

ORDER NO. 92606

Application of PSEG Renewable	*	BEFORE THE
Transmission LLC for a Certificate of	*	PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION
Public Convenience and Necessity to	*	OF MARYLAND
Construct a New 500 kV Transmission	*	
Line in Portions of Baltimore, Carroll,	*	
and Frederick Counties, Maryland	*	Case No. 9773
	*	

Issue Date: August 27, 2026

ORDER ON REVISED PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

On May 22, 2026, PSEG Renewable Transmission LLC (“PSEG”), filed a motion for adoption of revised procedural schedule (“Motion”) in relation to its Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. In this Order, the Commission approves the revised procedural schedule, with the modifications discussed below.

BACKGROUND

Procedural Schedule

On April 2, 2026, the Power Plant Research Program (“PPRP”) of the Maryland Department of Natural Resources filed a Status Report requesting an extension of the procedural schedule stating that the current timeline was untenable.¹ PPRP cited concerns about continuing the project without complete data as required by Order No. 91825 and suggested that the current procedural schedule be revised to ensure that the Commission has a “thorough administrative record for review to support its requirement to give ‘due consideration’ to the factors set forth under Public Utilities Article, Section 7-207.”

¹ Maillog No. 328668. PPRP also filed comments supporting PSEG’s proposed procedural schedule in Maillog No. 330514.

On May 22, 2026, PSEG filed a Motion² to revise the procedural schedule originally established for this matter in Order No. 91825.³ PSEG noted in its Motion that PSEG and PPRP held discussions to develop a compromise on the revised procedural schedule, which was filed as the proposed revised procedural schedule.⁴

On May 28, 2026, intervenor Todd Jones-Prettyman filed comments opposing PSEG's Motion, highlighting deviations between the proposed schedule and the original schedule in terms of pacing, and concluding that PSEG's proposed revised schedule shortens the timeframe between each schedule milestone without explanation. Intervenor Jones-Prettyman argued that the revised schedule unfairly burdens *pro se* litigants, noting in particular that the PSEG-proposed revised procedural schedule shortens the timeframe for public hearings from two weeks to one week.

On June 3, 2026, Potomac Riverkeeper Network, StopMPRP, and other intervenors⁵ jointly filed comments requesting that the Commission deny PSEG's proposal and set a remote scheduling conference.⁶

On June 5, 2026, the Office of People's Counsel ("OPC") commented on the proposed procedural schedule, noting that OPC did not oppose the extension of the filing

² Maillog No. 330412, PSEG Motion for Adoption of Revised Procedural Schedule. .

³ Maillog No. 322272, Order No. 91825, *Establishing a Procedural Schedule for the Maryland Piedmont Reliability Project*.

⁴ Maillog No. 330412, PSEG Motion for Adoption of Revised Procedural Schedule.

⁵ Intervenors cited on Maillog No. 330774 as submitting joint comments include: Potomac Riverkeeper Network; River Valley Ranch, LLC; Peter and John Radio Fellowship, Inc.; the Maryland Farm Bureau (in partnership with the Frederick County Farm Bureau, Carroll County Farm Bureau, and the Baltimore County Farm Bureau); Arnold Developer Associates Inc., Jesse Smith LLP; Dwight Baugher and Baugher Enterprises, Inc.; Michael and Lisa Gaver and Gaver Farm, LLC; John and Robin Kable, Wakefield Farm, LLC, John Allder Kable Trust, and Robin Smith Kable Trust; John and Donna Reese and Broadview Farm, LLC; and Jane Shaw, Rockland Farms, Inc., and Jane Shaw Revocable Living Trust; StopMPRP; Gunpowder Riverkeeper; and Joshua Morningstar.

⁶ Maillog No. 330774, Potomac Riverkeeper Network et. al. comments on the proposed procedural schedule.

date for direct testimony from September 2, 2026, to March 2, 2027. OPC also stated its concern that the proposed procedural schedule reduces the time intervenors have to respond to PSEG's rebuttal testimony. OPC requests that the Commission revise the schedule to retain the original 28-day timeframe between rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony.⁷

On June 8, 2026, the Commission opened an official comment period on the proposed procedural schedule.⁸

On June 9, 2026, Frederick County filed comments adopting Jones-Prettyman's comments and also adopting OPC's comments.⁹ On June 11, 2026, Baltimore County filed comments adopting Intervenor Jones-Prettyman's comments.¹⁰

On June 12, 2026, PJM Interconnection, L.L.C. filed comments supporting the proposed revised schedule and stating that the project remains necessary for the State of Maryland's reliability needs.¹¹

On June 16, 2026, Delegate Nino Mangione filed comments opposing PSEG's Motion, noting that the proposed schedule shortened public participation.¹² He further emphasized that Marylanders deserve a fair, transparent, and complete review, which would include outstanding environmental studies.

On June 17, 2026, Commission Technical Staff ("Staff") filed its comments on the proposed procedural schedule. Staff indicates that the proposed revised schedule is

⁷ Maillog No. 330866, Office of People's Counsel, responding to the Revised Procedural Schedule.

⁸ Maillog No. 330920, the Commission's Notice of Opportunity to Comment on Requests to Modify the Procedural Schedule.

⁹ Maillog No. 330961, Frederick County Comments on the proposed procedural schedule.

¹⁰ Maillog No. 331080, Baltimore County Comments on the proposed procedural schedule.

¹¹ Maillog No. 331103, PJM Comments on the proposed procedural schedule.

¹² Comment filed by Delegate Nino Mangione (Maillog No. 331203).

workable provided that the required speed of response to discovery requests, as laid out in Commission Order No. 91709, remains unchanged.¹³ Staff also noted that setting a target date for the filing of the final order would be beneficial for forecasting other activities involving the regional electric grid.¹⁴

Many additional parties filed comments¹⁵ on the PSEG Motion, in large part expressing concerns about parties having adequate time to respond to PSEG testimony throughout the proceeding.

Petition to Intervene

On June 5, 2026, Kim Howell filed a petition to intervene as an impacted landowner, stating that she is directly impacted by the proposed PSEG project, and that as an adjacent landowner, she should have been—but was not—notified of the project by PSEG.¹⁶ PSEG has noted that it does not oppose this intervention.¹⁷

¹³ Maillog No. 331265, Staff Comments on the proposed procedural schedule.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ The commenters who wrote in before or during the comment window include Brandon Hill (Maillog No. 330436), Brenda Myers (Maillog No. 330504), Whitney Miller (Maillog No. 330532), William Sykora (Maillog Nos. 330797 and 331238), Scott Molony (Maillog No. 330893), Kathy Grochowski (Maillog No. 330978), Kwong Cheng (Maillog No. 331055), Laura Seibel (Maillog No. 331088), Kathryn Kilroy (Maillog No. 331107), Michele Ringger-Weil (Maillog No. 331177), Jennifer Teeter and William Frank Baylor (Maillog No. 331185), Elizabeth and Michael McFarland (Maillog No. 331191), Hattery Farm LLC (Maillog No. 331202), Deborah Boots (Maillog No. 331209), Cheryl Ebaugh (Maillog No. 331220), James Werner (Maillog No. 331223), Jonathan and Amanda Krumrine (Maillog No. 331225), Chantal Mosellen (Maillog No. 331226), Nichola Early (Maillog No. 331227), Gaver Farm LLC (Maillog No. 331231), Derek Seibel (Maillog No. 331247), Frederick County Farm Bureau (Maillog No. 331252), Joshua Cy Morningstar (Maillog No. 331263), Dianne and John Rose (Maillog No. 331271), and Benjamin Miller (Maillog No. 331273).

¹⁶ Maillog No. 330851, Kim Howell, Petition to Intervene.

¹⁷ Maillog No. 331056.

COMMISSION DECISION

The Commission remains committed to ensuring that PPRP can conduct a full and proper review. The Commission therefore accepts PSEG's proposed revised procedural schedule, which was developed in collaboration with PPRP and to which PPRP does not object, with the following modifications:

- (1) The Commission agrees with OPC that parties should be allowed sufficient time for surrebuttal responses to rebuttal positions. The Commission-adopted schedule therefore maintains the originally scheduled timeframe of 28 days between rebuttal and surrebuttal testimony; and
- (2) the Commission finds that the proposed revised schedule did not include sufficient time for public comment. The Commission-adopted schedule therefore provides for three in-person public comment hearings, one in each County, held on a Saturday, between the submission of Direct Testimony and prior to Evidentiary Hearings.¹⁸

The Commission must perform its required statutory public interest review under *Annotated Code of Maryland*, Public Utilities Article § 7-207, which requires a thorough administrative record to review. The revised procedural schedule will allow the Commission to act on an appropriately full record.

The Commission also affirms that discovery rules and response times, as established in Order No. 91709, remain unchanged.

The Commission therefore amends the Procedural Schedule to adopt the following dates that will govern this proceeding:

¹⁸ Intervenor Jones-Prettyman made reference to the *Transource* case (Case No. 9471); the Commission notes that for comments on the Application, ultimately in that case, one hearing was held in each impacted county, similar to the schedule the Commission is adopting in this case. See Maillog 224434, Case No. 9471, "Notice of Hearings for Public Comment," (Mar. 25, 2019).

- (1) Staff OPC, PPRP, and Intervenors shall file Direct Testimony by Tuesday, March 2, 2027;
- (2) in-person only, Public Comment Hearings in each County (one in each County, to be held on a Saturday), beginning Saturday, March 6, 2027;
- (3) Rebuttal Testimony responding to other parties and Supplemental Testimony responding to public comments, and any updated recommended conditions shall be filed by Monday, March 29, 2027;
- (4) Surrebuttal Testimony shall be filed by Monday, April 26, 2027;
- (5) Evidentiary Hearings will be held beginning Tuesday, May 11, 2027 through Friday, May 21, 2027,¹⁹ time and location to be determined;
- (6) Parties shall file Post Hearing Initial Briefs by Monday, June 14, 2027;
- (7) Parties shall file Post-Hearing Reply Briefs by Monday, June 28, 2027; and
- (8) the Target Final Order date shall be 60 days following the conclusion of the evidentiary hearing.

Additionally, given that no party has opposed Ms. Howell's petition to intervene, the Commission grants intervenor status to Ms. Howell.

IT IS, THEREFORE, this day 27th day of August, in the year Two Thousand Twenty-Six, by the Public Service Commission of Maryland, **ORDERED** that the procedural schedule detailed above shall govern this matter, subject to amendment for good cause, and that Kim Howell be granted intervenor status.

By Direction of the Commission,

/s/ Andrew S. Johnston

Andrew S. Johnston
Executive Secretary

¹⁹ Live rejoinder at the evidentiary hearing will be limited to new issues raised in surrebuttal testimony.