

# Sugarloaf Conservancy

3409A Urbana Pike Frederick, Maryland 21704 e-mail: info@sugarloafconservancy.org web: www.sugarloafconservancy.org, nomoretowers.org

**After the State Corporation Commission (SCC) in Virginia received all written testimony, SCC experts concluded, “adequate transmission reliability/needs justification has not been established.” If demand response and energy efficiency resources that cleared the May 2009 PJM (regional authority) auction are included as required by PJM own rules, a “critical need” will not occur until 2021!**

## Current Status of PATH’s Applications

- Maryland:** On July 14<sup>th</sup>, the PSC issued an order in favor of allowing PATH to file as they proposed. A Pre-Hearing Conference is scheduled for September 28, 2010 in Baltimore. On August 5<sup>th</sup>, Potomac Edison filed an application with the Frederick County Government for a special exception to locate an electric power substation in agricultural zoned land and for a finding of consistency with the County’s Comprehensive Plan. Hearings are scheduled for September 15<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup>.
- Virginia:** PATH withdrew support for its own application on December 29, 2009. The Commissioners accepted PATH’s motion to withdraw on January 27, 2010, and directed that any future application “include changes in generation, demand response, and energy resources.” PATH has notified the SCC that they intend to file a new application during the 3rd quarter of 2010.
- West Virginia:** On November 24, 2009, the staff’s (PSC) motion to dismiss was denied and PATH’s request to delay case accepted. On June 3, 2010, the PSC accepted PATH’s motion to delay the statutory deadline for the WV PATH to May 16, 2011.

## PATH Changing Positions

- Day 1: PATH filed an application for a CPCN in Maryland stating that there would be a “critical need” in 2014. 12/21/09
- Day 1: PATH filed a motion to withdraw in Virginia and stated they planned to re-file in January 2010. They stated reason for the motion to withdraw was that PATH did not want to file rebuttal testimony due January 4, 2010. 12/21/09
- Day 8: PJM sent a letter to Allegheny Energy stating that there was no “critical need” for PATH in 2014 as previously stated. 12/28/09
- Day 9: PATH modified their motion to withdraw in Virginia, stating that there would not be a “critical need” in 2014. 12/29/09
- Day 15: PATH filed a letter with the Maryland PSC stating there will not be a “critical need” in 2014 as previously stated, but asking to bifurcate proceedings by addressing non-need issues first and need issues after new need analysis numbers are available in June 2010. 1/4/10

## Need for PATH and New Options

There continues to be a question if PATH or any other transmission lines, which have been proposed to PJM (regional authority) as an alternative are necessary. As can be seen on the enclosed graphs, PJM’s forecasts are overly optimistic when compared to the US Energy Information Administration numbers; especially since 2008. Even if their projections were valid, alternative and less expensive solutions would be more prudent. Two alternative solutions have recently been presented to PJM. The first by Dominion Virginia Power, where one proposal would cost about 1/3 the cost of PATH and the other submitted by Northeast Transmission Development which would cost several hundred million dollars less. Either proposal has the advantage of phasing in over time various aspects of their projects, costing rate payers substantially less each year and giving ample time for wind power to flourish.

August 15, 2010