RANKING MEMBER COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE

## FRANK PALLONE, JR.

6TH DISTRICT, NEW JERSEY

## Congress of the United States

House of Representatives

**Mashington, DC 20515–3006**January 18, 2017

□ 237 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515–3006
(202) 225–4671
□ 504 BROADWAY
LONG BRANCH, NJ 07740
(732) 571–1140
□ 67/69 CHURCH STREET
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08901
(732) 249–8892
TOLL-FREE NUMBER:
(888) 423–1140
pallone.house.gov

REPLY TO:

Mr. James V. Fakult President Jersey Central Power and Light 331 Newman Springs Road, Building 3, Suite 325 Red Bank, NJ 07701

Dear Mr. Fakult:

I write regarding the Monmouth County Reliability Project (MCRP), the proposed 10-mile, 230-kilovolt (kV) transmission line and substation enhancement project announced in June 2016 by Jersey Central Power and Light (JCP&L), a subsidiary of FirstEnergy. In light of recent questions raised by the New Jersey Division of Rate Counsel and strong opposition from communities along the proposed route, I respectfully request that FirstEnergy/JCP&L withdraw the MCRP proposal.

As you know, last week, the state Rate Counsel submitted a number of comments on MCRP to the NJ Board of Public Utilities (NJ BPU), raising questions about the necessity of the project for meeting its proposed goal of increasing reliability of the portion of the grid serving Monmouth County. For example, the Rate Counsel testimony described several technical alternatives to the MCRP, which could improve reliability and satisfy the requirements of the North American Electric Reliability Corporation (NERC), including the use of static var compensators or static compensators; distributed generation; smart invertors; or smart grid technologies. The feasibility and costs of these alternatives should be fully explored as they may fulfill reliability requirements at lower cost. The use of these types of alternative technologies may have the added benefit of avoiding the strong community opposition generated by the proposed MCRP.

In addition to the questions and concerns raised by the Rate Counsel, there continues to be opposition from communities along the proposed route. One of the issues raised by community members is the impact this project could have on home values, specifically the poles the plan states are necessary, which will be up to 210 feet tall in places. The height of the line is in part due to requirements necessary to construct along the NJ Transit right-of-way (ROW). It should be noted that NJ Transit has not yet granted FirstEnergy/JCP&L approval to construct along its ROW.

When the concerns of the Rate Counsel are coupled with opposition from communities along the proposed route, it is clear that the MCRP is not the best or most cost effective way to increase reliability in Monmouth County. FirstEnergy/JCP&L should withdraw the MCRP proposal. While NERC reliability requirements must be addressed, the company should explore

other viable alternatives to meet those requirements in Monmouth County. The company should examine all viable alternatives fully to ensure that we achieve the goal of enhanced reliability through the most cost-effective means.

Thank you for your consideration of my request.

Sincerely,

FRANK PALLONE, J

Member of Congress

cc: Mr. Charles Jones, President & Chief Executive Officer, FirstEnergy