http://michigan.gov/mpsc

Minutes of the Regular Commission Meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission Held In Its Offices and Available Via Microsoft Teams Video Conferencing on August 27, 2026.

Commission Chair Daniel C. Scripps called the meeting to order at 1:00 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:	Shannon Wambaugh Matt Helms Lisa Felice Dan Williams Blair Renfro Kaitlyn Miracle Austin Glass Jill Rusnak Erika Poli Kate Halloran Lori Mayabb Dolores Midkiff-Powell Andy Hannum Charlie Tidwell Ben Johnson Joe Cole Jerry McClung Sarah Mullkoff Stephanie Fitzgerald Quinn Sharkey Zoe Salamey Paul Proudfoot Mike Byrne Steve Kimbrell
Public:	George Heartwell, Stop the Dam Sale Coalition Suzy Westmoreland, MEGA Valerie Brader, Rivenoak Law

Additional Staff & Public Attending Telephonically/Video Conferencing: 246 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 August 6, 2026, Commissioner Myers seconded.

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

The minutes were approved.

III. Consented Orders

A. Communications

1.	U-13378	In the matter of the joint request for Commission approval of an interconnection agreement between Comcast Telecommunications, Inc. and Michigan Bell Telephone Company d/b/a SBC Michigan (twentieth amendment)
	U-17143	In the matter of the joint request for Commission approval of an interconnection agreement between New Horizons Communications Corp. and Michigan Bell Telephone Company d/b/a AT&T Michigan (third amendment)
	U-18135	In the matter of the joint request for Commission approval of an interconnection agreement between Access Point, Inc. and various AT&T Inc. owned companies, including AT&T Michigan (fourth amendment)
	U-18398	In the matter of the joint request for Commission approval of a multi-state interconnection agreement between Airus, Inc. and various AT&T Inc. owned companies, including AT&T Michigan (third amendment)
2.	U-22115	In the matter of the application of Ezee Fiber Michigan Assets, LLC, for a temporary and permanent license to provide basic local exchange service (interim order)
3.	U-22122	In the matter of the notice of dispute of Omni Fiber, LLC against City of Bay City, Michigan and request for mediation pursuant to Metropolitan

		Extension Telecommunications Rights-of-Way Oversight Act, MCL 484.3101 et seq. (order closing docket)
4.	Minute Action	Peninsula Fiber Network LLC (9-1-1 wireless, U-14000, invoice no. INV-3903 dated August 1, 2026)
5.	Minute Action	Peninsula Fiber Network Next Generation Services LLC (9-1-1 wireless, U-14000, invoice no. INV-1350 dated August 1, 2026)

B. Electric

1.	U-21881	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, 2026 (proposed settlement agreement)
2.	U-22025	In the matter of the application of Alpena Power Company to commence a renewable energy cost reconciliation proceeding for the 12-month period ended December 31, 2025 (proposed settlement agreement)
3.	Minute Action	Maryland Energy Administration, et al. v. Baltimore Gas and Electric Company, et al. (FERC Docket No. EL26-87-000)
4.	Minute Action	Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc., request for tariff revisions to Module E-2 (FERC Docket No. ER26-3083)

C. Gas

1.	U-21605	In the matter of the application of Upper Michigan Energy Resources Corporation for reconciliation of its gas cost recovery plan (Case No. U-21604) for the 12-month period ended October 31, 2025 (proposed settlement agreement)
2.	U-21895	In the matter of the application of SEMCO Energy Gas Company for approval of a gas cost recovery plan and authorization of gas cost recovery factors for the 12-month period ending March 31, 2027
3.	U-22159	In the matter of the complaint of Eric Totz against DTE Gas Company (request to withdraw complaint/final order)

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 4 minute actions were adopted.

IV. Other Orders

A. Electric

1. U-20852 In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, to commence a collaborative to consider best practices to ensure cost-effective development of new energy resources and to limit procurement barriers for emerging technologies, including processes for competitive bidding (opportunity to comment/interim order)

Case No. U-20852 involves a matter, on the Commission's own motion, to commence a collaborative to consider best practices to ensure cost-effective development of new energy resources and to limit procurement barriers for emerging technologies, including processes for competitive bidding. The order before you invites interested persons to submit initial and reply comments in this docket regarding the revised draft Competitive Procurement Guidelines. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its August 27, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

Commissioner Peretick commented:
"I would like to highlight the opportunity for any interested person to comment on the Staff's proposed updates to the competitive procurement guidelines, as outlined in this order. We last updated our competitive bidding guidelines in 2021, which were meant to encourage fair, transparent, and nondiscriminatory processes for utilities to use when seeking competitive bids for new energy resources. The updates proposed in the guidelines submitted by Staff make these guidelines even stronger.

Affordability is front of mind for the Commission, and increasing competition via competitive procurement is one way we are taking action to help keep costs down for electric customers."

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

The order was adopted.

2. U-20889 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 charges/interim order)

Case No. U-20889 involves an application filed by Consumers Energy Company for a financing order approving the securitization of qualified costs. The order before you approves the routine true-up of the securitization charges. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its August 27, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

3. U-21285 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*/Northwood Solar Park/proposed contracts)

Case No. U-21285 involves an application filed by DTE Electric Company for *ex parte* approval of the company's Northwood Solar Park Project. The order before you approves the application. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its August 27, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

4. U-21932 In the matter of the application of Acceleration Solar, LLC for a renewable energy or storage siting certificate to construct a solar energy facility
(proposed settlement agreement)

Case No. U-21932 involves an application filed by Acceleration Solar, LLC, to develop a solar energy facility in Ingham County, Michigan. The order before you approves a settlement agreement that resolves all issues in the case and further authorizes Acceleration Solar, LLC to construct a 90-megawatt solar energy facility pursuant to Public Act 233 of 2023. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its August 27, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

Commissioner Myers commented:
"U- 21932 is the first solar siting case under PA 233 of 2023 that has been filed with the Commission and gone through the case process. This first case is also a tangible opportunity to see the legislation that I worked on while in the House move from paper into practice. When developing the legislation, we knew that creating the statutory framework was only the beginning. The real test would be whether the process could work in an actual community, with an actual project, and with real concerns from the people and local governments affected by that project.

I hope we continue to learn as we go through the process of other cases. Each proceeding will present different circumstances and different community concerns, but the underlying principles should remain the same: transparency, consistency, meaningful participation, a complete evidentiary record, and accountability after a project is approved.

The Legislature gave the Commission the responsibility: to develop a siting process for certain utility-scale renewable energy projects under specified circumstances. Before any individual project came before us, the Commission engaged in a substantial implementation process to develop procedures designed to provide clarity and transparency for future applications.

When the Acceleration Solar application was submitted, Staff reviewed the filing to ensure the application contained the necessary information based on the guidelines developed. This was a contested case proceeding where discovery requests were made and testimony and exhibits were filed. The contested case process provided the parties with an opportunity to examine the application, request additional information, present evidence, and raise issues that they believed were relevant to the Commission's consideration of the project. This provides the Commission with a complete record for which decisions can be made.

A settlement agreement was reached between the parties of the case which included Acceleration Solar, MPSC Staff, and Leslie Township, Onondaga Township, and Vevay Township in Ingham County. The settlement established requirements for construction, noise control, screening, lighting, complaint resolution, decommissioning, financial assurance, and community benefits.

The case doesn't end here; the Commission will receive reporting's from the applicant through the project's life. This provides a mechanism for the Commission to monitor the construction phase, the project's energy performance at the completion of the construction, complaints received, maintenance, and financial assurance.

As this was the first siting case, it provides an important foundation moving forward."

Commissioner Peretick commented:
"This is the first siting case under PA 233 that has come before the Commission, and it has resulted in a settlement agreement between all parties involved.

There has been a lot of discussion about the new siting process established by PA 233 which gave the MPSC authority over renewable energy siting in in some circumstances, and what that means for the respective roles of the state, local governments, developers, and communities. But I think this case is a useful example of what this process can look like in practice.

The three townships that will host the proposed project — Leslie, Onondaga, and Vevay — participated directly in this proceeding along with our staff and the developer. There was testimony filed, there was a detailed review of the project, and ultimately those parties were able to sit down together and reach an agreement that resolves all of the issues in the case.
And importantly, the settlement contains real, enforceable protections and commitments for the host communities.

There are detailed requirements around noise, including monitoring, modeling, and post-construction testing. There are requirements for dark-sky lighting, vegetative screening, pollinator-friendly ground cover, habitat protection, complaint tracking and resolution, and first-responder training. There are also community benefit payments and additional commitments related to legal expenses, drain maintenance, and public safety.

And there are decommissioning requirements, which have understandably been an important concern for communities considering large renewable projects. Communities want to know that defunct infrastructure won't be left in the ground and become a blight in their neighborhoods. This settlement ensures that the developer (not the township and not local taxpayers) will be responsible for the cost of decommissioning this facility when that time comes, and the developer has to prove up front that it has the financial means to do so before construction ever begins. And at the end of the project's life, the settlement requires removal of the underground infrastructure and restoration of the land to productive agricultural use.

I also think it is important that our involvement does not end when we issue this certificate. The developer is required to comply with reporting requirements, both during construction and after operation begins. Reporting will cover energy production, complaints, maintenance, and financial assurance. The Commission and the townships will therefore continue to have visibility into this project throughout its life.

This is our first solar siting case under the new law, so I think it is particularly important that we establish from the beginning that this process can provide a workable path for projects that meet the requirements established by the legislature without sacrificing rigorous review, transparency, and focus on local concerns.

I want to thank our Staff for the substantial amount of work that has gone into standing up an entirely new siting process and into reviewing this first application, especially Sarah Mullkoff and her whole team: Gus Cordero, Austin Glass, Melissa Lawson, Joseph Lobodzinski, Katey Miracle, and Elisabeth Sinclair, and Candice McElhaney. And I also want to thank the representatives of Leslie, Onondaga, and Vevay Townships for engaging in this proceeding, as well as all of the parties for doing the work necessary to reach a resolution."

Chair Scripps commented:
"We had a saying in the Legislature that 'everything's been said, but not everybody's said it', and I think this fits that as well. I echo my colleagues' points and just reinforce those and offer a couple of additional observations. The first, picking up on what both Commissioner Myers and Commissioner Peretick said, that that settlement agreement before us today is the result of a thorough review. And just to underscore that, we have 12 applications pending under the 2023 law. Of those, the staff has actually issued letters of incompleteness in five of them. So, nearly half ultimately were found to be incomplete at the time of submittal.

We are intentionally setting a high bar. We want complete, full applications and it's important for developers to dot the i's and cross the t's as this helps facilitate a level of engagement with affected communities and ensures robust review through the contested case process. Those 12 applications, by the way, represent a total of 2.1 gigawatts of projects, including nearly 1900 megawatts of solar, 300 megawatts of wind, and 150 megawatts of battery energy storage.

The second point that I'd highlight is that process. Again, I want to echo thanks to Sarah Mullkoff and her team, including those from other sections across the Commission who have pitched in to help. This is truly the work of many hands. The second point that has already been flagged is that this is a settlement agreement. It represents agreement among all the parties. I think particularly in cases like this, that is a good thing. The settlement agreement was fiercely negotiated by the parties to the case, including local leaders in Leslie, Onondaga, and Vevay Townships, who were able to achieve through the settlement agreement – meaningful and binding commitments, including hundreds of thousands of dollars in direct payments, as well as township legal expense, drain maintenance, and training for local fire personnel and first responders, as Commissioner Peretick mentioned. Those are real benefits to the communities who, ultimately, will host this project.

I want to thank the community leaders in Ingham County, who ultimately chose not to participate, though were extended the opportunity to do so after the Court of Appeals' decision earlier this year. But as a result of their engagement with project developers, will still see meaningful local community benefits, including direct payments as a result of a separate agreement that they entered into with the project developer.

This is, in my view, an example of getting this right. It is a law that is working as intended. Changing the conversation around development, providing meaningful opportunities for project development, but also meaningful opportunities for local engagement in the process.

I'm pleased to support the settlement agreement that's in front of us today."

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

The order was adopted.

5. U-21986 In the matter of the application of Indiana Michigan Power Company for approval of modifications to its Large Power Tariff – Tariff LP (final order)

Case No. U-21986 involves an application filed by Indiana Michigan Power Company for approval of certain amendments to its Large Power Tariff—Tariff LP. The order before you approves amendments to Tariff LP, adopts annual reporting requirements, and provides guidance for a future rate case and related requirements as described in the order. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its August 27, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

Commissioner Peretick commented:
"We have spent a lot of time at this Commission over the past year thinking about large loads and the effects they would have on our electric system and other electric customers. This order is another important step toward making sure that if and when this new load comes to Michigan, we have a framework in place that allows us to capture the potential benefits while protecting the customers who are already here.

Even a single large customer can materially change the size and characteristics of this system, which is why it is particularly important that this order is focused so clearly on protecting existing customers from cost shifting and stranded-asset risk.

There are several provisions here that I think are worth highlighting. First, we require I&M to establish and present a separate standalone rate for large load customers in its next rate case. These customers can be fundamentally different in scale and risk from the customers currently served under the existing industrial tariff and therefore should have a different allocation of cost that appropriately matches their costs to the system.

Relatedly, we require I&M to present six different cost-allocation and rate-design analyses in its next rate case, including scenarios that directly assign generation, transmission, and distribution costs to large-load customers. That will give the Commission and interested parties a better factual basis for understanding who is actually causing costs and who would pay them under different approaches.

Second, this order puts meaningful protections in place before a customer ever takes service. It includes a 15-year initial contract term following the ramp-up period, substantial collateral requirements, high exit fees, and limitations on capacity reductions. These provisions matter because an investment made by the utility to serve these customers could be substantial and long-lived, and we need to ensure the customer causing the investment is the one paying for it.
And importantly, before each large-load customer takes service, I&M will have to make a filing with this Commission demonstrating both compliance with the tariff and that the costs caused by that customer are not paid by other customers.

Individual customer review is important when contemplating loads at this scale. We are dealing with loads of size and character that are still relatively novel. We simply cannot anticipate every circumstance today. Having an additional checkpoint gives us the ability to look at the actual customer, the actual infrastructure required to serve it, and the actual cost impacts before approval.

I also want to highlight the reliability protections in this order, because at this scale, large loads can become a grid reliability issue as well. The order before us requires I&M to update its technical interconnection requirements, including requirements intended to address the behavior of these loads on the system.

Finally, I want to highlight that this order requires ongoing reporting once I&M enters into a large-load contract, including the amount of large load on the system, capacity changes, contract terminations, and exit fees. The scale and speed of potential data-center growth mean that we need to get these protections in place *before* the load arrives, not after we discover a problem.

The order before us gives I&M a pathway to serve large new customers while establishing meaningful financial protections, transparency, Commission oversight, and a process to develop a more appropriate long-term rate structure as we gain actual experience with these loads.
I appreciate the extensive work of Staff, the ALJ, the parties to the case, and everyone involved in developing this record.

We are continuing our strict customer protections around large loads to maintain our standing as having some of the strongest protections for existing customers in the country."

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

The order was adopted.

6. U-22059 In the matter of the compliance submission of DTE Electric Company concerning Emergency Electrical Procedures in Section C3 of its rate book for electric service
(*ex parte*/ final order)

Case No. U-22059 involves an application filed by DTE Electric Company for *ex parte* approval of updates to the company's Emergency Electrical Procedures in Section C3 of the company's rate book for electric service. The order before you approves the application, as modified by this order. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its August 27, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

B. Gas

1. U-21938 In the matter of the complaint of Jordan Development Company, Muzyl Oil Corporation and NuEnergy, LLC against Phillips 66 and DCP Michigan Pipeline and Processing LLC
(motion to dismiss)

Case No. U-21938 involves a complaint filed by Jordan Development Company, L.L.C.; Muzyl Oil Corporation; and NuEnergy, LLC, against Phillips 66 Company and DCP Michigan Pipeline & Processing LLC. The order before you remands the matter to the administrative law judge division to set a schedule for the case to proceed as a contested case in accordance with the Michigan Administrative Procedures Act of 1969 and for the previously filed petitions to intervene to be also reconsidered as a result. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its August 27, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

V. Public comments

George Heartwell, retired Mayor of Grand Rapids, hopes that the Croton Dam/Muskegon River is undammed. He also addressed his concerns about the ownership transfer.

John Bebow, retired journalist and lives on the Au Sable River, addressed his concerns about the dam ponds.

James Ward/Hardy Dam Preservation, addressed his concerns about the sale of the dams and 13 communities that are affected.

Kimberly Bogan, retired nurse from Holt, indicated that DTE, Consumers, and I&M's reports on the recent storm are due today. She is interested in their responses to the storms, and extended outages. She is concerned about what happens next time.

Rick Chapala, West Michigan/Ottawa County, addressed his concerns about the sale of the dams and urged the Commission to reject the sale.

Valerie Brader/Ann Arbor Sustainable Energy Utility, provided an update on the status of the SEU.

Carol Daringer/Lake Allegan Association, addressed her concerns about the sale of the dams and the local property values.

Nate Winkler/Traverse City, addressed his concerns about the sale of the dams to Confluence Hydro.

Elizabeth Riggs/Great Lakes Regional Director for American Rivers, addressed her concerns about the sale of the dams.

Mike Krcatovich, Supervisor for Valley Township and Allegan Township urges the Commission to approve the sale of the dams to Confluence Hydro.

Jake Vates, Superintendent of Bear Lake Schools, is concerned about the ecological and financial affects on the community.

Andy Fias/Croton Township Trustee, discussed the economic impact of Croton Township.

Alex Chesley urged the PSC to approve the sale of the 13 dams to Confluence Hydro.

Mark Bennett/Mecosta Township, supports the sale of the dams to Confluence Hydro but is concerned about the economic impact.

Joe Porterfield/Administrator, Wexford County, read a letter on behalf of Karen Melcheck/Mesick. The letter indicated that initial surveys indicated that residents want to keep dams and addressed concerns.

Several neighbors that live on the Croton Hardy dam. Collectively, that expressed their concerns regarding the sale of the dams.

Chair Scripps announced:
"First, earlier this week the Commission launched a new affordability web page that outlines actions the Commission has taken in recent years to control energy costs, as well as expanding energy assistance programs for those most in need. There's a host of information on that. I encourage those who are interested to review that. Michiganders struggling with home energy costs can find information through that website or go directly to www.michigan.gov/mpsc/get help.com for help and other resources that are available.

This was part of a broader effort around controlling energy costs, and earlier this month we released a letter that responded to the Governor's call for us to investigate legislative opportunities to promote affordability and grid reliability, as well as options for new and improved energy assistance programs. Our recommendations which fall into three broad categories but contain nearly two dozen separate and specific recommendations are available on our website, as well as the full text of that letter.

Just to highlight maybe three, because they also play into issues that were discussed earlier in the meeting. One is around competitive procurement and the opportunity to increase competition within the current regulatory structure in Michigan. Commissioner Peretick spoke to efforts that are ongoing at the Commission. The letter also includes legislative recommendations. Second is the use of securitization that allows utilities to recover the remaining book balance on retired assets, while also using a lower cost of financing. The case that was approved earlier today is just an annual regular true up, but the securitization in that particular instance is projected to save customers $126 million over the traditional financing that would otherwise have been used. Third is the codification of some of the strongest customer protections in the nation relating to data center tariffs, and that relates to an issue that we also took up earlier today. Those recommendations, as well as a host of others, are included in that.

Also related, we want to make sure that the public has an opportunity to learn more about the affordability of energy services, as well as to have your say. I want to highlight that we will be holding a public hearing and workshop in Detroit on September 3rd to discuss energy affordability as we work to reduce the number of households with unsustainable energy burdens. That event, again, is Thursday, September 3rd, 6:00 – 8:30 p.m. at the Durfee Innovation Society, on the city's near West Side. More information about that is available on our website.

I also want to say a particular thank you to those who took part in a similar hearing and workshop in Grand Rapids on August 11th, as well as those who attended a hearing on August 12th at Westshore Community College between Manistee and Ludington on transmission issues. I particularly want to thank the MISO representatives who attended and provided an overview of MISO's long range transmission planning process."

Commissioner Myers announced:
"Yesterday our Chair Scripps celebrated a milestone birthday. We want to publicly wish him a happy birthday. Thank you for your leadership, Chair.

A recording of the proceedings of the August 27, 2026 meeting is archived at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XiQGsFO6Uq0 .

Chair Scripps announced that the next regularly scheduled Commission Meeting will be held on Thursday, September 10, 2026 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 2:33 p.m.

Lisa Felice

Lisa Felice
Executive Secretary