



201 North Washington Square • Suite 910  
Lansing, Michigan 48933  
Telephone 517 / 482-6237 • Fax 517 / 482-6937 • www.varnumlaw.com

**Timothy J. Lundgren**

tjlundgren@varnumlaw.com

August 16, 2017

Ms. Kavita Kale  
Executive Secretary  
Michigan Public Service Commission  
7109 W. Saginaw Highway  
P.O. Box 30221  
Lansing, Michigan 48909

**Re: MPSC Case No. U-18248**

Dear Ms. Kale:

Attached for electronic filing in the above-referenced matter, please find the Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibit of Alexander J. Zakem on behalf of Energy Michigan Inc., as well as the Proof of Service. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

VARNUM

Timothy J. Lundgren

TJL/kc

Enclosures

c. ALJ

All parties of record.

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

\*\*\*\*\*

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
to open a docket to implement the provisions of )  
Section 6w of 2016 PA 341 for )  
**DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY'S** )  
service territory. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**Case No. U-18248**

**REBUTTAL TESTIMONY**  
**OF**  
**ALEXANDER J. ZAKEM**  
**ON BEHALF OF**  
**ENERGY MICHIGAN, INC.**

1 **Q. Please state your name and business address.**

2 A. My name is Alexander J. Zakem and my business address is 46180 Concord, Plymouth,  
3 Michigan 48170.

4  
5 **Q. On whose behalf are you testifying in this proceeding?**

6 A. I am testifying on behalf of Energy Michigan, Inc. (“Energy Michigan”).

7  
8 **Q. Are you the same Alexander J. Zakem who provided direct testimony in this**  
9 **proceeding?**

10 A. Yes, I am.

11  
12 **Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits in your rebuttal testimony?**

13 A. Yes, I am sponsoring Exhibit EM-16 (AJZ-6).

14  
15 **Q. Was this exhibit prepared by you or under your supervision?**

16 A. Yes, it was.

17  
18 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

19 A. On behalf of Energy Michigan, I am addressing how the subtractions for all energy  
20 market sales and other sales specified in Section 6w(3) subparagraph (b) of PA 341  
21 should be included in the proposed SRM charges of the Commission Staff, ABATE, and  
22 Constellation. I am not addressing or critiquing the SRM proposals of these parties that

1 relate to capacity-related generation costs, but rather advising the Commission of how the  
2 subtractions specified in the statute might be applied.

3  
4 **Q. Would you summarize your conclusions?**

5 A. In summary, Section 6w(3) subparagraph (b) must be applied to the outcome of  
6 “capacity-related generation costs” under subparagraph (a) for the implementation of an  
7 SRM charge to be complete. If, under the Michigan cost of service statute, capacity  
8 related costs are determined from methods other than embedded costs, then subtraction  
9 for the various sales in subparagraph (b) is not needed.

10  
11 In short, the application of a credit for “all energy market sales” and other sales specified  
12 in subparagraph (b) is straightforward:

- 13 1. If “capacity-related generation costs” are extracted from the utility’s base rates  
14 under subparagraph (a), then “all energy market sales” net of fuel must be  
15 subtracted under subparagraph (b). The two subparagraphs in Section 6w(3)  
16 go together.  
17  
18 2. If the SRM charge is determined by a method that does not use the utility’s  
19 embedded costs, then no subtraction for “all energy market sales” is needed.  
20

21 **Q. Which proposed SRM charges use embedded costs and which do not?**

22 A. DTE Electric (“DTE”), Staff, ABATE, and Constellation offer an SRM charge where the  
23 “capacity-related generation costs” are based on embedded costs, where a subtraction is  
24 required. Staff and Constellation also offer an SRM charge based on costs benchmarks  
25 other than embedded, so no subtraction is required.  
26

1 **Q. Are there other statutes that apply to rates set by the Commission including the**  
2 **SRM charge?**

3 A. As described in my Direct Testimony, Michigan's cost of service statute, MCL  
4 460.11(1), also applies to rates set by the Commission. PA 341 is not the only law that  
5 applies to setting a capacity charge under Section 6w. Because the capacity charge  
6 becomes part of the rate structure for the utility, then MCL 460.11(1) also applies. Thus,  
7 two statutes – not one – apply to the setting of the SRM charge. How the Commission  
8 will harmonize Section 6w and MCL 460.11(1) is open to legal argument. In this rebuttal  
9 testimony, I will describe how the subtractions for all energy market sales and other sales  
10 should, in my view, be applied to SRM charges determined from PA 341 and from MCL  
11 460.11(1).

12  
13 **Q. Will you be offering a legal interpretation of PA 341 or of other relevant Michigan**  
14 **statutes?**

15 A. No, not at all. I am not a lawyer, and am not offering legal interpretations. Nevertheless,  
16 the components of the SRM charge are described in the statute, and it is necessary to cite  
17 that statute, as did DTE in its Application and testimony. So I will recognize and explain  
18 the practical effect of implementation choices presented to the Commission under Section  
19 6w and MCL 460.11(1), namely, the subtraction for all energy market sales.

20  
21 **Q. What does PA 341 specify as components of the SRM charge?**

22 A. Section 6w(3) describes two components of the SRM charge, in subparagraphs (a) and  
23 (b). Subparagraph (a) in part states:

1 . . . include the capacity-related generation costs included in the utility’s base  
2 rates, surcharges, and power supply cost recovery factors, regardless of whether  
3 those costs result from utility ownership of the capacity resources or the purchases  
4 or lease of the capacity resource from a third party. [Section 6w(3)(a). Emphasis  
5 added.]  
6

7 Subparagraph (b) in part states:

8 . . . subtract all non-capacity-related electric generation costs, including, but not  
9 limited to . . . the projected revenues, net of projected fuels costs, from all of the  
10 following:

- 11 (i) all energy market sales.  
12  
13 (ii) off-system energy sales.  
14  
15 (iii) ancillary services sales.  
16  
17 (iv) energy sales under unit-specific bilateral contracts.  
18

19 [Section 6w(3)(b). Emphasis added.]  
20  
21

22 **Q. What are “all energy market sales”?**

23 A. MISO buys all energy injected into the grid, except what is scheduled to a receiver  
24 external to MISO. MISO also charges for all load. Since all the output of all generation  
25 is sold to the MISO energy market, and all energy delivered to LSEs is bought from the  
26 MISO energy market, face-value interpretation of “all energy market sales” means all  
27 energy sales, not energy sales less energy used by bundled customers. Therefore, netting  
28 of MWh energy generation against MWh of energy load is inaccurate and does not reflect  
29 the real and complete sales to the MISO market. For this reason, it would be inaccurate  
30 to net MISO sales against bundled customer load and subtract only the difference.  
31

32 It would also be potentially in conflict with the plain meaning of the statutory language to  
33 assume “all energy market sales” means only the hourly amount above the utility’s load

1 as an LSE. The statute specifically calls only for netting of “projected fuel costs” while  
2 specifically stating “all” energy market sales. See Section 6w(3)(b).

3  
4 To be clear, MISO in its bill to a market participant may offset some charges against  
5 some credits to get to one payable number for a particular service. This is not what I  
6 mean by “netting” of energy in the explanation above.

7  
8 **Q. Could it also make sense to interpret “all energy market sales” as either net of**  
9 **purchases annually or net of customer load hourly?**

10 A. Although that is for the Commission to decide, there are difficulties with such an  
11 interpretation. Load and generation can be priced differently, so the net dollars that go  
12 with net energy may have no meaning. If “all energy market sales” were net of  
13 purchases, what would “net of projected fuel costs” mean for projected purchases? While  
14 totals can always be netted, such totals may not be meaningful to subparagraph (b). I  
15 cannot see a way to make netting of sales with purchases work, under the MISO market.

16  
17 The plain meaning of “all energy market sales” would be everything sold, meaning  
18 everything that MISO pays for. The Commission could interpret “sales” as wholesale or  
19 retail, but my opinion is that wholesale is the appropriate meaning. The word “all” is  
20 attached to “energy market sales.” Presumably, this is for emphasis, since “all” is not  
21 attached to “off-system energy sales,” “ancillary services sales,” and “energy sales under  
22 unit-specific bilateral contracts” yet the plain meaning of these three types of sales would  
23 be all such sales as well.

1  
2 **Q. Section 6w(3) subparagraph (b) states “net of projected fuel costs.” How should this**  
3 **be applied?**

4 A. The words have no qualifier, such as “hourly” or “marginal” or “average.” The statement  
5 is a flat “projected fuel costs,” not cost of goods sold or a cost imputed for a specified  
6 sale. PA 341 was a negotiated statute. Plain meaning would indicate total fuel costs  
7 during the period under study, which would be a year, which Mr. Jennings has done in  
8 his projections.

9  
10 **Q. What is included in Energy Michigan’s assessment of “all energy market sales”?**

11 A. Energy Michigan witness Mr. Jennings explains the inclusions on pages 7-10 of his direct  
12 testimony. The sales include both DTE-owned power plants and generation related to  
13 purchase power agreements, as Mr. Jennings notes on page 7 of his testimony, lines 22-  
14 24.

15  
16 **Q. Why are purchases included, when the statute says “sales.”**

17 A. While it is the Commission’s responsibility to determine the subtraction for “all energy  
18 market sales,” Energy Michigan is laying out and valuing the complete picture for the  
19 Commission.

20  
21 MISO pays the Locational Marginal Price (“LMP”) for energy injected into the market,  
22 and that transaction is the “sale.” The question is, “Who gets paid the LMP for the sale?  
23 Is it DTE, or is it the party selling to DTE?”



1  
2 In DTE's PSCR Plan filing for 2017, Case No. U-18143, DTE reports the purchase price  
3 of the energy purchases for its MISO Wholesale Purchases, Renewable Purchases, and  
4 other purchases. If the selling party were credited by MISO with the energy sale into the  
5 MISO market, then the selling party would be collecting twice, so to speak: collecting  
6 the purchase price from DTE and collecting the LMP from MISO. So obviously the  
7 selling party is not receiving the energy market LMP price from MISO.

8  
9 If the selling party were receiving the LMP from MISO but passing it on to DTE, then the  
10 DTE PSCR would show as an expense only the difference between the purchase price  
11 and the MISO LMP. But the PSCR shows the full purchase price, not a difference.

12  
13 MISO charges for all load, but there is no such charge reported. DTE, therefore,  
14 according to its PSCR accounting, is apparently paying the full purchase price to the  
15 selling party and receiving from MISO the LMP value for energy injected into the MISO  
16 market. This is the sale to MISO – dollar credit for energy injected into the MISO  
17 market.

18  
19 **Q. Are there other factors that could affect the Commission's interpretation of Section**  
20 **6w(3) subparagraph (b)?**

21 A. PA 341 (as Senate Bill 437) was debated, deliberated, and revised over an 18-month  
22 period. The outcome, in my view, is not a carefully constructed rate design but rather a  
23 negotiated agreement among the parties involved. Some words were put in, other words

1 were taken out, trade-offs were made, and the final result is the deal. I do not know what  
2 was conceded in return for the words “all energy market sales.” The Commission will  
3 have to interpret the intent of subparagraph (b), but I believe it is important for  
4 Commission to bear in mind that PA 341, and in particular Section 6w(3), is the product  
5 of a negotiated deal and not necessarily a unified, self-coherent, and internally consistent  
6 proposal.

7  
8 **Q. Under its plain meaning, how should Section 6w(3)(b) be applied to an SRM**  
9 **charge?**

10 A. Again, there are two statutes that govern the setting of rates, PA 341 and the cost of  
11 service statute 460.11(1). First, if the Commission or a party uses subparagraph (a) –  
12 “*capacity-related generation costs included in the utility’s base rates, surcharges, and*  
13 *power supply cost recovery factors*” – then it should also include the subtraction for  
14 subparagraph (b) – “*projected revenues, net of projected fuels costs, from . . . all energy*  
15 *market sales.*” For example, DTE determined its SRM charge using the embedded costs  
16 per subparagraph (a), but did not subtract “all energy market sales” as required by  
17 subparagraph (b).

18  
19 Energy Michigan, in the testimonies and exhibits of witnesses Mr. Smith and Mr.  
20 Jennings showed how the subtraction should be done, using Mr. Jennings' projection of  
21 DTE generation.

22

1 Second, if the Commission or a party uses a cost-of-service pricing method that is not  
2 based on the utility's embedded costs, then subparagraph (b) should not apply.

3

4 **Q. What is the value of the subtraction for subparagraph (b)?**

5 A. In his testimony and exhibits, Energy Michigan witness Mr. Jennings has determined that  
6 on a projected basis, the value is \$584 million, considering all energy used by DTE and  
7 all fuel. This number is for 2018, consisting of Total Sales Revenue of \$1,385 million on  
8 Exhibit EM-14 (RRJ-4) less Total Fuel Cost of \$801 million on Exhibit EM-15 (RRJ-5).

9

10 **Q. How would the \$584 million affect the proposals of the Staff, ABATE, and**  
11 **Constellation?**

12 A. The Staff presents two methods for determining an SRM charge. The first method does  
13 not need a subtraction. The second method does.

14

15 The first method uses the Cost of New Entry ("CONE") that MISO calculates based on a  
16 combustion turbine and is approved by the FERC. Staff witness Mr. Revere states: "In  
17 Staff's opinion, the proper cost of capacity is the Cost of New Entry (CONE), or the cost  
18 to build a combustion turbine (CT)." [Mr. Revere Direct Testimony, page 5, lines 11-  
19 13.] Mr. Revere notes that "all energy is bid into the market" and that such sales "capture  
20 what Staff could consider to be the energy related portion of capacity costs"; Staff  
21 concludes that if one is using a CT as the cost of capacity service provided, then "to  
22 remove all costs above a CT and then apply an offset which effectively, if imperfectly,  
23 does the same, would be double counting the offset." [Mr. Revere Direct Testimony,

1 page 5, line 23, to page 6, line 2.] Staff also offers that the levelized per year cost of a  
2 CT resulting from the Company’s PURPA case, U-18091, could be utilized, because  
3 “This would provide consistency in the Commission’s determination of the value of  
4 capacity.” [Mr. Revere Direct Testimony, page 8, lines 5-6.]

5  
6 I certainly agree with this. Staff is using CONE/CT/PURPA value as a cost-of-service  
7 capacity value – not using the utility embedded costs – and so no subtraction for all  
8 energy market sales or other specified sales is needed.

9  
10 The second way that Staff presents is to determine “capacity-related” costs from the  
11 utility’s Cost of Service Study, using the utility’s embedded costs in rates, per Section  
12 6w(3) subparagraph (a). Here, Staff does make a subtraction for subparagraph (b),  
13 agreeing with DTE’s calculation of the subtraction except for one item: “The only issue  
14 Staff takes with the calculation is the inclusion of administrative costs. The law  
15 expressly states that the revenues shall be netted against fuel costs, and does not mention  
16 administrative costs.” [Mr. Revere Direct Testimony, page 8, lines 9-11.] Staff subtracts  
17 \$44,194 (000) from Staff’s calculation of DTE’s embedded costs, for the subparagraph  
18 (b) items, as shown on Exhibit S-1.1.

19  
20 **Q. Do you agree with this subtraction?**

21 A. I agree that a subtraction is required. However, for the reasons I have explained  
22 previously, the subtraction should be for “all energy market sales” as stated in Section

1 6w(3)(b), not just the portion of energy that is “above the use of the Company’s  
2 customers.” Again, the Commission is implementing a statute, not revising it.

3  
4 In his Exhibit S1.1, on the third line, Mr. Revere shows a subtraction of \$44,194 (000). as  
5 part of the determination of a capacity-related cost number on the fourth line of \$769,620  
6 (000). I recommend that the Commission replace the \$44,194,000 with a subtraction of  
7 \$584,000,000, which Energy Michigan witness Mr. Jennings has determined is the  
8 appropriate value for sales revenue less fuel costs. This results in a cost of \$229,814,000  
9 or about \$58 per MW-day (= \$229,814,000 /10839 MW / 365).

10  
11 **Q. How would the \$584 million affect ABATE’s proposal?**

12 A. ABATE’s proposal is similar to Staff’s second method, using the utility’s embedded  
13 costs as the basis for determining “capacity-related generation costs.” ABATE makes no  
14 subtraction for energy sales, so such a subtraction should be included in its calculation.

15  
16 On pages 1 and 2 of ABATE witness Mr. Dauphanais’s Exhibit AB-2 (JRD-2), capacity-  
17 related costs are shown on line 7, column (A) as \$1,725,790 (000), less the energy  
18 allocator on line 9 of \$431,448 (000) for a resulting recommended capacity-related  
19 number of \$1,294,343 (000). Mr. Jennings’s determination of “all energy market sales”  
20 and other sales, net of fuel, of \$584 million, should be subtracted, resulting in a SRM  
21 charge cost of \$710,343 (000). This is equivalent to about \$180 per MW-day (=  
22 \$710,343,000 / 10839 MW / 365).

1 **Q. How would the \$584 million affect Constellation’s proposal?**

2 A. Constellation has two approaches – one is the determination of capacity-related costs  
3 using an “Average and Excess” analytical method, the other is a review the cost of  
4 capacity from evidence in the market.

5  
6 Constellation’s “Average and Excess” method of determining capacity-related costs is  
7 based on DTE’s embedded costs, so a subtraction for “all energy market sales” should be  
8 included in its calculation under the provisions of Section 6w(3) subparagraph (b). On  
9 page 27 of his testimony, Table 1, column (c), Constellation witness Dr. Makhholm shows  
10 a capacity-related allocated amount of \$887,810 (000). This is a determination of  
11 capacity-related costs from the embedded costs in DTE’s rates, and so would comport  
12 with Section 6w(3) subparagraph (a). Therefore, Mr. Jennings’s \$584 million – the  
13 subparagraph (b) amount – should be subtracted from this, resulting in \$303,810 (000),  
14 equivalent to about \$77 per MW-day. Again, this is to maintain the “deal” of PA 341.

15  
16 On pages 30-31 of his direct testimony, Dr. Makhholm checks the reasonableness of his  
17 SRM charge determination based on two visible indicators: MISO CONE of  
18 approximately \$260 per MW-day, and Consumers Energy’s RFP for demand side ZRCs,  
19 where only responses at or below \$164 per MW-day were picked. As explained  
20 previously for cost-of-service methods not based on the utility’s embedded costs, no  
21 subtraction for “all energy market sales” is needed.

22

1 **Q. The resulting amounts from several of the above methods that include the**  
2 **subtraction for “all energy market sales” are low compared to DTE’s proposals. Do**  
3 **you understand why?**

4  
5 A. The differences in perspective here are differences among (1) a traditional capacity rate  
6 that could be charged to customers based on DTE’s embedded costs, where “capacity” is  
7 valued by DTE’s traditional embedded cost method, and (2) other methods that adjust for  
8 “capacity related” extractions from embedded costs, and (3) the “deal” under PA 341.

9  
10 **Q. Would you summarize the outcomes when the subtractions for “all energy market**  
11 **sales” and other sales are applied?**

12  
13 Outcomes of the SRM charge from Section 6w(3) subparagraphs (a) and (b) are shown in  
14 Exhibit EM-16 (AJZ-6). Column B shows the equivalent \$ per MW-day. Column C  
15 identifies the source of the proposal. Column D identifies whether or not the proposal is  
16 based on DTE’s embedded costs. Column E identifies how the subtraction for Section  
17 6w(3) subparagraph (b) is applied.

18  
19 Again, PA 341 is not the result of a careful rate design, but rather a settlement from 18  
20 months of arguing and negotiating. Specification of the charging method changed over  
21 time. We don’t know what the parties involved foresaw as the ultimate outcome after the  
22 final bill was enacted. The outcome as determined by law – not by rate design – is  
23 something the Commission will have to assess.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

**Q. Would any of the above outcomes be suitable as an SRM charge?**

A. The numbers alone are insufficient. A charge has to be applied to a specified quantity under specified circumstances, and the result must be just and reasonable and in accordance with costs of service. Energy Michigan has a single proposal for an SRM charge in two parts, as explained in my direct testimony and as shown in Exhibit EM-16 (AJZ-6). The first part applies to all LSEs as a sharing of the cost of new local resources acquired by DTE. Beyond that, all LSEs are able to use any resource allowed by MISO, including the capacity auction, to demonstrate sufficient capacity under PA 341, as PA 341 allows. The second part of the charge applies to any capacity requirements that the LSE has not satisfied in its demonstration with resources that MISO allows.

The SRM charges proposed by other parties have to be attached to something, and that something has not been clearly identified and quantified in their filings.

Further, the SRM charge has to be used to provide some service of benefit to the AES. As explained in my direct testimony, DTE may not have the ability under the MISO tariff to take on the responsibility for and the cost of providing capacity for AESs that are deemed deficient under PA 341. The Commission will have to decide not only on the method of determining the SRM charge, but also on how that charge will be applied.



1 Finally, the Commission will have to harmonize the requirements of setting an SRM  
2 charge – a rate – derived from Section 6w (3) of PA 341 with a rate derived from the cost  
3 of providing service under MCL 460.11(1).

4

5 **Q. Does this conclude your testimony?**

6 **A. Yes, it does.**

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

\*\*\*\*\*

In the matter, on the Commission's own motion, )  
to open a docket to implement the provisions of )  
Section 6w of 2016 PA 341 for )  
**DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY'S** )  
service territory. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**Case No. U-18248**

**EXHIBIT**  
**OF**  
**ALEXANDER J. ZAKEM**  
**ON BEHALF OF**  
**ENERGY MICHIGAN, INC.**

## Outcomes of Proposed SRM Charges With and Without Required Subtractions for “All Energy Market Sales”

(A) <u>Outcome</u>	(B) <u>\$ per MW-day</u>	(C) <u>Proposal</u>	(D) <u>Cost Method</u>	(E) <u>Section 6w(3) (b) subtraction for “All Energy Market Sales” etc.</u>
#1	\$436	DTE embedded	<i>embedded</i>	• w/o required subtraction
#2	\$327	ABATE embedded	<i>embedded</i>	• w/o required subtraction
#3	\$260	Staff CONE	COS	• no subtraction required
#4	\$260—ACP	Energy MI CONE-ACP - applied to new local cost sharing	COS	• no subtraction required
	\$260	Energy MI CONE - applied to residual non-demonstration after using resources allowed by MISO	COS	
#5	\$224	Constellation embedded	<i>embedded</i>	• w/o required subtraction
#6	\$195	Staff embedded	<i>embedded</i>	• with \$44 M partial subtraction
#7	\$180	ABATE embedded	<i>embedded</i>	• with \$584 M subtraction
#8	\$164	Constellation review, CE RFP for demand response	COS	• no subtraction required
#9	\$77	Constellation embedded	<i>embedded</i>	• with \$584 M subtraction
#10	\$58	Staff embedded	<i>embedded</i>	• with \$584 M subtraction

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

\*\*\*\*\*

In the matter, on the Commission’s own motion, )  
to open a docket to implement the provisions of )  
Section 6w of 2016 PA 341for )  
**DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY’S** )  
service territory. )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

Case No. U-18248

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

STATE OF MICHIGAN )  
 ) ss.  
COUNTY OF INGHAM )

Kimberly J. Champagne, the undersigned, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that she is a Legal Secretary at Varnum LLP and that on the 16th day of August, 2017, she served a copy of the Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibit of Alexander J. Zakem on behalf of Energy Michigan Inc., as well as this Proof of Service upon those individuals listed on the attached Service List via email at their last known addresses.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kimberly J. Champagne

**SERVICE LIST**  
**MPSC CASE NO. U-18248**

**Administrative Law Judge**

Hon. Mark D. Eyster  
Administrative Law Judge  
Michigan Public Service Comm.  
7109 W. Saginaw Hwy., 3rd Floor  
Lansing, MI 48917  
[eysterm@michigan.gov](mailto:eysterm@michigan.gov)

**Counsel for DTE Electric Company**

Jon P. Christinidis  
Andrea Hayden  
Richard P. Middleton  
DTE Electric Company  
One Detroit Plaza, 688 WCB  
Detroit, MI 48826  
[christinidisj@dteenergy.com](mailto:christinidisj@dteenergy.com)  
[andrea.hayden@dteenergy.com](mailto:andrea.hayden@dteenergy.com)  
[richard.middleton@dteenergy.com](mailto:richard.middleton@dteenergy.com)  
[mpscfilings@dteenergy.com](mailto:mpscfilings@dteenergy.com)

**Counsel for the Michigan Public Service Commission**

Lauren D. Donofrio  
Meredith R. Beidler  
Bryan A. Brandenburg  
7109 W. Saginaw Hwy., 3rd Floor  
Lansing, MI 48919  
[donofriol@michigan.gov](mailto:donofriol@michigan.gov)  
[beidlerm@michigan.gov](mailto:beidlerm@michigan.gov)  
[brandenburgb@michigan.gov](mailto:brandenburgb@michigan.gov)

**Counsel for the Sierra Club**

Christopher M. Bzdok  
Tracy Jane Andrews  
Olson, Bzdok & Howard, P.C.  
420 E. Front St.  
Traverse City, MI 49686  
[chris@envlaw.com](mailto:chris@envlaw.com)  
[tjandrews@envlaw.com](mailto:tjandrews@envlaw.com)  
[karla@envlaw.com](mailto:karla@envlaw.com)  
[kimberly@envlaw.com](mailto:kimberly@envlaw.com)

**Counsel for Residential Customer Group**

Don L. Keskey  
Brian W. Coyer  
Public Law Resource Center PLLC  
University Office Place  
333 Albert Avenue, Suite 425  
East Lansing, MI 48823  
[donkeskey@publiclawresourcecenter.com](mailto:donkeskey@publiclawresourcecenter.com)  
[bwcoyer@publiclawresourcecenter.com](mailto:bwcoyer@publiclawresourcecenter.com)

**Counsel for ABATE**

Michael J. Pattwell  
Sean P. Gallagher  
Clark Hill PLC  
212 E. Grand River Ave.  
Lansing, MI 48906  
[mpattwell@clarkhill.com](mailto:mpattwell@clarkhill.com)  
[sgallagher@clarkhill.com](mailto:sgallagher@clarkhill.com)

Stephen A. Campbell  
500 Woodward Ave.  
Detroit, MI 48226  
[scampbell@clarkhill.com](mailto:scampbell@clarkhill.com)

**Counsel for Wal-Mart Stores East, LP and Sam's East, Inc.**

Melissa M. Horne  
Higgins, Cavanagh & Cooney, LLP  
10 Dorrance St., Ste. 400  
Providence, RI 02903  
[mhorne@hcc-law.com](mailto:mhorne@hcc-law.com)

**Counsel for Spartan Renewable Energy Inc.**

Jason Hanselman  
Dykema Gossett, PLLC  
201 Townsend, Ste. 900  
Lansing, MI 48933  
[jhanselman@dykema.com](mailto:jhanselman@dykema.com)

**Counsel for Wolverine Power Marketing Cooperative, Inc.**

Richard Aaron  
Courtney Kissel  
Dykema Gossett, PLLC  
201 Townsend, Ste. 900  
Lansing, MI 48933  
[raaron@dykema.com](mailto:raaron@dykema.com)  
[ckissel@dykema.com](mailto:ckissel@dykema.com)

**Counsel for Constellation NewEnergy, Inc.**

Jennifer Utter Heston  
Fraser, Trebilcock, Davis & Dunlap, PC  
124 W. Allegan, Ste. 1000  
Lansing, MI 48933  
[jheston@fraserlawfirm.com](mailto:jheston@fraserlawfirm.com)

**Counsel for Local 223, Utility Workers Union of America (UWUA), AFL-CIO**

John R. Canzano  
Patrick J. Rorai  
McKnight, Canzano, Smith, Radtke & Brault, P.C.  
423 N. Main Street, Suite 200  
Royal Oak, MI 48067  
[jcanzano@michworkerlaw.com](mailto:jcanzano@michworkerlaw.com)  
[prorai@michworkerlaw.com](mailto:prorai@michworkerlaw.com)

**Counsel for Michigan Municipal Electric Association**

Nolan J. Moody  
Peter H. Ellsworth  
Dickinson Wright, PLLC  
215 S. Washington Square, Ste. 200  
Lansing, MI 48933  
[nmoody@dickinsonwright.com](mailto:nmoody@dickinsonwright.com)  
[pellsworth@dickinsonwright.com](mailto:pellsworth@dickinsonwright.com)

Jim B. Weeks  
Michigan Municipal Electric Association  
809 Centennial Way  
Lansing, MI 48917  
[jweeks@mpower.org](mailto:jweeks@mpower.org)

**Michigan Department of Attorney General Special Litigation Unit**

Michael E. Moody  
Assistant Attorney General  
G. Mennen Williams Bldg., 6th Floor  
525 W. Ottawa St.  
Lansing, MI 48909  
[moodym2@michigan.gov](mailto:moodym2@michigan.gov)  
[ag-enra-spec-lit@michigan.gov](mailto:ag-enra-spec-lit@michigan.gov)

**Counsel for The Kroger Company**

Kurt J. Boehm  
Jody Kyler Cohn  
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry  
36 East Seventh St., Ste. 1510  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202  
[KBoehm@BKLawfirm.com](mailto:KBoehm@BKLawfirm.com)  
[JKylerCohn@BKLawfirm.com](mailto:JKylerCohn@BKLawfirm.com)