

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR COMMISSION MEETING OF THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION HELD IN ITS OFFICES AND AVAILABLE VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS VIDEO CONFERENCING ON NOVEMBER 6, 2025.

Commission Chair Daniel C. Scripps called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m.
Executive Secretary Lisa Felice called the roll and declared there was a quorum.

PRESENT

Commission: Daniel C. Scripps, Chair
Katherine Peretick, Commissioner
Shaquila Myers, Commissioner

Staff: Charlie Cavanagh
Matt Helms
Lisa Felice
Blair Renfro
Paul Proudfoot
Mark Pung
Nathan Blizzard
Ryan McAnany
Wendy Thelen
Dave Isakson
Drew Simon
Al Freeman
Diane Martin
Theresa McMillan-Sepkoski
Ryan Wilson
Stephanie Fitzgerald
Jill Rusnak
Deanne Wizner
Andy Hannum
Ben Johnson
Jerry McClung
Kate Daymon
Jillian Bowden
Sarah Mullkoff
Gustavo Cordero
Daniel Gottschalk
Mike Byrne
Andi Taylor

Public: Heidi Myers, Consumers Energy
Kelly Hall, Consumers Energy

Additional Staff & Public Attending Telephonically/Video Conferencing: 221 Participants

- I.** Commissioner Peretick moved to approve today’s agenda, Commissioner Myers seconded.

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

The agenda was approved.

- II.** Commissioner Peretick moved to approve the minutes of the Regular Commission Meeting of October 9, 2025, Commissioner Myers seconded.

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

The minutes were approved.

III. CONSENTED ORDERS

A. COMMUNICATIONS

1. U-13175 IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT REQUEST FOR COMMISSION
APPROVAL OF AN INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT BETWEEN
XO MICHIGAN, INC. AND AT&T MICHIGAN
(thirty-third amendment)
U-13758 IN THE MATTER OF THE JOINT REQUEST FOR COMMISSION
APPROVAL OF AN INTERCONNECTION AGREEMENT BETWEEN
AT&T MICHIGAN AND MCIMETRO ACCESS TRANSMISSION
SERVICES, LLC
(twenty-fourth amendment)
2. MINUTE ACTION PENINSULA FIBER NETWORK NEXT GENERATION SERVICES
LLC
(9-1-1 wireless, U-14000, invoice no. INV-1311 dated October 20, 2025)
3. MINUTE ACTION PENINSULA FIBER NETWORK NEXT GENERATION SERVICES
LLC
(9-1-1 wireless, U-14000, invoice no. INV-1312 dated October 20, 2025)
4. MINUTE ACTION PENINSULA FIBER NETWORK NEXT GENERATION SERVICES
LLC
(9-1-1 wireless, U-14000, invoice no. INV-1313 dated October 20, 2025)

5. MINUTE ACTION PENINSULA FIBER NETWORK NEXT GENERATION SERVICES LLC
(9-1-1 wireless, U-14000, invoice no. INV-1314 dated November 1, 2025)
6. MINUTE ACTION PENINSULA FIBER NETWORK LLC
(9-1-1 wireless, U-14000, invoice no. INV-3756 dated November 1, 2025)

B. ELECTRIC

1. U-21265 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF UPPER MICHIGAN ENERGY RESOURCES CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL TO IMPLEMENT A POWER SUPPLY COST RECOVERY PLAN FOR THE 12 MONTHS ENDING DECEMBER 31, 2023
(proposed revised amended settlement agreement)
2. U-21422 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF ALPENA POWER COMPANY FOR RECONCILIATION OF ITS POWER SUPPLY COST PLAN (CASE NO. U-21421) FOR THE 12 MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2024
(proposed settlement agreement)
3. U-21430 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF NORTHERN STATES POWER COMPANY FOR RECONCILIATION OF ITS POWER SUPPLY COST RECOVERY PLAN (CASE NO. U-21429) FOR THE 12 MONTHS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 2024
(proposed settlement agreement)
4. U-21672 IN THE MATTER, ON THE COMMISSION'S OWN MOTION, REGARDING THE REGULATORY REVIEWS, REVISIONS, DETERMINATIONS, AND/OR APPROVALS NECESSARY FOR DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY AND DTE GAS COMPANY TO FULLY COMPLY WITH PUBLIC ACT 295 OF 2008, AS AMENDED
(energy waste reduction reconciliation/ proposed settlement agreement)
5. U-21841 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF INDIANA MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY FOR RECONCILIATION OF ITS 2023 AND 2024 DEMAND RESPONSE PROGRAM COSTS
(proposed settlement agreement)

6. MINUTE ACTION MIDCONTINENT INDEPENDENT SYSTEM OPERATION, INC.,
TARIFF FILING REGARDING ATTACHMENT X REVISED
EXPEDITED RESOURCE ADDITION STUDY
(FERC Docket No. ER25-3543-000)

C. GAS

1. U-21610 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF MICHIGAN GAS
UTILITIES CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL OF A GAS COST
RECOVERY PLAN AND AUTHORIZATION OF GAS COST
RECOVERY FACTORS FOR THE 12-MONTH PERIOD ENDING
MARCH 31, 2026
(proposed settlement agreement)
2. U-21885 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF UPPER MICHIGAN
ENERGY RESOURCES CORPORATION FOR APPROVAL OF A
GAS COST RECOVERY PLAN AND AUTHORIZATION OF GAS
COST RECOVERY FACTORS FOR THE 12-MONTH PERIOD
ENDING OCTOBER 31, 2026
(proposed settlement agreement)

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

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

The 8 orders and 6 minute actions were adopted.

IV. OTHER ORDERS

A. COMMUNICATIONS

1. U-21904 IN THE MATTER, ON THE COMMISSION’S OWN MOTION,
DIRECTING CMC TELECOM AND INTERNET, INC. TO SHOW
CAUSE WHY IT SHOULD NOT BE FOUND IN VIOLATION OF 1991
PA 179, THE MICHIGAN TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT, AS
AMENDED
(final order)

Commission Staff Wendy Thelen, Telecommunications Division, presented a brief
synopsis of the case listed above. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission

approve the order at its November 6, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

Commissioner Peretick commented:

“I’d like to begin by thanking our excellent telecommunications staff for their work on this case, including Wendy Thelen and her team.

This is a clear case of a violation of the Michigan Telecommunications Act, and our Staff was able to identify the issue and order CMC Telecom to cease and desist providing unlicensed basic local exchange phone service. As described by Ms. Thelen in her presentation, this came to our attention when two customer complaints were filed with the Commission. Our telecommunications Staff then thoroughly investigated the complaints and found that an unlicensed company was providing voice service to at least two customers. Basic local exchange service – or landline telephone service – is crucial to customers who rely on it. For example, customers who need to dependably communicate during an emergency, for rural customers who would otherwise have unreliable or prohibitively expensive service, and for businesses and critical services like hospitals, schools or other businesses that need to maintain redundancy in case their VoIP systems fail. Landline services provide access to lifeline programs that subsidize basic phone service to our most vulnerable to ensure universal communication access for everyone. Importantly, it is still the law – under Michigan law and under the FCC – that everyone must have access to basic telephone service.

So, under this backdrop, it is very concerning to have a bad actor violating the law in an attempt to provide unreliable unlicensed telecommunications services.

The order before us not only orders CMC Telecom to cease and desist operations in Michigan, but it also fines the company \$500 per day over the period of known violation and directs the company to issue refunds to the two customers who filed complaints with us.

Thanks again to our vigilant telecommunications team for your work on this case.”

Chair Scripps commented:

“I echo those comments and express my appreciation for the staff’s diligence in this regard and frustration with the activities of this unlicensed provider. As Ms. Thelen noted, they had previously applied for a license. That license was ultimately rejected in 2018. They had an affiliate who had previously been licensed as a telecommunications provider of basic local exchange service in Michigan. That license was revoked for separate violations of the Michigan Telecommunications Act in March of 2021.

I appreciate the work of staff in responding not only to the specifics of the complaints that we received but uncovering a pattern of broader non-compliance with Michigan law, and as Ms. Thelen noted, FCC provisions and corporate registry with the licensing with the Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs.

My only frustration in this case is that (even given the known violations) our ability to sanction this company is limited; limited by the two known violations for the two months in which we knew that those violations occurred against the backdrop of the high likelihood (in my view) that there were

additional months of service being provided in an unlicensed manner and additional customers who may have been impacted.

Again, appreciation for our staff's diligence in this, and frustration with the activities of this company. Hopefully, this cease and desist notification, as well as the fines imposed today provide a clear indication to this company and others that we expect them to follow the law and Commission orders and the provision of basic local exchange service in Michigan."

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

The order was adopted.

2. U-21913 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF UP FIBER, INC. FOR A TEMPORARY AND PERMANENT LICENSE TO PROVIDE BASIC LOCAL EXCHANGE SERVICES IN THE STATE OF MICHIGAN IN CERTAIN AREAS SERVED BY AT&T MICHIGAN (final order)

Case No. U-21913 involves an application, as amended, filed by UP Fiber, Inc., for a permanent license to provide basic local exchange service in the state of Michigan in certain areas served by AT&T Michigan. The order before you grants the permanent license. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its November 6, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

B. ELECTRIC

1. U-15800 IN THE MATTER, ON THE COMMISSION'S OWN MOTION, TO IMPLEMENT 2008 PA 295 THROUGH ISSUANCE OF A TEMPORARY ORDER AS REQUIRED BY MCL 460.1191 (opportunity to comment/transfer price & peak time definition/interim order)

Case No. U-15800 involves a matter, on the Commission's own motion, to implement provisions of Public Act 295 of 2008. The order before you invites comments on the Commission Staff's August 29, 2025 final report and recommendations. Comments must be filed no later than 5:00

pm (Eastern time) on December 8, 2025. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its November 6, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

2. U-20604 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF POWER PURCHASE AGREEMENTS
(*ex parte*/Pivot Energy MI 10 & 19 solar plants/final order)

Case No. U-20604 involves two applications filed by Consumers Energy Company requesting *ex parte* approval of a power purchase agreement between the company and Pivot Energy MI 10 and a power purchase agreement between the company and Pivot Energy MI 19. The order before you approves the applications. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its November 6, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

3. U-21816 IN THE MATTER OF CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY'S APPLICATION FOR THE REGULATORY REVIEWS, REVISIONS, DETERMINATIONS, AND/OR APPROVALS NECESSARY TO FULLY COMPLY WITH PUBLIC ACT 295 OF 2008, AS AMENDED BY PUBLIC ACT 235 OF 2023
(*ex parte*/build transfer agreement/45th Parallel Solar project/ final order)

Case No. U-21816 involves an application filed by Consumers Energy Company requesting *ex parte* approval of a build transfer agreement to acquire the 45th Parallel Solar Project. The order before you approves the application. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its November 6, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

4. U-21859 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF CONSUMERS
ENERGY COMPANY FOR *EX PARTE* APPROVAL OF CERTAIN
AMENDMENTS TO RATE GPD
(final order)

Commission Staff David Isakson, Regulated Energy Division, presented a brief synopsis of the case listed above. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its November 6, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

Commissioner Myers commented:

“Today’s decision reflects the Commission’s effort to revise Rate GPD and find the right balance between economic development and customer protection due to the size of the customers assigned to the large load provision. As this market evolves and demand for new technologies continues to grow, our policies must allow the system to adapt, supporting new industries such as data centers while protecting customers.

We recognize that the data center industry is still in flux, both nationally and within our state. That uncertainty makes it all the more important to put protections in place now. We must be proactive rather than reactive, ensuring that growth occurs in a way that is responsible, equitable, and sustainable.

As utilities and developers respond to this growing demand, we need to be mindful of the potential effects on rates and affordability for customers. The investments required to support large-scale industrial customers can carry significant financial risk, and if market conditions change, there is a very real concern about stranded costs - investments for infrastructure that no longer serve its intended purpose but still need to be paid for. The Commission determined a 15-year contract is appropriate due to it being approximately the life of an investment that will need to be made from PPAs or self-built generation to support the load.

We welcome growth and the opportunities it brings—but it must come with a measured and responsible approach that keeps customer interests at the forefront of the decisions we make. It’s important to note that even though the Commission is supportive, it is not on existing ratepayers to fund the efforts of project proposals to draw large load customers into the utility’s service territory.

The Commission’s order today supports industry development and protects customers from undue risk.”

Commissioner Peretick commented:

“First and foremost, in my decision-making process for this order, my goal was to ensure that data centers and other very large loads added to Consumers Energy’s electric system do not cause cost increases for other customers. Data centers can provide critical services for national security, for American businesses, and for economic growth. But these data centers also put strains on our infrastructure, including water use, land use, and energy use. Land use and water use are outside the jurisdiction of this Commission. So, when reviewing this tariff, I focused on ensuring that all

necessary measures are taken to prevent the very high energy use of these data center customers from impacting the electric bills of other Consumers Energy electric customers.

Additionally, data center customers can pose the risk of stranded assets – particularly, the risk that our utilities will build out new generation to serve new load that does not materialize. Customers should not be unfairly burdened with paying for potentially stranded assets. To that end, the contracts between the utility and the large load customers must be sufficiently protective of other customers.

The tariff in the order before us addresses these concerns in a few ways, as outlined by Mr. Isakson. I will highlight a few of the major ones:

First, it requires a minimum contract length. This helps to make sure that long-term investments made to interconnect and serve the new large load customers are paid for over at least 15 years. It also requires the new large load customers to pay a minimum amount over those 15 years. If the customer says they are going to use a certain amount of energy and capacity, this tariff requires the company to pay for at least 80% of that energy and capacity whether or not the customer actually uses it. This provides certainty that those long-term investments will be paid for even if the customer uses less energy than they originally said they would.

It also puts in place an exit fee that a large load customer must pay if they choose to end service before the end of their 15-year minimum contract. This is a substantial fee that is equal to the minimum monthly bill I just described multiplied by the number of months remaining on the customer's contract.

Importantly, the order contains a method to protect other residential, commercial, and industrial customers from the possibility of over-optimism or over-speculation from the large load customers. The tariff in the order before us does this by requiring substantial collateral to be posted. The default level of collateral outlined in this order is equal to half of the exit fee and can only be changed by Commission approval of an ex-parte filing made by Consumers Energy.

And the final term that I want to highlight is the filing we are requiring from Consumers Energy for each new large load customer. In this filing, Consumers will be required to prove that any costs caused by the new large load are paid for *only* by the new large load. No other residential, commercial, or industrial customer may subsidize the costs or have their electric rates raised as a result of a new large load customer interconnecting to the system. This filing requires details on what generation will be used to serve the load and how the new customer is paying for the resources. The filing will be reviewed carefully by the Commission and Commission Staff to ensure compliance.

There are many other provisions included in this order, and I encourage everyone to read the issue brief which will be posted on our website on the Consumer Information – Be Informed page. And if you want even more information, read our full order that can be found on E-dockets under Case No. U-21859.

It was a lot of work for us to get to this point today to issue this order. I'd like to thank all the intervenors who participated in this case, and I'd especially like to thank our staff who provided invaluable expertise to help us ensure customers are protected while allowing for progress and development: David Isakson, Bill Stosik, Nick Revere, Jesse Harlow, Lisa Gold, and Stephanie Fitzgerald."

Chair Scripps commented:

"I won't spend as much time on the particulars, but zooming out, I think it's a fair reading of the 20th century to say that increasing load over a course of decades allowed for us to develop backbone infrastructure, both generation and the poles and wires that connected an ever growing homes and an ever growing number of electrified appliances, all while keeping rates in check; that the increase in the number of kilowatt hours sold ultimately helped defray the costs, and in fact cover the costs without rate shock to customers. It's simple math. It is numerators and denominators where the denominators (in terms of kilowatt hours) were growing faster than the numerators, in terms of the fixed cost of the system. Put bluntly, that has not been the story of the last 20 years when we've needed to replace old infrastructure in a time of limited to flat load growth, which has resulted in a significant increase in rates and affordability concerns becoming ever more front and center. While those have been offset by squeezing some of the energy waste out of the system, and Michigan certainly been a leader in that area, there are challenges in how we replace that old infrastructure.

Data centers and the loads that they represent, as well as other large load customers, provide an opportunity in this regard, but they also look different than the load growth of the past. In part, because we're talking about gigawatt additions at a time as opposed to the more incremental issues. That creates the challenge that this tariff is designed to address. It really is sort of a fundamental issue of how to take advantage of the opportunities that growth represents, as Commissioner Myers detailed, without adding additional costs to existing customers. A principle that's as foundational to utility regulation as the bond principles that we look to add, in fact animates the first two principles of sufficiency of revenue to cover costs and fairness in how costs are allocated between customers.

The tariff includes a number of important provisions to protect against cost shifts and stranded assets, including the avoidance of existing customers ultimately holding the bag if data centers or other large load customers can't pay in the form of the collateral provisions that Commissioner Peretick mentioned.

It also provides some important flexibility based on this nascent industry, including the opportunity to ramp to the full level over a course of up to 5 years, the one-time opportunity to reduce the capacity obligation of up to 10%, plus more than that if the customer pays a prorated exit fee or is ultimately approved by the Commission is being unnecessary, and the ability to enter into special contracts for the additional costs that are being incurred. I think this provides an important balance in suggesting that Michigan is open for business from data centers and other large load customers, while also leveraging those potential benefits of the growth that they represent in a way that's good for all customers, as well as the state as a whole.

I do recognize that this is likely to add an additional step in the process. At least early on before we get the results of the comprehensive cost of service and that could inform a new rate for these customers that ultimately ensures that the revenues from those customers over the terms of these

contracts are sufficient to meet the costs involved. I think even in that, we provide two opportunities to move forward in a meaningful way. First, is through the filing that Commissioner Peretick mentioned, by which the utility may demonstrate through modeling in a cost of service study that the existing rate GBT is sufficient over the minimum term and minimum billing demand requirements to ensure that revenues exceed costs and avoid additional costs to existing customers. Second, as part of this, through the opportunity to consider on an expedited basis, special contracts related to the additional generation and other storage demand side resources, load flexibility, etc. where the data center or large load customer agrees to cover the costs needed to serve that customer. That can be included as part of these ex-parte filings, as well.

As both of my colleagues have mentioned, I think this is a balanced approach, a reasonable one that suggests that we are open, and indeed, welcome the opportunity to serve new loads in Michigan. Particularly, in this tariff in the Consumers Energy service territory, but in a way that ultimately sees those as a net benefit to the system, as opposed to additional costs or risks that fall on other customers.”

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

The order was adopted.

5. U-21870 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY FOR AUTHORITY TO INCREASE ITS RATES FOR THE GENERATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF ELECTRICITY AND FOR OTHER RELIEF
(application for leave to appeal/interim order)

Case No. U-21870 involves an application filed by Consumers Energy Company seeking authority to increase its rates for the generation and distribution of electricity and for other relief. The order before you grants the Commission Staff’s September 18, 2025 application for leave to appeal, along with the requested relief therein; grants Michigan Environmental Council, Citizens Utility Board of Michigan, Sierra Club, and Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.’s motion for leave to respond; and strikes the amended return on equity provision set forth in the September 5, 2025 amended scheduling memo, along with any evidence filed in response thereto and since admitted into the record. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its November 6, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

6. U-21977 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY FOR APPROVAL OF ONE-TIME ACCOUNTING AUTHORITY
(*ex parte*/ request for regulatory asset/final order)

Case No. U-21977 involves an application filed by DTE Electric company requesting *ex parte* approval of a one-time regulatory asset treatment of \$19 million in deposits made to Powin, LLC in accordance with an approved Equipment Supply Agreement between DTE Electric Company and Powin, LLC. The order before you approves the application, as described in this order. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its November 6, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

7. U-21979 IN THE MATTER OF THE *EX PARTE* APPLICATION OF CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY FOR ACCOUNTING APPROVAL TO ACCRUE AN ALLOWANCE FOR FUNDS USED DURING CONSTRUCTION ON CONSTRUCTION WORK IN PROGRESS FOR PROJECTS WITHIN ITS RENEWABLE ENERGY PLAN
(final order)

Case No. U-21979 involves an application filed by Consumers Energy Company for *ex parte* approval to accrue an allowance for funds used during construction on construction work in progress for projects within the company's renewable energy plan. The order before you approves the application. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its November 6, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

C. GAS

1. U-21960 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF SPRAGUE OPERATING RESOURCES LLC FOR AN ALTERNATIVE GAS SUPPLIER LICENSE
(final order)

Case No. U-21960 involves an application filed by Sprague Operating Resources LLC to become a licensed alternative gas supplier. The order before you approves the application with conditions. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its November 6, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

2. U-21965 IN THE MATTER OF THE APPLICATION OF WAVE ENERGY MICHIGAN, LLC FOR AN ALTERNATIVE GAS SUPPLIER LICENSE
(final order)

Case No. U-21965 involves an application by Wave Energy Michigan LLC to become a licensed alternative gas supplier. The order before you approves the application with conditions. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its November 6, 2025 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Phone number XXX-XXX-0558 commented on DTE's Smart Choice Meter Opt Out Program. The same phone number commented on the proposed data center in Saline.

Ryan M, Ann Arbor, commented on the proposed data center in Saline.

Chair Scripps announced:

“First, this is the last Commission Meeting for one of our outstanding attorneys in our Regulatory Affairs Division, Jana Bachman. Ms. Bachman began work at the Commission in January of 2011, but her service as a state employee with the State of Michigan dates back 47 years, to July of 1978. At the Commission, Ms. Bachman has been the primary attorney responsible for reviewing matters involving residential customer complaints and for all licensing proceedings involving telecommunications. During her time at the Commission, she handled countless prima facie determinations, multiple rulemakings, and has been recognized as an expert regarding our billing rules. Her contributions to our work have been immense. Over the past five years, Ms. Bachman has drafted a combined total of over 200 orders and minute actions.

On a personal note, I doubt you’ll find a kinder individual than Ms. Bachman. I have enjoyed each of our interactions over our time together, and will miss her warmth, friendship, and good humor.

She has had a remarkable career, and we will miss her. Thank you, Ms. Bachman, for your 47 years of outstanding service. We wish you all the best in your retirement and future endeavors.

Second, I want to officially congratulate and welcome back to the Commission Daniel Gottschalk, who was recently named manager of our Rates and Tariff Section, succeeding Nick Revere after Nick was promoted to Director of the Energy Operations Division earlier this year. For the last two-plus years, Daniel has held the position of Senior Rate and Business Consultant with the National Rural Utilities Cooperative Finance Corporation. Previously, Daniel spent nearly 12 years with the MPSC, starting as a student assistant in the Renewable Energy Section before being hired full time as a Departmental Analyst in August of 2013 and then promoted to the position of Electric Cost of Service Specialist in October 2018. Welcome back Daniel!

Third, I want to also welcome back Administrative Law Judge Theresa Staley, who returned to the Michigan Office of Hearings and Rules as an ALJ overseeing Commission proceedings earlier this fall. Judge Staley previously served as an ALJ with MOAHR’s predecessor agency (MAHS) from 2010 to 2014, where she presided over this same subject matter involving complex contested case hearings on behalf of the PSC. Since that time, Theresa’s practice has remained focused on utility law, including electric, gas and telecommunications, both as a senior counsel in two private law firms and as in-house regulatory counsel for a major utility company. Welcome back Judge Staley.”

A recording of the proceedings of the November 6, 2025 meeting is archived at:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=laTVxVKTtwI> .

Chair Scripps announced that the next regularly scheduled Commission Meeting will be held on Friday, December 5, 2025 at 1:00 p.m.

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

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

The motion was approved.

The meeting adjourned at 1:54 p.m.

Lisa Felice
Executive Secretary