



Energy Costs Listening Tour

Summary Report of Findings

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Opposition to the Merger

Energy Costs Listening Tour: Meeting Minutes

- Full Summary
- Loudoun County, Virginia
- Norfolk, Virginia
- Richmond, Virginia
- Charlottesville, Virginia
- Roanoke, Virginia

Appendices

- A: Lt. Governor Hashmi Op-Ed: Call for an Extended Review Period
- B: Lt. Governor Hashmi Letter to the SCC

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The **Energy Costs Listening Tour**, delivered through the Office of the Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi, occurred throughout September 2026. The Tour included stops in Loudoun County, Norfolk, Richmond, Charlottesville, and Roanoke. Each stop gave Virginians the opportunity to publicly express their perspectives on the proposed takeover of **Dominion Energy** by **NextEra**. Joining the Lieutenant Governor on stage at every stop were elected officials, energy and merger experts, and trusted community voices. This report includes the full minutes of each stop.

The report also provides the Lieutenant Governor's conclusion: Based on discussions, research, and the listening tour itself, the proposed takeover of Dominion Energy by NextEra is not in the best interest of Virginians.

OPPOSITION TO THE MERGER OF DOMINION ENERGY AND NEXTERA

Summary of Efforts

On September 2, 2026, the Office of the Lieutenant Governor launched a five-city listening tour to hear directly from the citizens of the Commonwealth about the proposed takeover of Virginia's Dominion Energy by Florida-based NextEra. **The Energy Costs Listening Tour** emerged as an extension of **Virginia's Voices**¹, an initiative established through the Office in January 2026. The listening tour was built on earlier efforts to raise questions about the proposed takeover and better understand its potential impact on Virginians.

In June 2026, shortly after the announcement of the proposed merger, I called for an extension of the review period by Virginia's State Corporation Commission (SCC or Commission) through an op-ed (see Appendix A). That publication was soon followed by a letter (see Appendix B) to the Commissioners of the SCC requesting that a series of comprehensive questions outlined in the letter be presented to the two corporations prior to their filing of acquisition documents.

These efforts were followed by the launch of a five-city listening tour to hear directly from Virginians across the Commonwealth. The Energy Costs Listening Tour included stops in Loudoun County, Norfolk, Richmond, Charlottesville, and Roanoke. At each stop, we heard different perspectives and gained valuable insight from local elected officials, experts on energy and mergers, leading community voices, and concerned citizens. The primary goal of the tour was to listen, learn, and report. At every stop, participants were assured that their comments and questions were being faithfully documented and that their perspectives would be shared directly with the Commissioners of the SCC. This report provides the full minutes of each of the tour stops.

¹ **Virginia's Voices** has as its primary focus the goal of civic engagement through direct connections with Virginia residents, community leaders, business and civic leaders, and various organizations all throughout the Commonwealth.

Opposition to the Merger

After reviewing presentations made to the **Energy Commission of Virginia** (formerly Commission on Electric Utility Regulation or CEUR), engaging in discussions with experts and industry officials, reading analyses of the proposed merger, and listening to the perspectives of hundreds of Virginians, I have concluded that the proposed takeover of Dominion Energy with NextEra is ***not*** in the best interest of Virginians. I therefore oppose the proposal presented by the two corporations to the SCC for the following reasons:

The legal threshold for the acquisition, as outlined in the Virginia Code, requires the corporations to prove *that adequate service to the public at just and reasonable rates will not be impaired or jeopardized*. When measured against this standard, this transaction fails to provide this full assurance.

The first risk that Virginians would face is the risk of NextEra itself. The company includes thousands of individual project entities, many in businesses far riskier than a regulated utility. Thus far NextEra has refused to provide assurances as to limits on future acquisitions or whether the Virginia SCC will have review authority. The corporation offers no assurances that it will not place its other ventures ahead of Virginia's needs.

Although NextEra officials have stated that Dominion's Virginia utility will still be headed by Dominion executives, these executives will not have autonomy to make decisions in the best interests of Virginia's residential and business customers. NextEra has declined to relinquish control over any significant decisions such as when to seek rate increases, how to balance reliability against cost, how much to spend on storm response, and how much money to deliver to shareholders as dividends.

Today, Dominion's Virginia utility – Dominion Energy – accounts for nearly 72% percent of its parent company's revenue. Should the takeover proceed, Dominion Energy would be about 27% of the much larger parent company. This massive corporation would include Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Florida.

Further, NextEra has told investors that it will grow its earnings by adding as much new infrastructure as possible to the base on which customers pay for the company's profit. Dominion already projects that demand on its system will grow massively in the next 20 years, driven mainly by data centers. NextEra intends to accelerate the buildout of infrastructure to serve data

centers, regardless of whether it is the least-cost option or the best choice for Virginia families and businesses. If the projected demand does not materialize, residential customers will be left paying for even more of the cost of what NextEra builds.

As public concern around the transaction has grown, the companies have expanded their package of bill credits offered to ratepayers. However, these projected credits are promised to last for only four years; the risk of NextEra's ownership will be permanent. The law does not allow offsets to excuse harm or the risk of harm: Approval should not be granted on the basis of payments that have nothing to do with the legal standard which requires that the corporate entities demonstrate *substantial evidence that the transaction will not impair or jeopardize rates now or in the future*.

The Commission must decide whether relinquishing control of Virginia's largest utility to a Florida holding company creates a risk for Virginians who have no choice but to pay its bills. From every corner of the Commonwealth, Virginians have shared their deep concerns, the challenges that they are experiencing with escalating energy costs, and their opposition to the merger.

After reviewing the proposal in detail and finding that it provides no substantial protections for our ratepayers, I have concluded that the concerns of Virginians are well founded. The proposal before the Commission fails to protect Virginians and should not be approved.

ENERGY COSTS LISTENING TOUR MEETING MINUTES

Provided by Kiser's Legal Support Solutions

KISER'S LEGAL SUPPORT SOLUTIONS

ENERGY COSTS LISTENING TOUR

FULL MEETING SUMMARY - ALL FIVE LOCATIONS

Loudoun • Norfolk • Richmond • Charlottesville • Roanoke

September 2-24, 2026

SOURCE NOTE

Prepared solely from the five uploaded tour packets, including the certified public-comment transcripts and the full-meeting summaries/minutes contained in those packets. This document is a summary and does not replace the certified verbatim transcripts.

Summary of the Full Meeting Record

This report summarizes the full meeting experience across all five locations, including the organized program, public participation, major questions and responses, and closing actions. It is designed to let a reader understand not only the issues raised, but how the statewide conversation developed from stop to stop.

How the Meetings Were Structured

Although the exact program varied, each stop followed a similar structure: a local welcome; framing remarks from Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi; presentations or discussion by legislators, community voices, and energy-policy participants; instructions for public participation; a timed public-comment and question period; responses from panel participants; and closing remarks directing residents toward the SCC process, elected officials, and continued civic engagement. The public-comment portion was separately captured in certified verbatim transcripts.

Loudoun: Full Meeting Narrative

September 2, 2026 | Dreamscapes Performing Arts Center | 21014 Whitfield Place, Sterling, Virginia 20165

Opening and organized discussion

The first stop established the tour's core framework: household affordability, the proposed Dominion Energy-NextEra Energy transaction, rapid data-center load growth, transmission and generation needs, environmental and public-health effects, SCC oversight, and public participation. The organized discussion connected utility planning to land, air quality, water, infrastructure, clean-energy requirements, and the question of who should bear the cost of large-load development.

Featured speakers were Senator Danica Roem; Senator Russet Perry; Delegate John McAuliff. Delegate Atoosa Reaser opened the program; Elena Schlossberg facilitated the public-participation format; Shelby Green and Thomas Donahue participated in the organized discussion. Additional elected officials and community leaders were acknowledged.

Public-participation period

The designated public-comment record ran 6:44 p.m.-approximately 7:33 p.m. and contained 21 indexed commenters.

Public comments were dominated by concern over rising household bills, data-center growth, infrastructure cost allocation, SCC oversight, transparency, and clean-energy obligations. Residents described paying more despite using less electricity, questioned whether residential customers were subsidizing data-center-driven expansion, raised concerns about transmission corridors and local land impacts, and called for stronger statewide coordination. Commenters also addressed air pollution from backup generation, water use, residential solar, political contributions, nondisclosure agreements, labor protections, and public access to utility decision-making. Most speakers opposed the acquisition or demanded heightened scrutiny; one commenter expressly supported it based on demand growth, innovation, investment capacity, and economic competitiveness.

Meeting significance

Loudoun presented the issue through the lived experience of a region already carrying unusually concentrated data-center development. The central question was not simply whether Virginia needs more power, but who benefits from growth, who pays for the infrastructure, and whether existing regulatory and local-government systems are keeping pace.

Norfolk: Full Meeting Narrative

September 8, 2026 | The Slover | 235 East Plume Street, Norfolk, Virginia 23510

Opening and organized discussion

Norfolk placed energy affordability within a coastal-community context. Opening and panel remarks addressed household costs, reliability, flooding and climate vulnerability, infrastructure investment, jobs, regulatory review, and consumer safeguards. The program also discussed the proposed transaction's potential effect on Virginia workers and customers and the need for measurable public benefits.

Featured speakers were Delegate Jackie Glass; Delegate Nadarius Clark; Delegate Phil Hernandez. Senator Angela Williams Graves delivered the welcome; Gaylene Kanoyton moderated public participation; Shelby Green participated as an energy-policy subject-matter speaker; Kim Suddharth provided a Norfolk community perspective. Interpreters were available.

Public-participation period

The designated public-comment record ran 6:38 p.m.-7:30 p.m. and contained 27 indexed commenters.

Commenters raised questions about rate increases, severe-weather cost exposure, the possibility that Virginia customers could bear costs associated with disasters in other states, data-center and AI-driven demand, jobs, union protections, political influence, antitrust and monopoly power, municipal or public ownership alternatives, clean energy, storage, grid reliability, health, flooding, lighting, weatherization, and the SCC process. The record included both opposition and support for the transaction. Opposition emphasized concentration, out-of-state control, unanswered questions, consumer risk, and political influence; supportive comments emphasized scale, reliability, investment capacity, growth, and the possibility of stronger infrastructure.

Meeting significance

Norfolk broadened the tour beyond the immediate merger question by tying energy policy to resilience, severe weather, public health, employment, and the financial vulnerability of households. Participants repeatedly asked for concrete protections rather than generalized assurances.

Richmond: Full Meeting Narrative

September 9, 2026 | Diversity Richmond | 1407 Sherwood Avenue, Richmond, Virginia 23220

Opening and organized discussion

Richmond focused heavily on the relationship between monopoly utility power, affordability, corporate accountability, political influence, labor, consumer protection, and the legal framework governing the proposed transaction. The panel framed electricity as both an essential service and a regulated business and repeatedly returned to whether enforceable benefits and protections would reach Virginia customers.

Featured speakers were Delegate Leslie Mehta; Delegate May Nivar; Delegate Charlie Schmidt. Delegate Betsy Carr delivered the welcome; Alexis Rogers moderated; Shelby Green provided an energy-policy presentation; Sean Crippen presented a community perspective. Additional elected officials, ASL interpreters, staff, and event-support personnel were acknowledged.

Public-participation period

The designated public-comment record ran Approximately 6:48 p.m.-7:30 p.m. and contained 32 indexed commenters.

Thirty-two indexed speakers produced the largest public-comment record of the tour. Most opposed the acquisition, while several supported it based on reliability, infrastructure, jobs, investment, or renewable-energy experience. Opposition centered on rising bills, utility political spending, labor and worker concerns, monopoly power, SCC oversight and perceived conflicts, disconnections, vulnerable households, data-center demand, tax incentives, transmission costs, clean-energy commitments, rural siting, and the durability of promised customer benefits. Supportive speakers cited Virginia's growth, the need for large-scale investment, continuity of major energy projects, and NextEra's infrastructure or renewable-energy experience.

Meeting significance

Richmond was the tour's most explicit examination of corporate power and the legal-regulatory structure around the transaction. The discussion repeatedly asked whether promises made during acquisition review would be enforceable, durable, and sufficient to protect captive utility customers.

Charlottesville: Full Meeting Narrative

September 14, 2026 | Jefferson School, African American Heritage Center | 233 4th St NW, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

Opening and organized discussion

Charlottesville emphasized the intersection of merger review with Virginia's long-term energy planning. The meeting addressed electricity costs, utility shutoffs, the SCC review standard, public-hearing access, the Virginia Clean Economy Act, proposed gas generation, data-center demand, easements, land and biodiversity, regulatory authority, and legal or legislative options after an SCC decision.

Featured speakers were Senator Creigh Deeds; Delegate Amy Laufer; Delegate Katrina Callsen. Natalie Oschrein, Charlottesville Vice Mayor, welcomed attendees; Kajsa Foskey of the Virginia Energy Consumer Alliance participated; Shelby Green responded to energy-policy questions. Additional regional officials were recognized.

Public-participation period

The designated public-comment record ran 6:38 p.m.-7:29 p.m. and contained 26 indexed commenters.

Commenters focused on affordability, disconnections, the SCC review timeline, intervention and hearing opportunities, clean-energy commitments, proposed gas plants, rooftop solar and virtual power plants, data-center growth, land and easements, water and scenic resources, corporate profits, political influence, worker protections, grid reliability, long-term planning, and legal recourse. Several speakers asked what could happen if the SCC approved the acquisition and what statutory or judicial options would remain. Public comments also stressed that residents and communities should be treated as primary sources of information in evaluating long-term energy decisions.

Meeting significance

Charlottesville connected the immediate transaction to a longer horizon: whether Virginia's existing laws, planning processes, clean-energy commitments, and judicial or legislative remedies are strong enough to govern a major transfer of utility control.

Roanoke: Full Meeting Narrative

September 24, 2026 | Harrison Museum of African American Culture at Melrose Plaza | 2502 Melrose Ave NW, Roanoke, Virginia 24017

Opening and organized discussion

Roanoke brought a distinct Southwest Virginia perspective. The program addressed affordability and reliability, Appalachian Power and shared-grid concerns, data-center development, water and drought, transmission and generation, utility regulation, local zoning, economic development, transparency, and the proposed acquisition. The discussion made clear that residents may experience regional grid and infrastructure effects even when they are not Dominion customers.

Featured speakers were Mayor Joe Cobb; Delegate Sam Rasoul; Delegate Lily Franklin; Victoria Higgins. Dr. Brandy Faulkner moderated. The full-meeting record also included remarks from a community representative and an energy-policy advocate before public participation.

Public-participation period

The designated public-comment record ran 7:14 p.m.-7:29 p.m. and contained 22 indexed commenters.

Commenters raised water consumption during low-water conditions, aging-grid capacity, billing disputes, out-of-state ownership, monopoly power, SCC oversight, political contributions, alleged conflicts of interest, data-center transparency and nondisclosure agreements, climate and emissions, utility-assistance demand, renewable-energy requirements, a proposed data-center moratorium, public ownership, severe-weather and insurance risk, local development decisions, and the need for better public notice. Multiple speakers urged a pause on new data centers while statewide rules are considered. The record also emphasized the burden on low-income households and the need for Southwest Virginia to be represented in statewide energy decisions.

Meeting significance

Roanoke showed that the tour's concerns were not confined to Dominion's direct service territory. Water, grid capacity, regional cost allocation, affordability, local development, and public notice were presented as statewide or regional issues requiring broader coordination.

How the Conversation Changed Across Virginia

The sequence of stops matters. Loudoun began from a place where data-center development is already a daily physical and financial reality. Norfolk added a coastal lens in which energy policy intersects with flooding, hurricanes, health, and resilience. Richmond, in the state capital, produced the tour's largest indexed public-comment record and concentrated attention on monopoly regulation, political influence, labor, and the legal enforceability of corporate promises. Charlottesville pushed the discussion toward the Clean Economy Act, long-term resource planning, easements, legal standards, and remedies. Roanoke then made the statewide nature of the debate unmistakable by focusing on regional grid effects, water, Appalachian Power customers, affordability, and local development decisions outside Dominion's direct service footprint.

Statewide Synthesis

Affordability and household energy burden

Every stop returned to the price paid by ordinary customers. Speakers described higher bills, billing disputes, utility-assistance needs, shutoff concerns, and the fear that new generation and transmission costs could be shifted to households. Several comments were especially pointed because speakers reported higher bills even when their own consumption had fallen.

The proposed Dominion Energy-NextEra Energy transaction

The acquisition was the central organizing issue. Most public comments across the tour were opposed or called for substantially greater scrutiny, transparency, enforceable customer protections, and a longer or more robust review. A smaller number of speakers supported the transaction based on reliability, investment capacity, renewable-energy experience, economic growth, or the scale needed to meet future demand.

Data-center growth and cost responsibility

Data centers were a recurring issue at all five stops, but the emphasis varied by region. Loudoun described the direct experience of concentrated development; Charlottesville and Richmond tied data-center demand to long-term generation and transmission planning; Norfolk connected demand growth to affordability and infrastructure; Roanoke focused on whether Southwest Virginia would inherit water, grid, land-use, or cost impacts. The repeated policy question was who should pay for infrastructure built to serve very large loads.

SCC oversight, transparency, and public confidence

Participants repeatedly discussed the State Corporation Commission's review process, hearing access, statutory authority, public-comment opportunities, commissioner recusal concerns raised by speakers, and the adequacy of Virginia's existing merger-review framework. Calls for more field hearings, clearer records, stronger disclosure, and broader public participation appeared throughout the tour.

Clean energy, reliability, and generation choices

Speakers debated the relationship among the Virginia Clean Economy Act, renewable energy, offshore wind, solar, storage, virtual power plants, natural-gas generation, backup generators, grid reliability, and rapidly increasing demand. The record reflects concern that reliability and affordability not be used as reasons to abandon clean-energy commitments, while other participants emphasized the need for sufficient firm capacity and investment.

Corporate power, political influence, and monopoly regulation

Public comments repeatedly addressed campaign contributions, lobbying, utility political spending, corporate concentration, shareholder incentives, monopoly conditions, and the difficulty customers face when they cannot choose another electric provider. These concerns were often linked to requests for stronger legislative safeguards and more independent regulatory review.

Land, water, health, and environmental impacts

The tour captured local concerns about transmission corridors, easements, rural and scenic land, air pollution, backup generation, water consumption, drought, flooding, climate risk, biodiversity, and public health. The geography changed, but the common demand was for energy planning to account for cumulative community impacts rather than evaluate projects in isolation.

Jobs, labor, and economic development

The record was not solely oppositional. Speakers and panelists discussed jobs, union protections, worker standards, economic competitiveness, renewable-energy employment, infrastructure investment, and local tax or development benefits. The recurring question was whether economic benefits would be enforceable and broadly shared if ownership changed.

Public participation and continuing action

Each stop ended with an emphasis on continued civic participation. The record repeatedly points residents toward SCC comments and hearings, direct contact with delegates and senators, local-government engagement, and participation in organizations working on energy, consumer, labor, environmental, or community issues.

Closing Perspective from the Record

The five meetings collectively show a public trying to connect large institutional decisions to everyday consequences. Residents discussed electricity not as an abstract commodity but as a necessity tied to housing stability, health, household budgets, local land, water, employment, and community development. The proposed acquisition concentrated those concerns into a single regulatory proceeding, but the record repeatedly moved beyond the transaction itself to the rules Virginia uses to approve growth, allocate costs, regulate monopolies, disclose information, and give the public a meaningful role.

The tour also documented genuine disagreement. Some participants saw a larger utility platform as a potential source of investment, reliability, jobs, and renewable-energy capability. Others saw increased concentration, political influence, out-of-state control, and risk to ratepayers. What united much of the record was a demand for evidence: clear customer benefits, transparent assumptions, public access to information, credible cost allocation, enforceable commitments, and meaningful avenues for review and accountability.

KISER'S LEGAL SUPPORT SOLUTIONS

ENERGY COSTS LISTENING TOUR

CONSOLIDATED FIVE-STOP TOUR MINUTES

Loudoun • Norfolk • Richmond • Charlottesville • Roanoke

September 2-24, 2026

SOURCE NOTE

Prepared solely from the five uploaded tour packets, including the certified public-comment transcripts and the full-meeting summaries/minutes contained in those packets. This document is a summary and does not replace the certified verbatim transcripts.

Purpose and Record Basis

These consolidated minutes provide a chronological administrative record of the five Energy Costs Listening Tour meetings. They summarize meeting structure, principal subjects discussed, public-participation periods, and closing actions. They are not verbatim transcripts. The certified public-comment transcripts in the underlying packets remain the authoritative record of the designated public-comment sessions.

1. LOUDOUN, VIRGINIA - September 2, 2026

Venue	Dreamscapes Performing Arts Center 21014 Whitfield Place, Sterling, Virginia 20165
Meeting Time	Approximately 6:00 p.m.-7:36 p.m.
Public Comment	6:44 p.m.-approximately 7:33 p.m. 21 indexed commenters
Host / Featured Speakers	Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi Senator Danica Roem; Senator Russet Perry; Delegate John McAuliff

Meeting purpose and organized program

The first stop established the tour's core framework: household affordability, the proposed Dominion Energy-NextEra Energy transaction, rapid data-center load growth, transmission and generation needs, environmental and public-health effects, SCC oversight, and public participation. The organized discussion connected utility planning to land, air quality, water, infrastructure, clean-energy requirements, and the question of who should bear the cost of large-load development.

Public participation

Public comments were dominated by concern over rising household bills, data-center growth, infrastructure cost allocation, SCC oversight, transparency, and clean-energy obligations. Residents described paying more despite using less electricity, questioned whether residential customers were subsidizing data-center-driven expansion, raised concerns about transmission corridors and local land impacts, and called for stronger statewide coordination. Commenters also addressed air pollution from backup generation, water use, residential solar, political contributions, nondisclosure agreements, labor protections, and public access to utility decision-making. Most speakers opposed the acquisition or demanded heightened scrutiny; one commenter expressly supported it based on demand growth, innovation, investment capacity, and economic competitiveness.

Principal outcomes

Affordability, data-center cost allocation, SCC transparency, transmission and land impacts, clean-energy obligations, and stronger statewide coordination emerged as principal outcomes. The record contained predominantly skeptical views of the acquisition with a documented supportive counterpoint.

Closing / continuing action

Closing remarks encouraged continued contact with legislators and regulators, participation in public processes, and sustained engagement on the proposed transaction and broader energy-policy issues. The stop concluded at approximately 7:36 p.m.

2. NORFOLK, VIRGINIA - September 8, 2026

Venue	The Slover 235 East Plume Street, Norfolk, Virginia 23510
Meeting Time	6:00 p.m.-7:30 p.m.
Public Comment	6:38 p.m.-7:30 p.m. 27 indexed commenters
Host / Featured Speakers	Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi Delegate Jackie Glass; Delegate Nadarius Clark; Delegate Phil Hernandez

Meeting purpose and organized program

Norfolk placed energy affordability within a coastal-community context. Opening and panel remarks addressed household costs, reliability, flooding and climate vulnerability, infrastructure investment, jobs, regulatory review, and consumer safeguards. The program also discussed the proposed transaction's potential effect on Virginia workers and customers and the need for measurable public benefits.

Public participation

Commenters raised questions about rate increases, severe-weather cost exposure, the possibility that Virginia customers could bear costs associated with disasters in other states, data-center and AI-driven demand, jobs, union protections, political influence, antitrust and monopoly power, municipal or public ownership alternatives, clean energy, storage, grid reliability, health, flooding, lighting, weatherization, and the SCC process. The record included both opposition and support for the transaction. Opposition emphasized concentration, out-of-state control, unanswered questions, consumer risk, and political influence; supportive comments emphasized scale, reliability, investment capacity, growth, and the possibility of stronger infrastructure.

Principal outcomes

Affordability, resilience, severe-weather exposure, jobs, consumer safeguards, clean energy, infrastructure investment, political influence, and the scope of SCC review were principal outcomes. The record contained both opposition and support.

Closing / continuing action

Closing remarks identified three public action paths: submit comments to the SCC docket, contact state elected representatives, and participate in organizations aligned with the issues residents wished to advance. The public-comment session concluded at 7:30 p.m.

3. RICHMOND, VIRGINIA - September 9, 2026

Venue	Diversity Richmond 1407 Sherwood Avenue, Richmond, Virginia 23220
Meeting Time	Approximately 6:00 p.m.-7:30 p.m.
Public Comment	Approximately 6:48 p.m.-7:30 p.m. 32 indexed commenters
Host / Featured Speakers	Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi Delegate Leslie Mehta; Delegate May Nivar; Delegate Charlie Schmidt

Meeting purpose and organized program

Richmond focused heavily on the relationship between monopoly utility power, affordability, corporate accountability, political influence, labor, consumer protection, and the legal framework governing the proposed transaction. The panel framed electricity as both an essential service and a regulated business and repeatedly returned to whether enforceable benefits and protections would reach Virginia customers.

Public participation

Thirty-two indexed speakers produced the largest public-comment record of the tour. Most opposed the acquisition, while several supported it based on reliability, infrastructure, jobs, investment, or renewable-energy experience. Opposition centered on rising bills, utility political spending, labor and worker concerns, monopoly power, SCC oversight and perceived conflicts, disconnections, vulnerable households, data-center demand, tax incentives, transmission costs, clean-energy commitments, rural siting, and the durability of promised customer benefits. Supportive speakers cited Virginia's growth, the need for large-scale investment, continuity of major energy projects, and NextEra's infrastructure or renewable-energy experience.

Principal outcomes

The discussion concentrated on enforceable consumer benefits, monopoly power, political influence, labor, disconnections, SCC oversight, data-center incentives, and possible statutory or legislative action. Most public speakers opposed the transaction, while several supported it.

Closing / continuing action

Closing remarks urged attendees to file comments in the SCC docket, contact delegates and state senators, and join or support organizations engaged in the issue. Event staff then handled photographs, action cards, and final logistics. The event concluded at approximately 7:30 p.m.

4. CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA - September 14, 2026

Venue	Jefferson School, African American Heritage Center 233 4th St NW, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
Meeting Time	Approximately 6:00 p.m.-7:34 p.m.
Public Comment	6:38 p.m.-7:29 p.m. 26 indexed commenters
Host / Featured Speakers	Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi Senator Creigh Deeds; Delegate Amy Laufer; Delegate Katrina Callsen

Meeting purpose and organized program

Charlottesville emphasized the intersection of merger review with Virginia's long-term energy planning. The meeting addressed electricity costs, utility shutoffs, the SCC review standard, public-hearing access, the Virginia Clean Economy Act, proposed gas generation, data-center demand, easements, land and biodiversity, regulatory authority, and legal or legislative options after an SCC decision.

Public participation

Commenters focused on affordability, disconnections, the SCC review timeline, intervention and hearing opportunities, clean-energy commitments, proposed gas plants, rooftop solar and virtual power plants, data-center growth, land and easements, water and scenic resources, corporate profits, political influence, worker protections, grid reliability, long-term planning, and legal recourse. Several speakers asked what could happen if the SCC approved the acquisition and what statutory or judicial options would remain. Public

comments also stressed that residents and communities should be treated as primary sources of information in evaluating long-term energy decisions.

Principal outcomes

The meeting connected merger review to the Clean Economy Act, long-term utility planning, data-center demand, land and easements, statutory standards, public hearings, and post-decision legal or legislative options.

Closing / continuing action

Closing remarks emphasized participation in the SCC comment and hearing process, contact with elected and local officials, and connection with organizations working on relevant issues. The meeting then moved to handouts, photographs, and vendor tables and concluded at approximately 7:34 p.m.

5. ROANOKE, VIRGINIA - September 24, 2026

Venue	Harrison Museum of African American Culture at Melrose Plaza 2502 Melrose Ave NW, Roanoke, Virginia 24017
Meeting Time	6:30 p.m.-8:00 p.m. scheduled event time
Public Comment	7:14 p.m.-7:29 p.m. 22 indexed commenters
Host / Featured Speakers	Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi Mayor Joe Cobb; Delegate Sam Rasoul; Delegate Lily Franklin; Victoria Higgins

Meeting purpose and organized program

Roanoke brought a distinct Southwest Virginia perspective. The program addressed affordability and reliability, Appalachian Power and shared-grid concerns, data-center development, water and drought, transmission and generation, utility regulation, local zoning, economic development, transparency, and the proposed acquisition. The discussion made clear that residents may experience regional grid and infrastructure effects even when they are not Dominion customers.

Public participation

Commenters raised water consumption during low-water conditions, aging-grid capacity, billing disputes, out-of-state ownership, monopoly power, SCC oversight, political contributions, alleged conflicts of interest, data-center transparency and nondisclosure agreements, climate and emissions, utility-assistance demand, renewable-energy requirements, a proposed data-center moratorium, public ownership, severe-weather and insurance risk, local development decisions, and the need for better public notice. Multiple speakers urged a pause on new data centers while statewide rules are considered. The record also emphasized the burden on low-income households and the need for Southwest Virginia to be represented in statewide energy decisions.

Principal outcomes

The meeting emphasized affordability, water and grid capacity, regional impacts outside Dominion's direct service territory, data-center siting, transparency, political influence, regulatory adequacy, and proposals for a data-center moratorium.

Closing / continuing action

Closing remarks encouraged SCC comments and in-person participation opportunities, contact with delegates and senators, and continued engagement through community and advocacy organizations. The meeting concluded following the Lieutenant Governor's closing thanks.

Consolidated Principal Outcomes of the Five-Stop Tour

Affordability and household energy burden

Every stop returned to the price paid by ordinary customers. Speakers described higher bills, billing disputes, utility-assistance needs, shutoff concerns, and the fear that new generation and transmission costs could be shifted to households. Several comments were especially pointed because speakers reported higher bills even when their own consumption had fallen.

The proposed Dominion Energy-NextEra Energy transaction

The acquisition was the central organizing issue. Most public comments across the tour were opposed or called for substantially greater scrutiny, transparency, enforceable customer protections, and a longer or more robust review. A smaller number of speakers supported the transaction based on reliability, investment capacity, renewable-energy experience, economic growth, or the scale needed to meet future demand.

Data-center growth and cost responsibility

Data centers were a recurring issue at all five stops, but the emphasis varied by region. Loudoun described the direct experience of concentrated development; Charlottesville and Richmond tied data-center demand to long-term generation and transmission planning; Norfolk connected demand growth to affordability and infrastructure; Roanoke focused on whether Southwest Virginia would inherit water, grid, land-use, or cost impacts. The repeated policy question was who should pay for infrastructure built to serve very large loads.

SCC oversight, transparency, and public confidence

Participants repeatedly discussed the State Corporation Commission's review process, hearing access, statutory authority, public-comment opportunities, commissioner recusal concerns raised by speakers, and the adequacy of Virginia's existing merger-review framework. Calls for more field hearings, clearer records, stronger disclosure, and broader public participation appeared throughout the tour.

Clean energy, reliability, and generation choices

Speakers debated the relationship among the Virginia Clean Economy Act, renewable energy, offshore wind, solar, storage, virtual power plants, natural-gas generation, backup generators, grid reliability, and rapidly increasing demand. The record reflects concern that reliability and affordability not be used as reasons to abandon clean-energy commitments, while other participants emphasized the need for sufficient firm capacity and investment.

Corporate power, political influence, and monopoly regulation

Public comments repeatedly addressed campaign contributions, lobbying, utility political spending, corporate concentration, shareholder incentives, monopoly conditions, and the difficulty customers face when they cannot choose another electric provider. These concerns were often linked to requests for stronger legislative safeguards and more independent regulatory review.

Land, water, health, and environmental impacts

The tour captured local concerns about transmission corridors, easements, rural and scenic land, air pollution, backup generation, water consumption, drought, flooding, climate risk, biodiversity, and public

health. The geography changed, but the common demand was for energy planning to account for cumulative community impacts rather than evaluate projects in isolation.

Jobs, labor, and economic development

The record was not solely oppositional. Speakers and panelists discussed jobs, union protections, worker standards, economic competitiveness, renewable-energy employment, infrastructure investment, and local tax or development benefits. The recurring question was whether economic benefits would be enforceable and broadly shared if ownership changed.

Public participation and continuing action

Each stop ended with an emphasis on continued civic participation. The record repeatedly points residents toward SCC comments and hearings, direct contact with delegates and senators, local-government engagement, and participation in organizations working on energy, consumer, labor, environmental, or community issues.

Record Note

These consolidated minutes should be read together with the individual certified public-comment transcripts and location-specific meeting materials. Where the underlying packets characterize a statement as a concern, allegation, opinion, or proposal from a participant, these minutes preserve that status and do not independently validate the claim.

LOUDOUN COUNTY
VIRGINIA

ENERGY COSTS LISTENING TOUR

LOUDOUN, VIRGINIA

MEETING MINUTES – FULL MEETING

September 2, 2026 | Dreamscapes Performing Arts Center | Sterling, Virginia

DATE	TIME	LOCATION
September 2, 2026	6:00 p.m.-7:36 p.m.	Dreamscapes Performing Arts Center 21014 Whitfield Place Sterling, Virginia 20165

MEETING PURPOSE

Community listening session concerning rising energy costs, the proposed acquisition of Dominion Energy by NextEra Energy, data-center growth, utility regulation, energy infrastructure, environmental impacts, and related legislative and regulatory concerns.

HOST, FEATURED SPEAKERS, AND PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi: Host; delivered opening and closing remarks and responded to public questions.

Senator Danica Roem: Featured speaker; discussed energy affordability, data-center growth, clean-energy requirements, SCC oversight, and legislative options.

Senator Russet Perry: Featured speaker; discussed SCC recusal concerns, utility and data-center cost allocation, transparency, and prior legislative efforts.

Delegate John McAuliff: Featured speaker; discussed clean generation, battery storage, backup-generator emissions, and infrastructure-cost responsibility.

Delegate Atoosa Reaser: Delivered the opening welcome and introduced Lieutenant Governor Hashmi.

Elena Schlossberg: Facilitator and moderator; explained the public-participation format and managed the question-and-comment period.

Shelby Green: Energy-policy subject-matter participant; discussed utility fuel costs, profits, nondisclosure practices, and ratepayer protections.

Thomas Donahue: Program participant; addressed transmission infrastructure, property impacts, and Virginia's energy future during the organized program.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATORS, ELECTED OFFICIALS, AND ANNOUNCED OR NAMED PARTICIPANTS

Delegate Fernando J. "Marty" Martinez: Acknowledged as present and later spoke during the public-comment period in opposition to the merger and in favor of expanding and regionalizing SCC representation.

Senator Kannan Srinivasan: Acknowledged as present and later spoke on transparency, accountability, customer benefit, and data-center water-use reporting.

Delegate J J Singh: Acknowledged by Lieutenant Governor Hashmi as attending.

Mayor Christopher M. Hornbaker: Mayor of Lovettsville; acknowledged as attending.

April Chandler: Chair of the Loudoun County School Board; acknowledged as attending.

Edwin W. "Ike" Broaddus: Fauquier County supervisor and member of the Rappahannock-Rapidan Regional Commission; participated during public comment.

Zach Cummings: Leesburg Town Council member; acknowledged during the opening portion of the event.

Al Swin: Thanked during closing remarks for assisting with event organization.

Office of the Lieutenant Governor staff: Approximately four staff members were referenced collectively; individual names were not stated in the working record.

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

The Loudoun stop of Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi's Energy Costs Listening Tour convened at approximately 6:00 p.m. at Dreamscapes Performing Arts Center in Sterling. Delegate Atoosa Reaser delivered the opening welcome and introduced Lieutenant Governor Hashmi. Local and state officials, community representatives, staff, and event-support personnel were acknowledged during the opening program.

2. ORGANIZED PROGRAM AND ISSUE OVERVIEW

Lieutenant Governor Hashmi and the featured speakers framed the event around household energy affordability, the proposed Dominion Energy-NextEra transaction, growth in data-center electricity demand, transmission and generation requirements, environmental and public-health concerns, SCC oversight, and the need for public engagement. Program participants discussed how utility decisions and large-load development can affect residential customers, communities, land, air quality, water, infrastructure planning, and Virginia's clean-energy goals.

The organized discussion also addressed possible legislative and regulatory responses, including stronger transparency, cost

allocation, data collection, generator standards, consumer protections, public participation, and continued General Assembly action. The program emphasized that the session was designed to hear directly from residents and stakeholders.

3. PUBLIC-PARTICIPATION INSTRUCTIONS

Elena Schlossberg explained the public-participation process and invited attendees to use the microphone for questions and comments. Participants were initially provided approximately one to two minutes. As time became limited, the allotment was reduced to approximately one minute with one question or comment requested from each remaining participant.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

The verbatim public-comment session began at 6:44 p.m. Twenty-one participants were identified in the working transcript. The following minutes summarize the principal issue raised by each participant and the substance of responsive discussion; they are not a substitute for the certified verbatim transcript.

1. Bronwyn Longchamp — Sterling/Data Center Alley

Reported substantially higher household electricity costs despite lower usage and attributed the increase to the concentration and energy demand of nearby data centers. Her comment framed affordability as an immediate household burden rather than an abstract policy concern.

2. Chitra Kumar — Arlington

Opposed the proposed transaction and questioned whether Virginia's clean-energy mandates would be protected if the acquisition proceeds. She raised concerns about renewable-energy targets, climate impacts, gas and nuclear generation, and NextEra's prior political and corporate conduct.

3. Donna Stowe — Leesburg

Opposed both additional data-center growth and the proposed acquisition. She asked how the transaction developed, when public officials learned of it, and what position the Governor had taken. The response described officials' late-spring awareness and the Governor's intervention in the SCC proceeding.

4. Dan — Ashburn

Asked that affordability and environmental protection be treated as compatible goals. He emphasized greenhouse-gas emissions, particulate pollution, and the need to avoid framing economic and environmental interests as mutually exclusive.

5. Derick Miller — Sterling area

Opposed additional data centers and supported a moratorium. Drawing on his AI, engineering, and business background, he argued that

projected AI growth does not justify unlimited new data-center construction and that mergers generally benefit shareholders rather than customers.

6. Larry Zaragoza — Alexandria

Warned that constrained grid capacity could lead to greater reliance on diesel and natural-gas generation. He emphasized documented health, air-quality, environmental, and water impacts and argued that data-center cooling does not inherently require extensive water use.

7. Betsy Scott-Alobino — Little River District

Connected Loudoun's reliance on data-center revenue to the aftermath of the housing-market collapse and compared the proposed consolidation to "too big to fail" financial institutions. She urged decision-makers not to approve a transaction that would create an even larger utility.

8. Gina — Ashburn

Described community pressure surrounding a proposed data center near a school, church, day-care facilities, and homes. She questioned whether SCC Chair Kelsey Baggett should recuse herself because of prior employment with NextEra and asked what legislative action could address the perceived conflict.

9. Shane Crow — Sterling/Algonkian District

Asked whether the General Assembly could expand the SCC from three to five members and whether that issue could be considered in a special session. The discussion focused on appointment dynamics, neutrality, recusal concerns, and the ability of constituents to advocate for a special session.

10. Marshall Brown — Ashburn/Laborers' International Union of North America

Presented labor's perspective, noting Dominion's history of using union labor and the scale of anticipated infrastructure investment. He stated that labor was intervening in the proceeding to seek worker protections and continuity of established labor relationships if the transaction advances.

11. Kamal — Ashburn

Asked whether the Commonwealth had studied the effect of data-center approvals on residential utility bills and what could be done to reduce bills and consider a moratorium. Responses addressed statewide planning, generator standards, transmission-cost allocation, separate data-center rates, prior legislation, public advocacy, existing studies, utility fuel-risk allocation, and utility profits.

12. Ziv Hammett — Fairfax County/Manassas Park

Opposed transferring additional control over Virginia's energy system to an out-of-state company. He raised concerns about monopoly power, corporate political contributions, Virginia campaign-finance rules,

and the influence of utilities and large corporations on the legislative process.

13. Keith — Loudoun area

Opposed the merger and raised a separate public-safety issue involving AI-generated nonconsensual intimate imagery and exploitative content. He asked Virginia to require data centers to follow proactive media-sanitization standards and to place greater responsibility on infrastructure providers.

14. Edwin “Ike” Broaddus — Fauquier County

Described the cross-jurisdictional effects of data-center decisions and the tension between local authority and statewide consequences. He characterized current development competition as a “tragedy of the commons” and asked how local officials and citizens could support a statewide moratorium.

15. Mark — Arlington/Piedmont Environmental Council

Questioned private contracts, nondisclosure practices, and unreviewed projections of large future data-center demand. He urged cumulative review of generation, transmission, land, environmental, and community impacts and asked about legislation addressing demand verification and transparency.

16. Name not stated

Promoted a ratepayer-advocacy pledge asking legislators to oppose the merger, protect constituents from bill increases associated with excessive utility profits, and protect communities from data-center impacts.

17. Jessica Buell — Prince William County

Expressed frustration with local resistance to a data-center moratorium and asked whether residential solar could meaningfully reduce bills when delivery charges remain high. The response referenced recently passed legislation expanding plug-in solar and other solar initiatives.

18. Wakeen Diviana — Aldie

Challenged support for Virginia’s participation in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative on affordability grounds. The response characterized RGGI revenue as supporting flood resilience and energy-efficiency programs and described the program as part of Virginia’s emissions-reduction strategy.

19. Deborah Johnson — Prince William County

Spoke in favor of the proposed transaction, citing increasing power demand, economic competitiveness, innovation, and the possibility that a larger combined utility could provide resources needed for growth. Her statement provided a clear counterpoint to the majority opposition expressed during the session.

20. Delegate Marty Martinez — Loudoun County

Called for expanding the SCC and considering regional representation so commissioners better understand local conditions. He expressly opposed the merger, arguing that it would increase costs and prioritize corporate revenue rather than community benefit.

21. Senator Kannan Srinivasan — Senate District 32

Called for full transparency and accountability and argued that the transaction must create identifiable benefits for customers, not only corporations. He also highlighted legislation requiring publication of actual data-center water use by river basin beginning January 1, 2027, and urged continued public engagement.

5. PRINCIPAL DISCUSSION OUTCOMES

- 1. Energy Affordability and Household Bills:** Participants repeatedly described rising electric bills, including higher costs despite reduced consumption. They asked what portion of future generation, transmission, fuel, and profit-related costs will be borne by residential customers and what legislative or regulatory measures could reduce or stabilize bills.
- 2. Proposed Dominion Energy-NextEra Transaction:** Most commenters opposed the acquisition or demanded heightened scrutiny. Concerns included rate impacts, out-of-state control, corporate consolidation, customer benefit, political influence, SCC review, and whether the transaction primarily benefits shareholders. One participant supported the transaction based on demand growth, innovation, and economic development.
- 3. Data-Center Growth and Cost Responsibility:** Data centers were consistently linked to rising demand, new infrastructure, backup generation, and local land-use conflicts. Several participants supported a moratorium or stronger statewide controls; others emphasized responsible development, employment, and the need to distinguish useful growth from unchecked expansion.
- 4. SCC Oversight, Recusal, and Public Confidence:** Speakers questioned SCC composition, potential conflicts of interest, recusal, opportunities for public participation, and the possibility of expanding the Commission. Public confidence and transparency were recurring concerns.
- 5. Transmission, Land, and Regional Impacts:** Commenters discussed transmission corridors, property effects, environmental impacts, schools and neighborhoods, and the ability of one locality's approvals to impose burdens on another. Calls for statewide coordination were prominent.
- 6. Clean Energy, Air Quality, Water, and Health:** Comments addressed Virginia's clean-energy requirements, renewable generation, diesel and natural-gas backup generators, particulate pollution, battery storage, water use, climate impacts, and the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative.

- 7. Transparency in Demand Forecasting and Contracting:** Participants raised concerns about nondisclosure agreements, private data-center contracts, demand projections, and the lack of cumulative public review before large infrastructure commitments are made.
- 8. Jobs and Worker Protections:** Labor testimony emphasized Virginia jobs, union relationships, and enforceable worker protections. The discussion recognized both employment benefits and the need to preserve existing standards if ownership changes.
- 9. Additional Public-Interest Issues:** The record also included campaign-finance concerns, residential solar and delivery charges, local-government authority, AI-enabled exploitation and data-storage responsibility, and water-use reporting.

6. CLOSING REMARKS AND ADJOURNMENT

The public-comment session concluded at approximately 7:33 p.m. Closing remarks encouraged attendees to remain informed, continue contacting legislators and regulators, participate in public processes, and sustain engagement on the proposed transaction and broader energy-policy issues. Lieutenant Governor Hashmi thanked the featured speakers, officials, staff, organizers, and attendees. Al Swin and the Office of the Lieutenant Governor staff were among those recognized for event support. The tour stop concluded at approximately 7:36 p.m.

7. RECORDS AND DELIVERABLES

A separate certified verbatim transcript documents the designated public-comment session. These minutes summarize the full meeting structure and principal discussion and should be read together with the detailed public-comment summary and certified transcript.

PREPARATION NOTE

Prepared by Shaylah Kiser of Kiser's Legal Support Solutions from the full event audio and the final certified verbatim transcript of the designated public-comment session. These minutes are a good-faith administrative summary of the full meeting and do not replace, alter, or supersede the certified verbatim record.

NORFOLK
VIRGINIA

ENERGY COSTS LISTENING TOUR

NORFOLK, VIRGINIA

MEETING MINUTES - FULL MEETING

September 8, 2026 | The Slover | Norfolk, Virginia

DATE	TIME	LOCATION
September 8, 2026	6:00 p.m.-7:30 p.m.; public-comment session began at 6:38 p.m. and concluded at 7:30 p.m.	The Slover 235 East Plume Street Norfolk, Virginia 23510

MEETING PURPOSE

Community listening session concerning energy affordability and reliability, the proposed acquisition of Dominion Energy by NextEra Energy, data-center growth and electricity demand, utility regulation, jobs, infrastructure, environmental and health impacts, and related legislative and regulatory concerns.

HOST, FEATURED SPEAKERS, AND PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi: Host; framed the listening tour as part of Virginia's Voices, discussed the proposed Dominion Energy-NextEra transaction and the need for public input, responded to questions, and delivered closing action items.

Senator Angela Williams Graves: Delivered the opening welcome, welcomed attendees to Norfolk and the 21st Senate District, and introduced Lieutenant Governor Hashmi.

Delegate Jackie Glass: Featured speaker and panelist; focused on affordability, reliability, investment, consumer and worker protections, and responses to public concerns.

Delegate Nadarius Clark: Featured speaker and panelist; addressed affordability, disconnection protections, constituent assistance, campaign-finance questions, and related legislative concerns.

Delegate Phil Hernandez: Featured speaker and panelist; discussed energy affordability, efficiency, economies of scale, public ownership questions, and the need for measurable consumer benefits.

Shelby Green: Corporate-merger and energy-policy subject-matter participant; discussed NextEra, regulatory review, customer protections, municipalization, antitrust concerns, and intervention in the proceeding.

Kim Suddharth: Community voice; described Norfolk community conditions, climate and flooding concerns, household energy burdens, and concerns about the proposed transaction.

Gaylene Kanoyton: Moderator; managed the public-participation format, speaker timing, and transitions during the public-comment session.

ADDITIONAL ANNOUNCED OR ACKNOWLEDGED PARTICIPANTS

Delegate Benita Anthony: Acknowledged as present during the organized program.

Norfolk School Board Member Tanya Basin: Acknowledged as present during the organized program; name is rendered as stated in the working full-meeting record.

Interpreters: Interpreters were present on stage and attendees were invited to use interpretation support when needed.

Office/event staff: Staff supported recording, public participation, action-form distribution, and the closing photo process; individual staff names were not consistently stated in the working record.

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

Senator Angela Williams Graves opened the Norfolk stop, welcomed attendees to the city and the 21st Senate District, and introduced Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi. Hashmi described the event as part of the broader Virginia's Voices initiative and said the purpose was to elevate public concerns about energy affordability, reliability, data centers, transmission, eminent domain, and the proposed Dominion Energy-NextEra transaction.

2. ORGANIZED PROGRAM AND ISSUE OVERVIEW

Hashmi framed the transaction as a consequential utility decision affecting bills, jobs, communities and Virginia's long-term energy future. She described her request for additional review time and her submission of detailed questions to the companies, and emphasized the need for facts, data, transparency and public participation. Kim Suddharth then provided a community perspective centered on Norfolk, flooding, climate impacts, household costs and community protection. The featured delegates and Shelby Green discussed affordability, reliability, investment, regulatory review, jobs and consumer safeguards.

3. PUBLIC-PARTICIPATION FORMAT

Gaylene Kanoyton moderated the question-and-comment period. Attendees were asked to state their first name and locality. Because of the number of speakers, the speaking time was later reduced to approximately 60 seconds. The public-comment portion began at 6:38 p.m. and included 27 numbered commenters.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

1. Name Not Stated

Raised concerns that recent rate increases had displaced attention from healthier LED street-light choices and asked about NextEra's lighting offerings and the state's willingness to advocate for public-health-oriented lighting. Shelby Green responded that NextEra had not provided enough information to answer those questions.

2. Kerisha

Asked what Lieutenant Governor Hashmi could and would do to stop data-center growth and the proposed transaction. Hashmi described seeking a longer review, submitting comprehensive questions, conducting the listening tour, and preparing a report for the SCC.

3. Peggy - Norfolk

Asked for written protections ensuring Virginia customers would not bear costs associated with hurricane damage or system impacts in Florida after a merger.

4. David Tucker - Isle of Wight County

Called for greater bill transparency, stronger treatment of data-center rates, improved utility accountability, and more in-person SCC field hearings. Shelby Green agreed that in-person field hearings would improve direct public participation.

5. Amanda Dowdy - Newport News

Warned about monopoly power and expressed distrust of the SCC, including allegations concerning Commissioner Kelsey Baggett's prior NextEra employment. She asked elected officials to protect constituents.

6. Phyllis McCants - Norfolk

Described a sharp increase in her Dominion bill, a shutoff notice, and concern about an odor she associated with nearby power infrastructure. Her comments emphasized affordability and possible environmental or health effects.

7. Wanda Turner - Norfolk

Asked what hope she could take back to neighbors who believed the transaction was inevitable. Shelby Green emphasized that the SCC must decide the case and that public comments, intervenors, and the public-interest standard can matter.

8. Alan - Williamsburg

Supported the proposed transaction, citing Virginia's growth, rising electricity demand, clean-energy investment, offshore wind, and the potential value of combining two large utilities. Hashmi responded that she had not taken a final position and wanted data on reliability, affordability, and community protection.

9. Joel - Virginia Beach

Praised the Coastal Virginia Offshore Wind project and Dominion's role in it and supported combining Dominion and NextEra as a way to strengthen the capacity to meet future energy needs.

10. Thelma Drake

Expressed confidence in the SCC, questioned the need to extend its review period, and argued that economies of scale with regulatory guardrails could benefit customers and improve reliability. Phil Hernandez responded that claimed efficiencies should be demonstrated with math showing how savings reach customers.

11. Vicki - Norfolk

Asked whether Virginia's utility-merger law should be strengthened in a special General Assembly session before the SCC decides the transaction. Hashmi discussed the existing statutory standard, the importance of due diligence, and the SCC's ultimate decision-making role.

12. Mary Domingo - Norfolk

Asked how the transaction came about, why constituents have limited direct control over it, and why infrastructure needs remain despite utility revenues. Shelby Green explained the corporate-acquisition process and the SCC's approval role.

13. Alicia - Goochland

Focused on renewable-energy and Dominion jobs, asking for enforceable protections if the transaction proceeds. Hashmi said job, renewable-energy, labor-contract, and project-labor protections remained among the unanswered questions.

14. Charlie O'Brien - Virginia Beach

Asked whether Virginia had studied public ownership of utilities or transmission infrastructure as an alternative to the investor-owned model. Panel responses referenced recent affordability, efficiency, solar, virtual-power-plant, and disconnection-protection legislation.

15. Joshua Boyd - United Association Local 110

Presented a labor perspective, emphasizing jobs created by large projects while also calling for rate safeguards and for Virginia-related decisions and benefits to remain centered in Virginia.

16. Noah Alper - Norfolk

Opposed the transaction and urged representatives to protect constituents from data-center impacts and bill increases and to oppose the merger. He criticized the companies' lack of direct engagement with the public and officials.

17. Brandon - Norfolk

Asked whether officials would personally help residents facing disconnection or displacement because of unaffordable electricity. Panelists emphasized constituent advocacy, existing assistance, and personal experiences helping residents.

18. Myron - Virginia Beach

Spoke favorably about the proposal as a possible way to strengthen reliability and finance needed investment while retaining local regulation. Shelby Green stressed that NextEra, not Dominion, would control the combined company if approved.

19. Bill Johnson Miles - Virginia Beach

Raised concerns about utility and corporate political contributions and asked panelists about campaign money and influence. Responses discussed Virginia campaign-finance rules, individual lawmakers' practices, and concern about increased lobbying influence.

20. John Murdock - Virginia Beach

Focused on antitrust and governmental leverage over a monopoly utility, asking whether a larger multistate company would reduce Virginia's leverage. Shelby Green discussed state and federal approvals and concerns about concentration of market power.

21. Debbie - Norfolk

Described severe winter electric bills and the choice between electricity, food, and medicine. She urged elected officials to fight more forcefully for lower-income and older residents, including those unable to afford weatherization.

22. Dr. Tamika Quinn

Asked how the review would measure health consequences of energy unaffordability for vulnerable communities, not merely financial effects. Panel responses acknowledged stress, health burdens, and the need to include health outcomes in affordability analysis.

23. A.J. - Newport News

Opposed bringing NextEra's Florida operating model to Virginia and asked about clean-energy standards, battery storage, affordability, and renters. Hashmi said Virginia's established clean-energy standards must be addressed as the review proceeds.

24. Natalie - Norfolk

Expressed distrust of the SCC and described charitable organizations seeing electric bills of \$800 to \$1,000 that exceed available assistance. She emphasized that energy affordability remains a crisis regardless of the transaction's outcome.

25. Rob Brackman - Norfolk

Said the event had become too one-sided and pressed for evidence on affordability, reliability, economies of scale, worker protections, and claimed savings. He asked that asserted efficiencies be demonstrated rather than assumed.

26. Name Indiscernible - Hampton Roads Gen Z Commission

Asked what would be required for state or local governments to own electric utilities. Shelby Green described municipalization: a locality purchasing utility assets and operating a public municipal utility.

27. Dan - Norfolk

Asked whether data-center and AI-driven electricity demand was motivating the transaction and whether the Governor might reconsider opposition to a data-center moratorium. Hashmi said she could not speak for the Governor and noted that legislators may consider data-center legislation.

5. PRINCIPAL DISCUSSION OUTCOMES

1. Energy affordability and household hardship: Residents repeatedly described high or rising bills, shutoff risk, difficult tradeoffs among electricity, food and medicine, and limits of existing assistance.

2. Proposed Dominion Energy-NextEra transaction: The record included both opposition and support. Opponents emphasized corporate concentration, out-of-state control, consumer risk and unanswered questions; supporters emphasized scale, reliability, investment capacity and growth.

3. SCC review, transparency and public confidence: Participants debated the SCC's review period, legal standard, field hearings, public accountability, and confidence in the Commission.

4. Data centers and rising electricity demand: Commenters linked Northern Virginia data-center and AI growth to demand, infrastructure investment, rate pressure and questions about who should bear system costs.

5. Jobs, labor and local economic effects: Comments addressed Dominion jobs, renewable-energy employment, union agreements, project labor, large-project employment and whether Virginia jobs and decision-making would be protected.

6. Clean energy, reliability and infrastructure: Offshore wind, renewable-energy standards, battery storage, virtual power plants, grid investment, severe-weather reliability and public ownership alternatives were discussed.

7. Political influence, antitrust and corporate power: Participants raised campaign contributions, lobbying, monopoly leverage, antitrust concerns and the potential concentration of power in a larger multistate utility.

8. Health, environment and community impacts: Comments connected energy affordability with health stress and discussed emissions, odors, flooding, climate impacts, lighting, weatherization and vulnerable communities.

6. CLOSING REMARKS AND ACTION ITEMS

At the close of the session, Kanoyton thanked the Lieutenant Governor and panel. Hashmi emphasized that listening to constituents was itself part of the governmental response and identified three public action items: submit comments to the SCC docket, contact state elected representatives, and participate in organizations aligned with the issues residents want to advance. Event staff then directed attendees to action forms and closing photographs. The public-comment session concluded at 7:30 p.m.

RECORD NOTE

These minutes summarize the working full-meeting record together with the certified public-comment transcript. They are not a verbatim transcript. The certified public-comment transcript remains the authoritative record of the words spoken during the designated public-comment session.

RICHMOND
VIRGINIA

ENERGY COSTS LISTENING TOUR

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MEETING MINUTES — FULL MEETING

September 9, 2026 | Diversity Richmond | Richmond, Virginia

DATE	TIME	LOCATION
September 9, 2026	6:00 p.m.–7:30 p.m.	Diversity Richmond 1407 Sherwood Avenue Richmond, Virginia 23220

MEETING PURPOSE

Community listening session concerning rising energy costs, the proposed acquisition of Dominion Energy by NextEra Energy, utility regulation, data-center growth, energy infrastructure, environmental and public-health impacts, labor and employment concerns, and related legislative and regulatory issues.

HOST, FEATURED PANELISTS, AND PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi: Host; opened and closed the listening session, framed the proposed acquisition and related energy issues, responded to public questions, and issued the closing calls to action.

Delegate Leslie Mehta: Featured panelist; discussed consumer protection, fairness, public-interest review, affordability, and the need to prevent families and vulnerable residents from bearing disproportionate utility costs.

Delegate May Nivar: Featured panelist; discussed public-utility accountability, corporate citizenship, enforceable benefits for Virginians, energy-policy oversight, and legislative review of data-center incentives.

Delegate Charlie Schmidt: Featured panelist; discussed monopoly power, corporate influence, labor concerns, public resources, antitrust history, and possible legislative action.

Alexis Rogers: Moderator; explained the public-participation rules, managed the speaker line and response format, enforced time limits, and guided the public-comment period.

Delegate Betsy Carr: Delivered the opening welcome, thanked Diversity Richmond and Lieutenant Governor Hashmi, and introduced the host.

Shelby Green: Energy-policy attorney and subject-matter participant; discussed NextEra's corporate record, utility regulation, customer disconnections, political influence, ratepayer protections, and SCC oversight.

Sean Crippen: Community-voice participant and Virginia Community Voice board member; discussed household energy burdens, monopoly conditions,

affordability, and concern that shareholder interests could outweigh community interests.

ADDITIONAL ELECTED OFFICIALS, GUESTS, AND EVENT-SUPPORT PARTICIPANTS

Senator Schuyler VanValkenburg: Acknowledged by Lieutenant Governor Hashmi as an elected official attending to listen to constituents.

Senator Mike Jones: Acknowledged as an elected official in attendance; also identified during the public-comment discussion in connection with proposed legislation concerning utility political spending.

Delegate Kirk McPike: Acknowledged by Lieutenant Governor Hashmi as an elected official attending the event.

Henrico County Supervisor Jessica Schneider: Acknowledged by Lieutenant Governor Hashmi as an elected official attending and listening to constituents.

Councilwoman Jordan: Acknowledged during the public-comment portion as representing the City of Richmond.

June: Event-support participant who assisted with timekeeping and delivered the final logistical announcements and formal conclusion.

Aislinn: Event volunteer assigned to mark the end of the public-comment line.

American Sign Language interpreters: Provided accessibility support for attendees wishing to ask questions or offer comments.

Office of the Lieutenant Governor staff and event-support personnel: Supported organization, documentation, participant flow, and the continuation of the statewide listening tour.

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

The Richmond stop convened at approximately 6:00 p.m. at Diversity Richmond. Delegate Betsy Carr welcomed attendees, thanked the venue and Lieutenant Governor Hashmi, described the importance of the subject, and introduced the Lieutenant Governor.

2. HOST REMARKS AND TOUR CONTEXT

Lieutenant Governor Hashmi described the event as part of the Virginia's Voices initiative and said the tour was intended to create direct channels between residents, organizations, advocates, and public officials. She framed the discussion around affordability, reliability, data-center growth, transmission lines, eminent domain, and the proposed Dominion Energy-NextEra Energy acquisition. She also described her request for additional review time and detailed questions for the SCC process.

3. ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF OFFICIALS AND GUESTS

The host introduced or acknowledged the featured delegates, energy-policy attorney Shelby Green, community representative Sean Crippen, moderator Alexis Rogers, ASL interpreters, and additional elected officials. Senator Schuyler VanValkenburg, Senator Mike Jones, Delegate

Kirk McPike, Henrico County Supervisor Jessica Schneider, and Councilwoman Jordan were identified as attending or participating.

4. COMMUNITY-VOICE PRESENTATION

Sean Crippen discussed monopoly conditions, the inability of customers to choose an alternative electric provider, pressure from rising bills, and concern that a large publicly traded utility transaction would principally benefit shareholders rather than residents.

5. FEATURED PANELIST REMARKS

Delegate Leslie Mehta emphasized fairness, consumer advocacy, affordability, and the need to protect families, seniors, small businesses, and environmental-justice communities. Delegate May Nivar discussed the dual nature of electricity as a necessity and a business, corporate accountability, enforceable public benefits, and the obligation to place Virginia customers first. Delegate Charlie Schmidt addressed monopoly power, historical corporate influence, public-resource stewardship, labor concerns, and the need for legislative action to restrain corporate excess.

6. SUBJECT-MATTER PRESENTATION

Shelby Green described NextEra's corporate and regulatory history from a Florida perspective, including profits, disconnections, political influence, and alleged misconduct. She urged attendees to move from concern to active challenge and public participation.

7. PUBLIC-PARTICIPATION INSTRUCTIONS

Moderator Alexis Rogers instructed attendees to line up at the central microphone, state their first name and locality, limit comments to approximately 45 seconds, and remain respectful. June served as timekeeper, Aislinn marked the end of the line, and panel responses were generally limited to one respondent.

8. PUBLIC COMMENT AND PANEL RESPONSES

The public-comment session began at approximately 6:48 p.m. Thirty-two indexed speakers presented differing views. Most opposed the transaction; several supported it based on reliability, investment, jobs, and infrastructure. Major issues included rising bills, monopoly power, political influence, SCC oversight and recusal, statutory review standards, data-center demand and tax incentives, transmission costs, clean energy, rural siting, labor and union interests, medical dependence on electricity, vulnerable households, employee benefits, and possible legislative action.

9. SPECIFIC REGULATORY AND LEGISLATIVE QUESTIONS

Questions repeatedly addressed Commissioner Kelsey Baggett's participation, expansion of the SCC, a special legislative session, amendment of the Virginia Utilities Transfers Act, utility tariff policy, data-center tax incentives, public hearings, cost allocation, and the role of the Governor and General Assembly. Panelists discussed

legislative studies, possible 2027-session proposals, public-comment filing, and the importance of constituent pressure.

10. CLOSING DISCUSSION

Shelby Green closed the substantive discussion by emphasizing the SCC's role in regulating monopoly utilities and the government's authority to impose stronger controls or alter monopoly arrangements when public trust is violated. Lieutenant Governor Hashmi thanked the panel, additional elected officials, and attendees and noted that the tour would continue to Charlottesville and Roanoke.

11. CALLS TO ACTION

Lieutenant Governor Hashmi urged attendees to file comments in the SCC docket, contact their delegates and state senators, and join or support organizations engaged in the issue. She emphasized that community participation and regional perspectives would inform the broader record and future action.

12. ADJOURNMENT AND LOGISTICS

June asked panelists and elected officials to remain for group photographs, advised attendees about the photo line, shared a traffic-safety notice, and announced the conclusion of the program. Attendees were directed to take an action card when leaving. The event concluded at approximately 7:30 p.m.

13. RECORD NOTE

These minutes summarize the full meeting using the full-event working transcript and the final certified verbatim public-comment transcript. They are not a verbatim record. The certified transcript remains the authoritative record of the designated public-comment session.

CHARLOTTESVILLE
VIRGINIA

ENERGY COSTS LISTENING TOUR

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA

MEETING MINUTES - FULL MEETING

September 14, 2026 | Jefferson School, African American Heritage Center | Charlottesville, Virginia

DATE	TIME	LOCATION
September 14, 2026	6:00 p.m.–7:34 p.m.	Jefferson School, African American Heritage Center 233 4th St NW Charlottesville, Virginia 22903

MEETING PURPOSE

To provide a public forum on the proposed NextEra Energy acquisition of Dominion Energy and related questions of electricity affordability, reliability, utility regulation, clean-energy policy, data-center growth, infrastructure, and the long-term public interest in Virginia.

HOST, FEATURED SPEAKERS, AND PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi: Host; framed the tour as a public-listening process focused on energy affordability, reliability, the proposed Dominion–NextEra acquisition, data-center growth, and public participation in the SCC review.

Senator Creigh Deeds: Featured legislator; discussed the SCC review standard, regulatory authority, data-center policy, rates, employment, and Virginia's energy future.

Delegate Amy Laufer: Featured legislator; addressed ratepayer impacts, public-hearing access, data-center demand, clean-energy concerns, and the need for additional due diligence.

Delegate Katrina Callsen: Featured legislator; stated her opposition to the acquisition and discussed consumer protections, clean-energy requirements, utility profits, and regulatory accountability.

Kajsa Foskey: Director, Virginia Energy Consumer Alliance; provided a consumer-advocacy perspective and participated in the public-comment discussion.

Shelby Green: Energy-policy researcher; responded to questions concerning utility regulation, fuel-cost risk, and consumer protections.

Ihsan: Youth/community voice from Albemarle High School; discussed political transparency, prior NextEra merger efforts, rate impacts, and clean-energy concerns.

Natalie Oschrin: Charlottesville Vice Mayor; welcomed attendees and introduced the local context for the discussion.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATORS, ELECTED OFFICIALS, AND ANNOUNCED OR NAMED PARTICIPANTS

Manny Fleming: Announced as Vice Mayor of Harrisonburg and recognized in attendance.

Laura Finn: Announced as a Harrisonburg council member and recognized in attendance.

Ann Mallek: Albemarle County Board of Supervisors, White Hall District; recognized in attendance.

Governor Abigail Spanberger: Referenced during the meeting in connection with the SCC review and intervention.

Virginia Attorney General: Referenced as the Commonwealth's consumer advocate in the SCC process.

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

Charlottesville Vice Mayor Natalie Oschrin welcomed attendees to the Jefferson School and described local clean-energy and sustainability efforts. Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi then welcomed the audience, identified Charlottesville as

the fourth stop of the statewide tour, thanked the panel and attendees, and explained that the event was intended to listen to residents and carry their concerns into policy and regulatory discussions.

2. ORGANIZED PROGRAM AND ISSUE OVERVIEW

The organized program included opening remarks from Hashmi and presentations by community and policy participants. Ihsan, a youth/community voice, discussed political transparency, prior NextEra merger efforts, rates, and clean-energy concerns. Delegate Katrina Callsen addressed newly announced deal commitments, consumer protections, clean-energy requirements, and her opposition to the acquisition. Kajsa Foskey discussed consumer affordability, utility profits, shutoffs, and political influence. Delegate Amy Laufer discussed ratepayer impacts, reliability, public process, and due diligence. Senator Creigh Deeds discussed the SCC's statutory standard, the review timeline, rates, employment, data centers, and Virginia's energy future.

3. PUBLIC-PARTICIPATION INSTRUCTIONS

Before public comment, attendees were instructed to line up at the microphone, state their first name and locality, and limit comments or questions to approximately 60 seconds. A timekeeper displayed remaining time. Directed questions were to be answered by the named panelist, while general questions could be answered by a panel member. Participants were asked to remain respectful and listen to differing perspectives.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

The designated public-comment session began at 6:38 p.m. and concluded at 7:29 p.m. Twenty-six public commenters were heard. The summaries below are administrative summaries; the certified verbatim transcript remains the authoritative record.

1. Howard Armstead / Farmville

Urged the SCC to reject the acquisition, citing prior failed NextEra merger efforts and raising a conflict-of-interest concern regarding an SCC commissioner's prior employment. He called for recusal and possible legal action if the transaction were approved under the circumstances he described.

2. Cindy / Warrenton, Fauquier County

Described negative experiences with data centers and Dominion in Fauquier County and cited concerns about NextEra's conduct in New England. She asked that Virginia not compound existing data-center and utility concerns by approving the acquisition. Hashmi thanked her for traveling to attend.

3. Frances Rousset / Charlottesville

Focused on the Virginia Clean Economy Act, renewable-energy goals, proposed gas plants, and affordability. She asked officials to oppose the acquisition, continue seeking more review time, analyze alternatives and impacts, and consider legislation protecting residents from disconnection.

4. Sage / Albemarle County

Raised concerns about NextEra's record on renewable-energy policy and political activity and linked the acquisition to climate, extreme-weather, rooftop-solar, and transmission issues. The commenter urged that NextEra be kept out of Virginia.

5. Martha Dunley / Charlottesville

Shifted the discussion to land, biodiversity, water, air, heat, and environmental impacts. She argued that environmental review should be central to decisions about energy infrastructure and the proposed acquisition.

6. Millie Fife / Fluvanna County

Questioned Delegate Callsen about NextEra's clean-energy record, gas investment, and Mountain Valley Pipeline stake and asked whether Callsen opposed the acquisition. Callsen answered that she did.

7. Andrew / Charlottesville

Raised concerns about NextEra's record on worker protections and asked Senator Deeds to oppose the acquisition. Deeds said he remained highly skeptical, had unanswered questions, and emphasized that the SCC—not the General Assembly—makes the approval decision.

8. Tom Dale / Albemarle County

Raised concerns about profit levels, the six-month SCC review period, legislative involvement, and long-term ratepayer exposure. He suggested permanent profit constraints and greater legislative involvement. Callsen responded about concerns over the completeness and timing of the filing.

9. Stephanie / Fluvanna County

Connected the acquisition, proposed gas plants, and data-center growth to climate change and the 1.5-degree Celsius threshold. She asked what current decisions communicate to future generations about priorities and a livable planet.

10. Emmett Toms / Augusta County

A retired Dominion employee, he offered a comparatively supportive perspective, noting continued regulatory oversight, supply-chain constraints, infrastructure needs, and possible scale efficiencies. Callsen responded by distinguishing regulatory oversight from the risk of regulatory capture and questioned whether Virginia consumers could be insulated from affiliate risk.

11. Emily / Charlottesville

Described patients at the Charlottesville Free Clinic struggling to afford basic expenses and asked Senator Deeds what people should prioritize when energy bills compete with other necessities. Deeds discussed the SCC's rate standard, his concerns about the deal, and his efforts to ensure the SCC has adequate information.

12. Lucas Striegel / Charlottesville

Raised monopoly concerns and pressed Senator Deeds for a public position. Deeds reiterated the SCC's authority. Hashmi urged public participation in the SCC comment and hearing process, and Laufer encouraged residents to direct concerns to the Attorney General as consumer advocate.

13. Jan / Albemarle County

Focused on Dominion's fuel-cost recovery and securitization and asked how Dominion could be held more accountable if the acquisition did not proceed and how the governing 1940s statute could be changed. Deeds, Green, and Laufer discussed fuel-cost risk sharing, regulatory reform, and separating data-center demand in regional planning.

14. Elizabeth Stark / Charlottesville

Argued that essential electricity service should not be controlled by a for-profit monopoly and linked the acquisition to utility shutoffs, housing hardship, clean-energy transition, and data-center growth. Foskey acknowledged the difficulty faced by households seeking utility assistance.

15. Maria / Charlottesville

Called for stopping the acquisition rather than negotiating concessions and pressed Deeds and Laufer on their positions. Deeds said he was continuing to study rates, employment, and energy-future implications; Laufer said she wanted additional due diligence before reaching a final position.

16. Jillian / Charlottesville

Asked what would be done to ensure Charlottesville residents are heard if the SCC's in-person hearings are not held locally. Laufer said she would continue advocating for accessible hearings; Hashmi emphasized that telephonic testimony and the tour record would also be transmitted and considered.

17. Overton McGee / Fluvanna County

Thanked officials for supporting rooftop solar for low-income homeowners and virtual power-plant pilots, describing solar as part of the response to rising electricity prices. Hashmi noted her prior work on virtual power plants.

18. Donna Shaughnessy / Charlottesville

Raised concerns about utility disconnections in Florida, heat-related risks, and NextEra/FPL profit levels. Callsen responded that Virginia has extreme-weather shutoff protections but said gaps remain for households already disconnected.

19. Sive / Charlottesville

Linked the acquisition to challenges meeting the Clean Economy Act, new gas plants, data-center demand, nondisclosure agreements, and compressed public-review timelines. Hashmi responded that proposed gas generation and pressure on clean-energy goals are interconnected and should be evaluated together.

20. Ethan Bush / Charlottesville

Asked how Dominion's integrated resource planning and the SCC's prior concerns about long-term planning should factor into review of the acquisition. Hashmi said the merger should be evaluated in the broader context of Virginia's energy history, data-center-driven demand, and long-term clean-energy planning.

21. Wendy / Charlottesville

Urged officials to center working Virginians who do not stand to benefit as shareholders and questioned large political contributions by Dominion. She also thanked Ihsan for becoming engaged in the issue at a young age.

22. Anne / White Hall District, Albemarle County

Raised concerns about the transfer of Dominion-held easements and generation assets to NextEra and said she intended to use her voice to oppose the acquisition.

23. Ernie / Albemarle County

Asked what recourse would exist after an SCC approval and whether legislators supported the acquisition. Deeds said an SCC decision could be appealed to the Supreme Court of Virginia and discussed the older statutory standard; Hashmi highlighted intervention opportunities, and the discussion noted review in other affected states.

24. Paula / Albemarle County

Asked what Virginia can do to slow data-center proliferation and protect water, property, scenic resources, and communities from associated infrastructure. Deeds discussed the state sales-tax exemption for data centers, unsuccessful legislative efforts to change it, and local land-use decisions.

25. Honey Ann / Albemarle County

Asked panelists to explain their collective strategy for giving the strongest possible effort to prevent the acquisition. Hashmi emphasized coordinated public engagement and amplification of community concerns; Callsen discussed potential litigation and policy work with organizations experienced in energy and environmental law.

26. Jamie Powers / Albemarle County

Offered two closing comments: concern about political contributions and accountability, and a message that constituents themselves are the information elected representatives should weigh. Hashmi thanked attendees and later echoed the importance of residents as primary sources for the tour's report.

5. PRINCIPAL DISCUSSION OUTCOMES

1. Affordability and Utility Shutoffs

Speakers repeatedly focused on rising household electricity costs, disconnections, extreme-weather risks, and whether any acquisition benefits would produce durable consumer savings.

2. SCC Review, Transparency, and Public Participation

Comments emphasized the short review timeline, public hearings, intervention rights, the SCC's statutory authority, perceived conflicts, and the need for a transparent record.

3. Clean Energy and Climate Commitments

Participants discussed the Virginia Clean Economy Act, renewable energy, gas generation, emissions, rooftop solar, virtual power plants, and whether the acquisition would advance or impede decarbonization goals.

4. Data Centers and Infrastructure Demand

Data-center growth was repeatedly connected to rising demand, new generation, transmission infrastructure, tax policy, land use, and Virginia's attractiveness to NextEra.

5. Corporate Power, Profits, and Regulation

Many commenters raised concerns about monopoly power, profit levels, political influence, regulatory capture, and whether existing oversight can protect Virginia ratepayers.

6. Land, Easements, and Environmental Impacts

Residents raised concerns about easements, property impacts, scenic resources, biodiversity, water, air, and the footprint of new generation and transmission projects.

7. Jobs, Reliability, and Long-Term Risk

The discussion included workforce commitments, grid reliability, supply-chain capacity, affiliate risk, and the long-term consequences of transferring control of Dominion.

8. Legislative and Legal Options

Speakers discussed statutory reform, possible appeals, litigation, special-session or legislative involvement, fuel-cost policy, and future changes to Virginia's utility laws.

9. Public Accountability and Collective Action

The meeting repeatedly returned to constituent engagement, direct comments to regulators and elected officials, organizing, and continued participation after the listening tour.

6. CLOSING REMARKS AND ADJOURNMENT

Hashmi thanked the public, panelists, and facilitator and emphasized that the comments would be compiled and shared. She identified three continuing calls to action: participate in the SCC comment/hearing process, contact elected representatives and local officials, and connect with organizations working on issues important to participants. The meeting then moved to handouts, a group photograph, vendor tables, and an opportunity for photographs with the Lieutenant Governor. The full meeting concluded at approximately 7:34 p.m.

7. RECORDS AND DELIVERABLES

A separate certified verbatim transcript documents the designated public-comment session. These minutes summarize the full meeting structure and principal discussion and should be read together with the detailed public-comment summary and certified transcript.

PREPARATION NOTE

Prepared by Shaylah Kiser of Kiser's Legal Support Solutions from the full event audio and the final certified verbatim transcript of the designated public-comment session. These minutes are a good-faith administrative summary of the full meeting and do not replace, alter, or supersede the certified verbatim record.

ROANOKE
VIRGINIA

ENERGY COSTS LISTENING TOUR

ROANOKE, VIRGINIA

MEETING MINUTES - FULL MEETING

SEPTEMBER 24, 2026 | HARRISON MUSEUM OF AFRICAN AMERICAN CULTURE AT MELROSE PLAZA |
ROANOKE, VIRGINIA

DATE	TIME	LOCATION
September 24, 2026	6:30 p.m.-8:00 p.m. (Event time)	Harrison Museum of African American Culture at Melrose Plaza 2502 Melrose Ave NW Roanoke, Virginia 24017

MEETING PURPOSE

The meeting was convened as the Roanoke stop of Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi's Energy Costs Listening Tour, part of the Virginia's Voices initiative. Its purpose was to hear directly from residents about energy affordability and reliability, data-center growth, grid and transmission impacts, utility regulation, and the proposed NextEra Energy acquisition of Dominion Energy; to provide issue context from officials and an energy-policy advocate; and to identify ways residents could participate in the SCC and legislative processes.

HOST, FEATURED SPEAKERS, AND PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS

Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi: Hosted the Roanoke stop, framed the event as part of Virginia's Voices, outlined questions surrounding energy affordability, data-center growth, grid reliability, transmission, and the proposed NextEra acquisition of Dominion Energy, and delivered the closing call to action.

Mayor Joe Cobb: Welcomed participants to Roanoke, described the city's economic and technological development, discussed local data-center zoning guardrails and renewable-energy goals, and later responded to a public question concerning the Woodhaven property and data-center development.

Delegate Sam Rasoul: Discussed utility regulation, corporate influence, energy costs, and legislative options; responded to public questions concerning a possible data-center moratorium, utility political contributions, and General Assembly action.

Delegate Lily Franklin: Discussed household energy affordability, utility monopolies, the proposed acquisition, and legislative options; responded to a public question concerning renewable-energy requirements and a possible data-center moratorium.

Victoria Hoggins, Virginia Director, Chesapeake Climate Action Network: Provided an issue overview addressing the regional PJM grid, data-center load growth, transmission-cost allocation, competition, corporate structure, political influence, and risks she associated with the proposed acquisition.

Dr. Brandy Faulkner: Facilitated the public-participation portion, explained the community agreements and time limits, directed questions to panelists, and closed the comment-and-question period.

Anita James Price, former Vice Mayor of Roanoke City and Harrison Museum board member: Opened the program, welcomed attendees to the Harrison Museum of African American Culture, provided housekeeping information, and introduced Lieutenant Governor Hashmi.

Catherine Haddam, community representative: Presented community concerns regarding data centers, energy development, transparency, environmental impacts, and the proposed acquisition, and called for stronger oversight and a moratorium on data-center development.

ADDITIONAL LEGISLATORS, ELECTED OFFICIALS, AND ANNOUNCED OR NAMED PARTICIPANTS

Governor Abigail Spanberger: Referenced during the meeting in connection with intervention in the merger proceeding, executive action concerning nondisclosure agreements, and public-comment discussion.

Attorney General Jay Jones: Referenced by Lieutenant Governor Hashmi in connection with a filing seeking additional review time following supplemental merger materials.

Kelsey Baggett, SCC Chair: Referenced by public commenters in connection with concerns they raised about the SCC review process and alleged conflicts of interest.

Delegate Tran: Referenced by a public commenter in connection with prior proposed legislation seeking a data-center moratorium.

Delegate Dan Helmer: Referenced by a public commenter in connection with House Bill 496 and committee action.

Delegate Luke Torian: Referenced by a public commenter in connection with Senate Bill 334 and committee action.

Speaker Don Scott: Referenced by a public commenter in connection with state budget policy and data-center tax exemptions.

Michael Rolband, DEQ: Referenced by the community representative during opening remarks while discussing concerns about regulatory independence and industry influence.

1. OPENING AND WELCOME

Anita James Price welcomed attendees on behalf of the Harrison Museum of African American Culture and introduced Lieutenant Governor Ghazala Hashmi. Lieutenant Governor Hashmi described the listening tour as part of her Virginia's Voices initiative and framed the evening around energy reliability and affordability, data-center growth, transmission, eminent domain, and the proposed NextEra acquisition of Dominion Energy. She described her request for additional SCC review time and questions to the companies, emphasized public participation, and said the tour's comments would be carried forward to state decision-makers.

2. ORGANIZED PROGRAM AND ISSUE OVERVIEW

The organized program included remarks from community representative Catherine Haddam, Mayor Joe Cobb, Victoria Hoggins of the Chesapeake Climate Action Network, Delegate Lily Franklin, and Delegate Sam Rasoul. Haddam presented community concerns about data centers, transparency, environmental impacts, and the proposed acquisition. Cobb discussed Roanoke's economic transformation, technology infrastructure, zoning guardrails, and renewable-energy goals. Hoggins addressed the shared PJM grid, data-center load growth, transmission costs, competition, corporate structure, and political influence. Franklin and Rasoul discussed household energy costs, utility regulation, the proposed acquisition, and possible legislative responses.

3. PUBLIC-PARTICIPATION INSTRUCTIONS

Dr. Brandy Faulkner asked speakers to line up at the microphone, state their first name and locality, and keep comments or questions to approximately 90 seconds. Questions directed to a particular panelist were to be answered by that person; general questions could be answered by one panel member so more attendees could participate. Participants were asked to remain respectful and listen to differing perspectives. The certified public-comment transcript records 22 numbered commenters; the designated verbatim public-comment session began at 7:14 p.m. and concluded at 7:29 p.m.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT SESSION

The designated verbatim public-comment session began at 7:14 p.m. and concluded at 7:29 p.m. The certified transcript records 22 numbered public commenters. The summaries below are administrative, neutral summaries of the comments, questions, and responsive discussion; the certified transcript remains the authoritative verbatim record.

1. Howard Leiser / Roanoke County

Raised concerns about data centers' water consumption during low-water conditions, the condition and capacity of the electric grid, added demand, and the possibility that residential customers could bear infrastructure and power costs.

2. Alex Smith / Roanoke

Described prior billing disputes while living in Richmond and expressed concern that an out-of-state utility owner could make it more difficult for customers to obtain assistance or accountability when billing or service disputes arise.

3. Howard Armstead / Farmville

Opposed the proposed acquisition, cited prior attempted utility mergers, questioned the strength of Virginia's merger-review laws, and alleged a conflict of interest involving the SCC chair. He urged rejection of the transaction and discussed possible legal action if it were approved.

4. Reverend David Denham / locality not stated

Characterized the proposal as a large-money corporate takeover and connected his opposition to broader concerns about money in politics and corporate influence over public decision-making.

5. Ann / Roanoke City

Opposed the acquisition, arguing that regulated utilities should serve customers rather than prioritize profit. She expressed concern about NextEra's size, future projects, data-center development, and the company's involvement in the Mountain Valley Pipeline.

6. Dr. Jack Leff / Roanoke City

Focused on transparency and local data-center decision-making. He criticized the handling of public disagreement, raised concerns about electricity and water impacts, questioned nondisclosure practices, and asked how state and local officials could improve accountability and public access to information.

7. Mark Lazar / Roanoke City

Asked whether there is an example of a multistate monopoly utility that has been successfully regulated by individual states and requested a definition of successful regulation. Lieutenant Governor Hashmi responded that she could not provide an example.

8. Haley Huber / Roanoke City

Raised environmental and affordability concerns, including climate change, drought, emissions, grid condition, and the additional demand associated with data centers. She urged regulations to be established before problems occur rather than after impacts are felt.

9. Irene / Montgomery County

Argued that utilities should provide service at a fair price and reasonable return rather than increasingly favor shareholders. She called for a new social contract for utility regulation and expressed concern about the size and market power of the combined company.

10. Josh Vanna / Montgomery County

Discussed his experience opposing major pipeline projects and expressed distrust of regulators and elected officials influenced by utility money. He urged unusually strong governmental action in response to what he viewed as an unusually consequential merger and raised conflict-of-interest concerns.

11. Gwyneth / Montgomery County

Raised concerns about money and corporate influence on environmental regulation and public health protections. She asked what authority state legislators and regulators would retain if the acquisition occurred. Victoria Hoggins responded that the issue creates an opportunity to pursue regulatory and corporate-influence reforms at the state level, and Lieutenant Governor Hashmi added comments on areas for state action.

12. Misty Vickers / locality not stated

Spoke as a preschool teacher and single mother about protecting future generations, water and electricity as essential resources, local decision-making structures, nondisclosure agreements, and the need to consider whether energy and data-center policies are beneficial or harmful to children and future residents. She urged reconsideration of a data-center moratorium.

13. Safrina Alito / Montgomery County; originally from Abingdon

Asked that future listening sessions reach farther into Southwest Virginia, including District 9, because of distance, poverty, energy affordability, and nuclear-development issues. She also questioned gas expansion tied to data-center growth and asked how the administration would enforce existing clean-energy requirements and hold the energy industry accountable.

14. Mary Ann Capp / Montgomery County

Compared the current debate with earlier electric-utility restructuring, emphasized energy justice and affordability for low-income residents, and urged a pause and fuller review so earlier policy tools and public input could be reconsidered. She also questioned the scale of data-center-driven revenue incentives and merger risk.

15. Catherine / Roanoke City

Asked Delegates Franklin and Rasoul what they planned to do in the next General Assembly session to address data-center construction at the statewide level. Delegate Rasoul said legislative options were on the table, expressed support for a moratorium, and discussed utility regulation and political contributions.

16. Ben Brashor / Roanoke City

Referenced several bills and budget actions from the prior legislative session that he believed would have increased data-center transparency or oversight. He asked how rank-and-file legislators would press legislative leadership to act on merger, data-center, and energy policy. Delegate Rasoul responded that public organizing had increased pressure for policy changes and discussed using that pressure in the next session.

17. Bob Egbert / Roanoke

Asked what the General Assembly could do to require new data centers to obtain a significant portion of their electricity from renewable sources. Delegate Franklin said legislation could impose renewable-energy requirements and reiterated her support for a moratorium on additional data centers.

18. Maryam / Roanoke City

Asked whether Virginia residents could have a greater ownership role in the utility system and how lawmakers could reduce monopoly power. Delegate Rasoul identified utility political contributions and a data-center moratorium as immediate areas for action and cited projected growth in electricity demand associated with data centers.

19. Andrea / Roanoke County

Described the volume of residents seeking utility assistance through the state program where she works and said affordability problems had worsened since the pandemic. She opposed the acquisition and additional data centers in the Roanoke area and urged state leaders to support the requested moratorium.

20. Carola / Montgomery County

Raised concern that a Florida-based parent company could expose Virginia customers to financial risks associated with hurricanes, wildfire, climate impacts, grid repairs, and insurance-market pressures. She urged those risks to be considered in the merger review.

21. Julie Rivens / Roanoke City

Asked Mayor Cobb to explain the city's position on the Woodhaven property after Roanoke adopted stronger data-center zoning regulations. She connected the proposed development to water use, electricity demand, greenhouse-gas goals, bills, and grid impacts. Mayor Cobb described the multi-locality due-diligence process, Roanoke's limited land availability, the economic-development rationale, local standards and parameters, and stated that he and the city had not signed an NDA concerning the matter.

22. Virginia / Roanoke City

Asked how government could communicate more proactively with residents about elections, public hearings, legislative decisions, and projects such as data centers. Lieutenant Governor Hashmi described communication as a shared responsibility of elected officials and citizens, pointed to newsletters, town halls, district engagement, and direct contact with legislators, and encouraged continued civic participation.

5. PRINCIPAL DISCUSSION OUTCOMES**1. Energy affordability and customer protection**

Speakers repeatedly discussed rising household utility costs, billing disputes, utility-assistance needs, low-income energy burdens, and whether the proposed acquisition would improve or worsen customer protections.

2. Data-center growth and electricity demand

Many comments linked rapid data-center development to increased electricity demand, new generation and transmission needs, grid strain, and concern that residential customers could absorb costs created by large-load growth.

3. Water, environmental, and climate impacts

Participants raised water consumption, drought, emissions, fossil-fuel generation, renewable energy, climate risk, backup generation, and long-term environmental effects associated with data centers and utility infrastructure.

4. Utility regulation, monopoly power, and merger oversight

Comments questioned whether state regulators could effectively oversee a much larger multistate utility, whether existing standards are sufficient, and how monopoly utilities should be structured and regulated.

5. Transparency, NDAs, and public participation

Participants called for earlier notice, public hearings, access to information, limits on nondisclosure agreements, and clearer opportunities for residents to participate before major energy and data-center decisions are made.

6. Corporate and political influence

Several commenters raised concerns about campaign contributions, lobbying, corporate money, alleged conflicts of interest, and the relationship between regulated utilities and state decision-makers.

7. Moratorium and legislative action on data centers

Multiple participants urged a pause or moratorium on new data centers while lawmakers consider statewide rules concerning siting, transparency, renewable energy, water, grid impacts, and cost allocation.

8. Southwest Virginia representation and regional impacts

Speakers emphasized that Southwest Virginia residents may be affected even when they are not Dominion customers because of the shared regional grid, transmission costs, Appalachian Power rates, local development, and distinct regional affordability concerns.

9. Civic engagement and accountability

The meeting repeatedly returned to public engagement: submitting comments to the SCC, contacting legislators, participating in hearings and advocacy organizations, and maintaining communication between residents and elected officials.

6. CLOSING REMARKS AND ADJOURNMENT

After the final public question, Dr. Brandy Faulkner ended the comment-and-question portion and returned the program to Lieutenant Governor Hashmi. Hashmi thanked participants and reiterated that her role in the Virginia's Voices initiative was to elevate concerns heard from residents. She identified several action items: submit comments through the SCC's open process, participate in available in-person SCC public opportunities, contact delegates and senators about the merger, and remain engaged through community and advocacy organizations. The meeting then concluded following her closing thanks.

7. RECORDS AND DELIVERABLES

A separate certified verbatim transcript documents the designated public-comment session. These minutes summarize the full meeting structure and principal discussion and should be read together with the detailed public-comment summary and certified transcript.

PREPARATION NOTE

Prepared by Shaylah Kiser of Kiser's Legal Support Solutions from the full event audio and the final certified verbatim transcript of the designated public-comment session. These minutes are a good-faith administrative summary of the full meeting and do not replace, alter, or supersede the certified verbatim record.

APPENDIX A

Richmond Times-Dispatch

REGULATORY REVIEW

Virginia's NextEra merger review must put Virginia families first | Guest column

GHAZALA HASHMI Jun 26, 2026

Virginia families are hurting, and the rising costs of electricity are a part of the problem. Before Virginia moves forward to approve the largest energy monopoly in American history, which proposes to merge Dominion Energy with Florida-based NextEra, **regulators and lawmakers** must guarantee that our actions are in the best interests of Virginians. Right now, the speed and the low-threshold legal standard for the merger are both alarming.

Virginia's regulatory process should protect families already struggling to pay their electric bills. Six months is simply not enough time to evaluate a \$67 billion merger that would reshape Virginia's electric utility landscape, affect millions of families, and impact the thousands of Virginians employed by Dominion Energy. Additionally, Virginia's current legal standard for the merger's approval is insufficient.

Under **Virginia law**, the State Corporation Commission (SCC) has just 180 days, six months, to conduct its full review. That is not enough time for a transaction of this complexity. Other states have taken a full year to assess similar deals. Virginia should, too.

Additionally, this compressed timeline is made worse by an approval standard that has not been updated in 80 years. Under current law, Virginia does not require these companies to show that the merger is actually good for Virginians. It does not even require Dominion Energy and NextEra to show that the merger will not raise rates. The current approval standard is a low bar, and it is the wrong one.

Because the current standard asks only whether a transaction would jeopardize adequate service at just-and-reasonable rates and does not require the merging companies to demonstrate that the merger is actually in the best interests of Virginians, it is simply too passive. This standard essentially says that the merger can be approved if it does not actively harm customers. As a profit-driven entity, NextEra's goal is to maximize its wealth, and Virginia's regulatory standard focuses only on potential harm without addressing the issue of what is in the best interest of Virginia's families.

Scott Hempling, a nationally recognized public utilities attorney and expert, has written extensively about this gap. He argues that regulators should apply a standard that focuses on public benefit. Such a standard would require applicants to demonstrate that a proposed transaction will not cause rates to increase for Virginia ratepayers, will not reduce competition or enable anticompetitive behavior, will not create new risks to customers or to the commonwealth's electric system, and will serve Virginia's best interests. I agree. A focus on public benefit is the standard this regulatory review process should meet.



John Ketchum, the president and CEO of NextEra Energy, speaks during the CERAWeek energy conference 2026 in Texas on March 23. Virginia must slow down and strengthen its outdated review process before approving a \$67 billion Dominion–NextEra merger that could raise costs and reshape the state’s energy future, writes Virginia Lt. Gov. Ghazala Hashmi.

Danielle Villasana, Reuters

NextEra's track record gives us reason to pump the brakes. After NextEra's Florida subsidiary acquired Gulf Power in 2019, many customers saw their costs increase significantly. Recently, a federal court ordered NextEra to pay \$150 million for **unlawful political activity** in Florida, a reminder that scale and political influence go hand in hand.

A merger of this size would create a utility serving 10 million customers across multiple states, wielding enormous leverage over energy policy, regulatory proceedings and legislative debates. That kind of consolidation poses real risks to democratic governance and equitable rate-setting.

Addressing worker and service quality questions is also critical. Will a merged utility consolidate operations in ways that sideline Virginia workers? Will corporate management prioritize cost-cutting over the local knowledge that actually keeps the lights on? These are the kinds of questions that a rushed review with a weak legal standard will fail to answer.

As lieutenant governor, I am committed to the promises I made to Virginians: to fight for their best interests on every front, including rising energy costs. Virginia families deserve better than a process designed for speed rather than scrutiny. Extending the review to one year and updating the approval standard are not bureaucratic obstacles. They are the responsible path forward.



Lt. Gov. Ghazala Hashmi

Provided

Ghazala Hashmi, elected in 2025 as Virginia's 43rd lieutenant governor, previously served six years in the State Senate representing the Richmond region and made history as both the chamber's first Muslim member and the nation's first Muslim woman elected statewide. She can be reached at ltgov43@ltgov.virginia.gov.

APPENDIX B



COMMONWEALTH of VIRGINIA
Office of the Lieutenant Governor

Ghazala F. Hashmi, PhD
Lieutenant Governor

1

Virginia State Corporation Commission
Attn: Kelsey A. Bagot, Chair
Jehmal T. Hudson, Commissioner
Samuel T. Towell, Commissioner
P.O. Box 1197
Richmond, VA 23218-1197

July 6, 2026

Via Email

Dear Commissioners Bagot, Hudson, and Towell:

As Lieutenant Governor, my foremost duty is to advocate for the economic well-being and long-term interests of the citizens of the Commonwealth. The proposed acquisition involving Dominion Energy (Dominion) and NextEra Energy (NextEra) carries unprecedented implications for Virginia's consumers and regulatory landscape. As such, I write to request the Commission use its established authority to ensure a thorough review framework is in place as you begin your review of the companies' proposed merger.

To that end, I respectfully urge the Commission to issue, expeditiously, an order requesting that Dominion and NextEra Energy not submit their acquisition application until the companies have answered the essential questions needed to understand this transaction. Furthermore, I urge that the Commission attach the enclosed questions to that order, directing the companies to respond either within the Application document itself or in the accompanying prefiled direct testimony.

The attached questions are fundamental inquiries that any party, or the Commission staff, would naturally ask. Their depth and volume demonstrate that this highly complex transaction cannot be adequately reviewed under the current statutory six-month timeline.

If the Commission does not require these answers before the application triggers that rigid review window, valuable time will be wasted on discovery inquiry submissions, discovery disputes, objections, and incomplete responses. Additionally, many of these questions require original analysis from

Dominion and/or NextEra, which could not be uncovered through the discovery process. Forcing this process into the six-month timeline will render an already inadequate period completely unworkable.

While I recognize that the Commission has issued the “Chapter 5 Utility Transfers Transaction Summary – Applicable Provisions” (and its baseline list of 28 questions under § 56-88.1), a more structured, granular framework is required for a merger of this magnitude. Also, the existing baseline questions allow the applicants to frame the narrative in their own terms, potentially omitting the details, rigorous data support, and challenging topics necessary for a true public-interest review. Given the unprecedented size and complexity of this transaction, relying solely on these standard filing requirements risks oversimplifying the proposal and depriving the Commission, Virginia legislature, and parties of the complete information needed to fulfill their duties.

To assist the Commission, I have attached 64 questions in the following 11 categories:

Category 1: Transaction purposes and goals

Category 2: Transaction form and terms

Category 3: Transaction costs and transition costs

Category 4: Capital structure and finance costs

Category 5: Acquisition cost

Category 6: Risks of harms

Category 7: Assertions of benefits

Category 8: Corporate structure and governance

Category 9: Effect of the transaction on competition

Category 10: “Bill credits”

Category 11: Merger and acquisition history

I trust that neither Dominion nor NextEra will oppose this request. I assume that both companies share the goal of ensuring that the Commission and the public have full knowledge of all reasons for and possible effects of the transaction.

I also recommend that the Commission, in issuing these questions, require the following:

- Every answer should be authored by a named individual or individuals.
- Every answer should be accompanied by all internal documents that are relevant to the question.
- If an answer was crafted for the first time—meaning that the question asked had not been considered by companies until now—say so explicitly.

Commissioners Bagot, Hudson, and Towell

July 6, 2026

Page 3

Thank you for your time, dedication, and careful consideration of this matter as you weigh the interests at play in this case. I appreciate the Commission's ongoing leadership and diligence in reviewing this historic transaction. I look forward to your favorable response to this request.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ghazala Hashmi". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a prominent initial "G".

Ghazala F. Hashmi, PhD
Lieutenant Governor of Virginia

Appendix: Recommended Questions

Category 1: Transaction purposes and goals

1. Identify, in order of importance, all the reasons (a) why NextEra wants to acquire ownership and control of Dominion; and (b) why Dominion wants to sell control of its utility franchise and its corporate future to NextEra. Include all reasons discussed by the Dominion Board, the NextEra Board, advisors, rating agencies, shareholders, bondholders and others. Make clear which reasons were stated by whom to which audience.
2. To what extent is Dominion's decision to be acquired influenced by current interest rates? Explain in detail.
3. Is this transaction in any way a reaction to or influenced by other utility mergers or acquisitions? Which ones? What features of these other transactions influenced the decision to do this transaction?
4. Is the dominant purpose of this transaction to improve service or lower costs for the customers? If the answer is yes, what is the evidence to support the answer? Is any purpose to improve service or lower costs for the customers? (By "purpose," I mean in terms of the original intent of the two companies, not in terms of their post-negotiations strategy to win support and approval).
5. Five and ten years from now, by what criteria will each of Dominion and NextEra judge this transaction a success or failure? At those two points in time, by what criteria should the Commission judge this transaction a success or failure?
6. Of all possible acquirers, why did Dominion choose NextEra?
7. Of all possible acquisition targets, why did NextEra choose Dominion?
8. Does either Dominion or NextEra believe that the Commission's ratesetting policies and decisions have ever caused Dominion or Dominion Virginia to be unable to raise the debt and equity capital that it needs at reasonable cost? Explain.
9. Provide all evidence indicating or suggesting that without this transaction, the Commission's ratesetting policies and decisions will leave Dominion unable to raise the necessary debt and equity capital at reasonable cost.
10. (a) Does Dominion intend to insist that new large load customers be fully responsible financially for the capital expenditures necessary to serve that load?

(b) If so, why won't that fact, plus the Commission's continued compliance with statutory and constitutional requirements concerning ratemaking, allow Dominion to raise the capital it needs without its being acquired by NextEra?

11. The Investor Presentation (May 18, 2026) at 12 states: "The transaction is expected to be immediately accretive to NextEra Energy's adjusted EPS at closing." (a) Explain fully the arithmetic and reasoning that support this statement. (b) You say "expected." Specifically who is doing the expecting? (c) You say "at closing." What about one year after closing?
12. The Investor Presentation (May 18, 2026) states that the companies' combined size will enable them to buy, build, finance, and operate more efficiently together than apart (Presentation at 2-8, 20). (a) Provide all technical evidence supporting this statement. (b) Provide all technical evidence that the combination of Dominion and SCANA enabled the two companies to buy, build, finance, and operate more efficiently together than apart.
13. The Investor Presentation (May 18, 2026) states that the companies' combined size will produce "scale" (Presentation at 12). (a) For this statement, what is your definition of "scale"? (b) To which specific activities does this statement apply? (c) Provide all technical evidence that supports the statement. (d) In what specific ways, for which specific activities, is Dominion's size below the level necessary to achieve scale—if we define scale to mean that company size that allows the company to carry out a specific activity at minimum cost.
14. The Investor Presentation (May 18, 2026) states that the companies' combined size will increase "innovation." (a) What is the empirical basis for associating size with innovation, given the size that Dominion currently has? (b) Is Dominion's size too small to achieve the innovation that the May 18 statement references? (c) What are the specific areas of innovation presently lacking at Dominion? (d) Identify all ways in which Dominion's acquisition of SCANA increased innovation at SCANA.

Category 2: Transaction form and terms

15. (a) Provide the full narrative of the process by which the two companies approached each other and arrived at final terms. At a minimum, include all details stated in any proxy statement filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission. (b) Provided the proxy statement when it becomes available. (c) For each stage of the negotiation process, provide the documents that the participants in the negotiations, including the corporate boards, reviewed.
16. Provide all reasons why the two companies designed this transaction primarily as an exchange of stock rather than as a cash buyout.
17. Provide all the reasons why the parties included the \$360 million cash payment.

18. Describe all criteria and calculations that each party used to determine that the final price, in terms of the share ratio and the \$360 million cash component was acceptable.
19. In determining the acquisition price, what facts did each party assume about Dominion's continuing role as the exclusive franchisee to provide obligatory retail electric service to nonshopping customers? The answer should consider, but not be confined to, these questions: (a) For what number of years did each party assume that Dominion would retain its franchise? (b) For each of those years, what level of earnings did each party assume that Dominion would have? (c) What specific future rate-basing opportunities, in terms of dollars, did each party assume that Dominion would have? (d) What rate-base-reducing penetration into the utility's exclusive service territory, from direct retail competition or distributed energy resources, did each party assume? (e) More specifically: For the future generation-building and transmission-building opportunities that the parties anticipated for Dominion, what fraction did the two companies assume would go to Dominion, and what fraction did they assume would go to retail competitors?

Note: The answer to (e) cannot be "We don't know," because the Investor Presentation shows specific expectations of rate-base growth. There must have been assumptions underlying those expectations about total construction opportunities, and then the extent to which those opportunities would be Dominion's. If the answer is 100%, say so.

20. Assume that within five years of consummation this transaction, the Commission or the Legislature decides either that (a) one or more activities then performed by Dominion should be performed by one or more entities chosen competitively (where Dominion can be one of the competitors); or (b) Dominion's exclusive franchise itself should be offered to others on a competitive basis (again, where Dominion can be one of the competitors). From each of Dominion's and NextEra's perspective, how does that possibility affect the desirability of this transaction—as the transaction is currently priced between the parties?
21. Assume that the Commission intends to include in any transaction approval a condition stating that if the merged company violates an approval condition, Commission rule or state statute, the Commission will start a proceeding to determinate appropriate consequences, including possible transfer of the utility's franchise to a more deserving provider. (a) State your acceptance of this condition; or (b) state that if the Commission requires this condition the applicants will withdraw their application, or (c) state why you think such a condition is inappropriate. (d) Provide your proposed language for how the Commission should address violations of approval conditions, rules, or statutes by the post-transaction Dominion or NextEra.

Category 3: Transaction costs and transition costs

22. Describe all transaction costs. Transaction costs are the costs to consummate—to reach agreement and obtain regulatory approvals. Explain who paid what to whom, for what services.

23. Describe all transition costs. Transition costs are the costs to effectuate the combination of two separate companies. Provide the full level of detail presently available, by category and by year. For each category of expenditure, explain the purpose, and identify the executives responsible for achieving that purpose.

Note: The Commission recognizes that the companies plan to promise not to seek the transaction costs and transition costs in rates. To enforce that promise, the Commission needs to know the activities and costs at issue.

Category 4: Capital structure and finance costs

1.

24. Provide all rating agency reports relating to the transaction.
25. Provide all rating agency reports, for both companies and their affiliates, issued since January 1, 2022.
26. Describe the current capital structure of each of Dominion and NextEra, at the total system level and at the utility level.
27. Describe the capital structure of the post-merger consolidated system, and of each utility in that system, (a) at closing, and (b) one year after closing.
28. The Investor Presentation (May 18, 2026) states the companies' specific expectations for bond ratings. (a) For each of those expectations, provide the full empirical basis. (b) For what period of time do the companies' expectations apply? Only at closing? For some specific period of time after closing?

Category 5: Acquisition cost

29. (a) What is the total cost to NextEra to acquire Dominion? In other words, what value is NextEra giving up to acquire Dominion's shares? (b) Explain with precision how the exchange rate (each Dominion share exchanged for 0.8138 of a NextEra share) was calculated. (c) Identify the premium implicit in the share exchange—the excess of purchase price over trading price—on a per-share basis and on a total company basis, and explain how the premium was calculated. (d) When one adds in the \$360 million cash payment by NextEra to Dominion shareholders, what is the total premium over Dominion share price, as an absolute figure and as a percentage over the existing Dominion share price?
30. (a) Describe all types, sources, and terms of the acquisition financing for this transaction. (b) What are the sources for the \$360 million cash payment?

31. What percentage of the total purchase cost does NextEra attribute to the value that NextEra sees in (a) having legal control over Dominion's exclusive retail electricity franchise, and (b) future rate-basing opportunities?
32. (a) What is NextEra's expected return on the full acquisition cost? (b) What are the specific net revenue flows that the acquirer projects will produce that expected return? (c) What are the factual bases for the expectations of those net revenue flows?
33. (a) Is it correct that Dominion's retail rates reflect an authorized return on book cost? Explain the answer. (b) If NextEra's acquisition cost exceeds Dominion's book cost, by how much? Explain in detail. (c) Assuming that NextEra's acquisition cost exceeds Dominion's book cost, how will NextEra make up the difference between what the utility can earn on book cost and NextEra's full acquisition cost? (d) To what extent is NextEra relying on the following factors to recover its acquisition costs: (1) regulatory lag, (2) earning an equity-level return on target equity financed with debt, and (3) other factors—which NextEra should identify and discuss.

Category 6: Risks of harms

34. For each NextEra affiliate, including but not limited to FP&L, (a) describe its business activities; (b) provide the income statements and balance sheets starting with 2021, and (c) describe all material risks to customers, including but not limited to all material risks you have disclosed to shareholders.
35. For each listed risk, describe the specific events that would convert the risk into harm to the Dominion or its customers. In answering the question, use the same level of care that you apply when describing risks in filings required by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. State the probability that each event would occur (from 0 to 100%—and explain the chosen percentage), and the types of harms it could cause. For each risk, describe the actions you are committing to take to eliminate the risk and thus to eliminate the possibility of harm.
36. Given that the statute says “will not jeopardize,” where the phrase “will not” signals 100% certainty, who are the specific company officials (a) who will testify that there is zero possibility of harm, and (b) who will be responsible for ensuring that there is zero possibility of harm—not zero harm, but zero possibility of harm?
37. Do you agree or disagree that the phrase “will not jeopardize” requires certainty of no harm and certainty of no risk of harm?

Category 7: Assertions of benefits

38. (a) Identify every benefit, if any, to Dominion customers solely from the transaction—meaning, from the joining of two holding company systems that are presently independent; meaning, excluding anything that is external to the actual joining of the companies. (b) Quantify each benefit in dollars, identifying the specific years in which the dollar benefit will occur. (c) Which of the claimed benefits are achievable by Dominion without the transaction? (d) For the benefits identified in (c), provide all reasons why Dominion is not producing those benefits now.
39. (a) Precisely which current Dominion or Dominion Virginia practices, if any, is NextEra committing to improve? (b) Precisely what is suboptimal about those current Dominion or Dominion Virginia practices? (c) Identify the Dominion executives currently responsible for those practices. (d) Explain why Dominion Virginia or Dominion is not making those improvements on its own, and why it cannot make those improvements without being acquired by NextEra. (e) If the Commission today ordered Dominion Virginia to make those improvements, without an acquisition of Dominion, would the changes occur? If not, why not? (f) Identify all other changes that NextEra intends to make to Dominion Virginia’s current practices. (g) Identify the specific executives responsible for making these changes, the schedule for making them, and the consequences for those individuals if they fail to make the changes. (h) Identify the consequences that the Commission should impose on the combined company if the identified improvements do not occur.
40. (a) At what point, if any, in the process of considering and fashioning this transaction did each company, separately and together, study cost savings and management improvements? (b) Who performed the studies? (c) Identify all instructions or guidance provided to the individuals responsible for performing the studies.
41. Regarding all prior acquisitions to which either Dominion or NextEra was a party: (a) List, and provide references for, all claims and commitments that the company made about benefits. (b) Which individuals made or supported each claim? (c) For each claim, which individuals were responsible for producing the results? (d) For each claim, what were the results?

Category 8: Corporate structure and governance

42. Provide an annotated diagram of (a) the pre-acquisition corporate structures associated with each company, and (b) the merged entity’s corporate structure. Include all Dominion affiliates and all NextEra affiliates.
43. (a) Describe fully the board of directors of post-transaction NextEra and the post-transaction Dominion. The description should include, but not be limited to, leadership, structure, committees, biographies, compensation, and terms. (b) Which directors are independent? In this context, precisely what does “independent” mean—independent of what?

44. (a) Within the post-transaction holding company structure, who will have what powers over which Dominion decisions? (b) Identify all decisions affecting Dominion that will be under the ultimate control of one or more individuals who are not executives of or Board members of Dominion. (c) Identify all possible Dominion decisions that NextEra will legally commit not to control or influence.
45. (a) Who will make decisions about the timing and amounts of dividend payments from Dominion to NextEra? (b) Is there any decision about such dividends that will be, as a legal matter, exclusively a decision by Dominion, free of any influence of control by NextEra? (c) Identify all possible considerations that will enter into these decisions about dividends paid by Dominion to NextEra.
46. (a) Who will make decisions about the timing and amounts of equity injections into Dominion? (b) Is there any decision about such equity injections that will be, as a legal matter, exclusively a decision by Dominion, free of any influence of control by NextEra? (c) Identify all possible considerations that will enter into decisions about equity injections..
47. (a) Indicate your commitment to, or explain your disagreement with, this proposition: If NextEra ever has insufficient financial resources to cover Dominion Virginia's needs along with the needs of NextEra and its other affiliates, Dominion Virginia's needs will always have top priority over NextEra's other affiliates. (b) If you commit to this statement, what will you tell the South Carolina Public Service Commission about what priority Dominion subsidiary Dominion Energy South Carolina will have—as both Dominion Virginia and Dominion South Carolina cannot both have the same priority?
48. For each of Dominion and NextEra, describe all existing interaffiliate contractual relationships, in terms of goods and services, pricing and other terms.
49. For each of Dominion and NextEra, describe all existing internal rules on compliance with regulations, and internal consequences for non-compliance.
50. Describe fully all utility assets and employees of Dominion, Dominion Virginia and Florida Power & Light used for non-utility purposes, including the reasons for and terms of the use.
51. Describe fully all non-utility assets and employees of the Dominion or NextEra holding company systems used for utility purposes, including the reasons for and terms of the use.

Category 9: Effect of the transaction on competition

52. (a) Identify with precision each market (identifying product dimension and geographic dimension) in which any affiliate of the post-transaction entity will be selling services in

competition with unaffiliated companies. For each market identified, explain what competitive advantages the affiliate will have due to its affiliation with the post-transaction entity.

53. Identify with precision each market (again specifying product dimension and geographic dimension) in which today a Dominion affiliate and a NextEra affiliate are competitors.
54. Focusing on the competition, between Dominion and with competitive retail suppliers, to serve high-load customers in Virginia: (a) Does NextEra believe that such competition exists? Explain. (b) Does NextEra believe that Dominion's current tariffs, specifically but not exclusively the generation demand charge in Dominion Virginia's Schedule GS-5, provide Dominion with no unfair or unearned advantage in the competition with competitive retail suppliers to serve high-load customers? (c) Does NextEra believe that in this competition, Dominion has no competitive advantage arising from its ability, subject to SCC approval, to cause nonshopping customers to bear stranded costs associated with generation that Dominion rate-bases to serve the large-load customers? Explain. (d) Does NextEra believe that there is no possibility of Dominion Virginia shifting to nonshopping customers those generation costs that Dominion Virginia incurred to serve large-load customers? Explain. (e) Does NextEra believe that the generation demand charge in Dominion Virginia's Schedule GS-5 will have any effect on the likelihood that NextEra will achieve its acquisition's earnings goals by rate-basing new generation made necessary by large-load customers?

Category 10: "Bill credits"

55. Provide all internal communications relating to the decision to offer bill credits to customers, including both the concept of bill credits and the specific amount of \$2.25 billion.
56. Explain why you are offering the bill credits over only the first two years of the post-acquisition entity rather than over the expected life of the post-acquisition entity. (b) Is the denial of bill credits to customers who consume after the first two years discriminatory against those customers? If not, why not? (c) What is the legal defense if the Commission is attacked for approving a plan that discriminates against post-two-years consumption?
57. Describe with precision the source of funds for the bill credits. For example: Is the source retained earnings of Dominion or NextEra? Proceeds from new debt? Reductions in the cost of providing electricity in each of Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina (in which case, is there a matching between the two-year bill-credit period and the period in which the cost reductions will occur?
58. (a) Assuming that the source of the funds is not a reduction in the cost of producing electricity, how do the companies reconcile the bill credits with the legal requirement that rates are just and reasonable? (b) Given that just-and-reasonable rates are rates that reflect reasonable cost, does a rate lowered by bill credits fall below reasonable cost, making the rate unlawful? If not, why not?

59. Would it be inaccurate to characterize the proposed bill credit as short-term inducement, unrelated to the actual meshing of the two companies, to win approval? Would a Commission policy of basing its acquisition approvals on the size of a temporary financial inducement be discriminatory against other potential acquirers whose smaller size prevented them from offering such an inducement—despite their ability to show more efficiencies inherent in the transaction itself?

Category 11: Merger and acquisition history

60. Identify all attempted mergers and acquisitions since 2010, regardless of whether consummated, to which either of NextEra or Dominion, or any of its affiliates, was a party.
61. For each merger or acquisition that was consummated, provide all evidence showing that the transaction made consumers better off, and that there was no harm and no risk of harm, compared to what would have happened had there been no transaction.
62. (a) Provide all evidence that Dominion's acquisition of SCANA made Dominion South Carolina's customers better off, caused them no harm and no risk of harm, and caused Dominion's customer no harm or risk of harm. (b) Identify all resources, human and otherwise, paid by Dominion the utility, that Dominion (utility or holding company) has used to negotiate or implement that transaction, or has otherwise been involved or is involved in Dominion South Carolina matters.
63. (a) Did NextEra or Florida Power & Light experience any negative financial consequences arising from the Hawaii PUC's rejection of NextEra's proposal to acquire Hawaiian Electric Industries? Explain. (b) Does either NextEra or Dominion believe that Dominion and/or Dominion Virginia will suffer any negative financial consequences if the SCC rejects this transaction or if the two companies withdraw from it?
64. Looking at the post-acquisition period: (a) Does NextEra commit that this acquisition of Dominion will be its last acquisition? Explain. (b) Is there any type of acquisition that NextEra will be willing to commit, in this proceeding, never to make—such as an acquisition in a particular industry or country or type of company? (c) If the Commission were to require that NextEra get Commission approval before each future acquisition above a particular dollar level, would NextEra withdraw from this present proposed transaction? Explain. (d) Does NextEra believe that no matter what future acquisition it might make, there is no possibility of harm or risk of harm to Dominion's customers from that acquisition?