Dominion Resources Services, Inc. Law Department 120 Tredegar St. Richmond, VA 23219 dom.com



Charlotte P. McAfee Senior Counsel Direct: (804) 819-2277; Facsimile: (804) 819-2183 Email: charlotte.p.mcafee@dom.com

VIA ELECTRONIC DELIVERY

May 17, 2016

William H. Chambliss, Esq. Alisson P. Klaiber, Esq. Andrea Macgill, Esq. Office of General Counsel Tyler Building – 10th Floor 1300 East Main Street Richmond, Virginia 23219

Application of Virginia Electric and Power Company for approval and certification of electric facilities: Haymarket 230 kV Double Circuit Transmission Line and 230-34.5 kV Haymarket Substation Case No. PUE-2015-00107

Dear Counsel:

Enclosed are the responses of Virginia Electric and Power Company to the Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents by the Staff of the State Corporation Commission (Fourth Set).

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely, Charlotte P. McAfee

Senior Counsel

Enclosure

cc: Mr. Neil Joshipura Will Reisinger, Esq. Cliona Mary Robb, Esq. Michael J. Quinan, Esq. James G. Ritter, Esq. Vishwa Link, Esq. Jennifer Valaika, Esq.

The following response to Question No. 25 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Haffison Potter Engineer III Virginia Electric and Power Company

Question No. 25:

What is the length, in circuit miles, for Gainesville Distribution circuits #378, #379, and #695 from the Gainesville Substation to the proposed Haymarket Campus?

Response:

The Company submits that the length, in circuit miles, for Gainesville Distribution circuits is as follows:

- DC#378 7.17 circuit miles
- DC#379 7.61 circuit miles
- DC#695 5.79 circuit miles

The following response to Question No. 26 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Robert J. Shevenock II Consulting Engineer Dominion Technical Solutions, Inc.

Question No. 26

For the proposed Project (1-66 Overhead) and 1-66 Hybrid Alternative Route, provide the following items:

- a. Number of overhead structures.
- b. Average, maximum, and minimum heights for the overhead structures.

Response:

a. The proposed Project (I-66 Overhead Route) was estimated to require installation of 48 structures that included two single circuit backbones, two single circuit 3-pole angle structures, and forty-four double circuit steel poles. The I-66 Hybrid Alternative Route was estimated to require installation of 26 structures that included two single circuit backbones, two single circuit 3-pole angle structures, and 22 double circuit steel poles.

b. The proposed Project (I-66 Overhead Route) was estimated with an approximate average structure height of 112 feet for the double circuit steel poles that included a range of heights between approximately 90 feet and 125 feet. The I-66 Hybrid Alternative Route was estimated with an approximate average height of 111 feet for the double circuit steel poles that included a range of heights between approximately 105 feet and 125 feet. Both routes would include single circuit backbones at a height of approximately 75 feet in the proposed stations and single circuit 3-pole angle structures at an approximate height of 55 feet at the Haymarket Junction to split the line under the 500kV Line #535. The referenced heights are preliminary in nature and are subject to change based on final engineering. The referenced heights do not include foundation reveal which would be a minimum of approximately 1.5 feet.

The following response to Question No. 27 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Diana Faison Sr. Siting & Permitting Specialist Dominion Virginia Power

Question No. 27

On page 17 of the Appendix to the Application, the Company states that "...if VDOT needed its right-of-way for further expansions of I-66 in the future." Is the Company aware of any plans to further expand I-66 in the area of the I-66 Hybrid Alternative route? If so, please provide an estimated timeframe and any documents from VDOT that provide information relative to such expansion(s).

Response:

Dominion Virginia Power is not aware of any future plans to expand I-66 in the Haymarket and Gainesville area between U.S. 15 and U.S 29 following the completion of the widening project currently under construction. In 2017, "Transform 66 Outside the Beltway" begins, which includes reconfiguration of regular travel lanes and the addition of express lanes, as well as bus service and commuter park and ride lots in the Haymarket and Gainesville area. See VDOT's website at <u>http://outside.transform66.org/</u> for additional information. The "Transform 66 Outside the Beltway" effort will begin while the Company's Project is under construction and may therefore require further coordination between VDOT and the Company.

The Hybrid Alternative route would pose additional coordination and construction efforts around the proposed stormwater facilities and in the vicinity of Keavy Place near the Jefferson Street Bridge. The VDOT sound wall is placed close to the edge of VDOT rights-of-way and/or the property line of the properties which back up to I-66, which would cause the underground transmission line to be placed within VDOT rights-of-way, on the road side of the sound wall, near proposed pavement.

The following response to Question No. 28 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Robert J. Shevenock II Constituing Engineer Dominion Technical Solutions, Inc.

Question No. 28

What is the estimated incremental cost for the Walmart Variation?

Response:

The estimated incremental cost for the Walmart Variation is \$1,038,616 more than the estimated cost for the Proposed Route. This cost is for the transmission line only.

The following response to Question No. 29 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

W. K

Thomas W. Reitz Jr. Consulting Engineer Dominion Technical Solutions, Inc.

Question No. 29

FST Properties, Inc. ("FST") requested consideration of a variation to the Proposed Route and the 1-66 Hybrid Alternative Route on 5/4/16 ("FST Route Variation"). What is the estimated incremental cost for the FST Route Variation with respect to the 1-66 Hybrid Alternative Route?

Response:

The estimated incremental cost is approximately \$512,204.

The following response to Question No. 30 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Thomas W. Reitz Jr. Of Consulting Engineer Dominion Technical Solutions, Inc.

Question No. 30

What is the width required for the right-of-way with respect to the underground portion of the I-66 Hybrid Alternative Route?

Response:

The width required for the permanent right-of-way for the I-66 Hybrid Alternative Route is forty feet. An additional ten feet of temporary right-of-way is required during the construction of the underground lines.

The following response to Question No. 31 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

1. Spint

Robert J. Shevenock II Consulting Engineer Dominion Technical Solutions, Inc.

The following response to Question No. 31 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Wilson Velazquez, PE Supervisor Substation Engineering Dominion Technical Solutions, Inc.

Question No. 31

With reference to the Heathcote Station described in the I-66 Hybrid Alternative Route, please provide the following items:

- a. A one-line and general arrangement for the Heathcote Station.
- b. The height of the backbone structures at the Heathcote Station.

Response:

- a. See Attachment Staff Set 4-31(1) for the one-line diagram and Attachment Staff Set 4-31(2) for the general arrangement for the Heathcote Station.
- b. The height of the backbone structures at Heathcote Station will be approximately 75 feet, which does not include the foundation reveal that would be a minimum of approximately 1.5 feet.

The following response to Question No. 31 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Robert J. Shevenock II Consulting Engineer Dominion Technical Solutions, Inc.

The following response to Question No. 31 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Wilson Velazquez, PE Supervisor Substation Engineering Dominion Technical Solutions, Inc.

Question No. 31

With reference to the Heathcote Station described in the I-66 Hybrid Alternative Route, please provide the following items:

- a. A one-line and general arrangement for the Heathcote Station.
- b. The height of the backbone structures at the Heathcote Station.

Response:

- a. See Attachment Staff Set 4-31(1) for the one-line diagram and Attachment Staff Set 4-31(2) for the general arrangement for the Heathcote Station.
- b. The height of the backbone structures at Heathcote Station will be approximately 75 feet, which does not include the foundation reveal that would be a minimum of approximately 1.5 feet.

The following response to Question No. 32 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

lark t

Mark R. Gill Consulting Engineer Dominion Virginia Power

The following response to Question No. 32 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Robert J. Shevenock II Consulting Engineer Dominion Technical Solutions, Inc.

Question No. 32

On page 59 of the Appendix to the Application, the Company describes the various types of conductors to be utilized for the proposed Project. Since the Haymarket Loop would cut into Line #124, which utilizes 636 ACSR 24/7 conductors, please provide the Company's rationale for using 795 ACSR 26/7 conductors on the Haymarket Loop as opposed to the 636 ACSR 24/7 conductors.

Response:

In its Northern Virginia service territory, the Company has started to see load flows exceed the summer rating of the bundled 636 ACSR 24/7 conductors for various contingency scenarios using the 2023 load flow model. As a result, the Company has revised its list of standard overhead transmission conductors to include the 795 ACSR 26/7 conductors which provide a higher ampacity (3076 Amps vs. 2628 Amps) for a minimal additional expense.

The following response to Question No. 32 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Mark R. Gill Consulting Engineer Dominion Virginia Power

The following response to Question No. 32 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Robert J. Shevenock II Consulting Engineer Dominion Technical Solutions, Inc.

Question No. 32

On page 59 of the Appendix to the Application, the Company describes the various types of conductors to be utilized for the proposed Project. Since the Haymarket Loop would cut into Line #124, which utilizes 636 ACSR 24/7 conductors, please provide the Company's rationale for using 795 ACSR 26/7 conductors on the Haymarket Loop as opposed to the 636 ACSR 24/7 conductors.

Response:

In its Northern Virginia service territory, the Company has started to see load flows exceed the summer rating of the bundled 636 ACSR 24/7 conductors for various contingency scenarios using the 2023 load flow model. As a result, the Company has revised its list of standard overhead transmission conductors to include the 795 ACSR 26/7 conductors which provide a higher ampacity (3076 Amps vs. 2628 Amps) for a minimal additional expense.

For the proposed Project, the 795 ACSR 26/7 conductors represent an additional incremental cost of approximately \$63,000, with de minimus cost difference expected for the structures and foundations. It is the Company's intent to specify the bundled 795 ACSR 26/7 conductor for any new 230 kV network transmission projects in its northern Virginia service territory as the new standard. For example, the Company's Poland Road and Yardley Ridge projects (Case Nos. PUE-2015-00053 and PUE-2015-00054, respectively), which are currently pending before the Commission, similarly propose the use of bundled 795 ACSR 26/7 conductors. At present, the 636 ACSR conductors on Line #124 will limit the maximum transfer capacity of the proposed Project.

.

The following response to Question No. 33 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Mark R. Gill Consulting Engineer Dominion Virginia Power

Question No. 33

Please provide an updated version of Attachment I.E.1 and Attachment I.E.2 that reflects the Commission-approved Project in Case No. PUE-2014-00025.

Response:

c

ŧ

See Attachment Staff Set 4-33.

The following response to Question No. 34 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Jon Bertin

Jon Berkin Routing Specialist Natural Resource Group

Question No. 34

Referring to the Wheeler Alternative Route and New Road Alternative Route, please explain why the transmission line originating from Wheeler Station is approximately 8.6 miles when the actual Wheeler Station is only approximately 4.5 miles (straight line) from the proposed Haymarket Substation

Response:

The process that was implemented to develop the potential route alternatives for the Project, including the Wheeler Alternative Route, is discussed in extensive detail in the Environmental Routing Study ("Routing Study") for the Haymarket Substation and 230 kV Transmission Line Project. This process included the detailed mapping and analysis of the existing land use, environmental, visual, and cultural features within this area. Sensitive environmental or constructability-related features were factored into the development of the route, as well as routing opportunities afforded by existing rights-of-way in the area. The Company's goal was to develop routes that reasonably minimized adverse impact on the scenic assets, historic districts and environment of the area. This resulted in an approximately 8.6 mile long route for the Wheeler Alternative Route. The specific constraints and routing opportunities associated with the Wheeler Alternative Route are presented in the Routing Study.

The following response to Question No. 35 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Jon Berlin

Jon Berkin Routing Specialist Natural Resource Group

Question No. 35

Referring to the New Road Alternative Route, please explain why the transmission line originating from the New Road Station is approximately 12.6 miles when the actual New Road Station is only approximately 8.1 miles (straight line) from the proposed Haymarket Substation.

Response:

The process that was implemented to develop the potential route alternatives for the Project, including the New Road Alternative Route, is discussed in extensive detail in the Routing Study for the Haymarket Substation and 230 kV Transmission Line Project. This process included the detailed mapping and analysis of the existing land use, environmental, visual, and cultural features within this area. Sensitive environmental or constructability-related features were factored into the development of the route as well as routing opportunities afforded by existing rights-of-way in the area. The Company's goal was to develop routes that reasonably minimized adverse impact on the scenic assets, historic districts and environment of the area that could be constructed. This resulted in an approximately 8.6 mile long route for the New Road Alternative Route. The specific constraints and routing opportunities associated with the New Road Alternative Route are presented in the Routing Study.

The following response to Question No. 36 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

John I. Harris Technical Consultant Dominion Virginia Power

The following response to Question No. 36 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Mark R. Gill Consulting Engineer Dominion Virginia Power

The following response to Question No. 36 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision as it pertains to legal matters.

Charlotte P. McAfee Senior Counsel Dominion Resources Services, Inc.

The following response to Question No. 36 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

John I. Harris Technical Consultant Dominion Virginia Power

The following response to Question No. 36 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Tark R.L

Mark R. Gill Consulting Engineer Dominion Virginia Power

The following response to Question No. 36 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision as it pertains to legal matters.

Charlotte P. McAfee Senior Counsel Dominion Resources Services, Inc.

The following response to Question No. 36 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

John I. Harris Technical Consultant Dominion Virginia Power

The following response to Question No. 36 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Mark R. Gill Consulting Engineer Dominion Virginia Power

The following response to Question No. 36 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision as it pertains to legal matters.

Charlotte P. McAfee Senior Counsel Dominion Resources Services, Inc.

Question No. 36

Recognizing that the Company would not construct the proposed Project were it not for the Customer's request for service, and referring to the following items within "Section I. - Definitions" and "Section XXII. — Electric Line Extensions and Installations" of the Company's Commission-approved Terms and Conditions:

- a. Definitions of "Electric Delivery Service," "Electric Service," and "Excess Transmission Facilities"
- b. Definition of "Approach Lines"

Please explain the Company's rationale on why "Section XXII Paragraph D — New Nonresidential and New Residential Three-Phase Service" is not applicable for the transmission facilities associated with this case.

Response:

The Company objects to this request to the extent it suggests that a "but for" test is applicable to this situation or to electric transmission planning in general. Notwithstanding and subject to the foregoing objection, the Company provides the following response.

Section XXII Paragraph D, "New Non-Residential and New Residential Three-Phase Service" is only applicable for the distribution facilities serving the Customer associated with the Project.

See Attachment Staff Set 4-36(1) for the Direct Testimony of Steven Eisenrauch filed in the Company's 2013 biennial rate case (Case No. PUE-2013-00020) sponsoring the revisions to Section XXII relating to underground installations. As noted in his testimony on page 11:14-17, "The facilities targeted for expanded underground installations are rated below 50 kV." Mr. Eisenrauch also made clear that the Company was "proposing a line extension plan that will expand the utilization of underground distribution lines for new services and enhance the opportunity to convert overhead service feeds to underground for existing residences. This new plan is facilitated by the development of improved and more reliable underground distribution cable and other facilities and equipment." (pages 1:15-2:2). Mr. Eisenrauch submitted with his testimony two schedules - Schedule 1 is Section XXII and Schedule 2 summarizes the cost impacts of Section XXII as to distribution facilities only - and 90 pages of workpapers filed under separate cover. For comparison purposes, see Attachment Staff Set 4-36(2) for "Underground Electric Service - Plan F" ("Plan F"), which was replaced by Section XXII and is referenced on page 3 of Mr. Eisenrauch's testimony. Attachment Staff Set 4-36(2) explicitly applies only to distribution facilities, as does Section XXII. Moreover, Staff Witness Neil Joshipura filed testimony stating that Staff did not oppose the replacement of Plan F with Section XXII.

Similarly, when the Company originally proposed replacement of Plan F in the 2009 biennial rate case (Case No. PUE-2009-00019), Company witness Julius M. Griles stated at 11:21-22 that, "The facilities targeted for expanded underground installations are rated below 50 kV." See Attachment Staff Set 4-36(3).

All Project components except the distribution side of the proposed Haymarket Substation are integrated transmission facilities subject to PJM operational control and the facilities may be used by any PJM customer. Once the Project is constructed, PJM operates the facilities and charges the cost to Dominion Virginia Power as the Load Serving Entity transmission customer.

Transmission planning takes into account the broad needs of serving all loads in the Dominion Zone of PJM. The transmission planning horizon extends out 15 years and key considerations include power flow modeling and existing and identified growth in the relevant transmission planning area. Transmission planning incorporates broader short-term and long-term system benefits in responding to load growth, rather than addressing only limited single needs unlike Section XXII.

The Company's Terms and Conditions do contemplate certain services at transmission-level voltage. "Electric Service" is defined in Section I as follows in relevant part: "The provision, by the Company to the Customer, of Electric Delivery Service and, to the extent provided by the Company, Electricity Supply Service and utility services." In turn, "Electric Delivery Service" is defined as follows: "Distribution Service, and the delivery of electricity under this tariff to Customers served at transmission level voltage, and related utility services, to the extent each is provided under this tariff by the Company." For the Project, however, the Customer is being served at distribution level voltage.

Section I defines "Excess Transmission Facilities" as follows: "All transmission facilities (69 kV and above) provided by the Company in addition to those the Company would normally utilize to provide Electric Service to the Customer at one Delivery Point." This term is not applicable to this Project as the Company is not installing any facilities in excess of the requirements of the normally-applicable transmission planning standards.

Although the Company's Terms and Conditions contemplate certain services at transmissionlevel voltage, Section XXII does not reference transmission facilities and the underground provisions were explicitly communicated to the Commission as not being applicable to transmission level voltage. In that regard, paragraph A of Section XXII defines the following terms, among others:

- "Approach Line" Facilities installed from an existing source to the property of the customer or developer requesting Electric Delivery Service.
- "Branch Feeder" Facilities installed on the property of the Customer or developer (only includes property within the recorded development) requesting Electric Delivery Service
- "Bulk Feeder" A three-phase main feeder circuit with an ampacity greater than 200 Amperes that is required to serve a general area, or large load(s).

The following is an excerpt from the Company's Engineering Manual as it relates to the definition of "Bulk Feeder:"

Bulk Feeder Cables

Bulk feeder cables are used to carry large amounts of electrical power between locations. They are the circuits that emanate from the

<u>distribution substation and provide a path of power flow down to the</u> <u>distribution (URD) system.</u> Bulk feeders usually consist of three single conductor cables but they can be a three conductor cable. In order to transport the large amounts of electrical power provided by these cables, bulk feeder cables have a large diameter and high ampacity.

A common example of bulk feeder cable on the Company system would be the cable that connects a distribution substation to a switch. From the switch, additional feeder cables would be used to connect to other switches in a "daisy-chain" fashion. From the switches, smaller cables, such as URD cables, would be used to carry smaller amounts of electrical power to distribution transformers for customer utilization.

Section XXII.D applies to distribution facilities by the application of the above defined terms. The Customer is requesting distribution service, and the Company will apply the definition of Approach Line and the charges for the associated distribution facilities to provide service to the Customer. See the Company's response to Question No. 14 of the Staff's First Set and Confidential Attachment Staff Set 1-14(2).

The transmission facilities components of the Project have been designated a Supplemental Project by PJM and, therefore, are not eligible for cost allocation beyond the Dominion Zone of PJM. Accordingly, the transmission costs will be charged to Network Integration Transmission Service ("NITS") customers in the Dominion Zone on a load ratio share basis. This is consistent with the treatment of new transmission extensions to cooperative delivery points in the Dominion Zone and with FERC precedent.

It would be unjust and unreasonable to expand the application of the Company's Terms and Conditions Line Extension Policy to the extension of transmission facilities to new delivery points for which the PJM Tariff already provides intra-zonal cost allocation (*i.e.*, from the entire Dominion Zone based on load ratio share). This could create absurd results, including, among others, incenting block load customers to locate exclusively within electric cooperative territory where Dominion Virginia Power is obligated to extend electric transmission facilities and where the bulk of the extension cost will be charged to Dominion Virginia Power because it is the NITS customer for the bulk of the Dominion Zone load.

The following response to Question No. 37 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision as it pertains to legal matters.

Charlotte P. McAfee Senior Counsel Dominion Resources Services, Inc.

Question No. 37

If the Company's Commission-approved line extension policy was applied to the proposed Project, please provide a cost assignment calculation.

Response:

See the Company's responses to Question No. 14 of the Staff's First Set, Confidential Attachment Staff Set 1-14(2), and the Company's response to Question 36 of the Staff's Fourth Set.

The following response to Question No. 38 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision as it pertains to legal matters.

Charlotte P. McAfee

Senior Counsel Dominion Resources Services, Inc.

Question No. 38

If the Company's Commission-approved line extension policy was applied to the Hybrid Alternative, please provide a cost assignment calculation.

Response:

The Company objects to this request because it requires original work. The Company further objects to this request as unduly burdensome and as not relevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this proceeding. Notwithstanding and subject to the foregoing objections, see the Company's response to Question No. 36 of the Staff's Fourth Set.

The following response to Question No. 39 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Patrick Haworth Key Account Manager II Virginia Electric & Power Company

Question No. 39

The Company's pre-certification process for data center site selection was mentioned at the local hearing on May 2, 2016, and on the Company's website <u>https://www.dom.com/business/dominion-virginia-power/b2b-services/economic-development-and-data-centers/data-center-services/sites</u>

- a. Provide a detailed explanation of the data center site certification process. How does a particular site become identified as a pre-certified site?
- b. Did the site for the Haymarket Campus qualify as a pre-certified site? Provide the Company's rationale behind its determination.

Response:

a. Dominion Virginia Power has contracted with Timmons Group, a third party consultant to analyze and qualify sites as certified data center sites. The certification process description is provided through the website referenced in this request. See

<u>https://www.dom.com/business/dominion-virginia-power/b2b-services/economic-development-and-data-centers/data-center-services/site-certification-process</u>, a screenshot of which is provided as Attachment Staff Set 3-39.

b. No. The Customer's site did not qualify because it did not meet the criteria. The Customer chose the location without seeking input from Dominion Virginia Power.

The following response to Question No. 40 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision as it pertains to legal matters.

Charlotte P. McAfee Senior Counsel Dominion Resources Services, Inc.

Question No. 40

Please provide the estimated bill impact, and the details to support such an estimate, to a residential customer using 1,000 kWh per month for the following scenarios:

- a. The Company's proposed Project if the Company's Commission-approved line extension policy is applicable to the Project and the Customer pays any deposit that may be required thereunder;
- b. The Company's proposed Project if the Company's Commission-approved line extension policy is not applicable to the Project;
- c. The Hybrid Alternative if the Company's Commission-approved line extension policy is applicable and the Customer pays any deposit that may be required thereunder; and
- d. The Hybrid Alternative if the Company's Commission-approved line extension policy is not applicable.

Response:

The Company objects to this request requires original work because it seeks a calculation of the Virginia rate impact of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission-approved Network Integration Transmission Service ("NITS") component of its federal transmission rates that are effective after the Project is in service, and because it seeks a calculation based on one Project's incremental impact on this future rate. The Company further objects to this request as unduly burdensome and as not relevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this proceeding.

The following response to Question No. 41 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Jon Berkin Routing Specialist Natural Resource Group, LLC

The following response to Question No. 41 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision as it pertains to legal matters.

Charlotte P. McAfee Senior Counsel Dominion Resources Services, Inc.

Question No. 41

Please identify and quantify the number of individual residences (apartments, townhomes and single family homes) and commercial facilities that directly face the I-66 Interstate corridor along the route of the proposed Project. Please include both the north and south sides of I-66.

Response:

The Company objects to this request because it requires original work. Notwithstanding and subject to the foregoing objection, the Company states as follows:

Dominion Virginia Power identified the number of individual residences and commercial facilities directly facing the proposed I-66 Overhead Route, both north and south of I-66. Dominion Virginia Power determined that there are 37 single family home residences, 249 townhome residences, and 13 commercial structures that face or abut the proposed Project route along I-66. Attachment Staff Set 4-41(a) shows the residences and commercial facilities that were identified and included in the counts provided above.

The following response to Question No. 41 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision.

Jon Berkin Routing Specialist Natural Resource Group, LLC

The following response to Question No. 41 of the Fourth Set of Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents Propounded by the Virginia State Corporation Commission Staff received on May 6, 2016 has been prepared under my supervision as it pertains to legal matters.

Charlotte P. McAfee Senior Counsel Dominion Resources Services, Inc.

Question No. 41

Please identify and quantify the number of individual residences (apartments, townhomes and single family homes) and commercial facilities that directly face the I-66 Interstate corridor along the route of the proposed Project. Please include both the north and south sides of I-66.

Response:

The Company objects to this request because it requires original work. Notwithstanding and subject to the foregoing objection, the Company states as follows:

Dominion Virginia Power identified the number of individual residences and commercial facilities directly facing the proposed I-66 Overhead Route, both north and south of I-66. Dominion Virginia Power determined that there are 37 single family home residences, 249 townhome residences, and 13 commercial structures that face or abut the proposed Project route along I-66. Attachment Staff Set 4-41(a) shows the residences and commercial facilities that were identified and included in the counts provided above.