Energy.</p> <p>14 And one of those sections includes a map 15 of the Company's generation resources by type; is 16 that correct?</p> <p>17 A That's right.</p> <p>18 Q Okay. So it is these four sections that 19 the Company is presenting as satisfying the 20 requirement to address environmental justice in 21 future IRPs and updates as the Commission ordered; 22 is that correct?</p> <p>23 A That is our intention, and that is my 24 understanding.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. So is it the Company's position</p>	<p>347</p> <p>1 what I just described as meaning to address.</p> <p>2 Q Thank you.</p> <p>3 So we'll stay here in Chapter 6.1. And 4 this is actually the end of the first section.</p> <p>5 I have a few questions about this 6 statement toward the end of that section 7 indicating the comparison of the environmental 8 justice consequences of constructing and/or 9 operating different types of power generation 10 resources contemplated by the 2024 IRP modeling 11 exercises, which you've noted is in Appendix 6A. 12 So I'm going to show Appendix 6A.</p> <p>13 So here, on page 1 of that appendix, in 14 the second paragraph, could you please read that 15 first sentence I've bracketed there in red?</p> <p>16 A It says:</p> <p>17 The Company believes that evaluating 18 potential effects from generic resources has 19 limited value and that environmental justice is 20 best evaluated on a case-by-case basis, informed 21 by the location of the facility or project in 22 question and project-specific characteristics.</p> <p>23 Q Thank you.</p> <p>24 And then this paragraph goes on to mention 25 the table provided later, which is the last page</p>
<p>346</p> <p>1 that it is indeed appropriate to address 2 environmental justice in the 2024 IRP?</p> <p>3 A Well, it depends on what you mean by 4 "address," right?</p> <p>5 So we have addressed it the way that we 6 felt was appropriate, which is, as it says and you 7 know, we don't feel that you can do much in terms 8 of specific debate over environmental justice and, 9 in particular, the impacts to any specific group 10 of people if you're only dealing with it in the 11 abstract.</p> <p>12 So we have addressed it, you know, by 13 providing high-level information that talks about 14 different ways that we look at environmental 15 justice, the process that we have in place for 16 individual projects and so on, the maps, our 17 analysis of the policy, if you will.</p> <p>18 And that -- yeah, so that's how we have 19 addressed environmental justice.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. So what I understood from that is 21 that you deem it is as appropriate to address 22 environmental justice; is that correct?</p> <p>23 A Sure. Yeah.</p> <p>24 Q Okay.</p> <p>25 A If by address you agree with, you know,</p>	<p>348</p> <p>1 of that section.</p> <p>2 And to be clear, this chart is not an 3 evaluation of potential adverse environmental 4 impacts of any of the Company's portfolios; is 5 that correct?</p> <p>6 A That's correct.</p> <p>7 Q And it does not compare adverse health 8 effects associated with different generation 9 resources; is that correct?</p> <p>10 A That's correct.</p> <p>11 Q And it looks like, based on this color 12 chart, the darkest color correlates to the highest 13 likelihood of environmental impacts; is that 14 correct?</p> <p>15 A Yes.</p> <p>16 Q And it looks like the natural gas simple 17 cycle and the natural gas combined cycle, coal, 18 and biomass have the highest air quality, climate, 19 and water impacts.</p> <p>20 Is that correct?</p> <p>21 A I would agree that resources that burn 22 fuels that involve carbon emissions, right, are 23 going to always show up as having a higher 24 quality -- or higher impact on air quality than 25 renewables, and that is what the table shows us,</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

58 (349 to 352)

<p>349</p> <p>1 yes.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. Specifically, though, the table</p> <p>3 seems to also show water and climate impacts as</p> <p>4 high likelihood.</p> <p>5 A Sure. There's a -- you see there's a list</p> <p>6 of different impacts there, and we did our best</p> <p>7 to, in the generic, assign likelihood, right.</p> <p>8 Yes, I see what you're pointing at. There</p> <p>9 are those several columns there on the far right</p> <p>10 that have dark blue circles for the water row.</p> <p>11 Q And it looks like the battery storage and</p> <p>12 distributed solar have only lowest or medium</p> <p>13 effects in those columns; is that correct?</p> <p>14 A Which columns?</p> <p>15 Q In the columns for battery storage and</p> <p>16 distributed solar.</p> <p>17 A And we're speaking about the water row</p> <p>18 again?</p> <p>19 Q I'm speaking of the column. It looks like</p> <p>20 only lowest or medium effects are listed in the</p> <p>21 columns under each of those.</p> <p>22 A I understand. Thank you.</p> <p>23 Yes, the Battery Storage column only has</p> <p>24 low likelihood and one medium likelihood</p> <p>25 indicated.</p>	<p>351</p> <p>1 community.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. So it sounded like, yes, if these</p> <p>3 two elements were included, if site-specific</p> <p>4 information and community feedback, that would</p> <p>5 indeed make the comparative analysis less</p> <p>6 limiting; is that fair?</p> <p>7 A Yes. I think I'm just trying to add kind</p> <p>8 of one more layer or factor to that, right. You</p> <p>9 can't go to a community and ask them how they are</p> <p>10 going to be affected until you have a design of</p> <p>11 something to show them, right. And then that is</p> <p>12 what kicks off the conversation about effects.</p> <p>13 So the first step is project design. Then</p> <p>14 you go and you can talk about how does the</p> <p>15 specific site combined with this design create</p> <p>16 effects, and you can speak to the community about</p> <p>17 those issues.</p> <p>18 Q And does that design component, is that</p> <p>19 specific to projects, or would that be inclusive</p> <p>20 of programs as well?</p> <p>21 A Well, I'm struggling to think of how the</p> <p>22 design of a program would cause environmental</p> <p>23 effects to a specific local area. You know, that</p> <p>24 gets into the abstract again, I think, a little</p> <p>25 bit.</p>
<p>350</p> <p>1 Q And that is the same for distributed solar</p> <p>2 as well?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q And would you agree that the Company has a</p> <p>5 number of all of these unit types currently in</p> <p>6 operation in its generating fleet?</p> <p>7 A Yes.</p> <p>8 Q Okay. Turning back to the narrative</p> <p>9 section of Appendix 6A, on page 2, the Company</p> <p>10 summarizes its ideas about the limitations of</p> <p>11 reviewing generic resources.</p> <p>12 Could you read the bracketed area, please?</p> <p>13 A It says:</p> <p>14 In sum, evaluating the potential adverse</p> <p>15 environmental consequences of generation resources</p> <p>16 in the abstract without crucial site information</p> <p>17 and community feedback greatly limits any</p> <p>18 comparative exercise.</p> <p>19 Q Thank you.</p> <p>20 So is it the Company's position that site</p> <p>21 information and community feedback would enhance</p> <p>22 an evaluation of potential adverse environmental</p> <p>23 consequences of specific generation resources?</p> <p>24 A Yes, once there is sufficient design in</p> <p>25 place to present facts and specifics to the local</p>	<p>352</p> <p>1 Q So your comment is specifically about</p> <p>2 project-specific information?</p> <p>3 A Yes.</p> <p>4 Q Okay. And doesn't the Company have</p> <p>5 site-specific and unit-specific pollution</p> <p>6 information on all of its existing generating</p> <p>7 facilities?</p> <p>8 A We certainly have information about our</p> <p>9 facilities, you know, how they operate and all</p> <p>10 sorts of different measures related to compliance</p> <p>11 reporting, et cetera. I struggle a little bit on</p> <p>12 the site-specific side. I mean, certainly, if</p> <p>13 it's in a location, you could gather site-specific</p> <p>14 information, but I can't say for sure we have</p> <p>15 every piece of site-specific data that one might</p> <p>16 ever want to ask these sorts of questions already.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. And is it your understanding that</p> <p>18 the Company is required to conduct outreach to</p> <p>19 engage the public in developing its IRP?</p> <p>20 A Can you repeat that? I'm sorry.</p> <p>21 Q Sure. Is it your understanding that the</p> <p>22 Company is required to engage in outreach to</p> <p>23 engage the public in developing its IRP?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q So for its next IRP, couldn't the Company</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

59 (353 to 356)

<p>353</p> <p>1 enhance its comparative exercise by evaluating 2 site-specific information and seeking 3 representatives from communities living near the 4 carbon-emitting units in its current generation 5 fleet? 6 A In terms of is it feasible? You know, I 7 think so. I can't -- I hesitate to say that too 8 strongly without, you know, knowing more specifics 9 about what it would take, but sure. 10 I will add, though, one concern that I 11 have when we start talking about, let's go out and 12 talk to the community who live near 13 carbon-emitting resources, is that there are also 14 plenty of other people that live near 15 noncarbon-emitting resources. 16 And so, you know, I've come to this stand 17 as a scientist as my background, and the 18 scientific method would require that you sample 19 evenly. 20 So if we were going to go out, start 21 asking questions of the community, or gathering 22 information about environmental impacts, I would 23 think the only unbiased way to do that would be to 24 look at both carbon-emitting, noncarbon-emitting 25 and any other categories of resources that you</p>	<p>355</p> <p>1 may consider the impact of unit retirement 2 decisions on environmental justice communities or 3 fence-line communities? 4 And you just confirmed that the Company 5 does have some site-specific information and unit 6 information about its existing generation 7 facilities. 8 So would it be possible, as the Company 9 suggests -- or rather, as the Commission suggests, 10 for the Company to evaluate the impact of unit 11 retirement decisions on environmental justice 12 communities or fence-line communities? 13 A It may be possible, but I feel like I 14 should probably point out, when you're looking at 15 a retirement, you're typically talking about 16 closing down a facility. 17 The analysis would probably be less about 18 environmental effects in that case and more 19 focused on the kind of social and economic aspects 20 of the closure in terms of employment, you know, 21 moving workers, you know, around, avoiding firing 22 them, those sorts of things. And also replacing 23 the lost tax revenues that the locality, you know, 24 would be concerned about. 25 So it's not to say that there's absolutely</p>
<p>354</p> <p>1 have. 2 And when you start to get into that, then 3 it becomes less feasible, right, because now you 4 have more facilities and so on. 5 Q It sounds like that's something that could 6 be brought to the stakeholder engagement process, 7 perhaps, for inputs on how that could be best 8 done. 9 Is that a fair assessment of what you just 10 shared, that it's possible to discuss this content 11 in the stakeholder process? 12 A You know, I am open to discussion, 13 absolutely. 14 Q Okay. Before we move on, I'd like to go 15 back to the environmental justice requirement we 16 discussed earlier. If you'd like me to put it on 17 the screen, I can. 18 A Yes, please. That would be helpful. 19 Q Are you able to see that? 20 A Pretty much. A little bit closer would 21 make it a little less blurry. 22 That's great. Thank you. 23 Q Sure. Okay. Let's see. 24 So here, that second sentence of the 25 requirement identifies an example that the Company</p>	<p>356</p> <p>1 zero environmental effect from a demolition. 2 There certainly could be minor stuff. But, you 3 know, the point is you're removing the resource 4 and the ongoing effect. So it would be a less 5 environmental analysis and more social and 6 workforce analysis. 7 Q Would you agree that the environmental 8 impact that the units were having as they 9 operated, like, the retirement of those units 10 would likely change the environmental impacts 11 associated with those units? 12 A Are you saying, if you stop operating 13 them, their environmental effects would decrease? 14 Q I am asking if -- 15 A You're asking me that? 16 Q -- retiring a unit that used to have 17 environmental impacts, retiring them would change 18 those impacts? 19 A I think I can agree that if you stop 20 operating or decrease the operation of any 21 facility, generally, that would decrease or 22 eliminate the impacts. 23 Q And so understanding those potential 24 eliminations, is that something that the Company 25 could undertake in a retirement study in a future</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

60 (357 to 360)

<p>357</p> <p>1 IRP?</p> <p>2 A I don't know that it's a question about is</p> <p>3 it technically possible. I think it's more a</p> <p>4 question of what's the benefit of that.</p> <p>5 You know, you have to -- when you're</p> <p>6 talking about environmental justice or, more</p> <p>7 broadly, about the IRP, what we're doing here is</p> <p>8 we're balancing things, right? We're saying we</p> <p>9 want cleaner energy, but we also need a reliable</p> <p>10 energy grid, and we're also trying to find a</p> <p>11 balance.</p> <p>12 So, you know, thinking about we don't have</p> <p>13 any retirements included in this year, right, and</p> <p>14 we start thinking about down the road, those</p> <p>15 decisions haven't been made yet, at least to my</p> <p>16 knowledge, and the piece that's missing is what's</p> <p>17 the public need at the moment of retirement or the</p> <p>18 decision point, right?</p> <p>19 The public need to have a reliable energy</p> <p>20 grid always has to be balanced against whatever</p> <p>21 the local benefit to closing that facility would</p> <p>22 be.</p> <p>23 So it can be difficult to understand a</p> <p>24 future public need in the moment, especially</p> <p>25 before the actual timeline and plan for closure</p>	<p>359</p> <p>1 balancing consideration.</p> <p>2 A So from the Company's perspective, when we</p> <p>3 talk about environmental protection, human health</p> <p>4 is included in that concept. We don't often talk</p> <p>5 directly about human health because we don't</p> <p>6 directly impact it in many instances, right.</p> <p>7 We work through the existing national,</p> <p>8 state, and local standards that our company, every</p> <p>9 other company in the energy industry, and every</p> <p>10 other industry in the country operates under.</p> <p>11 Those are different regulations,</p> <p>12 permitting, rules, and other kinds of laws that</p> <p>13 are specifically designed to protect the</p> <p>14 environment and human health at the standard that</p> <p>15 is acceptable by our nation and our state at this</p> <p>16 time. So that's how we look at it.</p> <p>17 Q Okay. I think that actually helps explain</p> <p>18 the response to one of our questions.</p> <p>19 MS. JAMES: So I'm going to ask that an</p> <p>20 exhibit be marked, please.</p> <p>21 Excuse me, Your Honor, my apologies.</p> <p>22 THE BAILIFF: Dominion's Response to</p> <p>23 Appalachian Voice Request 13-6 will be marked as</p> <p>24 exhibit --</p> <p>25 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: I believe it's 23.</p>
<p>358</p> <p>1 has been created.</p> <p>2 So that's where I would question what</p> <p>3 benefit it would give us to kind of spin our</p> <p>4 wheels and ask a lot of hypothetical, you know,</p> <p>5 questions about these, if we did this, what would</p> <p>6 happen.</p> <p>7 You're asking how can we benefit the local</p> <p>8 community, but, again, the IRP proceeding is about</p> <p>9 all, you know, 2.7 million customers, right? So</p> <p>10 again, the public need has to be balanced against</p> <p>11 the local issue.</p> <p>12 There's only a limited benefit to</p> <p>13 considering that when you don't have a timeline</p> <p>14 and a decision point.</p> <p>15 Q Is part of the calculation that you just</p> <p>16 mentioned in balancing, is there a consideration</p> <p>17 of human health improvement as associated with</p> <p>18 emissions from a polluting resource in the</p> <p>19 generation fleet of the Company?</p> <p>20 A Is there a consideration by the Company of</p> <p>21 that?</p> <p>22 Q You mentioned balancing of public need and</p> <p>23 reliability, and I'm curious if there's another</p> <p>24 component that the Company is also balancing, and</p> <p>25 I'm asking if human health impacts is part of that</p>	<p>360</p> <p>1 THE BAILIFF: -- Exhibit 23.</p> <p>2 (Exhibit No. 23 was marked for</p> <p>3 identification.)</p> <p>4 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Please proceed.</p> <p>5 MS. JAMES: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>6 BY MS. JAMES:</p> <p>7 Q This is the Company's response to</p> <p>8 Appalachian Voices' Set 13, Question 6.</p> <p>9 And did you sponsor this response,</p> <p>10 Ms. MacCormick?</p> <p>11 A I did.</p> <p>12 Q And here in the response to being asked to</p> <p>13 identify the section of the IRP that addresses</p> <p>14 potential human health effects of the Company's</p> <p>15 proposed portfolios, your response begins with:</p> <p>16 See Section 6.1 and Appendix 6A, and goes on to</p> <p>17 explain what's contained there are communication</p> <p>18 of environmental effects.</p> <p>19 Is this what you were speaking to in your</p> <p>20 prior comments about where environmental sort of</p> <p>21 includes health from your perspective?</p> <p>22 A Sure, yeah, this is getting at that same</p> <p>23 topic.</p> <p>24 Q Then is it the Company's intention to</p> <p>25 suggest that the generic environmental effects</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

61 (361 to 364)

<p>361</p> <p>1 information provided in the identified sections 2 should be considered the sections that address 3 potential human health effects of the Company's 4 portfolios in the IRP? 5 A Yes. 6 Q And did the Company address in any way the 7 potential adverse health effects related to 8 specific portfolios? 9 A No. As you asked earlier and I think we 10 clarified, the Appendix 6A does not address 11 individual portfolios. It's just looking widely 12 across the generation fleet. 13 Q And there wasn't some other section that 14 made that evaluation; is that correct? 15 A Correct. 16 Q Okay. And let's see. So I'm going to 17 turn back to Chapter 6.1, and it's going to be in 18 Section 3. 19 And here, in paragraph 2, could you please 20 read the bracketed section. 21 A It says: 22 Under the current federal and state-level 23 standards of environmental protection, a fully 24 permitted power generation or delivery facility of 25 any kind operating in compliance with all</p>	<p>363</p> <p>1 Q Okay. Thank you. 2 And although your statement here speaks 3 somewhat broadly about power generation and 4 delivery facilities of any kind, I'd like to 5 narrow your focus to generation units just in the 6 Company's existing fleet. 7 MS. JAMES: And I have an exhibit that I'd 8 like to be marked, please. This is a printout of 9 a page from the enforcement website of the 10 Environmental Protection Agency titled Virginia 11 Electric and Power Company d/b/a, or doing 12 business as, Dominion Energy Virginia Settlement 13 Information Sheet. 14 THE BAILIFF: The EPA-VEPCO document will 15 be marked as Exhibit 24. 16 (Exhibit No. 24 was marked for 17 identification.) 18 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Please proceed. 19 MS. JAMES: Thank you. 20 BY MS. JAMES: 21 Q Ms. MacCormick, are you aware of whether 22 all the generation resources in the Company's 23 fleet are fully permitted? 24 A I could not say that I've put my eyes on 25 every document, but in my role, I would assume</p>
<p>362</p> <p>1 applicable permitting conditions, regulations, and 2 laws will not cause significant adverse health 3 effects to any community, including EJ 4 populations. 5 Q And the Company offers this as a factual 6 statement; is that correct? 7 A Yes. I believe we clarified that in 8 discovery. 9 Q And the compliance that's mentioned here, 10 by whom is that determined -- or that compliance 11 determined? 12 A Well, since the IRP is not specific and 13 we're speaking very broadly and at a high level 14 about kind of all of the Company's operations, 15 what we're speaking about here are just the bevy 16 of government agencies at all levels, all the 17 laws, all the regulations, all the policies that 18 we follow. I couldn't even start to put a number 19 on it. It's thousands. 20 Q Not a number, but might you identify any 21 of the regulatory entities you're referring to 22 here in terms of compliance? 23 A Oh, sure. EPA, we're all familiar with; 24 Virginia DEQ, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, 25 you know, et cetera.</p>	<p>364</p> <p>1 that all of our facilities, yes, are fully 2 permitted. They have all the -- which means they 3 have all the permits that they are required by law 4 to have in order to operate. 5 Q You're saying that you haven't put your 6 eye on it, but you do believe that they all are 7 fully permitted; is that correct? 8 A Yes. And just to be clear, there's 9 thousands of facilities. So, you know, in my 10 role, I wouldn't know one person has seen every 11 single permit, but that is our -- the job of our 12 entire department is to ensure that those permits 13 are in place, yes. 14 Q Okay. Well, then, I would like to 15 redirect us to the Company's response to Question 16 6, that Exhibit 23. The second sentence 17 indicates: 18 The Company's facilities are operating in 19 compliance with all applicable laws and 20 regulations and there's no expectation of 21 significant risk to human health from their 22 operations. 23 So you have some awareness, it seems, from 24 the statement that all of the Company's operating 25 facilities are permitted and operating in</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

62 (365 to 368)

<p>365</p> <p>1 compliance; is that correct?</p> <p>2 A Yes.</p> <p>3 Q Okay. So is it the Company's position</p> <p>4 that significant risk to human health is only</p> <p>5 associated with facility operations if the</p> <p>6 facility is not operating in compliance with all</p> <p>7 applicable laws and regulations?</p> <p>8 A I hate to make really large blanket</p> <p>9 statements like that, but, yes, that -- I think in</p> <p>10 this context, that's fair.</p> <p>11 MS. JAMES: Your Honor, this printout,</p> <p>12 Exhibit 24, is referencing a settlement that was</p> <p>13 in response to violations listed on the second</p> <p>14 page, and the settlement was -- the settlement was</p> <p>15 a consent decree that was issued in July of 2020.</p> <p>16 And the fullness of that can be found at</p> <p>17 the EPA's website. I'm not going to get into the</p> <p>18 details of the consent decree.</p> <p>19 BY MS. JAMES:</p> <p>20 Q But I just want to ask, Ms. McCormick, if</p> <p>21 you're aware of the 14 violations that EPA</p> <p>22 identified here at a number -- rather, the 14</p> <p>23 facilities where violations were identified by the</p> <p>24 EPA.</p> <p>25 Are you familiar with these?</p>	<p>367</p> <p>1 A My role on the Virginia Council for</p> <p>2 Environmental Justice was to represent</p> <p>3 Native American communities across the state as a</p> <p>4 citizen. It had no direct relationship to my work</p> <p>5 at the Company.</p> <p>6 Q So throughout the full participation in</p> <p>7 the Council, you are just participating as a</p> <p>8 member of the Pamunkey Tribe?</p> <p>9 A That is correct, although I was</p> <p>10 representing Native people across the entire</p> <p>11 Commonwealth, not just for my own tribe.</p> <p>12 Q I just want to ask a clarifying question.</p> <p>13 This is -- I don't want to have this marked; I</p> <p>14 just want to inquire if I'm understanding</p> <p>15 something here correctly.</p> <p>16 This is the cover page of the 2023 Annual</p> <p>17 Report of Virginia Council on Environmental</p> <p>18 Justice. And this is just an excerpt showing the</p> <p>19 notes from a meeting in January and then another</p> <p>20 meeting in May. And in both of those, it looks</p> <p>21 like your name is listed, and the affiliation is</p> <p>22 Dominion Energy.</p> <p>23 So I want to understand if the entity</p> <p>24 you're representing changed at some point while</p> <p>25 you were on the Council.</p>
<p>366</p> <p>1 A I don't know the particulars of the cases</p> <p>2 that led to these consent decrees, but I</p> <p>3 understand conceptually what we're discussing,</p> <p>4 yeah.</p> <p>5 Q You understand that we're conceptually</p> <p>6 discussing violations at 14 of the Company's</p> <p>7 facilities?</p> <p>8 A If that's what the document says the</p> <p>9 number is, then yes.</p> <p>10 Q Does the Company's environmental justice</p> <p>11 analysis check for permit violations at or near</p> <p>12 its operating facilities?</p> <p>13 A Are EJ analysis -- no, it does not include</p> <p>14 any review of current compliance status.</p> <p>15 Q Of its facilities or others in the</p> <p>16 vicinity?</p> <p>17 A You mean non-Company operated?</p> <p>18 Q Correct.</p> <p>19 A No.</p> <p>20 Q Okay. On the exhibit identifying your</p> <p>21 experiences, you noted your participation on the</p> <p>22 Virginia Council on Environmental Justice.</p> <p>23 Was a portion of that time also as a</p> <p>24 company representative or was it entirely as a</p> <p>25 citizen representative?</p>	<p>368</p> <p>1 A Sure. I appreciate the question. It</p> <p>2 gives me an opportunity to clarify.</p> <p>3 So the members of the Council were very</p> <p>4 focused on the fact that I worked for Dominion</p> <p>5 Energy. And after multiple direct requests, both</p> <p>6 writing and verbally, to remove Dominion Energy</p> <p>7 from my name, as you can see, those were ignored.</p> <p>8 Q I see.</p> <p>9 Well, in your time on the Council, then --</p> <p>10 MS. JAMES: I'd like to have an exhibit</p> <p>11 marked. It's the Virginia Council on</p> <p>12 Environmental Justice 2021 Annual Report.</p> <p>13 And I will say that this is not the full</p> <p>14 report. It's just the cover page. It's then also</p> <p>15 the list of Council members, a table of contents,</p> <p>16 and then the introductory letters to the report,</p> <p>17 and then Appendix I.</p> <p>18 THE BAILIFF: The Virginia Council on</p> <p>19 Environmental Justice 2021 Annual Report excerpt</p> <p>20 will be marked as Exhibit 25.</p> <p>21 (Exhibit No. 25 was marked for</p> <p>22 identification.)</p> <p>23 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Please proceed.</p> <p>24 MS. JAMES: Thank you, Your Honor.</p> <p>25 BY MS. JAMES:</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

63 (369 to 372)

<p style="text-align: right;">369</p> <p>1 Q Here on the bottom of the cover page, I've 2 highlighted that the report was prepared by 3 members of the Virginia Council on Environmental 4 Justice. 5 And as I mentioned, there's an excerpted 6 Appendix I in the report. 7 Are you familiar with this report, 8 Ms. McCormick? 9 A Honestly, I think I have to say no. I 10 don't mean that I'm a hundred percent unfamiliar 11 with it, but without going too deep into a lot of 12 details that are very much not relevant here, 13 there was a lot of difficulty and realignment and 14 draft and new draft and who signed off on what, 15 all those sorts of problems with publishing these 16 reports amongst the Council, so I really can't 17 say, having not seen this before now, if this is 18 the version that I was involved in or signed off 19 on. 20 Q This is the version that's been selected 21 from the Secretary of Natural Resources web page 22 where it lists the various reports that the 23 Council has submitted. 24 So are you familiar with that version? 25 That version is this version.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">371</p> <p>1 A Correct, in June of 2023, and that goes to 2 my point that there was much difficulty and 3 confusion with the Council achieving the 4 publication of this report. 5 Q Okay. There's some content in the report 6 that I'd like to direct you to and answer what 7 you're able, given the circumstances, if you 8 could, please. 9 A Sure. 10 Q Okay. So on page 53, the Council details 11 the EPA, or Environmental Protection Agency's, 12 External Civil Rights Compliance Office Toolkit. 13 And that toolkit explicitly abandoned what was 14 known as the rebuttable presumption that applied 15 to permitting activities when the activity sought 16 to be permitted -- when the activity sought to be 17 permitted complied with applicable environmental 18 standards. And the EPA explicitly did away with 19 the presumption that compliance with environmental 20 standards is, by itself, sufficient to conclude 21 that no adverse impacts exist for the purposes of 22 Title VI and other civil rights laws. 23 Does that sound like content that's 24 familiar that you reviewed perhaps in the many 25 revisions?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">370</p> <p>1 A No. In fact, when I left the Council, I 2 think it wasn't -- it says in my thing -- I'm 3 sorry, my dates are messed up. 4 But when I left the Council, this report 5 had not even been published yet, even though it 6 had been well past a year when it should have 7 been. 8 So, no, I'm not familiar with what 9 eventually was publicly posted. I did not even 10 know until now that they ever actually made this 11 public. 12 Q It looks like the dates of your 13 participation as listed here in Exhibit 22 are 14 from July 2020 through June 2023; is that correct? 15 A Thank you. Yes. 16 Q Okay. And this report was published -- 17 you can see on page 4 the letter to the Governor 18 is on January 13th, 2022? 19 A I have no doubt that is the date that 20 letter was sent to the Governor, but what I can 21 assure you is that when I resigned my position on 22 the Council in June of 2023, this report had not 23 been finalized and had not been made public and 24 had not been posted to any websites. 25 Q The 2021 report?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">372</p> <p>1 A No. I'm sorry. 2 Q Okay. And then I've highlighted the 3 section later on where the Council is referring to 4 a court -- the Fourth Circuit's decision relying 5 on that rebuttable presumption being done away 6 with. 7 And the court's ruling held that even if 8 all pollutants within the county remain below 9 state and national air quality standards, that the 10 board, in this case Virginia DEQ, or Department of 11 Environmental Quality's board, failed to grapple 12 with the likelihood that those living closest to 13 the compressor station -- an overwhelmingly 14 minority population according to the Friends of 15 Buckingham Survey -- will be affected more than 16 those living in other parts of the same county. 17 Are you familiar with this conclusion? 18 A Not in a way that would make me 19 comfortable to speak about it here. I will just 20 say that the Company has a very different view of 21 the characterization of the local community and 22 the whole situation from Friends of Buckingham. 23 So what they have stated here is just their 24 opinion. 25 Q Is just the Fourth Circuit's opinion?</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

64 (373 to 376)

<p style="text-align: right;">373</p> <p>1 A Friends of Buckingham's opinion of 2 characterizing the community in that way. 3 I do know that the community living near 4 that area within so many -- you know, such a 5 distance included seven people, three of whom were 6 not minority and four who were. So to 7 characterize four out of seven people as you just 8 did is not accurate, in my mind. 9 Q To be clear, I'm just referring to the 10 court's ruling, not my characterization. So this 11 is represented in the report as what the Fourth 12 Circuit found. 13 So to be clear, you are disagreeing with 14 the Fourth Circuit's characterization that I just 15 read? 16 MS. NIELSEN: Your Honor, I would object. 17 I mean, Ms. McCormick has testified that she's 18 not familiar with this document, and there's -- 19 I've yet to see relevance here to what's stated in 20 the IRP. And we would -- 21 CHAIRMAN TOWELL: For what it's worth, 22 according to the highlighted language, I assume 23 that the witness is referring to the language that 24 says: An overwhelmingly minority population 25 according to the Friends of Buckingham Survey, not</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">375</p> <p>1 in publishing it, I don't think that anybody 2 should. 3 Q Okay. So is it fair to say that this 4 report -- let's put aside the report. 5 The federal references made in this report 6 to both the EPA and to the Fourth Circuit's 7 decision, were either of those used in informing 8 your inputs into the IRP this year -- rather, 9 2024? 10 A We did not specifically look at that case 11 or revisit any of the wording in it in preparing 12 the 2024 IRP. 13 MS. JAMES: No further questions, Your 14 Honor. Thank you. 15 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Counsel, before we 16 move forward, would you like those to be admitted 17 into the record? 18 MS. JAMES: Yes, if I may, please. 19 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: If there's no 20 objection, Dominion's Response -- 21 MS. NIELSEN: Your Honor, I'm sorry. The 22 Company does object to the admission of 24 and 25 23 on the basis that Ms. McCormick was not able to 24 authenticate either document. Specifically, she 25 did state that she does not know the particulars</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">374</p> <p>1 to the language of the Fourth Circuit opinion 2 itself. 3 Is that correct? 4 THE WITNESS: Yes. 5 CHAIRMAN TOWELL: Just to clarify. 6 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 7 CHAIRMAN TOWELL: Thank you. 8 MS. JAMES: Thank you for the 9 clarification, Your Honor. 10 BY MS. JAMES: 11 Q Thank you, Ms. McCormick. 12 The relevance to your counsel's statement 13 of this is this statement seems to be in 14 contradiction to your assertion that a facility 15 operating in compliance and permitted -- fully 16 permitted and operating in compliance will not 17 cause any harm to specific communities, even 18 including environmental justice communities. 19 So I'm curious if you could square what 20 seems to be contradictory in these two 21 conclusions. 22 A I think the best that I can offer is to 23 simply say that I'm not familiar with nor do I 24 endorse anything in this report. And with my 25 experience with the Council and all the difficulty</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">376</p> <p>1 of the cases that led to the consent decree. 2 She also testified that EJ does not cover 3 environmental rules by facility, so we believe 4 it's also not relevant. 5 And it's the -- Exhibit 24 is a summary 6 document that appears to be from the EPA website 7 and not a copy of the actual consent decree 8 itself. 9 And for all of those reasons, we believe 10 it's not been properly authenticated and not 11 relevant to this proceeding, and therefore, both 12 documents should be excluded. 13 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Any response, 14 Counsel? 15 MS. JAMES: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you. 16 As to the report, I understand not 17 admitting that. That's fine. 18 As to the EPA information sheet, I 19 specifically indicated that I was not referring to 20 the underlying consent decree and I was just 21 indicating the list of facilities that showed 22 violations. And Ms. McCormick confirmed that she 23 could see those and didn't dispute those. 24 So, indeed, I would like that inputted 25 into the record. I believe it's relevant to her</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

65 (377 to 380)

<p style="text-align: right;">377</p> <p>1 questions -- or her comments, rather, about fully 2 permitted facilities and how the Company reviews 3 them. 4 MS. NIELSEN: Your Honor -- we would just 5 reiterate, Your Honor, that regardless, she could 6 not authenticate the source of the information, 7 and specifically underlying that source appears to 8 be the consent decree itself. 9 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: So what I'll do for 10 a document -- Exhibit No. 23, I'll certainly admit 11 that into the record. 12 (Exhibit No. 23 was admitted into 13 evidence.) 14 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: For 24 and 25, I'll 15 certainly take that under advisement and come up 16 with a decision reasonably -- in a reasonable 17 amount of time. 18 MS. JAMES: Thank you, Your Honor. 19 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: So Exhibit No. 23 is 20 admitted into the record, and 24 and 25 I'll take 21 under advisement. 22 MS. JAMES: Thank you, Your Honor. 23 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you. 24 NRDC? 25 MS. JAFFE: No questions for Sierra Club</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">379</p> <p>1 living under similar circumstances; is that 2 correct? 3 A Not quite. What I really was saying was 4 that in any sampling effort, you have to be sure 5 not to incorporate sampling bias. But I wasn't 6 really speaking to the concept of the control, 7 which would be an untreated group. I'm not sure 8 what that would be in the context of energy 9 infrastructure and environmental impacts since all 10 people are exposed to environmental impacts. 11 Q But isn't the scientific method that 12 you're describing designed to find correlation 13 between variables, which is a feature of 14 quantitative analysis? But aren't we speaking 15 about qualitative analysis, interviewing live 16 people about their experiences? Wouldn't you 17 agree that the purpose of that analysis is to 18 determine how and why and not a correlation 19 between variables? 20 A I think I'm following you. Yeah, I mean, 21 I wasn't trying to make too fine a point on the 22 control issue. It's just, yes, it is advisable to 23 not just speak to one group of people, right, but 24 to seek out a diverse, you know, population of 25 people with different perspectives on an issue.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">378</p> <p>1 and NRDC. 2 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: United? 3 MS. POLLARD: No questions, Your Honor. 4 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Clean Virginia? 5 MR. REISINGER: No questions, Your Honor. 6 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: DCC? 7 MR. MURPHEY: No questions, Your Honor. 8 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Walmart? 9 MS. GRUNDMANN: No questions, Your Honor. 10 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: PEC? 11 MR. GREMA: No questions, Your Honor. 12 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Microsoft? 13 MS. ROBB: No questions, Your Honor. 14 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: City of Alexandria? 15 MR. WINSTON: Just a couple, Your Honor. 16 CROSS-EXAMINATION 17 BY MR. WINSTON: 18 Q Good afternoon, Ms. MacCormick. 19 You stated that predicated on your 20 background as a biologist that the scientific 21 method requires the establishment of a control 22 group so that -- and the implication was that it 23 would be difficult to conduct environmental 24 justice interviews because the Company would have 25 to also produce control groups that were not</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">380</p> <p>1 That's the best way to do any kind of survey or 2 feedback effort. 3 Q Can you identify any constraint that would 4 prevent the Company from doing just that? 5 A In regard to what? 6 Q Identifying those disparate groups and 7 being able to compare their responses to identify 8 causation? 9 I'm assuming that's why you would want to 10 speak to a variety of people, so that you don't 11 misassign causation based on a small sample group? 12 A Sure. Yeah, that's the concept I was 13 explaining, yep. 14 Q So the Company could undertake an 15 environmental justice analysis that involves the 16 quantity of interviews and the quality of 17 interviews that would satisfy your criteria, 18 correct? 19 A For an IRP proceeding? Like in that 20 context, right? You're saying -- 21 Q Sure. 22 A -- could we do that for the IRP? 23 Q Yes. 24 A The answer is, no, that would not be 25 feasible. The reason is because the IRP is a</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

66 (381 to 384)

<p style="text-align: right;">381</p> <p>1 planning document that, you know, we should assume 2 affects all the citizens of the Commonwealth. 3 So what you're saying is that we'd have to 4 go and interview pretty much all the citizens of 5 the Commonwealth, right, or some sampling of all 6 7 million of them. 7 That's where, you know, how much 8 sampling -- and then, of course, you get into, if 9 you have a small sample size, is it really 10 representative? 11 So we could talk about what is the right 12 amount of effort, but there certainly is a limit 13 to what is feasible in terms of how many people 14 you're going to survey and engage. And you also 15 have to consider that some people, frankly, aren't 16 interested in being surveyed or engaged. 17 Q So your position is that the Company 18 didn't interview anyone about environmental 19 justice because they would have had to interview 20 the entire Commonwealth in order to achieve some 21 sort of scientific stasis? 22 A That's not what I've said. I said that 23 there are inherent challenges in creating an 24 unbiased sampling of a community this large, if 25 we're talking about the entire Commonwealth, in</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">383</p> <p>1 IRP is. The IRP is justice. 2 Q Do you believe that a reduction in the 3 load forecast and, thus, a reduction in the need 4 for supply-side generation would overall have a 5 beneficial impact on environmental justice? 6 A I think, in theory, it sounds good. I 7 think what I -- I can't speak in great detail, but 8 what I hear from the Company side is that it can 9 be difficult to implement these in a successful 10 way. 11 So in theory, sure. But can it happen in 12 real life, I think that's the question. 13 Q You testified that by statute the Company 14 is required to conduct an environmental justice 15 analysis in its IRP, right? 16 A Not exactly. The statute states that it 17 shall be the policy of the Commonwealth to promote 18 environmental justice. There is no statutory 19 requirement for the Company to do anything under 20 the Virginia Environmental Justice Act. 21 Q But the statute did require the Company to 22 conduct that stakeholder engagement meeting 23 regarding environmental justice; is that right? 24 A I believe the requirement for stakeholder 25 engagement came through a Commission order.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">382</p> <p>1 addressing all the different topics of the IRP. 2 Yeah, there would be some challenges there. 3 Q Did the Company conduct any of these types 4 of community interviews in pursuit of its 5 environmental justice analysis for this IRP? 6 A So we did conduct a stakeholder engagement 7 effort that included, you know, focused discussion 8 around environmental justice. 9 Q And did the IRP's analysis and 10 environmental justice take energy efficiency and 11 demand-side management programs into consideration 12 at all and the impacts that those programs and 13 resources would have on environmental justice more 14 broadly? 15 A Well, I think the IRP itself is the 16 vehicle that does that, frankly. You know, we 17 talk a lot about the section of the IRP that's 18 labeled Environmental Justice, but I would also 19 put forth that any honest, open, public discussion 20 around how do we find the most affordable way to a 21 reliable and cleaner energy grid, that that 22 process is a process that is aligned with the 23 principles of environmental justice. 24 I think that's what we're doing here, 25 that's what the modeling is doing, that's what the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">384</p> <p>1 Q Okay. 2 A Is it a statute? 3 Q I'm not trying to say, gotcha. I just -- 4 for the clarity of the record. 5 A Okay. Yeah, I'm not familiar. Maybe we 6 should look at it together. 7 Q Yeah, sure. This is Appendix 6A, and 8 Roman numeral I says that: 9 Leading up to the submittal of the 2024 10 IRP, the Company conducted a stakeholder 11 engagement process as directed by Chapter 753 and 12 793 of the 2023 Virginia Acts of Assembly. 13 A Thank you. Yep. 14 Q So given that it was a statutory mandate 15 to conduct a stakeholder engagement process that 16 included a discussion about environmental justice, 17 specifically leading up to the submittal of the 18 2024 IRP, do you think that it would be more in 19 line with the spirit and letter of that statutory 20 directive to actually conduct some of these 21 interviews even if the vehicle is imperfect and 22 the methodology will be strained? 23 A I remain suspicious about the value of 24 that activity, but I don't think that there's 25 anything absolutely wrong about it.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

67 (385 to 388)

<p>385</p> <p>1 So, yes, to your point, could it be 2 potentially helpful? Possibly. But I also think 3 there's a lot of risk in it. What you're going to 4 hear is what we hear every day. Because, you 5 know, we do talk to stakeholders on a regular 6 basis, so it's not going to be a complete surprise 7 to us. 8 You're going to hear a lot of the 9 antisolar from people who live near solar. And 10 you're going to, you know, have people who don't 11 like living near other -- you know, it's whoever 12 lives near it, they don't like it is usually how 13 it goes. 14 So that's what I would expect to see. If 15 we just go out and start asking people who live 16 nearby infrastructure, how do you feel about the 17 infrastructure next door, generally they don't 18 have great opinions of it because they have to 19 live next door to it. 20 But we all know here that that 21 infrastructure -- we live under a social contract, 22 right, where that infrastructure is present in 23 places that sometimes people don't want it, 24 because by placing it there is the only way to 25 allow it to be accessible to everybody.</p>	<p>387</p> <p>1 So, yeah, I mean, I know -- I see that 2 there are people here that want us to engage more; 3 that seems like that's always the answer, just 4 engage more. But I think also the effort that we 5 did make was sufficient and that we did get good 6 feedback and that we responded to that feedback 7 where we could. 8 Q If directed by the Commission, would the 9 Company conduct a robust qualitative analysis for 10 environmental justice purposes? 11 A The Company will do what the Commission 12 asks, yes. 13 MR. WINSTON: Thank you. 14 No further questions, Your Honor. 15 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Consumer Counsel? 16 MR. BARTLEY: No questions, Your Honor. 17 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Commission Staff? 18 MS. PIERCE: No questions, Your Honor. 19 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Dominion, any 20 redirect? 21 MS. NIELSEN: Very briefly, Your Honor. 22 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 23 BY MS. NIELSEN: 24 Q Good afternoon, Ms. MacCormick. How are 25 you?</p>
<p>386</p> <p>1 Q Is the implication of your response, 2 Ms. MacCormick, that because not-in-my-backyard 3 reactions are common that they are unreliable? 4 In other words, I -- would you agree that 5 a qualitative analysis would say that a frequent 6 almost universal response in your testimony has 7 more salience, not less, but your suggestion is 8 otherwise? 9 A I won't speak to whether or not it's 10 salient. I think that's a little bit on the 11 person who's interpreting it. But I am agreeing 12 that, yeah, I think there's a pretty universal 13 not-in-my-backyard response that you would get. 14 I do also think the stakeholder engagement 15 process that we did endeavor to take last year was 16 well conducted, right. We advertised it in ways 17 that anyone who really was interested in 18 participating could access the information. 19 As some of those who participated will 20 tell you, there's a steep technical learning curve 21 to engage on Integrated Resource Planning topics. 22 It's not a topic area that you can just walk and 23 pick somebody off of a sidewalk and dip them into, 24 right. There's a lot of background and 25 technicality to it.</p>	<p>388</p> <p>1 A Just fine. 2 Q Holding up. I'll try to be brief. 3 You were just testifying about the 4 required stakeholder process versus the required 5 EJ analysis for purposes of the 2024 IRP. 6 Do you remember that? 7 A Yes. 8 Q Okay. And you correctly testified that 9 the requirement to perform an EJ analysis does not 10 come through statute. 11 Did I hear that correctly? 12 A Yes. 13 Q Okay. It comes through Commission order? 14 A I'm not even sure there's a Commission 15 order requiring any EJ analysis at this point. I 16 think it's more of a voluntary thing that the 17 Company is doing and that the Staff have indicated 18 they appreciate. 19 Q And I believe that you were shown a chart 20 that had certain requirements when counsel for APV 21 was up earlier, and it directed your attention to 22 a Commission order where certain EJ analysis had 23 to be performed as part of the 2024 IRP as -- I 24 believe it says, as appropriate. 25 Does that sound familiar?</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

68 (389 to 392)

<p>389</p> <p>1 A Yes.</p> <p>2 Q Okay. And Mr. Winston asked you a</p> <p>3 question that seemed to imply that the EJ analysis</p> <p>4 is somehow linked to or required by the statutory</p> <p>5 stakeholder process.</p> <p>6 Does that sound familiar?</p> <p>7 A Well, that was why I think I got a little</p> <p>8 confused in that moment, because the Virginia EJ</p> <p>9 Act does not have any requirement of that nature.</p> <p>10 Q Okay. And I'm going to show you now what</p> <p>11 is the statute that required the Company in the</p> <p>12 2024 IRP to complete the stakeholder review</p> <p>13 process.</p> <p>14 Can you read that or do you need me to</p> <p>15 make it a little bit bigger? We're going to be</p> <p>16 looking at subpart D.</p> <p>17 A That looks good. Thank you.</p> <p>18 Q Looks good? Okay.</p> <p>19 Okay. So this is Virginia Code 56-599,</p> <p>20 subpart D. And I'm going to give you a moment</p> <p>21 just to review that section for me, please, and</p> <p>22 you give me the green light when you're ready.</p> <p>23 A Okay. I think I'm ready.</p> <p>24 Q Okay. So nowhere in subpart D does it say</p> <p>25 that the stakeholder review process must</p>	<p>391</p> <p>1 the statute, the Company did, in fact, have a</p> <p>2 workshop specific to environmental justice as part</p> <p>3 of the 2024 IRP stakeholder review process; is</p> <p>4 that right?</p> <p>5 A That is correct. The Company not only did</p> <p>6 that, we have a company policy which is completely</p> <p>7 voluntary and not required. We screen all of our</p> <p>8 major projects completely voluntary, not required,</p> <p>9 and we report, you know, I think in more detail</p> <p>10 than most. In our IRPs and other proceedings, in</p> <p>11 many cases, that is also not required.</p> <p>12 Q Thank you, Ms. MacCormick. I appreciate</p> <p>13 your time.</p> <p>14 MS. NIELSEN: I have no further questions.</p> <p>15 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Ms. MacCormick,</p> <p>16 you're now excused.</p> <p>17 THE WITNESS: Thank you.</p> <p>18 MS. LINK: Your Honor, that concludes the</p> <p>19 Company's direct case.</p> <p>20 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you.</p> <p>21 MR. BENFORADO: Your Honor, Nate</p> <p>22 Benforado, for Appalachian Voices. I'm not sure</p> <p>23 what you guys are thinking for timing. We have</p> <p>24 two witnesses with surrebuttal. Happy to do both</p> <p>25 of them. I would say the surrebuttal for</p>
<p>390</p> <p>1 incorporate an EJ analysis or EJ discussion</p> <p>2 session, does it?</p> <p>3 A Correct.</p> <p>4 Q So it's not required by the statute; is</p> <p>5 that correct?</p> <p>6 A What -- by what statute?</p> <p>7 Q By 56-599 D. Thank you for making me</p> <p>8 clarify that point.</p> <p>9 EJ review is not required as a topic of</p> <p>10 discussion for 56-599, Subpart D?</p> <p>11 A Thank you. No.</p> <p>12 Q Okay. And you -- I'm going to refer you</p> <p>13 now to what is Appendix 1 of the 2024 IRP, which</p> <p>14 is the stakeholder process report.</p> <p>15 Are you familiar with that --</p> <p>16 A Generally --</p> <p>17 Q -- appendix?</p> <p>18 A -- yes.</p> <p>19 Q And this section identifies certain</p> <p>20 workshops that were completed as part of the</p> <p>21 stakeholder review process, and it says, workshop</p> <p>22 two is environmental justice.</p> <p>23 Does that sound familiar?</p> <p>24 A Yes.</p> <p>25 Q Okay. So despite not being required by</p>	<p>392</p> <p>1 Mr. Goggin is probably a little bit shorter, maybe</p> <p>2 in the five to 10 minutes' range, and I'm not sure</p> <p>3 about cross the other parties have.</p> <p>4 Dr. Laws would probably be more in the 10</p> <p>5 to 15-minute time range. My guess is he would be</p> <p>6 a little bit of a longer witness, but defer to the</p> <p>7 Commission, how you'd like to proceed.</p> <p>8 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Let see if we can</p> <p>9 get to the first two witnesses and, if so, then</p> <p>10 we'll adjourn and start Wednesday with Mr. Wilson.</p> <p>11 MR. BENFORADO: Excellent. Then we will</p> <p>12 call Dr. Laws.</p> <p>13 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Thank you.</p> <p>14 MS. GRUNDMANN: Your Honor, just to be</p> <p>15 clear about the schedule, my understanding is I</p> <p>16 thought you said Mr. Wilson Wednesday morning. I</p> <p>17 thought he wasn't available until Wednesday</p> <p>18 afternoon.</p> <p>19 MR. BENFORADO: Mr. Wilson is available</p> <p>20 tomorrow afternoon. Sorry. I apologize if the</p> <p>21 request was confusing. He has a hearing that he</p> <p>22 is still in. He should be done no later than</p> <p>23 2:00 p.m. Eastern tomorrow.</p> <p>24 So we were planning to put on our</p> <p>25 in-person witnesses now and have him out of turn.</p>

PLANET DEPOS

888.433.3767 | WWW.PLANETDEPOS.COM

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on April 15, 2025

69 (393 to 396)

<p style="text-align: right;">393</p> <p>1 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: So then maybe we 2 should do it the other way, just come in tomorrow 3 morning and have Dr. Laws and Mr. Goggin go 4 Wednesday morning and then have Mr. Wilson be 5 available for the afternoon, if that works. 6 MR. BENFORADO: That would be acceptable 7 to us. So I guess other respondents would proceed 8 this afternoon? 9 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Ms. Grundmann, did 10 you have anything you wanted to say? 11 MS. GRUNDMANN: I just -- when you said 12 it, I thought I made clear that my 13 understanding -- 14 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: No. 15 MS. GRUNDMANN: -- was that when you said 16 -- you said -- 17 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Sure. Maybe it's 18 better just to adjourn now, recess now, I mean. 19 MS. GRUNDMANN: I would be happy to do 20 whatever the Commission wants so that we are 21 potentially not here on Friday, but I also defer 22 to the Commission in terms of managing its 23 schedule. 24 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: Yeah, that would be 25 nice.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">395</p> <p>1 COURT REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE 2 3 4 I, Scott D. Gregg, Registered 5 Professional Reporter, certify that I recorded 6 verbatim by stenotype the proceedings in the 7 captioned cause before the HONORABLE COMMISSIONERS 8 of the State Corporation Commission, Richmond, 9 Virginia, on the 15th day of April 2025. 10 I further certify that to the best of my 11 knowledge and belief, the foregoing transcript 12 constitutes a true and correct transcript of the 13 said proceedings. 14 Given under my hand this 20th day of 15 April, 2025, at Norfolk, Virginia. 16 17 <u>Scott D. Gregg / RPT</u> 18 19 Scott D. Gregg, RPR 20 Notary Public 21 Notary Registration No. 215323 22 23 24 25</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">394</p> <p>1 Let's recess now and then have you come 2 and have the witnesses start tomorrow morning. 3 MR. BENFORADO: Thank you, Your Honor. 4 COMMISSIONER HUDSON: So what we'll do is 5 we'll recess until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow and 6 reconvene at that time. 7 We'll now stand in recess. 8 (The proceedings adjourned at 4:44 p.m., 9 to be reconvened on April 16, 2025, at 10:00 a.m.) 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25</p>	