

<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 October 1, 2026.

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 Cavanaugh
Matt Helms
Lisa Felice
Charlie Tidwell
Jerry McClung
Ben Johnson
Andy Hannum
Jake Thelen
Jill Rusnak
Cathy Cole
Dan Williams Jr.
Al Freeman
Mike Byrne
Quinn Sharkey
Stephanie Fitzgerald
Erika Poli

Public: Mike Hamm
Nick DeHaan
Joy DeHaan
Jonathan Bunge
Mark Campbell
Emerson Hyde
Charlene Hyde
Zoe Chadae, Media

Additional Staff & Public Attending Telephonically/Video Conferencing: 317 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 September 10, 2026 Commissioner Myers seconded.

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

The minutes were approved.

III. Consented Orders

A. Communications

1. U-13328 In the matter of the joint request for Commission approval of an interconnection agreement between AT&T Michigan and US Signal Company, L.L.C.
(eighteenth amendment)
- U-14964 In the matter of the joint request for Commission approval of an interconnection agreement between YMax Communications Corp. and AT&T Michigan
(sixth amendment)
- U-15362 In the matter of the joint request for approval of a multi-state Cellular/PCS interconnection agreement between New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC and various AT&T Inc. owned companies, including AT&T Michigan
(ninth amendment)
- U-22066 In the matter of the joint request for Commission approval of a multi-state interconnection agreement between Wide Voice, LLC and various AT&T Inc. owned companies, including AT&T Michigan
(first amendment)
2. U-22177 In the matter of the notification of the City of Wakefield of a dispute with Aspire Networks 1, LLC, under Section 6 of the Metropolitan Extension Telecommunications Rights-of-Way Oversight Act
(voluntary request to dismiss)

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 settlement agreement)
- U-22175 In the matter of the application of Upper Michigan Energy Resources Corporation for approval of an Integrated Resources Plan under MCL 460.6t and for other relief
- U-21813 In the matter of the application of Upper Michigan Energy Resources Corporation requesting approval of an amended renewable energy plan to comply with Public Act 235 of 2023
(joint motion to amend dates)
- U-18356 In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, regarding the regulatory reviews, revisions, determination, and/or approvals necessary for Upper Michigan Energy Resources Corporation to comply with Section 61 of 2016 PA 342
(joint motion to amend dates)
2. U-22033 In the matter of the complaint of Morgan Lindsey against Consumers Energy Company
(proposed dismissal)
3. Minute Action Consumers Energy Company, cost recovery filing pursuant to Section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act – August 2025 DOE order0
(FERC Docket No. ER26-3402-000)
4. Minute Action Consumers Energy Company, cost recovery filing pursuant to Section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act – November 2025 DOE order
(FERC Docket No. ER26-3403-000)
5. Minute Action Northern Indiana Public Service Company LLC, cost recovery filing pursuant to Section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act – DOE orders
(FERC Docket No. ER26-3423-000)

C. Gas

1. U-21887 In the matter of the application of Consumers Energy Company for approval of a gas cost recovery plan and authorization of gas cost recovery factors for the 12 months ending March 31, 2027
(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 5 orders and 3 minute actions were adopted.

IV. Other Orders

A. Electric

1. U-20604 In the matter of the application of Consumers Energy Company for approval of power purchase agreements
(*ex parte*/Manitou Farms solar plant/final order)

Case No. U-20604 involves an application filed by Consumers Energy Company seeking *ex parte* approval of a power purchase agreement with Manitou Farms LLC. The order before you approves the application. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its October 1, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

Commissioner Peretick commented:

“I’d like to take a moment to comment on an aspect of this order that highlights the absurdity of applying a financial compensation mechanism in certain instances. Section 28(8) of Public Act 235 of 2023 requires that when electric providers like Consumers enter into a PPA for renewable energy resources with an entity that is not an affiliate of the utility, the Commission must allow the utility to collect an annual financial incentive, presumably incentivizing the utility to contract with third parties for renewables.

But in cases like the one before us now, the utility is already required under PURPA to purchase the output of qualified facilities like Manitou Farms and the projects in the next three orders on this agenda. So, applying the FCM in this case only adds profits for the utility that gives customers nothing in return. Adding profits to utility contracts that are entered into pursuant to federal obligations results in unnecessary costs for customers.

Our current law dictates that we must approve an incentive for the utility to sign this contract, so that is what this order does. However, we shouldn’t need to provide the utility with an incentive simply for complying with federal law.”

Chair Scripps commented:

“Thank you, Commissioner Peretick. I certainly echo those comments. In fact, we included those in the response to the Governor’s recommendation for opportunities to improve the affordability of utility services in Michigan just a couple of months ago.

I want to touch on three other elements of the orders that are in front of us. I'd note that they come to us under a settlement agreement that was approved in June of 2022 that related to the utilities' Integrated Resource Plan. Under that broad based integrated resource plan, it contained a number of elements including a finding that was agreed to by the parties to that settlement agreement and approved by the Commission, that the utility would not have a capacity need for the length of the settlement and would be revisited in their next IRP which they filed just last month. As a part of that, there was also a standard offer power purchase agreement for projects of this type that was approved later in that year – November of 2022.

I just want to highlight a couple of elements. The first is around the capacity determination. As I mentioned, in that order that the settlement agreement that we approved, there was a finding that there would be no capacity need. It was something that the parties agreed to, and yet when we look at the planning year 2025, ultimately Consumers was deficient in their planning reserve margin requirements for three of the four seasons – summer, fall, and spring. They had sufficient capacity in the winter for the planning year 2025, but not for the other three seasons. There was a demonstrated capacity need even as the parties agreed three years prior that there was no capacity need. When you look out to planning year 2026, Consumers anticipates sufficient capacity to meet its planning reserve margin requirement. As of December of last year, and still needed projects to come online prior to June 1, 2026 in order to meet their capacity margins and without those projects would have been short in summer, fall, and spring.

You've got those PURPA contracts where the utility, as Commissioner Peretick noted, is required under federal law to enter into the contracts. Whether or not they pay capacity payments is largely determined by whether or not there's a capacity need and based on an agreement in the last IRP, there's no capacity need even as the planning auctions conducted by the regional grid operator show very clearly that at least in three of the four seasons, there is in fact a capacity need. The opportunity to acquire low-cost capacity from smaller projects for which the utility is required to enter into a contract seems like an easy and straightforward way to reduce the capacity needs of the system through customer sighted energy resources in ways that ultimately diminish the need for higher cost capacity resources.

Looking at the energy provisions of this contract, I'd like to note the full bundled cost. One of them is for a one-year contract and the other three are for 20-year contracts. Each of them falls between \$39 and \$41 per megawatt hour. That's approximately half of the approved cost in some of the more recent PPA's at the utility scale that the Commission has approved and is significantly less than the modeled price in the most recent IRP.

Again, it seems to me that the opportunity to what is ultimately the determined avoided cost is something that the Commission should, in fact, revisit as we move forward because the pricing on these contract, again, required them to enter into, but can provide both energy and capacity is significantly less at this point than the voluntary contract that the company's entering into.

My final point is, I mentioned that one of the contracts involving this particular project, Manitou Farms, that is front of us in the present order, has a contract of one year from October 1st of last year through yesterday, September 30th of this year. It is for approximately 150 kilowatts. Just under that and those types of projects are required to be governed by a standard offer contract. The reason

for the institution of a standard offer contract is to reduce, essentially, the cost and time associated with negotiating contracts. Particularly for these smaller resources. The value of using a standard offer contract and the ability to avoid the cost and time and headache of negotiating a contract for smaller projects is undermined when the term of that contract is for just 12 months. I would encourage the company, as it moves forward, to look at longer terms for these smaller contracts. Certainly, from the Commission's perspective, I think it's well past time to revisit both the pricing of avoided cost in these contracts, as well as the utility's capacity needs. The tightening of the market and their position with regard to their planning reserve margin requirements in recent years.

With all of that, I do recommend that we adopt the order in front of us."

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 1 solar plant/final order)

Case No. U-20604 involves an application filed by Consumers Energy Company requesting *ex parte* approval of a power purchase agreement between the company and Pivot Energy MI 1 LLC. The order before you approves the application. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its October 1, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

3. U-20604 In the matter of the application of Consumers Energy Company for approval of power purchase agreements
(*ex parte*/Pivot Energy MI 9 solar plant/final order)

Case No. U-20604 involves an application filed by Consumers Energy Company requesting *ex parte* approval of a power purchase agreement with Pivot Energy MI 9 LLC. The order before you approves the application. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its October 1, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

4. U-20604 In the matter of the application of Consumers Energy Company for approval of power purchase agreements
(*ex parte*/Pivot Energy MI 20 solar plant/final order)

Case No. U-20604 involves an application filed by Consumers Energy Company requesting *ex parte* approval of the power purchase agreement with Pivot Energy MI 20 LLC. The order before you approves the application. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its October 1, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

5. U-21483 In the matter of the application of Alpena Power Company for approval of its proposed interconnection procedures and forms, submitted pursuant to the Commission's own motion, commencing a collaborative for the development of electric utility interconnection procedures
(*ex parte*/ request for waivers/interim order)

Case No. U-21483 involves an application for approval of a waiver of Mich Admin Code, R 460.926(3)(c) and (d) for the interconnection system impact study fee and facilities study fee filed by Alpena Power Company. The order before you approves the extension of the waivers for Alpena Power Company for one year, as described in the order. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its October 1, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

6. U-21685 In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, regarding the regulatory reviews, revisions, determinations, and/or approvals necessary for Upper Michigan Energy Resources Corporation to fully comply with Public Act 295 of 2008, as amended
(energy waste reduction plan/final order)

Case No. U-21685 involves an amended application filed by Upper Michigan Energy Resources Corporation for approval of the

company's notification of intent to elect Efficiency United to implement energy waste reduction service for 2026-2027. The order before you approves the amended application, as set forth in the order. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its October 1, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

7. U-21946 In the matter of the application of Consumers Energy Company for approval of power purchase agreement amendments (T.E.S. Filer City Station/fourth amendment/final order)

Case No. U-21946 involves an application filed by Consumers Energy Company for approval of its Fourth Amendment to the Power Purchase Agreement with T.E.S. Filer City Station Limited Partnership. The order before you approves the amendment, as described in the order. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its October 1, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

8. U-22058 In the matter of the application of DTE Electric Company for approval of special contracts and for other relief (Google LLC/final order)

Commission Staff Quinlan Sharkey, Vermont Law Energy Policy Fellow, presented a brief synopsis of the case listed above. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its October 1, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

Commissioner Myers commented:

“The order in Case U-22058 grants conditional approval to the Special Contract between DTE Electric and Google. And I would like to highlight a few conditions that protect customers and ensure they are not responsible for the costs of which serving a new large load could create. Over the past year we have heard from ratepayers around the state about their concerns regarding data center build out in Michigan.

A data center can create substantial costs and commitments for the electric system. Those costs can arise from generation, transmission, distribution, capacity, reliability resources, system studies, and

other investments that may not otherwise be necessary. When those costs are driven by a new large load, it is important that the customers creating those costs are responsible for paying them. The Commission has a responsibility to adequately protect all customers, and order U-22058 today reinforces that:

- The standard D11 tariff could have been used to service this customer but the terms of the standard D11 rate did not contain the level of protection appropriate for a customer of this size.
- Under the standard D11 framework, a new customer with 1 MW or more of peak demand generally has a five-year agreement and a lower minimum billing requirement.
- A contract length of 20 years, compared to 5-year contracts normally required under DTE Electric's large-load D11 rate. This reduces the risk of stranded infrastructure costs were a data center to leave before costs to serve it are paid.
- A minimum billing demand of 80%, compared to 50%-65% in the general D11 rate. This means Google will have to pay a minimum of 80% of the contracted electric use, even if its actual use is lower.
- Early termination payment requiring Google to ultimately pay for at least 15 years of minimum monthly charges.
- Credit and collateral requirements to cover costs in the event Google were to cease operating the data center sooner than planned.
- Also, the company must update its amended Renewable Energy Plan to include options for equitable cost recovery and ensure that costs and benefits are evenly distributed among rate classes.
 - This provides an opportunity for the Commission to evaluate how the costs and benefits associated with this new load are allocated and to ensure that one class of customers are not inappropriately subsidizing another.
- And finally, DTE Electric must file a cost allocation and rate design proposal that ensures that future large load interconnection customers pay the full costs associated with interconnection in its next rate case.
- This establishes a framework for ensuring that the costs associated with serving future large loads are appropriately allocated to the customers creating those costs, rather than being shifted to other customers.

Taken together, these conditions are important safeguards for customers. They establish that the costs associated with serving new large loads should be identified, appropriately allocated, and recovered from the customers solely responsible for creating those costs.

“This conditional approval is not simply about connecting a new large customer to the electric grid. It is about making sure that growth happens responsibly. Existing ratepayers should not be asked to subsidize the infrastructure required to serve a new data center, and the protections incorporated into this approval are designed to ensure that the costs and risks associated with that new demand are appropriately allocated.”

Commissioner Peretick commented:

“First, I want to thank our Staff, the Attorney General, and all of the intervenors listed by Ms. Sharkey who participated in this proceeding. This was a substantial case and the record reflects an enormous amount of work by everyone involved.

As described by Ms. Sharkey, DTE filed two special contracts between itself and Google, LLC, with the Commission in March. From there, interested parties were able to intervene, hire experts, conduct discovery, submit testimony and evidence, cross-examine witnesses at an evidentiary hearing, and file briefs arguing what the Commission should ultimately decide. In this case, that process produced testimony from 18 witnesses, more than 1,000 pages of transcript, 135 exhibits, and approximately 650 pages of briefing.

A one-gigawatt data center is not an ordinary new customer. A load of this magnitude can have significant implications for generation, transmission, distribution, resource adequacy, and ultimately the bills paid by everyone else on the system.

So for me, the central question in this case has been straightforward: How do we make sure that existing customers are protected? This order answers that question in several different ways.

At the most fundamental level, our approval is conditioned on Google paying the costs that its presence on the system causes. The order is explicit that Google's payments under its tariff and these special contracts must cover the costs of serving Google, including generation, transmission, distribution, and other costs, so those costs are not borne by other customers. And if the collateral ultimately proves insufficient following a default or termination, that remaining liability belongs to DTE, not its other customers. That principle is backed up by multiple layers of financial protection.

Google is making a 20-year commitment. It will have an 80-percent minimum billing demand, meaning that even if its actual usage falls significantly below expectations, it must continue making substantial minimum payments. The record showed that even under a scenario in which Google reaches full load and then never pays more than the minimum bill, those payments cover the fixed costs associated with serving the customer.

The contracts include substantial termination payments if Google leaves early. There are credit and collateral requirements, including a parental guarantee and, under specified circumstances, a letter of credit. And there is an affordability backstop designed to protect other customers if the costs of serving this customer ultimately exceed the revenues and benefits associated with it. Taken together, the Commission finds that these provisions substantially mitigate the risks of stranded costs and cost subsidization.

The contracts include protections on the resource side as well. Under the Clean Capacity Accelerator Agreement, Google will pay the full cost of up to 480 megawatts of energy storage and up to 1,600 megawatts of renewable generation. If those assets have useful lives extending beyond the contract, Google's payments are accelerated so that the full cost is collected during the contract period rather than leaving remaining costs for other customers after Google is gone.

And the order before us today isn't the end of our oversight. We are requiring quarterly reporting during the load-ramp period and annual reporting thereafter. That reporting will allow the Commission and the public to see whether the load is actually materializing as projected, how much renewable generation and storage has come online, changes in Google's creditworthiness and collateral requirements, actual transmission costs, and whether the affordability benefits promised in this case are actually being realized.

We are also requiring the affordability analysis to be updated in future rate cases and Power Supply Cost Recovery proceedings using actual data to the extent possible.

It's our job to examine the contracts in front of us for prudence, but we also understand the need to put these contracts in the context of the utility's broader planning framework.

For this reason, the order before us also requires additional analysis in DTE's resource planning and capacity proceedings of the impacts of these large loads individually and collectively. It requires DTE to file a cost-allocation and rate-design proposal ensuring that future large-load interconnection customers pay the full costs associated with their interconnection. And it requires a future review of the termination payments and collateral once this facility has reached full load.

Arrival of large data-center loads is not simply a question of whether there is enough electricity to serve them. We must ask who pays for the infrastructure, who bears the risk if projected load does not materialize, what happens if a customer leaves early, how the load affects future resource needs, and how we make sure existing residential and business customers are not left holding the bill.

The framework we are applying here is therefore intentionally multi-layered: minimum payments, long-term commitments, exit payments, collateral, an affordability backstop, customer-funded resources, ongoing reporting, future prudence review, resource-planning analysis, and explicit protection against shifting unrecovered costs to other customers.

Our job is to make sure the risks and costs created by these extraordinarily large new customers follow the customers' creating them, and that the promised benefits to existing customers are transparent, measurable, and subject to continued Commission oversight."

Chair Scripps commented:

"I want to thank both of you for your detailed walkthrough of the level of protections that are included in the order before us. It has been said that Michigan has some of the strongest customer protections for electric service to data centers in the country. I will say that I think all three of us are proud of that description. There are a lot of examples of how to get this wrong; how to move forward in approving data center contracts that ultimately do increase costs to other customers. We've seen that play out across the country. We are committed to getting it right and to make sure that the data centers who are driving these additional costs are ultimately responsible for the cost they're imposing on the system. The contracts being approved today, along with the conditions in the order before us, reflect that commitment.

In the application, DTE projected a \$1.7 billion net benefit to its other customers. While there was some debate in the record on the amount of that benefit, there was no debate on whether or not there

is some net benefit to all customers. In fact, there was no participating party that ultimately found that this would result in net cost. More importantly, as Commissioner Peretick noted, the affordability backstop provision included in the contracts, along with the conditions that both Commissioner Myers and Commissioner Peretick highlighted, assure that DTE, and not its customers, bear the risk and ensure that there are no costs to serve the projects that are ultimately borne by DTE's other customers.

Put simply, Google is one of the biggest, best capitalized and most profitable companies on the planet. Google can pay its own energy bills, and the contracts and conditions in the order before us ensure that it does just that."

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

The order was adopted.

9. U-22064 In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, to promulgate rules to implement Public Act 30 of 1995, pursuant to MCL460.574 (rulemaking/public hearing announcement/interim order)

Case No. U-22064 involves a matter, on the Commission's own motion, to promulgate rules to implement Public Act 30 of 1995, pursuant to MCL 460.574. The order before you schedules a public hearing and a comment period for interested persons to make comments on the proposed rules. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its October 1, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

Chair Scripps commented:

"Public Act 30 is the Act that governs the siting of high voltage electric transmission infrastructure in Michigan. Following approvals of the first high in more than a decade last year. In fact, the first interstate high voltage line in more than 50 years. We realized that the process under Act 30 needed improvement and so we moved quickly to establish a set of filing guidelines that are voluntary but ultimately include more robust protections for landowners along those routes. We adopted those after a process of vetting them with customers, including landowners, in January of last year.

This is the next step on that. The beginning of promulgation of binding rules governing applications under Act 30. We had a public hearing at Westshore Community College between Ludington and Manistee two months ago in August. This takes the next step. There is a public hearing that provides an opportunity for individuals to participate and have their voices heard, as well as a comment period. This is a formal rule making process. We'll need to and expect to look forward to responding directly to the comments that are raised both in the hearing and in the written comment period and ultimately making the process for adjudicating applications filed under Act 30 much more robust than it's been in 30 years since the enactment of that law.

I support moving forward with the process and encourage anybody interested in transmission citing in Michigan, including, I think a number of you who are there today to participate in that process as well.

Commissioner Peretick commented:

“Well said, Chair Scripps. I just wanted to highlight that to get to this point, the development of these guidelines and these rules have included the public who have been affected by transmission citing lines to this point. The more public input we get, the better the final rules will be.”

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

The order was adopted.

B. Gas

1. U-21973 In the matter of the application of DTE Gas Company for authority to increase its rates, amend its rate schedules and rules governing the distribution and supply of natural gas, and for miscellaneous accounting authority
(proposed tariffs and attachments)

Case No. U-21973 involves an application filed by DTE Gas Company requesting authority to increase its rates, amend its rate schedules and rules governing the distribution and supply of natural gas, and for miscellaneous accounting authority. The order before you approves Attachment A (a summary of revenue by rate class), Attachment B (tariff sheets), and Attachment C (infrastructure recovery mechanism surcharge) reflective of the Commission’s authorizations and decisions in the September 10, 2026 order in this case. Commissioner Peretick moved that the Commission approve the order at its October 1, 2026 meeting. Commissioner Myers seconded that motion.

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

The order was adopted.

V. Public comments

Robert Huber commented on the proposed transmission line through Birchfield Park.

Mark Campbell, Okemos, commented on Consumers Energy’s tree trimming over his house.

Emerson Hyde, Mason, commented on ITC's proposed transmission lines through his property.

Charlene Hyde, Mason, commented on ITC's proposed transmission lines through her property.

Jon Bunge, Dimondale, commented on ITC's proposed transmission lines through his property.

Mike W. Hamm, Mason, commented on the Mason/Oneida transmission line project.

Nick DeHaan addressed his concerns about the Muskegon River and the Croton dam sale. He requested additional information.

Mike Kotovich, Supervisor/Allegan County, urged the approval of the sale of the dams to Confluence Hydro.

Jean DeHaan, Newago, urges Commission approval of the sale of the dams.

Emily Batker, Benzie County, commented on data centers, sale of the dams, and DTE's replacement of the coal plant.

Joseph Dekoski, Grand Rapids, commented that he has a second home on Croton Pond and approves the sale of the dams.

Joe Porterfield, Wexford County Administrator, urges the Commission to approve the sale of the dams.

Randy Paul, Big Prairie Township, urges the sale of the dams.

Kathy/Homeowner on Lake Allegan, addressed her concerns regarding the sale of the dams and the PPA.

Chair Scripps announced:

“On September 15th we started National Hispanic Heritage Month for 2026. It runs from September 15th through October 15th. It celebrates the contributions of Hispanic and Latino Americans. The date was set (I didn't know this unit I looked into it) as September 15th because it is actually the date that marks the independence anniversaries for Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua and Mexico and Chile also celebrate their independence at about the same time. Mexico on September 16th and Chile on September 18th. The theme this year is Unidos Somos Mas, or Together We are More. National Hispanic American Heritage Month started as a weeklong observation in 1968, established by President Lyndon Johnson and was expanded to a 30-day full month by President Ronald Reagan in 1988 and now is embedded in law.

We celebrated and recognized the International Week of Deaf People from September 21st to 27th. That underscores the importance of Michigan Telecommunications Relay services. At the beginning of each meeting, we actually flag that relay service is available through the phone option. That is one way that we try to make these meetings a bit more accessible to those that are hard of hearing or are deaf. At least 7.4% of Michiganders identify as deaf, deaf-blind, or hard of hearing. It is important that we increase public awareness of the issues and culture of the people who are deaf, as well as to promote equal access to information and services to deaf individuals.

Also in the telecommunications space, we celebrated earlier this week. The week of September 14th as Digital Connectivity and Lifeline Awareness Week. That highlights these lifeline programs with Governor Whitmer issuing a proclamation that honors that week. These are very important programs. Michigan has traditionally done well in terms of offering lifeline programs through Lifeline. Income-eligible people under the age of 65 get a minimum monthly discount on their telephone bill of \$8.25. That increases to \$12.35 for those who are 65 or older.

As a reminder, we'll hold our next meeting on October 15th in Houghton on the campus of Michigan Technological University. It'll be held at 11:00 a.m. Note the change in time as well – on Thursday, October 15th at Michigan Tech's Memorial Union building. Additional information is available on our website. We are excited. We always do these with a series of community meetings. This time is being lined up so that we can participate in North American Power Symposium 2026, which is an annual national event. This year it's being held at Michigan Tech from October 11th to 13th with our meeting following two days later on the 15th.

Finally, we have rescheduled the date for our Detroit public hearing on energy affordability for November 17th. We had hoped to do this last month, but there were a series of severe weather events, including a tornado that touched down on the east side of Detroit that forced us to reschedule. This event will take place on Tuesday, November 17th from 6:00 – 8:00 p.m. at the Durfee Innovation Society on the city's near west side. More information on that is available on our website.”

A recording of the proceedings of the October 1, 2026 meeting is archived at:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y7cBOIrb4nc> .

Chair Scripps announced that the next regularly scheduled Commission Meeting will be held on Thursday, October 15, 2026 at 11:00 a.m. in Houghton, Michigan.

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 2:41 p.m.

Lisa Felice

Lisa Felice
Executive Secretary