

**Virginia State Corporation Commission
eFiling CASE Document Cover Sheet**

Case Number (if already assigned)	PUR-2025-00079
Case Name (if known)	Petition of Virginia Electric and Power Company for approval to revise its net metering Program pursuant to § 56-594 of the Code of Virginia
Document Type	EXTE
Document Description Summary	Petition of Virginia Electric and Power Company for approval to revise its net metering program pursuant to § 56-594 of the Code of Virginia
Total Number of Pages	156
Submission ID	33677
eFiling Date Stamp	5/1/2025 4:28:32PM

WITNESS DIRECT TESTIMONY SUMMARY

Witness: J. Scott Gaskill

Title: Vice President – Regulatory Affairs

Summary:

Company Witness J. Scott Gaskill provides testimony in support of the Company's Net Energy Metering ("NEM") reform proposal, NEM 2.0. Specifically, Mr. Gaskill describes the inception and evolution of the Company's existing Net Metering Service, including its impact on non-participating customers. Mr. Gaskill also provides an overview of the NEM 2.0 proposal, discusses whether the six percent aggregate net metering cap should be eliminated or adjusted, and addresses the Commission's directive to evaluate the aggregate impact of net metering customers on the Company's long-run marginal costs of generation, distribution, and transmission.

First, Mr. Gaskill discusses the creation and development of the Company's NEM Program. Mr. Gaskill addresses various legislative and regulatory changes over the past two decades that have resulted in significant increases in applications to participate in the Company's NEM Program. In particular, he notes that the number of NEM customers enrolled with the Company has grown from approximately 2,100 in 2016 to over 49,000 through 2024. Mr. Gaskill then discusses the Company's current NEM Program (the "Legacy NEM Program"). He explains that the Legacy NEM Program allows a customer's usage to be offset by the energy they export to the grid over the course of the annual Net Metering Period. This is known as "annual netting."

Next, Mr. Gaskill explains the Company's NEM 2.0 proposal. Specifically, he explains that the Company's two key proposed changes to the NEM Program include: (i) a transition from annual to real-time netting, and (ii) an Export Credit Rate to compensate customers for excess exported energy. Mr. Gaskill states that real-time netting tracks the inflow and outflow from a customer's meter every half-hour and then charges or credits the NEM 2.0 customer accordingly. Mr. Gaskill also discusses the proposed Export Credit Rate compensation structure. The Export Credit Rate equals the weighted-average of first year prices for purchases from distributed solar projects ("Distributed Solar PPAs") executed in response to the Company's most recent Rider CE Request for Proposals ("RFP"). The weighted-average of first year prices from Distributed Solar PPAs represents the Company's cost to procure a comparable product. For the most recent CE rider, the weighted-average of first year prices for Distributed Solar PPAs was \$95.53 per MWh. The Export Credit Rate includes the value of the energy as well as REC value; therefore, the payments to NEM 2.0 customers reflect the value of an avoided renewable energy purchase. As such, the Company respectfully requests that the Commission allow the Company to adjust its annual RPS compliance obligation by the total amount of kWhs exported by NEM 2.0 customers.

Finally, Mr. Gaskill addresses the six percent aggregate net metering cap. As the Company's current net metering percentage stands at less than three percent, it is unnecessary to raise or remove the cap at this time. The Company proposes to continue to monitor and provide updates in its biannual net metering report. Mr. Gaskill also summarizes the Company's evaluation of long-term marginal costs related to distributed solar. He notes that the Company estimates that the total long-term marginal costs of incremental distributed solar is \$48.29 / MWh.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY
OF
J. SCOTT GASKILL
ON BEHALF OF
VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY
BEFORE THE
STATE CORPORATION COMMISSION OF VIRGINIA
CASE NO. PUR-2025-00079**

1 **Q. Please state your name, business address, and position of employment.**

2 A. My name is J. Scott Gaskill, and my business address is 120 Tredegar Street, Richmond,
3 Virginia 23219. I am the Vice President – Regulatory Affairs on behalf of Virginia
4 Electric and Power Company (the “Company”). A statement of my background and
5 qualifications is attached as Appendix A.

6 **Q. Please describe your areas of responsibility with the Company.**

7 A. In my role, I lead the team responsible for the Company’s rate-related activities,
8 including the preparation and support of rate filings and the implementation of rates. I
9 also have responsibility for regulatory accounting functions.

10 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?**

11 A. I am testifying in support of the Company’s Net Metering (“NEM”) reform proposal,
12 NEM 2.0. Specifically, my testimony discusses the inception and evolution of the
13 Company’s existing Net Metering Service, including its impact on non-participating
14 customers. Next, I provide an overview of the Company’s NEM 2.0 proposal and
15 address the Company’s position on whether the six percent aggregate net metering cap in
16 Virginia Code § 56.594 E should be eliminated or adjusted. I then address the
17 Commission’s directive to evaluate and provide the aggregate impact of net metering
18 customers on the Company’s long-run marginal costs of generation, distribution, and

1 transmission. Finally, I introduce the other Company witnesses presenting testimony in
2 this proceeding.

3 **I. Background**

4 **Q. Please briefly explain the inception and development of the Company's NEM**
5 **Program.**

6 A. Net energy metering programs afford eligible customers the opportunity to install and
7 operate renewable energy generation systems to offset all or part of a customer's
8 electricity requirements with the energy generated from renewable resources. The
9 Company's NEM Program began in 2000 with residential customers permitted to install
10 up to 10 kW and nonresidential customers to install up to 25 kW. At the inception of the
11 program, generator capacity was limited to 100% of the customer's historical annual
12 consumption, and total net metering penetration was limited to 0.1% of the Company's
13 peak load for the prior year. While net metering has been available to customers for the
14 last 25 years, the majority of all activity has occurred within the last decade, with the last
15 5 years seeing rapid growth and change partly due to advancing technology and federal
16 subsidies reducing barriers to adoption.

17 With legislative and regulatory changes, over time, both the size of individual generator
18 and the aggregate amount of net metering allowed on the system has steadily increased.
19 In 2020, the Virginia General Assembly expanded and revised its net energy metering
20 programs to incentivize and increase the penetration of Net Metering Distributed Energy
21 Resources ("DER") throughout Virginia, most notably under the Virginia Clean
22 Economy Act ("VCEA") (2020 Va. Acts 1193). Specifically, under Va. Code § 56-594
23 (the "NEM Statute"), Net Metering DER programs were significantly expanded to

1 increase the scope of customer eligibility. Eligible non-residential customers may now
2 construct generation facilities which produce up to 3 MW of generation. In addition,
3 customers who desire to interconnect to the Company's Electric Power System ("EPS")
4 may now produce up to 150% of the customer's expected annual energy consumption.¹
5 Moreover, the VCEA also raised the aggregate net metering cap from one percent of each
6 electric distribution company's adjusted Virginia peak-load forecast for the previous year
7 to six percent (with five percent available to all customers and one percent reserved for
8 low-income customers).² As a result of these changes, the Company has experienced
9 significant increases in customer applications to participate in its NEM Program.

10 In particular, the Company has seen the number of NEM customers grow from
11 approximately 2,100 in 2016 to over 49,000 through 2024, more than a 2500% increase
12 in that eight-year period. In 2024 alone, the Company facilitated interconnection of over
13 8,000 unique net metering installations. As of December 31, 2024, the Company
14 supports over 49,000 net metering customers with a collective capacity over 435 MW at
15 the system level. More NEM generation facilities, with higher capacity ratings, are now
16 rapidly developing and penetrating the Company's EPS. The growth in customer
17 adoption has led the Company to expand the team that supports the net metering
18 interconnection process significantly, growing from 1 FTE in 2016 to 6 FTEs focused
19 only on net metering interconnections. Numerous other groups, including Customer
20 Contact Organization, Billing, and Metering, also support the facilitation of a customer's
21 enrollment in net metering.

¹ Va. Code § 56-594 B.

² Va. Code § 56-594 E.

Q. Please provide a brief overview of the Company's current NEM Program (the "Legacy NEM Program").

A. As of the end of 2024, the vast majority of NEM customer-generators in the Company's Virginia service territory, approximately 99.9% of the 435 MW, have installed solar facilities with over 3,000 customers adding battery backup to their solar facility. The remaining net metering capacity is comprised of 0.14 MW of wind and 0.0035 MW of hydro.

The current Legacy NEM Program allows a customer's usage to be offset by the energy they export to the grid over the course of an annual Net Metering Period. This is known as "annual netting." When the energy generated by a Legacy NEM customer exceeds the customer's instantaneous load, the excess energy flows to the electric grid and is often referred to as "Received kWh" because the energy is recorded on the "Received Channel" of the customer's meter. Similarly, the energy consumed from the grid is recorded on the "Delivered Channel" of the customer's meter ("Delivered kWh"). When a customer's meter is read, the result is a value for Delivered kWh and a value for Received kWh. At the end of each monthly billing period, the Customer is billed for the net energy (Delivered kWh – Received kWh).

Additionally, when the Received kWhs exceeds Delivered kWhs over the course of a billing period, the customer receives billing period credits for the net excess generation (Received – Delivered) commonly referred to as "carryover." Any billing period credits generated for the month are accumulated, carried forward and applied at the first opportunity to any billing periods having net consumption. At the end of each Net Metering Period, defined as each successive 12-month period following the first meter

1 reading date following the final interconnection, any “carryover” accumulated on the
2 customer’s account is assessed against the customer’s billed consumption during the
3 current Net Metering Period and any carryover that was carried forward from the prior
4 Net Metering Period. The customer is permitted to carry forward kWh billing period
5 credits to the extent they do not exceed the sum of the billed consumption and the prior
6 year’s carryover. The customer has the option to enter into a power purchase agreement
7 (“PPA”) with the Company for any billing period credits remaining at the end of a Net
8 Metering Period rather than carrying forward into the next Net Metering Period. Such
9 excess kWh are paid to the customer at a price equal to the PJM DOMZONE Day Ahead-
10 Annual, Simple Average LMP.

11 Under the annual netting structure, since the billing period credits accrued within a Net
12 Metering Period or carried forward from prior periods are denominated in kWh, they are
13 treated as an offset to billable kWh and thus, effectively valued at the customer’s retail
14 rate.

15 II. Dominion Energy Virginia’s NEM 2.0 Proposal

16 **Q. Prior to addressing the NEM 2.0 proposal, is the Company’s general approach to**
17 **net-metering fundamentally changing?**

18 A. No. At its core, net-metering is a program that allows customers the opportunity to
19 install renewable energy behind their utility meter and use that generation to (i) offset
20 usage within their home or business and (ii) be compensated for any excess
21 generation. When net-metering first emerged decades ago, the available metering
22 technology had capability to reliably perform the essential functions of the program (i.e.
23 run meters both forward and backward) but was less sophisticated than technology

1 available today. Specifically, the typical meters did not have the ability to provide real
2 time insight into when a customer was drawing power from the grid versus when it was
3 exporting to the grid. As such, when net-metering programs were initially created, a
4 monthly time period was the most granular period available to measure net usage and
5 billing.

6 The Company has now deployed AMI technology that provides significantly more
7 capabilities and granularity than the meters previously used, including the ability to read
8 meters in real time. This newly available AMI metering technology provides the
9 Company and its customers real time insight into specifically *when* a customer is using
10 versus exporting energy. The Company believes it is important to use this new
11 technology to its fullest so that net metering customers are compensated based on the
12 times they are exporting energy and pay for their usage based on when they are using
13 energy. While this new technology allows for greater transparency for the program
14 mechanics, it does not fundamentally change the nature of net metering. It remains, at its
15 core, a program that allows customers the opportunity to install renewable energy behind
16 their utility meter and use that generation to (i) offset usage within their home or business
17 and (ii) be compensated for any excess generation.

18 **Q. Please generally describe the Company's primary changes to the program design**
19 **and compensation structure for NEM 2.0.**

20 A. The NEM Reform proposal contains two key changes related to net metering
21 compensation, as described by Company Witness Sam Shannon: a transition from annual
22 to real-time netting and an Export Credit Rate to compensate customers for excess
23 electricity they export to the grid. As explained in more detail by Company Witness

Timothy P. Stuller, Jr., the proposed Export Credit Rate would currently be set at an amount equal to the weighted-average of first year prices for purchases from Distributed Solar PPAs executed in response to the Company's most recent Rider CE Request for Proposals ("RFP").³

Q. Are there any additional changes under NEM 2.0?

A. Yes. The Company also proposes minor changes to the current Net Metering Terms and Conditions, including an application fee and an administrative charge of \$1.00 per month. Company Witness Stuller discusses these minor changes in more detail in his direct testimony.

Q. Please describe the real-time netting measurement interval.

A. Real-time netting allows the customer to pay for energy based on when they "net consume" and receive compensation for energy based on when they "net produce". This allows for a more sustainable program with less cross-subsidy than is experienced today under the annual netting construct of the Legacy NEM Program. Real time netting nets the inflow and outflow from a customer's meter every half-hour, the outcome being that each half-hour interval will be a net consumption or net production interval. For billing purposes, a customer has two registers: one for consumed energy and one for exported energy. If a customer is a net consumer in a half-hour, the net consumption for that 30-minute interval is added to the consumed energy register. Conversely, if a customer is a

³ *Commonwealth of Virginia, State Corporation Commission, Petition For approval of the Virginia Electric and Power Company 2024 RPS Development Plan under § 56-585.5 D 4 of the Code of Virginia, Case No. PUR-2024-00147, Final Order (April 15, 2025).*

1 net exporter in that half-hour, that amount is added to the exported energy register.

2 Energy is netted each half-hour to be charged or credited accordingly.

3 **Q. What rates will be charged to NEM customers for the net energy consumed each**
4 **billing period by the Company under NEM 2.0?**

5 A. As explained in more detail by Company Witness Stuller, the rates paid per kWh of
6 consumed energy will be largely the same as for non-NEM customers. The Company
7 will determine the net consumption in each measured interval and apply those to the rates
8 presented throughout the Company's tariff. This will include base rates, applicable
9 standby charges, and rider rates. Additionally, as previously noted, NEM 2.0 customers
10 will pay a modest program administration charge described in more detail by Company
11 Witness Stuller.

12 **Q. How will the NEM 2.0 customer be compensated for the excess generation it**
13 **supplies to the Company's grid during the billing period under the Company's**
14 **proposal?**

15 A. When the customer is a net producer of energy in any half-hour interval, the Company
16 currently proposes to compensate NEM customers via an Export Credit Rate set at an
17 amount equal to the weighted-average of first year prices for purchases from Distributed
18 Solar PPAs executed in response to the Company's most recent Rider CE RFP. Given
19 the current requirements of the Virginia Clean Economy Act and the corresponding
20 construct of Rider CE, the weighted-average of first year PPA prices from Distributed
21 Solar PPAs represents the appropriate avoided cost because it is representative of the
22 price the Company could otherwise pay for a comparable product. Through the Rider CE
23 proceeding, this rate will be updated annually. In the most recent Rider CE proceeding,

1 the weighted-average of first year Distributed Solar PPA prices was \$95.53 per MWh.
2 Company Witness Stuller describes this Export Credit Rate and how it will be updated
3 annually in more detail in his direct testimony. This Export Credit Rate is set at an
4 amount to compensate the customer for the purchase of all distributed solar output,
5 including energy, capacity, ancillary services, and environmental attributes, including
6 renewable energy credits ("RECs").

7 **Q. How does the Company propose to collect from all customers the costs associated**
8 **with payment for export credits to NEM 2.0 customers?**

9 A. The Export Credit Rate includes the value of the energy as well as the REC value;
10 therefore, the payments to NEM 2.0 customers reflect the value of an avoided renewable
11 energy purchase. In recognition of the renewable energy they are contributing to the grid,
12 the Company respectfully requests that the Commission allow the Company to adjust its
13 annual RPS compliance obligation by the total amount of kWhs exported by NEM 2.0
14 customers. This approach would benefit all other customers by reducing the net RPS
15 compliance costs as well as ensure that the Company and its customers receive the RPS
16 benefit for the export power for which it is paying. The Company proposes to collect the
17 credited energy value, net of RPS value, through the fuel factor as a purchased power
18 expense. The component of the Export Credit that is related to the RPS value will flow
19 through account 557, "other expense" and be recovered through Rider RPS.

Q. Could you provide an example of the adjustment the Company is proposing to the annual RPS compliance obligation to account for the kWhs exported by NEM 2.0 customers?

A. Yes. Table 1 below provides a simplified (using rounded numbers) calculation of the Company's RPS compliance obligation, using 2025 for the example.

Table 1

<i>2025 Illustrative RPS compliance obligation</i>	
Pr. Yr. Retail Sales	95,000,000
Pr. Yr. Nuclear	25,000,000
ARB	10,000,000
100 MW Customers	500,000
<u>Net</u>	59,500,000
<i>% Requirement</i>	26%
<u>RPS Requirement</u>	15,470,000
<u>1% Carve-Out for DER</u>	154,700

The Company's proposal is to then net the equivalent number of RECs equal to the total amount of kWhs exported by NEM 2.0 customers from the 1% DER carve-out calculation.⁴ So, in the above illustrative example, if NEM 2.0 customers exported 5,000 MWh, the Company would reduce the RPS compliance obligation specific to DERs by 5,000 and thus have to retire 5,000 fewer RECs. As noted above, this approach would benefit all other customers by reducing the total net RPS compliance costs.

⁴ Va. Code § 56-585.5 C provides, in relevant part, "A Phase II Utility shall meet one percent of the RPS Program requirements in any given compliance year with solar, wind, or anaerobic digestion resources of one megawatt or less located in the Commonwealth, with not more than 3,000 kilowatts at any single location or at contiguous locations owned by the same entity or affiliated entities."

1 **Q. How will the Company’s proposed changes affect current and future NEM**
2 **customers, respectively?**

3 A. Subsection E of the Net Metering Statute provides in relevant part that with respect to the
4 instant net metering proceeding: “Nothing in the Commission’s final order shall affect
5 any eligible customer-generators, eligible agricultural customer-generators and small
6 agricultural generators who interconnect before the effective date of such final order.”
7 Accordingly, the Company’s proposal will have no impact on a Legacy NEM customer
8 unless they modify an existing interconnection or file for a new interconnection
9 agreement. For customers interconnected on or after the effective date of the NEM 2.0
10 tariff, the impact will depend on whether the customer is a low-income customer.
11 Subsection E of the Net Metering Statute provides in relevant part that: “low-income
12 utility customers may interconnect under whichever terms are most favorable to them.”
13 Thus, low-income customers can select the Legacy NEM tariff or the NEM 2.0 tariff.

14 **Q. Please explain how the Company’s proposal ensures that there is not unreasonable**
15 **cost shifting to nonparticipating customers.**

16 A. As discussed above and further explained by Company Witness Sam Shannon, the
17 Company’s proposal to transition from annual netting to real-time netting ensures that a
18 net metering customer pays for all their kWh consumption received from the Company,
19 thereby incorporating the kWh sales that currently go unbilled into the ratemaking
20 framework. This minimizes the cost-shift to non-participants and better aligns the costs
21 and benefits to the appropriate rate mechanism (e.g. base rates, riders, and/or fuel). The
22 proposal to compensate a net metering customer for exports at an Export Credit Rate
23 comparable to the price the Company would otherwise pay for a similar product also

1 reduces the cost-shift, because it eliminates the implicit crediting at the full retail rate
2 under the current net metering construct.

3 **Q. Given the Company's proposal, should the six percent aggregate net metering cap**
4 **remain or be adjusted?**

5 A. Subsection E of the Net Metering Statute provides in relevant part that: "As part of [this]
6 net energy metering proceeding, the Commission shall evaluate the six percent aggregate
7 net metering cap and may, if appropriate, raise or remove such cap." In the Company's
8 view, it is unnecessary to raise or remove the cap at this time. The Company's net
9 metering percentage is currently at less than three percent. Therefore, the Company
10 proposes to continue to monitor and provide updates in its biannual net metering report
11 that provides a wind and solar update, including NEM penetration, in January and July of
12 each year. This allows the Commission to evaluate the effects of NEM 2.0 before
13 deciding whether it is appropriate to modify the current six percent cap.

14 **Q. Are there any other requirements from the Commission's Order establishing this**
15 **proceeding that you would like to address?**

16 A. Yes, the Commission also directed the Company to evaluate and provide the aggregate
17 impact of customer-generators on the electric utility's long-run marginal costs of
18 generation, distribution, and transmission in the context of the cost and benefits of the
19 utility's net energy metering programs. Table 2 below summarizes the Company's
20 evaluation of long-term marginal costs related to distributed solar.

21 Table 2

	Benefit/(Cost)	Source/Notes
	(\$/MWh)	
Energy	\$ 32.15	15 year levelized generation weighted LMP from 2024 IRP (with-EPA case)
Losses	\$ 1.63	Estimated Avoided T&D Losses
Capacity	\$ 5.72	15 year levelized projected PJM BRA pricing with solar ELCC
Redispatch	\$ (5.71)	15 year levelized redispatch cost from 2024 IRP
Ancillary	\$ (1.95)	Guidehouse study
Transmission	\$ 16.46	Guidehouse study
Total LT Marginal Cost	\$ 48.29	

The Company estimates that the total long-term marginal costs of incremental distributed solar is \$48.29 / MWh. This includes avoided energy and capacity purchases from PJM, avoided transmission and distribution line losses due to the generation being located at the customer load, and avoided transmission cost allocation. This is partially offset with increase in costs attributed to an increase in ancillary service costs and an estimated cost of redispatching units to balance the system between day-ahead and real-time operations.

Q. The Company's proposal in this proceeding is to pay an Export Credit Rate set at an amount equal to the weighted-average of first year prices for purchases from distributed solar projects ("Distributed Solar PPAs") executed in response to the Company's most recent Rider CE RFP. From the most recent Rider CE RFP, this amount was \$95.53/MWh. How does this compare to the estimated long-term avoided cost?

A. On the surface, the proposed Export Credit Rate set at \$95.53/MWh or \$0.09553/kWh exceeds the Company's estimated long-term avoided costs. However, it is important to recognize that the weighted-average of first year prices from Distributed Solar PPAs executed in response to the Company's Rider CE includes the REC value of the distributed solar output. When adjusting for the value of the REC, the remaining cost aligns well with the Company's estimated avoided cost.

1 As I mentioned earlier, to realize the value of this REC, the Company is proposing to
2 incorporate the purchased export energy into its RPS compliance going forward. If the
3 Commission were to decline this option, an avoided cost of \$48.29 / MWh may be the
4 more appropriate Export Credit Rate.

5 **Q. Mr. Gaskill, please introduce the other Company witnesses in this proceeding.**

6 A. The Company is presenting the following witnesses:

- 7 • Sam Shannon, Associate Director for Regulatory and Pricing Strategy with
8 Guidehouse, Inc., addresses cost shifting to nonparticipants under the Legacy
9 NEM Program, presents the underlying bases and rationale for the Company's
10 NEM 2.0 proposal, including real time netting, and sponsors the Economic
11 Benefits Report.
- 12 • Timothy P. Stuller, Jr., Manager – Regulation, addresses the proposed net energy
13 metering rate structure that will govern compensation for NEM 2.0 customers as
14 well as the amount and charges each NEM 2.0 customer will pay on their electric
15 bill each month for the cost of using the Company's infrastructure. Mr. Stuller
16 also addresses additional fees for future NEM customers, such as the application
17 fee and administrative charge, and presents the billing impacts of the Company's
18 NEM 2.0 proposal.
- 19 • Robert E. Miller, Manager – Regulation, presents the cost-of-service study and
20 addresses the implications and impacts of Legacy NEM customers on non-
21 participating customers within the same class.

22 **Q. Does this conclude your pre-filed direct testimony?**

23 A. Yes, it does.

24

**BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS
OF
J. SCOTT GASKILL**

J. Scott Gaskill joined the Company in 2007 as a Senior Financial Analysis Specialist in the Generation System Planning department. He has since held the positions of Manager of Generation System Planning, Director of Power Contracts and Origination, Director of Power Generation Regulated Operations, and General Manager – Regulatory Affairs. On February 1, 2024 he assumed the role of Vice President – Regulatory Affairs where he leads the team responsible for the Company’s rate-related activities, including the preparation and support of rate filings and the implementation of rates.

Prior to joining Dominion Energy Virginia, Mr. Gaskill worked for Ventyx (formerly known as NewEnergy Associates) as a Senior Consultant specializing in the areas of resource planning, market price forecasting, and unit valuation. Additionally, he assisted multiple utilities, including Dominion Energy Virginia, in their implementation and use of the PROMOD and Strategist production cost planning models.

Mr. Gaskill graduated from the Georgia Institute of Technology in 2003 with a Bachelor of Science in Industrial and Systems Engineering. While working for the Company, he also received a Master of Business Administration degree from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in 2011.

Mr. Gaskill has previously presented testimony before the State Corporation Commission of Virginia and the North Carolina Utilities Commission.