

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR COMMISSION MEETING OF THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION HELD IN ITS OFFICES AND AVAILABLE VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS VIDEO CONFERENCING ON JULY 10, 2025.

Commission Chair Daniel C. Scripps called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.  
Executive Secretary Lisa Felice called the roll and declared there was a quorum.

**PRESENT**

Commission: Daniel C. Scripps, Chair  
Katherine Peretick, Commissioner  
Alessandra Carreon, Commissioner

Staff: Corrie Schmidt-Parker  
Matt Helms  
Lisa Felice  
Charlie Cavanagh  
Jake Thelen  
Al Freeman  
Stephanie Fitzgerald  
Tayler Becker  
Anne Armstrong  
Jill Rusnak  
Dolores Midkiff-Powell  
Ryan Wilson  
Ben Johnson  
Jerry McClung  
Andy Hannum  
Kate Daymon  
Jesse Harlow  
Paul Proudfoot  
Nyhre Royal  
Kevin Krause  
Jessica Duell  
Jennifer Brooks  
Brandy Quinn  
Zoe Salamey  
Zach Heidemann  
Kayla Gibbs  
Reka Voelker  
Anna Schiller  
Dave Chislea  
Mike Byrne  
Ally Durfee

Additional Staff & Public Attending Telephonically/Video Conferencing: 220 Participants

- I.** Commissioner Peretick moved to approve today's agenda, Commissioner Carreon seconded.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The agenda was approved.

- II.** Commissioner Peretick moved to approve the minutes of the Regular Commission Meeting of June 12, 2025, Commissioner Carreon seconded.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The minutes were approved.

**III. CONSENTED ORDERS**

**A. COMMUNICATIONS**

1. U-15219 IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT REQUEST FOR COMMISSION APPROVAL OF AN INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT BETWEEN AT&T MICHIGAN AND CLIMAX TELEPHONE COMPANY (tenth amendment)  
U-21920 IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT REQUEST FOR COMMISSION APPROVAL OF A MULTI-STATE INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT BETWEEN STRATUS NETWORKS, INC. AND VARIOUS AT&T INC. OWNED COMPANIES, INCLUDING AT&T MICHIGAN (interconnection agreement and first amendment)  
U-21927 IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT REQUEST FOR COMMISSION APPROVAL OF AN INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT BETWEEN FARMERS MUTUAL TELEPHONE COMPANY, d/b/a CHAPIN TELEPHONE COMPANY AND LEVEL 3 COMMUNICATIONS, LLC (interconnection agreement)
2. MINUTE ACTION METRO ACT (amending tax credit determination report)

3. MINUTE ACTION PENINSULA FIBER NETWORK, LLC  
(9-1-1 wireless, U-14000, invoice no. INV-3673 dated July 1, 2025)
4. MINUTE ACTION PENINSULA FIBER NETWORK NEXT GENERATION SERVICES LLC  
(9-1-1 wireless, U-14000, invoice no. INV-1299 dated July 1, 2025)

**B. ELECTRIC**

1. U-21374 IN THE MATTER, ON THE COMMISSION’S OWN MOTION, REGARDING THE REGULATORY REVIEWS, REVISIONS, DETERMINATIONS, AND/OR APPROVALS NECESSARY FOR CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY TO COMPLY WITH SECTION 61 OF 2016 PA 342  
(Karn Solar Energy Center/proposed settlement agreement)
2. U-21550 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY TO COMMENCE A RENEWABLE ENERGY COST RECONCILIATION PROCEEDING FOR THE 12-MONTH PERIOD ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2023  
(proposed settlement agreement)
3. MINUTE ACTION CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY v. MIDCONTINENT INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR, INC., COMPLAINT  
(FERC Docket No. EL25-90-000)
4. MINUTE ACTION INTERNATIONAL TRANSMISSION COMPANY, TARIFF FILING REGARDING ABANDONED PLANT INCENTIVES  
(FERC Docket No. ER25-2425-000)
5. MINUTE ACTION MIDCONTINENT INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATOR, INC., TARIFF FILING REGARDING REVISED EXPEDITED RESOURCE ADDITION STUDY  
(FERC Docket No. ER25-2454-000)
6. MINUTE ACTION VECTOR PIPELINE L.P., TARIFF FILING REGARDING REVISED TARIFF RECORDS  
(FERC Docket No. RP25-936-000)

### **C. GAS**

1. U-21436 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF UPPER MICHIGAN ENERGY RESOURCES CORPORATION FOR RECONCILIATION OF ITS GAS COST RECOVERY PLAN (CASE NO. U-21435) FOR THE 12-MONTH PERIOD ENDED OCTOBER 31, 2024 (proposed settlement agreement)
2. U-21842 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE PIPELINES IN THE HESSEN STORAGE FIELD (proposed settlement agreement)
3. U-21854 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE THE W-1004, W-1005, AND W-1006 WELL LINES AND THE W-56N LATERAL (proposed settlement agreement)

Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve all the orders and minute actions on the consent agenda.  
Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The 6 orders and 7 minute actions were adopted.

## **IV. OTHER ORDERS**

### **A. ELECTRIC**

1. U-17473 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY FOR A FINANCING ORDER APPROVING THE SECURITIZATION OF QUALIFIED COSTS (proposed true-up adjustment to securitization charge)

Case No. U-17473 approves the request and accepts Consumers Energy Company's 2025 annual true-up adjustment. Commissioner

Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

2. U-20147 IN THE MATTER, ON THE COMMISSION'S OWN MOTION, TO OPEN A DOCKET FOR CERTAIN REGULATED ELECTRIC UTILITIES TO FILE THEIR DISTRIBUTION INVESTMENT AND MAINTENANCE PLANS AND FOR OTHER RELATED, UNCONTESTED MATTERS  
(interim order)

Commission Staff Tayler Becker, Energy Resources Division, presented a brief synopsis of the case listed above. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

**Commissioner Peretick commented:**

“I would like to thank our staff, especially Anna Schiller for leading this effort, and Paul Proudfoot, Tayler Becker, Kit Sabo, Li Szilagyi, and Luke Dennin, for their hard work on these distribution planning requirements, and for all the valuable input from the utilities and interested parties who offered suggestions and modifications and improvements. Planning for the future of our distribution system is crucial. There are a lot of changes happening that need to be appropriately considered.

At the Commission, we have spent countless hours investigating the distribution system through multiple forums; the third-party audit that was completed last year, service quality rule modifications, rate case investments, transportation electrification planning, and many other rulemakings and proceedings.

These distribution plans are where all of this work comes together. Where the utilities must adapt to changes happening simultaneously: like the evolution of grid technologies, the changing climate and increasing impacts of severe storms, and the shift in the way Michiganders are engaging with the grid and using electricity.

The order before us ensures that distribution system plans can keep up with this pace and scale of change. These changes will require harmonization between distribution plans and rate case investments. They require frequent updates to hosting capacity maps. They require additional thought to go into the use of advanced metering infrastructure and how demand flexibility can contribute to reliability and affordability via a technical conference. They require additional granularity in planning, and increased consideration of non-wires alternatives and distributed energy resources. The order also includes many other important modifications that will make our planning processes better.

I'm looking forward to getting these new filing requirements in place and be able to see the results in the next round of distribution plans that are submitted by our electric utilities."

**Commissioner Carreon commented:**

"The filing guidelines we are approving through today's order represent years' worth of engagement and careful evaluation of effective measures to improve our utility distribution systems. The concerted effort at the Commission to ensure utilities deliver these improvements for reliability and resilience is evident not only in the framework itself for distribution system plans, or DSPs, but – as Commissioner Peretick alluded to – in the way the DSPs are meant to interact with rate cases, implementation of third-party audit results, transportation electrification plans, and even the very concepts of equity and environmental justice for utility customers. So, first, sincere thanks for Staff's leadership in getting us to this point today, and to the many individuals and organizations who have provided thoughtful comments and proposals for Commission consideration over time.

The guidelines we approving are extremely comprehensive as a result of the robust engagement and input we received, and I want to focus specifically on a couple of topics.

First, I'll remark on how DSPs address issues of affordability and environmental justice in planning. As we note in the rate case improvement docket order we will address later, the Commission intentionally aims to provide continuity between the DSP, integrated resource plan, and rate case improvement processes on issues of affordability and environmental justice. Furthermore, these topics are also relevant to discussions on financial incentive and disincentive reliability metrics, as well as the regression analyses described in rate case dockets for environmental justice, both offering avenues for examining progress in equity broadly.

Within this docket, Staff has proposed, and the Commission has approved customer affordability and environmental justice mapping analysis guidelines, such as projected customer rate impacts by customer class, and a comparative analysis of reliability metrics against similarly situated non-EJ communities, plus percentages of populations participating in low-income, energy assistance, shutoff protection plans, or related plans by census tract.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge the years-long work and expertise of Staff and my esteemed colleagues around improving Grid Modernization Efforts through the inclusion of important considerations in these DSP guidelines, like interconnection processes, integration of Distributed Energy Resources, non-wires alternatives, electrification of buildings and transportation, and appropriate data granularity, including the corresponding need for quarterly hosting capacity map updates starting this year, for our two largest utilities, with encouragement for other utilities to develop their initial hosting capacity maps with regular updates.

DSPs, designed in parallel and meant to intersect with other planning activities, with equity and cost-effective implementation by utilities as core considerations, will help improve our state's electric distribution system to a level of reliability performance that all customers deserve."

**Chair Scripps commented:**

"First, I agree strongly with the remarks provided by both of my colleagues. Looking back to where we started with distribution plans, it went back to a pair of rate cases in 2017. From the beginning,

the core focus was really on reliability. The reliability of the distribution system and tackling some of the reliability challenges that we have seen. While issues of grid modernization or how to make full use of distributed energy resources would always come later, it was always outside the 5-year window of distribution plans, at the beginning stages.

With this order, I'm happy to say that later has finally arrived. I think the elements included in the order around hosting capacity maps, both what's included and the frequency of updates, the elements to be included in distribution plans, particularly around grid modernization and other ways to make full use of the distribution grid and to unlock the potential that distributed energy resources provide, really is outlined in the requirements and guidelines contained in the order in front of us.

I appreciate the work Mr. Becker, of you and your team, noted by Commissioner Peretick, and echo the comments of Commissioner Carreon, and talking about the years' long effort that this represents, as you noted, Mr. Becker, an important step in moving us forward."

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

3. U-21189 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF ITS INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLAN PURSUANT TO MCL 460.6t, AVOIDED COSTS AND FOR OTHER RELIEF  
(*ex parte*/Montpelier CPA/final order)

Case No. U-21189 involves an application filed by Indiana Michigan Power Company seeking *ex parte* approval of the amended and restated Montpelier capacity purchase agreement. The order before you approves the application. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 11, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

4. U-21262 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY FOR RECONCILIATION OF ITS POWER SUPPLY COST RECOVERY PLAN (CASE NO. U-21261) FOR THE 12-MONTH PERIOD ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2023  
(final order)

Case No. U-21262 involves an application filed by Indiana Michigan Power Company for reconciliation of its power supply

cost recovery costs and revenues for the 12-month period ended December 31, 2023. The order before you approves the application, as modified by the order. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

5. U-21361 IN THE MATTER OF DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY’S APPLICATION FOR THE REGULATORY REVIEWS, REVISIONS, DETERMINATIONS, AND/OR APPROVALS NECESSARY TO FULLY COMPLY WITH PUBLIC ACT 295 OF 2008, AS AMENDED (*ex parte*/Beecher Solar Project/final order)

Case No. U-21361 involves an application filed by DTE Electric Company seeking *ex parte* approval of an Engineering, Procurement, and Construction Master Service Agreement and Master Supply Agreements for the Beecher Solar Project. The order before you approves the application. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

6. U-21471 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF MICHIGAN ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION COMPANY, LLC FOR AN ACT 30 CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A MAJOR TRANSMISSION LINE BETWEEN ONEIDA SUBSTATION IN EATON COUNTY AND NELSON ROAD SUBSTATION IN GRATIOT COUNTY, MICHIGAN (final order)
- U-21472 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF MICHIGAN ELECTRIC TRANSMISSION COMPANY, LLC FOR AN ACT 30 CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A MAJOR TRANSMISSION LINE BETWEEN THE INDIANA/MICHIGAN STATE BORDER AT GILEAD TOWNSHIP IN BRANCH COUNTY AND THE



NEW HELIX SUBSTATION IN CALHOUN COUNTY,  
MICHIGAN  
(final order)

Commission Staff Stephanie Fitzgerald, Commissioner Advisor, presented a brief synopsis of the cases listed above. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

**Commissioner Peretick commented:**

“The MPSC is a creature of statute. That means we need to abide by the laws set by the legislature. In an electric transmission siting case like this one, it is our job to ensure the planned transmission line meets the requirements of the relevant statutes and regulations. In this case, that is MCL 460.561- through .575 (Act 30), which requires the Commission to approve a line if the Company meets the bar set by the Statute.

These transmission lines are needed infrastructure. We will, in fact, benefit from these lines, and they will improve reliability, accessibility, and bring benefits that exceed costs to electric customers in Michigan. But, in my opinion, Act 30 alone sets the bar much too low for transmission companies and does not give landowners adequate opportunity for shaping the outcome. I will tell you why I think that, and then what we will do about it.

Act 30 outlines the requirements for the transmission siting application and the requirements for routing. With regard to public input, it requires the applicant to:

- hold a public meeting in each affected municipality before the application is submitted, as well as offer to meet with local officials,
- summarize all comments received at each public meeting and the applicant's response to those comments,
- publish notice in a newspaper in each affected area, as well as send notice directly to each affected municipality and each landowner across whose land transmission line would be built

Notably, the statute only requires official notice to landowners directly on the route put forward by the company in its application. This leaves out official notice to anyone adjacent to the route, or in the general “study area” where intervenors may propose alternative routes that they recommend the company take.

While Act 30 theoretically allows the Commission to approve one of these intervenor-proposed alternative routes, that would mean that we would be approving a route that would be on the land of people who were never officially notified of the potential transmission line that could be built through their property. I cannot, in good conscience, approve a transmission line to be built on someone's property that was never even given the chance to argue their side of the case.

So that means, then, that the only routes I could in good conscience approve are on the property of noticed landowners, which limits my choices to either the proposed routes or alternate routes

presented by METC. Which is why the approval before us now is for the proposed route for the Helix-Hiple line and the alternate route for the Nelson-Oneida Line.

That's the first problem with the statute. The second problem is the shockingly low bar for landowners and public engagement.

Construction of a major transmission line is disruptive and can ultimately alter the aesthetics and practical use of a property. The dismissive way that METC treated landowners in the study area is completely unacceptable and does not give proper weight to the impacts of a new transmission line on local landowners and residents. However, because Act 30 sets an incredibly low bar for public engagement, METC has barely cleared it.

Ultimately, the Statute requires the Commission to approve the transmission line if it is reasonable and feasible. It doesn't have to be the best route, the least harmful route, the smartest route, or the most socially responsible route.

It is true that long-range transmission is desperately needed in our region for the public good, but landowners who are most impacted by construction of these lines deserve better.

Now I told you I was also going to describe what we are going to do about this to address the shortcomings in our legal framework. As regulators, we have the ability to flesh out a statute by developing and issuing rules in a formal rulemaking process to make this law work better for the people of Michigan. In a separate order that we will issue soon, we will be kicking off a process to establish required rules that any applicant must follow to improve public engagement and involvement in transmission siting cases and to find a solution to ensure that the Commission can meaningfully consider additional routes.

But, formal rulemakings take time. To ensure the next transmission siting application we receive will not be marred by the same deficiencies as this one, our Staff will immediately begin developing additional, more stringent and more fair filing guidelines for Act 30 cases in the interim. These guidelines will address, at a minimum:

- The amount of overlap that is considered reasonable between an alternate route and a proposed route.
- The degree that private benefits need to be estimated in advance of a project.
- The form and quality of information submitted as part of the summary of comments received at each public meeting and the applicant's response to those comments.
- The methodology and qualitative factors that should be used in route studies to form the basis for the applicant's selection of the proposed and alternate routes, including the standardization of data presented to enable the Staff to efficiently analyze the routes
- Requirements for documenting all landowner requests for minor modifications to a proposed or alternate route, what action was taken by the applicant in response to the request, and the reasoning why the applicant accommodated or failed to accommodate the request.
- Any other issue the Staff and/or interested parties believe are necessary to improve the application process under Act 30.

By taking these measures, I am confident that in future Act 30 siting cases, we will have a better framework in place that will result in a better application from transmission companies with substantially improved public input and engagement.

As for the case before us, I believe it would be generous to call METC's public engagement lackluster. We've heard from impacted parties that METC refused to answer simple questions, ignored glaringly obvious routing problems like an airport in the path of the transmission line, and took the easy, lazy path for the siting of the route in every place possible. All of this is even more egregious in the context that METC is a well-resourced corporation that has the ability and the means to do better. Yet, the statute governing our siting process compels us to approve the lines because METC has cleared that very low bar.

Therefore, I am required to approve this application, despite the fact that I believe that METC has shown blatant disregard for the interests of landowners who will be impacted most by this infrastructure that serves the needs of the state."

**Commissioner Carreon commented:**

"What I'm about to share in my remarks will largely echo what Comm. Peretick has already shared – but I think that goes to show the opportunity before us to make things better.

I'd like to begin by thanking Staff for their rigorous analysis in this case. There were virtually hundreds of route options to rank and Staff diligently and thoughtfully assessed these options against social, environmental, and engineering factors to propose meaningful and useful route recommendations to the record. I also want to thank the members of the public and affected landowners and families who engaged in this process. Your dedication has been truly impressive.

Regarding today's order, I'd like to start with a brief recap of the requirements for an independent transmission company seeking to construct a major transmission line under Act 30. My recap is brief not because I have had to summarize any lengthy requirements, but rather, because the requirements themselves under this law are limited. These requirements are:

- To submit a construction plan and any additional information the Commission requires before applying for a certificate;
- To hold a public meeting in each affected municipality and offering to meet with the chief elected official at least 60 days in advance;
- To submit an application with the proposed route and at least one alternate;
- To provide public notice through newspaper publication and direct notification to affected municipalities and landowners; and
- To undergo a contested case proceeding, with the Commission granting or denying the application within one year of filing.

Specifically, the Commission must either grant the application for the independent transmission company's proposed route, alternate route, or one of the proposed alternative routes, or deny the application.

This describes the application filing and decision-making process. That is my brief recap.

As for the criteria under the law that the Commission must evaluate to grant an application and issue a certificate, as Ms. Fitzgerald noted in her presentation, these are that:

- (1) the public benefits of the project justify its construction;
- (2) the proposed or alternate route is feasible and reasonable;

- (3) the line does not pose an unreasonable risk to public health or safety; and
- (4) the applicant has accepted any conditions in a conditional grant.

And those are all the criteria.

To bring greater clarity, efficiency, and transparency to this process, this order references another forthcoming order today in Case No. U-21930 that Ms. Fitzgerald and Comm. Peretick described and directs Staff to work with interested parties to develop voluntary filing guidelines for Act 30 applications. I especially want to highlight two aspects of the directed filing guidelines that are designed to ensure future applications reflect appropriate and meaningful engagement with the public and affected landowners.

- First, addressing the form and quality of how comments from public meetings are summarized and how applicants respond to those comments, vs. a nominal list; and
- Second, requiring documentation of all landowner requests for minor route changes, including the applicant's response and rationale for accepting or rejecting them.

Additionally, as mentioned, the Commission intends to initiate a rulemaking to codify information required in future Act 30 applications.

Because these guidelines and rules are not yet in place, today's order includes specific conditions to ensure landowner concerns continue to be addressed. To ensure transparency and accountability, the Commission conditions certificate approval on METC's commitment to consider and document landowner-requested minor route modifications, as outlined in Staff's testimony and presented by Ms. Fitzgerald.

Lastly, I want to address the role of public comment in our contested cases, such as this case, which is distinct from the participation of those individuals and families who formally intervened in the case. The public participation improvement docket order on our agenda today elaborates on the role of public comment, but I think it is worth emphasizing here too. Although many individuals submitted comments throughout this proceeding, they do not form part of the official record and therefore cannot be used as a basis for our decision. However, the upcoming rulemaking will serve as a critical channel for the public to help shape future Act 30 applications and outcomes and I invite those interested in influencing these outcomes to participate. Thank you."

**Chair Scripps commented:**

"I don't want it to be lost that these are critically important lines. Indeed, these are the first high voltage transmission lines approved by the Commission in more than a decade. They're the largest to be approved by the Commission since the Thumb Loop projects back in February of 2011. These are significant and they play an important role in a number of critical priorities to the Commission and indeed, to the state, including the backbone transmission that is central to reliability. An increase in the ability to import capacity and energy from other states, which was one of the key findings of our 2019 Statewide Energy Assessment. That is something that we've been working on at the Commission for a number of years and also access to lower cost resources outside the state of Michigan that can have an impact on customer bills. These are critically important lines, and I want to make sure that we underscore the importance of the infrastructure that is being approved today to our energy future.

In terms of the routes, I want to just add a couple of thoughts. On the Nelson Road to Oneida, as Ms. Fitzgerald noted, ultimately the route that was approved is the alternate route. The basis of the approval is that the alternate route was able to use a significant amount of existing utility infrastructure right-of-way. For the Commission, it really came down to an issue of fairness that

those who were within the right-of-way have either long been aware that infrastructure development was possible on their property or they purchased the land with the easement already in place. That advanced knowledge played a critical role in our decision and a finding that was unreasonable to ignore existing right-of-way in citing these lines.

I will just be candid that the Helix to Hiple route was a tougher case. We're well aware of the impact to the airport, the existing active airport that is on the line. Ultimately, it was a question of whether that route was reasonable and prudent, whether the alternative route was reasonable and prudent, or whether no route was reasonable and prudent. Ultimately, we relied on staff's analysis finding that the proposed route was, even with the airport, scored the highest among the factors that were looked at and the impact to others on the alternate route, including the significant increase in homes that would be brought with 500 feet of the infrastructure in making our finding that the proposed route was the reasonable and prudent route.

Finally, I want to speak on landowner engagement because I share the critiques made by my colleagues. When citing these, even with infrastructure that's as necessary as this is, I think we need to be cognizant and respectful that the approval carries significant consequences, not least of which the impact to private property of those along the route. Many of whom have owned their properties and farms for decades and even generations working to own and steward that land for future generations. Yet we saw what might be best deemed a cavalier approach to how landowners were engaged around the use of their private property. Landowners deserve greater respect than what was seen in this case, including the low (dismally low) level of successfully negotiated easements where condemnation was not used as a necessary back stop in extreme cases, but seemed to be the default means of engagement with landowners around their private property.

The single email that was sent from the Company to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources that resulted in the condemnation of 16 additional private parcels that are being included in the route for Nelson to Oneida Road. The proforma summaries of comments from individual landowners seeking to explore minor route modifications with no clarity on whether any action at all was taken as a result of the inquiries from these landowners on the use of, again, their private property, and then, of course, the condemnation of the active airport.

My hope is that even as I am pleased to see these critical projects move forward, I would implore the Company to do a better job, a much better job, of public engagement in future applications."

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

7. U-21538 IN THE MATTER, ON THE COMMISSION'S OWN MOTION, TO  
OPEN A DOCKET FOR CERTAIN REGULATED ELECTRIC  
UTILITIES TO FILE TRANSPORTATION ELECTRIFICATION  
PLANS AND FOR OTHER RELATED MATTERS  
(*ex parte*/requests for waivers/interim order)

Case No. U-21538 involves the requests for temporary waivers from the requirement of filing a Transportation Electrification Plan filed by Upper Michigan Energy Resources Corporation, Northern States Power Company, and Alpena Power Company. The order before you approves the temporary waivers as described in the order. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

8. U-21547 IN THE MATTER, ON THE COMMISSION’S OWN MOTION, TO OPEN A DOCKET TO IMPLEMENT THE PROVISIONS OF PUBLIC ACT 233 OF 2023  
(application filing instructions and procedures/ interim order)

Case No. U-21547 involves a matter, on the Commission’s own motion, to open a docket to implement the provisions of Public Act 233 of 2023. The order before you waives the collection of certain fees assessed pursuant to the Commission’s Application Filing Instructions and Procedures, which were adopted in the Commission’s October 10, 2024 order in this case, as corrected by the October 21, 2024 errata, and are applicable to applications submitted to the Commission pursuant to Public Act 233 of 2023. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

9. U-21637 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  
(opportunity to comment/interim order)

Case No. U-21637 involves a matter, on the Commission’s own motion, to investigate opportunities for improving the process by which the Commission reviews rate case applications. The order before you provides guidance and seeks comment on additional

issues. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

**Commissioner Carreon commented:**

“As indicated by Ms. Schmidt-Parker, this order investigates opportunities for improving rate case processes under Public Act 231 of 2023. I thank all the commenters who answered the nine questions we posed and, importantly, the numerous parties who intervene and support the decision-making process for every utility rate case in this state. As a matter of context and example, DTE Electric's 2023 rate case involved 69 parties, 85 witnesses, and over 4,000 pages of testimony. It's news to no one here how involved and complex the rate case review and decision-making process is and how impactful it can be, ranking among the most crucial proceedings the Commission can conduct. Recognizing the role of the rate case, and the directives resulting from today's order, I wanted to emphasize the Commission's request for comments, today, on bill impacts.

As described in the order, the Commission agrees with commenters who noted that environmental justice and affordability are indeed not tangential to ratemaking. The focus on affordability and environmental justice occurs in multiple places across Commission proceedings, including the distribution system planning docket we already addressed, and in integrated resource planning with new criteria around affordability analyses also under Public Act 231 of 2023. The Commission acknowledges that EJ and equity issues are not statutorily required to be heard in rate cases but finds that they are closely tied to an analysis of reasonableness and prudence. The Commission does not find that these issues should be moved to a separate proceeding, but rather, encourages the recent practice displayed by some utilities of tying capital investments to impacts related to environmental justice.

In a related fashion, the Commission recognizes that data on bill impacts are critical to the rate setting process and should be provided by the filing utility. Considering the link between affordability and resulting impacts on customer bills stemming from the rate case process, today's order seeks comment on how bill impact assessments should be provided to customers as part of the rate case process. I highly encourage those parties who commented on affordability, EJ, and bill impact issues from this docket as well as other organizations, individuals, and interested parties who seek to find ways to tie the appropriate way to communicate the impact of rate cases on customer bills to a broad customer base to provide input and help shape the future of measuring and disclosing bill impacts – especially for our most vulnerable customers – as we strive to ensure the delivery of more just and equitable energy services.”

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

10. U-21638 IN THE MATTER, ON THE COMMISSION’S OWN MOTION, TO  
CONSIDER OPTIONS TO EXPAND OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC  
ENGAGEMENT IN ITS DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES AND  
PROCEDURES  
(final order)

Case No. U-21638 involves a matter, on the Commission's own motion, to hold a hearing, pursuant to the directives of Public Act 231 of 2023, to take comments regarding additional improvements the Commission may make for communicating with the public and explaining Commission activities, expanding accessibility and participation, and enhancing the transparency of Commission proceedings. The order before you orders the Commission's participation and engagement framework to be updated periodically, as necessary, and closes the docket in this case. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

**Commissioner Carreon commented:**

"I wanted to express my thanks to all the commenters who contributed to this docket, including the attendees who joined us for and the Staff who ensured the success of our townhall meeting in Detroit on enhancing public participation and engagement on May 29. The event was also significant given the representation from the Utility Consumer Participation Board, or UCPB, and the Attorney General's Office. The UCPB and AG's Office presentations at the townhall meeting offered different perspectives and insights on what it means to engage in Commission proceedings, especially on behalf of the public and utility customers. We will soon be posting our public participation framework on our website and intend to treat this framework as a living document, so we very much want to maintain an open feedback loop between the public and our framework.

One area of ongoing inquiry to the Commission and discussed within this order is the role of public comment. In this order, the Commission encourages parties intervening in contested cases to review public comments to use the comments where appropriate to inform discovery requests and testimony. The Commission plans to make it easier for members of the public to identify and connect with intervenors in contested cases of significant public interest, and to identify and publicize opportunities for meaningful public comment in these cases consistent with the goal of informing discovery requests and testimony as relevant in administrative case schedules. One channel the public can increasingly expect to lean on for more information and engagement with Commission activities is through our new Community Partner Network, or CPN, which – as the name implies – is a network of community partners with whom the Commission will newly or continue building relationships across all areas of the state to better understand and develop opportunities for community engagement and outreach. One of the objectives of this proceeding under Public Act 231 of 2023 was to consider options for participation opportunities in the Commission's decision-making processes, especially by low-income residential customers, residential customers that experience high energy burdens, and individuals and communities impacted by Commission decisions. I submit that CPN will be an important way for customers and community members experiencing high energy burdens to engage with the Commission through our community partners.

I want to conclude my remarks here by sharing the inaugural guiding principles in our efforts to expand public participation opportunities, as documented in the order, which we have established as a result of past work across multiple work groups at the Commission, community input, and comments in this docket and other dockets. The guiding principles include:



1. Building and maintaining trust with people and organizations with whom the Commission engages and those who participate in the Commission's processes,
2. Ensuring transparency, and
3. Increasing Commission visibility and access.

For those interested in staying involved in this work, I encourage you to visit our website to learn more. We will be sure to announce when the framework is available."

**Commissioner Peretick commented:**

"I'd also like to begin by thanking all of the organizations and members of the public who submitted comments as a part of this docket and showed up in person at our public hearing in late May in Detroit to talk to us directly about how we can do better. Both the quality and volume of comments are evidence that Michiganders care about the work we are doing here at the Commission, and that they are willing to give up their own time to show up and make the process better.

I have been impressed and heartened by the interest showed in our work, and thankful to all of you who care so much about making sure that our decisions are in the best interest of all Michiganders. While we weren't able to implement each of the comments received as a part of this docket, I did read each of them and we were able to make some changes to our processes as a result.

One challenge that we've been grappling with is that our laws prohibit the Commission from considering public comments as evidence in contested cases. The evidence we are allowed to consider is limited to what is submitted by parties or intervenors to a case. In my small group conversation in Detroit at our public town hall, some excellent ideas were raised on how to make voices heard during the contested case process, despite this limitation.

In the order before us now, we are proposing improvements on how to better communicate about cases we know will be important to a particular community. Our goal is that early communication will make it easier for members of the public to connect with intervenors in those cases and allow for engagement in the case through that connection.

This order also encourages parties in contested cases to review public comments and to use those comments, if appropriate, to inform discovery requests and testimony. Also informed by this feedback, we are in the process of finalizing a framework to govern the MPSC's public participation efforts, which will be published on our website and updated periodically based upon lessons learned and input received from community-based organizations and members of the public.

And another thing we have kicked off in response to increased public interest that I'm particularly excited about is our Community Partner Network. This is a network that our Communications Team, particularly Reka Holley Voelker, Jennifer Brooks, Brandy Quinn, and Steve Kimbrell, are establishing so we can have an extended, regular point of contact with trusted organizations that are already embedded in their communities. The goal of this network is to be able to get informal input and feedback, have open lines of two-way communication, and ultimately be able to better serve the public.

Our new public outreach website will be live shortly, and I hope you will notice how your input through this docket has shaped the way we are now working. If you would like to get in touch with a member of our public outreach team or have an organization that you would like to be part of the Community Partner Network, please reach out to [LARA-MPSC-External-Affairs@michigan.gov](mailto:LARA-MPSC-External-Affairs@michigan.gov).”

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

11. U-21930 IN THE MATTER, ON THE COMMISSION'S OWN MOTION, TO COMMENCE A PROCEEDING TO IMPLEMENT FILING GUIDELINES FOR APPLICATIONS UNDER ACT 30 OF 1995, AS AMENDED  
(order opening docket)

Case No. U-21930 involves, on the Commission’s own motion, the commencement of a proceeding to implement filing guidelines for applications submitted under Public Act 30 of 1995, as amended. The order before you directs the Commission Staff to develop voluntary application filing guidelines to be used by applicants submitting applications to the Commission pursuant to Public Act 30 of 1995 and to file these draft application filing guidelines in this docket. The order also establishes a comment period for interested persons to file comments regarding the Commission Staff’s draft application filing guidelines. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

**B. GAS**

1. U-16230 IN THE MATTER ON THE COMMISSION'S OWN MOTION, TO CONSIDER THE APPROPRIATE REGULATORY RESPONSE TO PROPOSALS BY VARIOUS PRODUCERS OF NATURAL GAS FROM ANTRIM SHALE FORMATION TO OPERATE THEIR WELLS UNDER A VACUUM  
(*ex parte*/motion to amend reporting requirements/final order)

Case No. U-16230 involves a motion filed by Riverside Energy Michigan, LLC, to amend the reporting requirements for wells, pools, or fields that operate under vacuum in the Antrim Shale Formation. The order before you grants the motion and approves the proposed amendment. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

2. U-21622 IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPLAINT OF MARK & SUSAN ADAMS AGAINST CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY (final order)

Case No. U-21622 involves a formal complaint, as amended, filed by Mark and Susan Adams against Consumers Energy Company. The order before you dismisses the complaint, as amended, with prejudice. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

3. U-21835 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY FOR A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO CONSTRUCT AND OPERATE THE C-1103 WELL LINE (*ex parte*/final order)

Case No. U-21835 involves an application filed by Consumers Energy Company for *ex parte* approval to construct and operate a new, proposed C-1103 Well Line in Winterfield Township, Clare County, Michigan. The order before you approves the application and makes the required agency findings regarding the project's environmental impact. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

4. U-21917 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF DTE GAS COMPANY  
FOR APPROVAL OF A REGULATORY ASSET TO DEFER  
TRANSMISSION EXPENSES RELATED TO THE TRAVERSE  
CITY/ALPENA REINFORCEMENT PROJECT  
(*ex parte*/final order)

Case No. U-21917 involves an application filed by DTE Gas Company seeking *ex parte* authorization to defer amounts for services provided by DTM Michigan Lateral Company related to the Traverse City/Alpena Reinforcement Project, and to record a regulatory asset in Account 182.3. The order before you approves the application. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its July 10, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Carreon seconded that motion.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The order was adopted.

## V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Robert Williams, 18MI Ranch owner, addressed his concerns regarding Case No. U-21471 and his affected airport.

Dr. Judi Sikarskie provided comments regarding Case No. U-21471.

Karol Sanborn, Lebanon Township, addressed her concerns regarding Case No. U-21471.

Avery Sanborn, Clinton County, addressed his concerns regarding Case No. U-21471.

Rose Williams addressed her concerns regarding Case No. U-21471.

### **Commissioner Carreon announced:**

“Because my appointment term on the Commission ends this month, this meeting is my last Commission Meeting. As such, I wanted to say that serving as a commissioner has been the honor of a lifetime. Importantly, I leave this bench with sincere and deep gratitude - for the Staff at the Commission who wake up every day and perform their duties as public servants and leaders for the benefit of Michiganders across our great state - and for my two exceptional colleagues, whose

brilliance, compassion, and integrity will continue to serve in the very best interest of the people of Michigan. Thank you, Chair Scripps and Commissioner Peretick, for your principled, caring, and heart-centered leadership, collegueship, and friendship.”

**Chair Scripps announced:**

“When I was thinking about what to say today, I was reminded of how William McAdoo responded, an odd reference, I realize, when asked to describe his tenure as Secretary of the Treasury, more than a hundred years ago during Woodrow Wilson’s presidency. It was a time during which he presided over the creation of the Federal Reserve system, helped prevent an economic crisis after the outbreak of World War I, and in so doing saw a decisive shift in the global balance of economic power from Europe to the United States. ‘They were crowded years’, said McAdoo. Crowded years, and I think the same could be said for your experience, Commissioner Carreon, serving as Commissioner over the last two years.

Two years that may well be remembered as the critical time overseeing the energy transition in Michigan. You’ve been a indispensable part of the progress we’ve made over that time, including working to negotiate, and that as importantly, implement the suite of energy laws enacted by the legislature in November 2023, including separate specific dockets on the expansion of energy waste reduction programs, increases in the state’s renewable standard, increases in distributed generation programs, a new statewide energy storage target, consideration of climate, environmental justice, and affordability in utility integrated resource plans, the citing of large-scale renewable energy and storage projects, issues affecting the energy landscape in the Upper Peninsula, and two proceedings on which we took further action just today, opportunities to expand public participation and engagement, and improvements to utility rate case processes. We also received and took action on the first of its kind independent third-party audit of the distribution systems for Consumers Energy and DTE laying the groundwork for fewer and shorter outages, fewer customers experiencing multiple outages and cost-effective strategies to improve distribution reliability. We worked with legislative partners to expand eligibility and funding for the Michigan Energy Assistance Program, helping those people struggling with their utility bills to keep their heads above water. Working together, we approve \$21 million in renewable energy and electrification infrastructure and economic development grants, supporting 19 projects in all parts of the state from solar and battery installations in Detroit to electrification of district heating in Grand Rapids, to helping the Keweenaw Bay Indian community install solar and energy storage in the UP. We also saw Michigan recognized by the American Council for an energy efficient economy as the top state in the nation for utility energy efficiency public benefits and policies, including finding that Michigan utilities achieved higher natural gas efficiency savings than any other state and that Michigan was second in the nation for energy waste reduction in the electric sector. All while spending less to get more for customers than other leading states. We also pursued groundbreaking efforts around transportation electrification, many of which you led, including a new regulatory framework for evaluating transportation electrification plans, and a first in the country ruling clarifying that the home backup power systems included with the Ford F-150 Lightning EV do not require interconnection authorizations from an electric utility, helping to streamline regulatory requirements as EVs continue to grow, both in number and services they can provide to the grid. So, crowded years indeed!

In all of these activities, we have worked the three of us as a team. It's clear that the progress that has been achieved over the last two years would simply not have been possible or nearly as much fun without you. At the same time, you have quickly emerged as a national leader on a number of issues, including electric vehicles, natural gas planning, and community engagement, including your service on the task force on natural gas resource planning nationally, the Michigan Council on Future Mobility and Electrification, and the World Resource Institute's Electric School Bus Initiative Advisory Council, among a number of others.

What stands out most about your tenure is the commitment that you brought to every discussion. Pushing us to be better regulators and never forgetting the public we serve. As the first Detroit to serve as a commissioner in nearly four decades, which is incredible to me. You brought an unmatched authenticity to our work, informing and animating every decision, every deliberation, and every bit of outreach. Everything you touched, you made better, and your positive impact will live on long after your tenure concludes.

Commissioner, it has been a joy to work with you. I thank you for all that you have contributed to the Commission and to the people of Michigan. I wish you the best of luck in your future endeavors."

**Commissioner Peretick announced:**

"I've been incredibly privileged to be able to serve alongside Commissioner Alessandra Carreon for these past two years. She is a true public servant in every aspect of her work.

Commissioner Carreon has been a fearless champion for Michigan electric, natural gas, and telecommunications customers. She approaches every single decision that she makes from a lens of fairness and inclusion and protecting our vulnerable citizens. And she has the keenest eye I've seen for following through and tracking metrics to ensure the results actually materialize. Her humble approach to leadership engenders a deep respect from all who meet her, and her principled approach to her work creates consistent and lasting direction.

She has taught me, personally, a lot as well. The way she approaches her work, the way she brings our staff in, the way she brings public input in, the way she brings in a holistic view of making our energy and telecom services better and more affordable has truly been an inspiration and has taught me to do the same.

I can confidently say that over the 2 years that Commissioner Carreon has been able to serve on the Michigan Public Service Commission, she has improved service quality, reliability, accountability, and affordability for electric, natural gas, and telecom for all customers.

I'm honored to be able to sit alongside her at this bench one final time.

Ale, on behalf of all 10 million Michiganders, thank you for your care, your thoughtfulness, your integrity, and for fighting for all of us to be better. You've truly succeeded."

A recording of the proceedings of the July 10, 2025 meeting is archived at:  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XIIEiXLi5SY> .

Chair Scripps announced that the next regularly scheduled Commission Meeting will be held on Thursday, August 7, 2025 at 1:00 p.m.

Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission adjourn, Commissioner Carreon seconded.

Vote: Yeas – Scripps, Peretick, Carreon  
Nays – None

The motion was approved.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

---

Lisa Felice  
Executive Secretary