

**William M. Gausman**  
Senior Vice President  
Asset Management and Planning

202-872-3227  
202-872-3302 Fax  
wmgausman@pepco.com

February 11, 2009

Ms. Libby Nagel  
Chair, Dorchester Citizens for Safe Energy  
4762 Ravenwood Road  
Vienna, Maryland 21869

Ms. Nagel:

Thank you for your letter last week describing your concerns regarding the Mid-Atlantic Power Pathway. I also wanted to thank you and your members for meeting face-to-face with our Project Manager Vince Maione, Ms. Therese Yewell and Mr. John Allen this past Monday to further discuss these concerns. I continue to believe firmly that open and transparent dialogue is an important part of the process in building this much needed electricity transmission line.

Late last week, we sent a letter to the Dorchester County Council detailing some of our new efforts to improve public outreach including:

- Our search for a location, near the county facilities, to house a local presence for MAPP where citizens will be able to come ask questions or voice concerns.
- The production of a newsletter that will better inform citizens along the route
- Creation of a MAPP public advisory group made up of key organizations and representatives of the County

This public process is very important to us. I know that you asked in your letter for us to postpone our next meetings until we have more detailed answers for a long list of very complex questions. I can assure you that we will have answers. However, it is impossible to wait until we have all the answers to every question before we reach out to the public again.

We want the public's input throughout the process. That is why we will continue to hold regular meetings with citizens, including the upcoming question and answer sessions on February 19, 24 and 26. These are not the only meetings we will hold, and we are open to talking with you, the County Council and other influential groups about other venues we should consider such as your suggestion to hold another large meeting at the high school.

You mention that you were interested in learning more about the alternatives that PJM considered before approving the MAPP line. The best place to get this information is from PJM. Their Web site however, is full of information and can be a little overwhelming. I would suggest going to this link to see how they evaluated options: <http://www.pjm.com/documents/reports/rtep-report.aspx> . They discuss criteria for selection as well as the benefits of their decision for the electrical grid.

You also asked about the cost of various alternatives and suggested strongly that we should consider going up the Nanticoke River as an option. I would like to explain what we are doing related to route selection. In order for the commission to fully evaluate the impact of this project we must supply the Commission a cost and impacts comparison of various overhead and underground options. We are developing these cost estimates for the underground route and for us to evaluate the cost and impact of the overhead route we must select a route to perform this analysis. This is the purpose of the work that we are currently performing. At the upcoming community meetings, we will be presenting people with our three land-based route alternatives. This does not mean the Nanticoke option is off the table, but it does mean that there is going have to be a significant amount of new environmental studies that need to be completed before we can confirm if an all underwater or all underground option can be a viable route. That being said, we are actively conducting these studies and will get back to you with what we find.

Please understand that we also want a route that minimizes the impact on the County. This is not only our desire, but also the standard to which several agencies will hold us accountable. During the formal Public Service Commission process several facts will be heavily scrutinized:

- What is the need for this line?
- Does the proposed route balance historic, aesthetic, recreational, archeological, forest, agricultural and other land use factors?
- Has the project team listened to public input and incorporated that into route decision making?
- What are the environmental impacts of the line, and are all the proper permits in order?

These are just a few of the questions that will be asked throughout this process. We also will better be able to answer some of the more complex questions you asked in your letter as a result of this public process. As we provide data to the Commission, it will be made public for you and other interested groups to consider.

You mentioned the benefits to Dorchester County. It is important to understand how this county is part of a much larger electric system. As I stated at the Council meeting, this line will provide a new power source directly to the County through its connection in Vienna. This will ensure electricity reliability for years to come. There are also significant tax benefits that come with this project and there will be near-term construction jobs as well.

Finally, and understandably so, you noted that you have concerns about health effects posed by electromagnetic fields. This will be a high-voltage direct current, or DC, line. The advantage of using this technology is the different types of electric and magnetic fields that result. I have attached a fact sheet to this letter that better explains how this works. I am also happy to connect you with a third party expert we have hired to explore this issue further.

I understand that there are many people in this community who have questions. It wasn't hard to see that during the Council meeting. I am glad you have these questions and are willing to engage us in an ongoing conversation to find answers. Please feel free to give me or Project Manager Vince Maione a call at (410) 860-6207 or Delmarva's Regional Vice President John Allen at (410) 860-6205 anytime.

Sincerely,



William M. Gausman

cc Ms. Therese C. Yewell (PHD)

