STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, to investigate opportunities for improving the process by which it reviews applications filed under MCL 460.6a.	)))))	Case No. U-21637

At the December 18, 2025 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing, Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. Daniel C. Scripps, Chair
Hon. Katherine L. Peretick, Commissioner
Hon. Shaquila Myers, Commissioner

ORDER

On November 28, 2023, Governor Gretchen Whitmer signed Public Act 231 of 2023 (Act 231), which became effective on February 13, 2024. Section 6aa(3) of Act 231, MCL 460.6aa(3), provides that "[n]ot later than June 1, 2024, the commission shall open a proceeding to investigate opportunities for improving the process by which it reviews applications filed under section 6a." "Section 6a" refers to MCL 460.6a, which governs the utility rate case process. On May 23, 2024, the Commission opened the instant docket for the purpose of conducting this investigation into improving the rate case process (May 23 order).

As described in the May 23 order, the Commission's process for reviewing rate case applications was significantly altered when Public Act 341 of 2016 (Act 341) was signed into law. Section 6a(5) of Act 341, MCL 460.6a(5), reduced the amount of time available to the

Commission and the Commission Staff (Staff) to process electric, natural gas, and steam general rate cases from 12 months to 10 months. Notably, MCL 460.6a(5) states that, subject to limited exceptions, "if the commission fails to reach a final decision with respect to a completed petition or application to increase or decrease utility rates within the 10-month period following the filing of the completed petition or application, the petition or application is considered approved." This timeline can be extended, but only at the request of the filing utility.

Though described in the May 23 order, it is worth repeating that over the last eight years (while processing these cases within this compressed timeframe) the cases themselves have undergone an extraordinary expansion in size, particularly with respect to Michigan's two largest investor-owned utilities (IOUs), Consumers Energy Company (Consumers) and DTE Electric Company (DTE Electric). To provide a single example, DTE Electric's 2016 electric rate case, Case No. U-18014, involved 31 parties, 45 witnesses, and 2,031 pages of testimony, and resulted in a 332-page Proposal for Decision (PFD) and a 205-page final decision. By comparison, DTE Electric's 2023 electric rate case, Case No. U-21297, involved 69 parties, 85 witnesses, and 4,227 pages of testimony, and resulted in an 876-page PFD and a 481-page final decision. This trend of expanding case record volume is reflected in virtually every rate case filed since 2016. While there are a number of benefits to this expansion in intervening parties and issues raised, including the participation of groups representing communities and perspectives that have too often been marginalized in the past and a more robust evidentiary record on which the Commission can base its decisions, it has also put a strain on the resources of all of the entities involved in these cases, including the Commission and its Staff.

In the May 23 order, the Commission invited comment on a variety of topics and also welcomed open-ended comment. The Commission also indicated that it continues to seek ways

to enhance the opportunity for interested persons to participate in these matters and to improve the ability of utility customers to understand the implications of these cases, while also enhancing the Commission's ability to hear and decide each rate case issue in a reasonable and prudent manner based on a sufficient evidentiary record. The Commission notes that it has attempted to use the Rate Case Filing Requirements (RCFR) to bring as much predictability, structure, and organization as possible to these cases while ensuring the creation of an adequate record. Not all aspects of the rate case process are within the Commission's control, most notably the statutory 10-month decision window and the date that a utility chooses for filing its application.[1] However, the Commission also invited comments on topics that are outside the Commission's jurisdiction to inform the broader discussion around utility rate cases. *See*, May 23 order, pp. 3-4.

On July 2, 2024, the Commission issued an order in this docket extending the time for filing initial comments and reply comments.

On September 27, 2024, initial comments were filed by the Staff; Consumers; DTE Electric and DTE Gas Company (DTE Gas) (together, DTE); the Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity (ABATE); the Michigan Department of Attorney General (Attorney General); the Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules (MOAHR); the Ecology Center, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Union of Concerned Scientists, and Vote Solar (collectively, the Clean Energy Organizations, or CEOs); Michigan Electric and Gas Association (MEGA); the University of Michigan School for Environment and Sustainability; and the

[1] MCL 460.6a(6) provides that a utility may file an application for an increase in rates every 12 months, and MCL 460.6a(1) allows the Commission to require the two largest electric IOUs to space their rate case filings at least 21 days apart.

Natural Resources Defense Council, Ecology Center, EcoWorks, Legacy and Love LLC, Michigan Environmental Council, Michigan Environmental Justice Coalition, Michigan League of Conservation Voters, Sierra Club, Sistas in Development, LLC, Soulardarity, Urban Core Collective, and We Want Green, Too (collectively, NRDC). On September 30, 2024, initial comments were filed by Michigan Energy Innovation Business Council and Advanced Energy United (collectively, MEIU). On October 25, 2024, reply comments were filed by DTE, Consumers, MEGA, ABATE, the CEOs, NRDC, MOAHR, and the Attorney General. The CEOs stated that for their reply comments they are joined by Soulardarity, Urban Core Collective, and We Want Green, Too. CEOs' reply comments, p. 1.[2]

On July 10, 2025, the Commission issued an order in this docket (July 10 order) summarizing and addressing the filed comments, and inviting further comment on three specified issues no later than September 10, 2025.[3]

On September 10, 2025, comments on the three specified issues were filed by the Staff, the Attorney General, MEIU, DTE, Consumers, MEGA, and the City of Ann Arbor (Ann Arbor).

This order provides a brief description of the comments followed by the Commission's further findings regarding rate case process improvements.

[2] The Commission notes that it also held a town hall meeting on May 29, 2025, in Detroit to listen to comments on improving public engagement. Issues surrounding public engagement are addressed in the July 10, 2025 order in Case No. U-21638.

[3] The July 10 order also directed the Staff to file a draft proposal exploring the concept of adopting a separate, standalone proceeding covering the issues of cost of service and rate design in this docket no later than October 30, 2025, and to file a follow-up report on these issues no later than January 15, 2026. The Commission also invited comment on the latter topics, to be filed no later than February 16, 2026. The Commission notes that the Staff's report was filed on October 30, 2025 (filing #U-21637-0034). These issues will be addressed in a separate order when that effort is completed.

Comments and Discussion

In the July 10 order, the Commission invited "additional comment on the issues of: (1) an appropriate schedule for a contested settlement in a rate case; (2) a new DR [demand response] process; and (3) how potential bill impacts should be communicated to customers during the course of a rate case." July 10 order, p. 41. The three topics are addressed below.

The Schedule for a Contested Settlement in a Rate Case

MEGA comments that it is open to this concept, but that it will require further discussion. MEGA opines that contested settlements could increase regulatory lag, and the settlement itself may never occur even if the case is moved to a different schedule. MEGA's comments, p. 3. MEGA suggests that the Commission limit the amount of time that it has to rule on a contested settlement and suspend discovery during negotiations.

Consumers emphasizes that the Commission cannot compel a utility to waive the 10-month deadline. Consumers notes that settlement discussions will typically not occur until all pre-filed testimony is filed (about five months into the case), and sometimes not until cross-examination is complete. Consumers' comments, p. 3. Thus, Consumers posits that a settlement cannot reasonably be expected to be filed with the Commission with anything more than four months remaining of the ten months; and, per Mich Admin Code, R 792.10431(5)(a), the Commission must accept testimony from all parties, hold a hearing, and allow initial and reply briefing before the contested agreement can be considered. Then, Consumers notes, the contested settlement may be rejected. Consumers states that the utility may not be forced to waive its statutory rights, and a "single party can hold up settlement even where there is broad consensus on the issues among all the other parties, even if the party's settlement demands are unreasonable." Consumers' comments, p. 4. In sum, Consumers posits that it is difficult to develop a general

schedule for contested settlements, because the decision to make the waiver is fact-dependent and will be made on a case-by-case basis.

Consumers adds that:

> [i]f non-utility parties – particularly Staff – were willing to share a preview of their intended position in the case ahead of the due date for filing direct testimony, that could facilitate an earlier commencement of settlement discussions. The parties could be encouraged to do so by having the Administrative Law Judges set a date for case previews as part of the formal schedule in the case. . . . The Commission could also identify a "drop-dead" date for a contested settlement, which would mark the last date when the parties could file a contested settlement and . . . couple that with a commitment that, if a utility agrees to waive the 10-month deadline for a contested settlement filed after the "drop-dead" date, the Commission will issue a final order by a date that corresponds to the number of days that have elapsed since the "drop-dead" date.

Id., p. 5. Consumers comments that this would allow the utility to make an informed decision about whether to waive the 10-month deadline.

DTE comments that a consistent process for addressing contested settlements would be beneficial and that there should be a predetermined extension to the 10-month timeframe as part of the process. DTE's comments, p. 2. DTE proposes a 60-day contested settlement process with a 60-day stay of the case stipulated to in writing by the utility and filed with the proposed settlement agreement. *Id*.

MEIU states that it does not favor contested settlements and it cautions the Commission against appearing to endorse such settlements. MEIU posits that a procedure for addressing a non-unanimous settlement may result in intervenors losing status in rate cases, and may seem to approve a process wherein important issues remain unresolved. MEIU's comments, p. 3. MEIU comments that the Commission should not approve adoption of a mandated settlement conference or a contested settlement process.

The Attorney General opposes the use of contested settlements, commenting that rate cases have significant financial repercussions and that contested settlements add to the utility's negotiating power. Attorney General's comments, pp. 1-2 (using natural pagination order). The Attorney General adds that, if the Commission proceeds with this concept, "[t]he negotiating window should be no longer than 30 days and the Company would need to agree at the prehearing to delay the final order by the Commission by the same number of days past the 10-months statutory requirement for a final order in the rate case." *Id*., p. 2.

The Staff observes that approving a defined timeframe, such as 60 days, for the consideration of the contested settlement may incentivize the utility to waive the 10-month deadline; but that the 10-month timeframe makes the achievement of settlement very challenging. Staff's comments, p. 2.

As provided for in Mich Admin Code, R 792.10431(1), the Commission encourages parties to enter into settlements when possible. The Commission agrees with MEIU and the Attorney General that a mandated contested settlement process may unintentionally signal support for this type of resolution when, in fact, the Commission is simply interested in potential improvements to the rate case process within the bounds of the statutory constraints. The Commission declines the proposal to adopt a specific contested settlement schedule, but notes that there is consensus among the commenters around the need for at least 60 days for consideration of a contested settlement. Thus, the Commission recommends that, if the utility is a signatory to a contested settlement, then the utility should agree to pause the schedule for no less than 60 days to allow for sufficient evaluation of the contested settlement and to ensure that, in the event that the contested settlement agreement is rejected by the Commission, the Commission has enough time remaining to properly work through the record of the case.

The Demand Response Process

Ann Arbor opposes moving DR issues to separate plan filings but supports dealing with these issues entirely in rate cases, noting that several commenters in the previous round of comments indicated that yet another separate proceeding would not be ideal. Ann Arbor's comments, p. 2. Ann Arbor states that rate cases allow for holistic analysis, and argues that the introduction of a new surcharge would be confusing to ratepayers and could lead to DR being disfavored when, in fact, it is highly cost-effective.

MEGA supports a new process that provides flexibility to the utility to use either a plan proceeding or a rate case. MEGA's comments, p. 4. MEGA notes that smaller utilities have limited DR programs and annual filings may not be practical, because smaller utilities do not file annual rate cases. MEGA comments that DR should also be evaluated, for smaller utilities, in integrated resource plan (IRP) cases. MEGA states that the cadence of rate cases for smaller utilities may result in several years of regulatory deferrals. *Id*., p. 5. MEGA adds that:

> implementing a separate DR tracker exclusively for demand response costs would also be inefficient for small utilities due to the minimal revenue requirements involved. The utility and MPSC Staff resources required to prepare and audit stand-alone DR rider filings could outweigh the benefits. Instead, small utilities should have the option to include DR cost reconciliations within existing riders or tracking mechanisms, such as Energy Waste Reduction (EWR). . . . Recovery of DR costs could be included in the EWR revenue requirement[.]

Id. MEGA asks that the Commission consider the unique circumstances of smaller utilities.

Consumers supports one combined annual DR plan and reconciliation case, with a forward looking plan and a retrospective reconciliation collected through a surcharge similar to how EWR works. Consumers' comments, p. 6. Consumers states that it has made the same proposal in its pending electric rate case (Case No. U-21870) and its pending DR reconciliation case (Case

No. U-21906). Consumers argues that this change will reduce regulatory lag and the complexity of the current three-part process, and should be approved for the 2027 planning year. *Id*., p. 7.

DTE comments that any issues that are separated from a rate case should "be issues for which the Commission has the ability to authorize cost recovery[.]" DTE's comments, p. 3. DTE states that, "[t]o reduce and simplify the number of case filings where DR exists, DTE proposes that the DR plan, reconciliation and surcharge calculation all remain within the rate case filing." *Id*. DTE states that it supports the surcharge methodology that was approved for Consumers in Case No. U-21585.

MEIU comments that DR program targets and costs must continue to be included in IRP cases. MEIU's comments, p. 5.

The Attorney General opposes Consumers' proposal for one combined but separate plan and reconciliation case and supports the move towards rate cases for these DR issues. Attorney General's comments, p. 2. She comments that Consumers' proposal would continue the current bifurcation of proceedings and the unnecessary use of additional resources.

The Staff observes that both Consumers and DTE Electric have included testimony in their pending rate cases (Case Nos. U-21870 and U-21860, respectively) supporting a proposal to move DR issues outside of rate cases. Staff's comments, p. 2. The Staff also notes that in the March 21, 2025 order in Case No. U-21585, the Commission approved a DR surcharge for Consumers in a rate case; but DTE Electric has not pursued such a surcharge. In light of these developments, the Staff supports either of two scenarios. The Staff proposes that DR could be moved into a separate proceeding, with either a surcharge or deferred accounting. The Staff states that:

> [c]ombining the forward-looking plan with the reconciliation of spending for the prior period would allow a surcharge to be recalculated and reconciled within a

> single proceeding. To effectuate this approach, a utility would first need to have a surcharge approved in a rate case. Then all DR expenses could be moved from the rate case into the separate DR proceedings. This would replicate how [Consumers'] current DR surcharge was approved and align with its recommendations in its current rate case and DR reconciliation filing.

Staff's comments, p. 3 (emphasis removed). Alternatively, the Staff states that DR could be moved entirely into the rate case, and adds that: "To enable this process, each utility would need to file a final DR reconciliation wherein a final balance would be determined and recovered in a subsequent rate case. This would allow the reconciliation process to end and all DR costs to be included in subsequent rate cases." *Id*., p. 4 (emphasis removed).

The Commission agrees with Ann Arbor, DTE, the Attorney General, and the Staff, and finds the Staff's second proposal to be reasonable and prudent. The Commission notes that MEGA, while not supporting either option, did not propose any alternative. The Commission also notes that authorization of DR spending is already considered in rate cases for all applicable utilities. The Commission finds that the rate case option recognizes that DR is more akin to generation investments and should be part of the holistic review that occurs in rate cases (with capacity amounts being determined in IRPs). The Commission directs the Staff and the utilities to hereafter include DR in rate cases after a final reconciliation has taken place under the existing construct. The Commission recognizes that this is likely a two-year process, but finds that the advantages associated with moving the entire DR rate approval process to rate cases outweigh any inconvenience associated with the delay.

Communicating Potential Bill Impacts to Customers in a Rate Case

Ann Arbor supports the CEOs' recommendation that the Commission require utilities to notify customers of the impact of a requested rate increase on customer billing statements. Ann Arbor adds that the utility should be required to include instructions on how to submit comments

in an active rate case, with a link. Ann Arbor's comments, p. 3. Ann Arbor also supports requiring the Staff to include a summary and analysis of all public comments filed in the rate case so that it becomes part of the record of the case. *Id*.

MEGA comments that bills are not the optimal place to communicate rate case information, and notes that not all customers receive paper bills. MEGA's comments, p. 6. MEGA asks that the Commission maintain flexibility for the utility and not adopt an across-the-board approach to customer communication.

Consumers comments that bill impacts are not known until a rate case is concluded and that it is unnecessary to communicate anything beyond what is available in the public record of the rate case "when the full rate relief sought is rarely granted." Consumers' comments, p. 8. Consumers asks the Commission to focus on customer education about the rate case process, stating that:

> Consumers Energy would support a partnership with the Commission to develop educational materials targeted at customers who are interested in understanding how the process works. This could include an explanation of how the Company arrives at its rate relief request, how the proposed changes are allocated across different rate classes, and how the Commission works through the process to reach its final decision. Customers might also be interested in a step-by-step overview of the 10-month rate case process. Customers should be encouraged to participate in the rate case process and education would make participation more beneficial.

Id. Consumers posits that this type of information would be more constructive than potential bill impacts.

DTE states that, currently, bill impact information is included in the utility's initial filing and in the Commission's final order. DTE states that, upon issuance of the order, the company "communicates rate impacts to all customers through a combination of bill messages, direct outreach, and public media." DTE's comments, p. 4. DTE comments that this is sufficient.

MEIU comments that most residential and many commercial customers are not able to comprehend potential bill impacts if they are not clearly explained. MEIU states that:

> each utility should be required to provide customers with detailed rate comparison reports that can be accessed either through a customer's online account or via a report mailed separately from the customer's bill. Where options are present, such reports should allow customers to transparently compare the options and understand how the characteristics of their usage influence their bills (including under different rate designs). . . . Furthermore, customer rate impacts that are caused by a rate increase associated with a rate case should be conveyed to customers following the conclusion of a rate case through a customer's online account or via a statement mailed separately from the customer's bill.

MEIU's comments, pp. 6-7. MEIU states that the Commission should direct utilities to file these comprehensive bill impact customer engagement plans, with information about the timeline and the associated cost.

The Attorney General proposes the following two-prong approach:

> First, upon filing of a rate case, the utility should provide customers with the key aspects of the filed case, including (1) the amount of rate increase requested, (2) the average percent increase in rates for residential and small commercial customers, (3) the major reasons and related dollar amounts for the rate increase, (4) the amount of capital spending proposed and the areas where that spending is directed with explanations of what it is targeted to achieve, (5) the return on investment requested, and (6) any increases or decreases in operation and maintenance expenses and the related reasons. . . . The Company should also take this opportunity to communicate the historical level of service it has delivered to customers in recent years and the specific goals it has set for improvement in the level of service, such as reductions in power outages and service restoration time for electric utilities, and similar items for gas utilities, including how the utility's rates and cost structure compare to other utilities in surrounding states. The actual performance against these goals would be reported in the following case filing.
>
> Second, following the issuance of the Commission order, the Company would communicate to customers the amounts approved by the Commission against the requested amount for each of the 6 items identified above and previously communicated to customers. The Commission can also include a link in its press release to a website page that would explain to customers that after review of its request by the Commission Staff, the Attorney General, and several other parties representing the interest of customers, the Commission decided that certain portions of the request were not appropriate for inclusion in this rate case and

> would be avoided or could be resubmitted by the Company in a later rate case. Even though the Commission does explain its decisions in its final order for the case, the order is difficult for the general public to review. Accordingly, a more summarized explanation for the public would be helpful. To supplement this communication, the Commission could hold public hearings subsequent to the filing of the rate case and also after the issuance of the rate case order with utility management as part of the panel of speakers. The latter hearing would be an opportunity for customers to obtain explanations on any aspect of the order they do not understand or agree with.

Id., pp. 3-4.

The Staff comments that there are two alternative timing opportunities for these communications, and the Commission could employ one or both. The Staff states that the utility could provide information on the potential bill impact at the time of filing the rate case, where the utility would have specific details about the impact. Staff's comments, p. 5. The Staff states that the utility could also/alternatively provide information on the potential bill impact at the time it makes its filing announcement, 60 days prior to filing the rate case. The Staff notes that, while only a generic bill impact could be communicated at this stage, this timing would give customers more time to file written comments and seek more information before the case starts. The Staff adds that:

> customers communicate with the utility and MPSC through complaints, comments, and public forums. When contacting the MPSC, customers indicate they want to get involved, want to understand the impact, or want to be aware. Customers often find out about customer-facing impacts at some point during a proceeding, when they don't have a voice or even after a final determination has been made.

Id.

Turning to the issue of the delivery method, the Staff notes that Mich Admin Code, R 460.149 (Rule 49) requires the utility to notify customers when a request to change its rates has been filed. The Staff comments that the Commission may want to direct utilities to utilize

communication methods in addition to the traditional public media channel methods that are currently in use. The Staff lists the following potential methods:

a. [U.S.] Mail to Each Customer. High customer penetration.
b. Email to Customers. Not all customers have email.
c. Pre-recorded phone message to each customer.
d. Bill Insert. Not all customers receive paper bills.
e. On the Bill. (i) Insert information under quick tips (minimal space to use). (ii) A permanent redesign to produce a standard message on the bill - perhaps the very bottom of an electronic bill or on the back of a paper bill, etc. Could include a short message such as "no current rate case" or "rate increase requested, U-xxxxx" or a more specific message using the content mentioned above.
f. Mobile App (similar to power outage communications)[.]
g. Online payment site[.]
h. Using the utility website, create a dedicated landing page with only rate case information on that particular page. If this method were utilized, all other delivery methods (including the bill) could direct people to said landing page through a short message such as 'see www.utilityname.com/ratecase for more info' or 'click here for more information about current rate cases'. However, even if a landing page option were utilized, the existence of said page would still need to be successfully communicated to customers so that customers knew of its existence and be of value to customers. A dedicated landing page could include any of the dollar/percent content mentioned above, a calculator that shows what a customer bill would be if the rate request were approved, other information required by Commission rules, link to the docket/case, etc.

Id., pp. 5-6. The Staff does not make any recommendation with regard to the method.

Rule 49(3) provides as follows:

> A utility . . . shall provide to each customer, within 60 days after the utility has filed a general rate case application with the commission, all of the following information:
> (a) A notice that the utility has requested that the commission change its rates.
> (b) A notice that copies of the utility's application are available for inspection at all offices of the utility and on the utility's website.
> (c) A notice that an explanation of the proposed changes to the utility's rates is available from the utility upon request.

Rule 49(5) provides as follows: "A utility . . . shall provide the notice required by this rule either through a publication that is transmitted to each of its customers by a bill insert, or whatever transmission method is used to provide the customer's bill and on its website." The Commission

finds that the notice required by Rule 49(3) shall include both the dollar and percentage impact to the average residential and commercial customer bill, and, per Rule 49(5), shall be communicated both in a physical form, either by bill insert (for customers who receive a bill via U.S. Mail) or on the bill itself, and digitally on the utility's website home page and app home screen. The information may appear, for example, as a banner that may be removed 60 days after the conclusion of the rate case. This information shall initially be provided based on the utility's rate case application and, after issuance of the Commission's final rate case order, based on the order. A preview of what the notification will look like, both for the physical and digital notifications, shall be included with any new future rate case filing. The Commission also finds value in the Staff's suggestion (h) above to create a dedicated landing page on the utility's website to further detail the requests made in the rate case application and directs each of the physical and digital notifications to point to this web page. These changes are effective for any rate case filed on or after March 1, 2026. The Commission also intends to reflect these provisions in the RCFR at a future date.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:

A. After the conclusion of its pending or final reconciliation of demand response costs pursuant to the three-part process approved in Case No. U-18369, each investor-owned utility shall file its demand response cost request in a general rate case.

B. Effective for rate cases filed on or after March 1, 2026, notices issued pursuant to Mich Admin Code, R 460.149(3) and (5) shall include both the dollar and percentage impact to the average residential and commercial customer bill and shall be communicated by both physical form, either a bill insert (for customers who receive a bill via U.S. Mail) or on the bill itself, and digitally on each investor-owned utility's website home page and app home screen, from

initiation of the rate case until 60 days after the conclusion of the rate case. This information shall initially be based on the utility's rate case application and, after issuance of the Commission's final rate case order, it shall be based on the order. It shall also point to a dedicated web page that further details the requests made in the rate case, and a preview shall be included in each filed rate case, as described in this order.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26. To comply with the Michigan Rules of Court's requirement to notify the Commission of an appeal, appellants shall send required notices to both the Commission's Executive Secretary and to the Commission's Legal Counsel. Electronic notifications should be sent to the Executive Secretary at LARA-MPSC-Edockets@michigan.gov and to the Michigan Department of Attorney General - Public Service Division at sheac1@michigan.gov. In lieu of electronic submissions, paper copies of such notifications may be sent to the Executive Secretary and the Attorney General - Public Service Division at 7109 W. Saginaw Hwy., Lansing, MI 48917.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Daniel C. Scripps, Chair

Katherine L. Peretick, Commissioner

Shaquila Myers, Commissioner

By its action of December 18, 2025.

Lisa Felice, Executive Secretary

P R O O F O F S E R V I C E

STATE OF MICHIGAN)

Case No. U-21637

County of Ingham)

Brianna Brown being duly sworn, deposes and says that on December 18, 2025 A.D. she electronically notified the attached list of this **Commission Order via e-mail transmission**, to the persons as shown on the attached service list (Listserv Distribution List).

Brianna Brown

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 18th day of December 2025.

Angela P. Sanderson
Notary Public, Shiawassee County, Michigan
As acting in Eaton County
My Commission Expires: May 21, 2030

GEMOTION DISTRIBUTION SERVICE LIST

kabraham@mpower.org	Abraham,Katie - MMEA
mkuchera@AEPENERGY.COM	AEP Energy
mfurmanski@algerdelta.com	Alger Delta Cooperative
akellen@wppienergy.org	Alger Delta Cooperative
kd@alpenapower.com	Alpena Power
dgreen@alpenapower.com	Alpena Power
VSTRetailReg@VistraCorp.com	Ambit Midwest, LLC
kerdmann@atcllc.com	American Transmission Company
acotter@atcllc.com	American Transmission Company
john.calhoun@ardentnaturalgas.com	Ardent Natural Gas, LLC
awebster@baycitymi.gov	Bay City Electric Light & Power
sara.anderson@bayfieldelectric.com	Bayfield Electric
rbishop@BISHOPENERGY.COM	Bishop Energy
braukerL@MICHIGAN.GOV	Brauker, Linda
cherie.fuller@bp.com	BP Energy Retail Company, LLC
christine.hughey@bp.com	BP Energy Retail Company LLC
greg.bass@calpinesolutions.com	Calpine Energy Solutions
lachappelle@varnumlaw.com	Chappelle, Laura
manderson@wpsci.com	Cherryland Electric
mengels@wpsci.com	Cherryland Electric
cdrys@wpsci.com	Cherryland Electric
ljohnson@wpsci.com	Cherryland Electric
rjohnson@cherrylandelectric.coop	Cherryland Electric Cooperative
frucheyb@DTEENERGY.COM	Citizens Gas Fuel Company
crystalfallsmgr@HOTMAIL.COM	City of Crystal Falls
gpirkola@escanaba.org	City of Escanaba
jolson@gladstonemi.gov	City of Gladstone
kmaynard@cityofmarshall.com	City of Marshall
tdavlin@portland-michigan.org	City of Portland
cwilson@cloverland.com	Cloverland Electric
mheise@cloverland.com	Cloverland Electric
todd.mortimer@CMSENERGY.COM	CMS Energy
Kenneth.Johnston@cmsenergy.com	Consumers Energy
Yong.Keyes@cmsenergy.com	Consumers Energy
chibuzo.obikwelu@cmsenergy.com	Consumers Energy
sarah.jorgensen@cmsenergy.com	Consumers Energy Company
Michael.torrey@cmsenergy.com	Consumers Energy Company
CANDACE.GONZALES@cmsenergy.com	Consumers Energy Company
mpsc.filings@CMSENERGY.COM	Consumers Energy Company
mpsc.filings@CMSENERGY.COM	Consumers Energy Company
david.fein@CONSTELLATION.COM	Constellation Energy
kate.stanley@CONSTELLATION.COM	Constellation Energy
kate.fleche@CONSTELLATION.COM	Constellation New Energy

GEMOTION DISTRIBUTION SERVICE LIST

choicecompliance@constellation.com	Constellation New Energy Inc
lpage@dickinsonwright.com	Dickinson Wright
shaundillon@dillonenergy.com	Dillon Energy Services
info@dillonpower.com	Dillon Power, LLC
Neal.fitch@nrg.com	Direct Energy
Kara.briggs@nrg.com	Direct Energy
Ryan.harwell@nrg.com	Direct Energy
bryce.mckenney@nrg.com	Direct Energy
stephen.lindeman@dteenergy.com	DTE Energy
karl.lievense@dteenergy.com	DTE Energy
konstantin.korolyov@dteenergy.com	DTE Energy
mpscfilings@DTEENERGY.COM	DTE Energy
joyce.leslie@dteenergy.com	DTE Energy
karen.vucinaj@dteenergy.com	DTE Energy
customerservice@eligoenergy.com	Eligo Energy MI, LLC
regulatory@eligoenergy.com	Eligo Energy MI, LLC
frank.travaglione@vistracorp.com	Energy Harbor
rfawaz@energyintl.com	Energy International Power Marketing d/b/a PowerOne
sejackinchuk@varnumlaw.com	Energy Michigan
michael.reiss@engie.com	Engie Gas & Power LLC
customercare@plymouthenergy.com	ENGIE Gas & Power f/k/a Plymouth Energy
VSTRetailReg@VistraCorp.com	Everyday Energy, LLC d/b/a Energy Rewards
felicel@MICHIGAN.GOV	Felice, Lisa
bgorman@FIRSTENERGYCORP.COM	First Energy
phil@allendaleheating.com	Forner, Phil
dburks@glenergy.com	Great Lakes Energy
manderson@wpsci.com	Great Lakes Energy
mengels@wpsci.com	Great Lakes Energy
cdrys@wpsci.com	Great Lakes Energy
ljohnson@wpsci.com	Great Lakes Energy
slamp@glenergy.com	Great Lakes Energy Cooperative
sculver@glenergy.com	Great Lakes Energy Cooperative
johnm@gogreenlightenergy.com	Greenlight Energy Inc.
lrgustafson@CMSENERGY.COM	Gustafson, Lisa
jhammel@hillsdalebpu.com	Hillsdale Board of Public Utilities
coneill@homeworks.org	HomeWorks Tri-County Electric Cooperative
psimmer@HOMEWORKS.ORG	HomeWorks Tri-County Electric Cooperative
bmcbride@aep.com	Indiana Michigan Power
mgobrien@aep.com	Indiana Michigan Power Company
dan@megautilities.org	Integrys Group
daustin@IGSENERGY.COM	Interstate Gas Supply Inc
michael.nugent@igs.com	Interstate Gas Supply d/b/a IGS Energy
general@itctransco.com	ITC Holdings
cmarshall@itctransco.com	ITC Holdings
apascaris@itctransco.com	ITC Holdings

GEMOTION DISTRIBUTION SERVICE LIST

vanesetti@justenergy.com	Just Energy of Michigan Corporation
igoodman@commerceenergy.com	Just Energy Solutions
krichel@DLIB.INFO	Krichel, Thomas
dbodine@LIBERTYPOWERCORP.COM	Liberty Power
ham557@GMAIL.COM	Lowell S.
tjlundgren@varnumlaw.com	Lundgren, Timothy
tcarpenter@mblp.org	Marquette Board of Light & Power
regulatory@medianenergy.com	Median Energy Corporation
suzy@megautilities.org	MEGA
dan@megautilities.org	MEGA
mmann@USGANDE.COM	Michigan Gas & Electric
VSTRetailReg@VistraCorp.com	Michigan Gas & Electric (US Gas & Electric)
shannon.burzycki@wecenergygroup.com	Michigan Gas Utilities Corporation
mrzwiers@INTEGRYSGROUP.COM	Michigan Gas Utilities/Upper Penn Power/Wisconsin
kabraham@mpower.org	Michigan Public Power Agency
info@michigannaturalgasllc.com	Michigan Natural Gas, LLC
JHDillavou@midamericanenergyservices.com	MidAmerican Energy Services, LLC
JCAltmayer@midamericanenergyservices.com	MidAmerican Energy Services, LLC
LMLann@midamericanenergyservices.com	MidAmerican Energy Services, LLC
manderson@wpsci.com	Midwest Energy
mengels@wpsci.com	Midwest Energy
cdrys@wpsci.com	Midwest Energy
ljohnson@wpsci.com	Midwest Energy
dave.allen@TEAMMIDWEST.COM	Midwest Energy Cooperative
terry.rubenthaler@teammidwest.com	Midwest Energy Cooperative
kerri.wade@teammidwest.com	Midwest Energy Cooperative
Marie-Rose.Gatete@teammidwest.com	Midwest Energy Cooperative
meghan.tarver@teammidwest.com	Midwest Energy Cooperative
d.motley@COMCAST.NET	Motley, Doug
rarchiba@FOSTEROIL.COM	My Choice Energy
customerservice@nordicenergy-us.com	Nordic Energy Services, LLC
regulatory@nordicenergy-us.com	Nordic Energy Services, LLC
karl.j.hoesly@xcelenergy.com	Northern States Power
sarah.m.frazee@xcelenergy.com	Northern States Xcel
kbeattie@ntherm.com	nTherm, LLC
daho@ontorea.com	Ontonagon County Rural
esoumis@ontorea.com	Ontonagon County Rural Electric
regulatory@indraenergy.com	PALMco Energy MI, LLC d/b/a Indra Energy
mpauley@GRANGERNET.COM	Pauley, Marc
mmpeck@fischerfranklin.com	Peck, Matthew
bschlansker@PREMIERENERGYLLC.COM	Premier Energy Marketing LLC
manderson@wpsci.com	Presque Isle

GEMOTION DISTRIBUTION SERVICE LIST

mengels@wpsci.com	Presque Isle
cdrys@wpsci.com	Presque Isle
ljohnson@wpsci.com	Presque Isle
MVanschoten@pieg.com	Presque Isle Electric & Gas Cooperative, INC
aberg@pieg.com	Presque Isle Electric & Gas Cooperative, INC
yesterdae@getprovision.com	Provision Power & Gas, LLC
johnbistranin@realgy.com	Realgy Corp.
BusinessOffice@REALGY.COM	Realgy Energy Services
akeilson@genieretail.com	Residents Energy LLC
btrombino@rpaenergy.com	RPA Energy d/b/a Green Choice Energy
mvorabouth@ses4energy.com	Santana Energy
rabaey@SES4ENERGY.COM	Santana Energy
ttynes@ses4energy.com	Santanna Natural Gas Corporation
trish.mcfadin@southstarenergy.com	SouthStar d/b/a Grand Rapids Energy
kejoseph@sparkenergy.com	Spark Energy Gas, LP
cborr@WPSCI.COM	Spartan Renewable Energy, Inc. (Wolverine Power Marketing Corp)
jbelec@stephenson-mi.org	Stephenson Utilities Department
kay8643990@YAHOO.COM	Superior Energy Company
legal@symmetryenergy.com	Symmetry Energy Solutions, LLC
regulatory@texasretailenergy.com	Texas Retail Energy, LLC
agilbert@cleanskyenergy.com	Tital Gas, LLC d/b/a CleanSkyEnergy
bessenmacher@tecmi.coop	Thumb Electric Cooperative
president@tomorrowenergy.com	Tomorrow Energy Corporation
manderson@wpsci.com	Tri-County Electric
mengels@wpsci.com	Tri-County Electric
cdrys@wpsci.com	Tri-County Electric
ljohnson@wpsci.com	Tri-County Electric
mlindsay@uetllc.com	United Energy Trading d/b/a Kratos Gas & Power
colleen.sipiorski@wecenergygroup.com	Upper Michigan Energy Resources Corporation
djmier@integrysgroup.com	Upper Michigan Energy Resources Corporation
James.Beyer@wecenergygroup.com	Upper Michigan Energy Resources Corporation
Richard.Stasik@wecenergygroup.com	Upper Michigan Energy Resources Corporation
nbell@uppco.com	Upper Peninsula Power Company
jformol@uppco.com	Upper Peninsula Power Company
ghaehnel@uppco.com	Upper Peninsula Power Company
estocking@uppco.com	Upper Peninsula Power Company
manager@villageofbaraga.org	Village of Baraga
Villagemanager@villageofclinton.org	Village of Clinton
VSTRetailReg@VistraCorp.com	Viridian Energy PA, LLC
jeinstein@volunteerenergy.com	Volunteer Energy Services
leew@WVPA.COM	Wabash Valley Power
melissa.schauer@wecenergygroup.com	We Energies
andrew.miller1@wecenergygroup.com	We Energies
melissa.schauer@wecenergygroup.com	Wisconsin Public Service

GEMOTION DISTRIBUTION SERVICE LIST

andrew.miller1@wecenergygroup.com	Wisconsin Public Service
tking@WPSCI.COM	Wolverine Power
jbaumann@wpsci.com	Wolverine Power
cborr@wpsci.com	Wolverine Power
ddecouer@wpsci.com	Wolverine Power
bvalice@wpsci.com	Wolverine Power
Amanda@misostates.org	Wood, Amanda
Deborah.e.erwin@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy
Michelle.Schlosser@xcelenergy.com	Xcel Energy
bryce.mckenney@nrg.com	Xoom Energy Michigan, LLC d/b/a Xoom Energy