

Note: This report was written to consolidate the discussion held during the small group meeting on the date and time below as part of Dominion Energy's 2024 Virginia and North Carolina IRP stakeholder process. It does not necessarily represent consensus viewpoints or unanimously held positions of all participating organizations.

Summary Report Small Group Meeting

5/17/2024

9:00 – 11:00 AM

Initial Questions or Follow-Ups:

- How is Dominion Energy treating location specific demand differently than in the 2023 IRP?
- Is Dominion Energy looking at making land available near generation facilities for direct connect? If so, how would ratepayers be impacted by that cost?
- Why were there build limits on utility scale solar in the 2023 IRP?
- How does Dominion Energy plan on implementing hydrogen and SMRs?
- How will the new FERC transmission order impact the IRP?
- How does replacing natural gas with hydrogen impact the IRP?
- How does the IRA implementation affect modeling?
- How has legislation from 2023/2024 impacted the modeling?
- Is Dominion Energy required to file Virginia and North Carolina's IRP together?

Initial Feedback Received:

- Reliability and Affordability
 - Reliability redundancy is critical to the data center industry, which is why they consider having onsite back-up generation. Outages are not acceptable.
 - Allowing for direct connection to generation facilities could reduce transmission costs and provide more reliable power to data center customers.
 - Would like to see a realistic timeline for implementation of nascent technologies (SMRs, hydrogen)
- Technologies / Programs
 - Renewables:
 - Long-term energy storage
 - Would like to see more aggressive assumptions in modeling
 - Utility-scale, distributed solar
 - Would like to see no build limits on utility scale solar
 - Would like to see more monetization of utility-scale solar and other aggregated resources
 - Demand-side management:
 - More aggressive energy efficiency targets
 - Inclusion of grid-enhancing technologies
 - Advanced reconductoring
 - Hydrogen
 - Replacement for natural gas

- Small Modular Nuclear Reactors
- Virtual Power Plants
- Modeling
 - Would like to see location specific modeling for load growth, transmission capability.
 - Would like to see the social cost of carbon thoroughly considered using the EPA and Commission-set standards.
 - Would rather see holistic approach to Environmental Justice than a project-by-project analysis.
 - Would like to see plan for natural gas to meet current demands and then SMRs for long-term need.
 - Would like to see EPA Power Plant rules included as an assumption.
 - Would like to see IRA Implementation included in the model.

Post-Meeting Feedback Received by One or More Stakeholders

- The ‘monetization’ comment was about customer-sited generation and storage, not utility-scale (which has a ROI built in), and pertained to both reliability and affordability. Aggregation of distributed resources that include generation and storage, through virtual power plants, should be considered as potential ‘firm generation’ and assigned value accordingly. For the customer, this means going beyond an incentive of saving money on bills (e.g. net metering) to a business model that assures the customer an ROI on the investment based on the savings that accrue to the utility. This would go a long way to scaling up the amount of DER that could feed into a VPP. While this emerging approach may play a small role in the current IRP, the potential could at least be explored and acknowledged.
- Every project must assess and, if considered manageable, mitigate EJ impacts in accordance with that project’s detail, but the IRP should include a holistic framework that establishes requirements and definitions, etc., rather than just punting the issue to the project scale.