S T A T E O F M I C H I G A N

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

* * * * *

In the matter of the application of **CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY** for authority to recover implementation costs, approval of a stranded cost true-up methodology, and other relief.	)	Case No. U-11955
In the matter of the application of **CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY** to recover implementation costs for the 12-month period ended December 31, 1999.	)	Case No. U-12358
In the matter of the application of **CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY** to recover electric restructuring implementation costs for the 12-month period ended December 31, 2000.	)	Case No. U-12891
In the matter of the application of **CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY** to recover electric restructuring implementation costs for the 12-month period ended December 31, 2001.	)	Case No. U-13340

At the June 29, 2004 meeting of the Michigan Public Service Commission in Lansing, Michigan.

PRESENT: Hon. J. Peter Lark, Chair
Hon. Robert B. Nelson, Commissioner
Hon. Laura Chappelle, Commissioner

ORDER

In its July 11, 2001 order in Case No. U-12358, the Commission approved recovery of $25,156,000 for expenditures made by Consumers Energy Company (Consumers) during the

12-month period ended December 31, 1999 to implement a retail open access (ROA) program in accordance with previous orders of the Commission in Cases Nos. U-11290 et al. However, the Commission deferred immediate recovery of that amount by Consumers. In so doing, the Commission indicated that its July 11, 2001 determination was conditional and subject to additional review. Citing its October 24, 2000 order in Cases Nos. U-11955 and U-12956, the Commission held that recovery of implementation costs should be conditioned upon the success of the utility in implementing its ROA program. According to the Commission, the record in the case did not provide a basis for concluding that the utility's ROA program was sufficiently successful to merit full recovery of implementation costs.

Consumers appealed the July 11, 2001 order in Case No. U-12358 to the Michigan Court of Appeals. On April 1, 2004, the Court of Appeals found that the Commission should not have adopted a methodology that deferred determination of the amount to be recovered by Consumers indefinitely.[1] The Court of Appeals ordered the Commission to convene a hearing and to issue an order that provides for full recovery of Consumers' 1999 implementation costs. The procedure established by the Court for the remand proceeding allows for discovery by the Commission and the filing of data by Consumers that "Consumers believes is germane to the issue of its right to recover its implementation costs."[2] Slip opinion, p. 4.

In an order in Case No. U-12358, issued on April 28, 2004, the Commission noted that in its June 2, 2003 order in Case No. U-13715, the Commission granted Consumers authority to

---

[1]Consumers Energy Co v Public Service Comm, ____ Mich App____; ____NW2d____ (April 1, 2004, Docket No. 243360).

[2]In separate orders issued on May 6, 2004, the Court of Appeals remanded Consumers' 2000 implementation cost case (Case No. U-12891) and its 2001 implementation cost case (Case No. U-13340) to the Commission for similar treatment.

securitize all $25,156,000 of the implementation costs that were reviewed and approved by the Commission's final order in Case No. U-12358, including carrying costs at 7%.[3] Given that the order in Case No. U-13715 postdated the July 11, 2001 order in Case No. U-12358 and predated the April 1, 2004 order of the Court of Appeals, the Commission found that Consumers should have the option of choosing whether it preferred to recover its implementation costs pursuant to the Commission's final order in Case No. U-13715 as part of its second securitization filing, or whether the company preferred to withdraw the implementation costs from consideration in Case No. U-13715 and have their recovery controlled by this proceeding. Consumers was directed to file its decision in this docket by May 7, 2004. The April 28, 2004 order in Case No. U-12358 was served on all parties to that proceeding, none of which sought rehearing.

On May 7, 2004, Consumers filed its election, which was served on all parties to Cases Nos. U-12358 and U-13715. In so doing, Consumers elected to recover its implementation costs incurred for the years 1997-2001 through surcharges rather than through its securitization case (Case No. U-13715). Including carrying costs calculated at the rate of 7%, the total amount of previously approved implementation costs totals $87,633,000, as follows:

[3]The total amount of implementation costs approved for securitization by Consumers in the June 2, 2003 order was $64,108,000, which also includes Consumers' non-incremental implementation costs incurred for 1998 and 2000. The implementation costs for 1998 and 2000 were approved for deferred recovery in Cases Nos. U-11955 and U-12891, respectively.

Determination of Recoverable Implementation Charges

Line No.	Year	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
1	1998	$15,376	$16,452	$17,604	$18,836	$20,155	$21,566
2	1999		25,156	26,917	28,801	30,817	32,974
3	2000			19,587	20,958	22,425	23,995
4	Sub-Total			64,108			78,535
5	2001				7,947	8,503	9,099
6	**Total Recoverable Implementation Charges**						**$87,633**

Consumers proposes to recover the approved implementation costs through the use of per kilowatt-hour (kWh) surcharges on all customer classes (for both full service and ROA customers) that begin, for large manufacturing and commercial customers, when the surcharges are approved, and for other rate classes at the expiration of the applicable rate caps. For purposes of calculation of surcharges, Consumers has assumed that recovery from large commercial and industrial customers will begin July 1, 2004. The proposed recovery period for each customer group is 36 months. Because the residential surcharge will not commence until January 1, 2006, the total recovery period will extend over 5 years. The proposed per kWh surcharges for the large commercial and industrial group, the small commercial and industrial group, and the residential customer group are equal, except for an adjustment to reflect differences in carrying costs that occur based upon when collection begins and ends. This is done so that customers do not receive a benefit or suffer a detriment based upon when collection begins from their customer group. Consumers proposes that each customer group be separately reconciled through the filing of reconciliation filings after the three collection periods so that amounts collected can be reconciled with total implementation costs, including carrying costs, and so that customers will pay no more and no less than the recoverable costs. The development of the surcharges proposed by Consumers is set forth in Attachment A to this order.

The Court of Appeals' April 1, 2004 decision required the Commission to conduct an evidentiary hearing and to make detailed fact findings. In an order issued on June 3, 2004, the Commission chose to afford all parties to these four proceedings[4] an opportunity to have such a hearing -- albeit on an expedited basis. In that order, the Commission advised the parties that it intended to take official notice of all pleadings, testimony, and exhibits already contained in the records of the four individually captioned proceedings so as to minimize the need of any party to present additional proofs. Although under no obligation to do so, parties to any of the four proceedings were given until June 11, 2004 to file additional testimony and/or exhibits relevant to the issues left open by the Court of Appeals' April 1, 2004 order or raised by Consumers' May 7, 2004 filing. No such testimony or exhibits were submitted by the June 11, 2004 deadline.

On June 22, 2004, Administrative Law Judge Daniel E. Nickerson, Jr., conducted an evidentiary hearing to receive additional proofs, if any, submitted by the parties. The hearing was attended by Consumers, Attorney General Michael A. Cox (Attorney General), and the Commission Staff (Staff). Consumers submitted one exhibit, a copy of the February 1, 2004 annual report to the Legislature prepared by the Commission pursuant to MCL 460.10u. Thereafter, the parties were given until June 25, 2004 to submit briefs to the Commission. Timely briefs were submitted by Consumers, the Attorney General, the Staff, and the Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity (ABATE). A Proposal for Decision was not prepared as the Commission agreed to read the record.

Exhibit A-1, the report to the Legislature that was received into evidence at the June 22, 2004 hearing, states that "[d]uring 2003, competition in Michigan's electric markets continued steady progress, with the number of customers participating more than doubling." Report, p. 1. The

[4]Cases Nos. U-11955, U-12358, U-12891, and U-13340.

report also indicates that Commission has licensed a total of 26 alternative electric suppliers (AESs), 19 of which are actively serving customers now in the Consumers' and The Detroit Edison Company's service territories. According to the report, over 13,000 customers currently participate in Michigan's ROA program. In 2003, load served by the ROA programs of both companies reached 2,128 megawatts (MW), which represents a 70% growth rate.

Page 4 of the report contains a Consumers-specific table demonstrating the growth in its ROA program that depicts the numbers of customers and their electricity demand in MW served by each AES in the program at the end of 2001, 2002, and 2003**.** The ROA sales served in Consumers' service territory at year-end 2003 totals 658 MW**,** which represents a 40% annual growth rate. The report states that nearly 7% of Consumers' commercial sales and 16% of its industrial sales are presently met through ROA. Additionally, the report indicates that the number of customers served in Consumers' ROA program increased at an average annual rate of 45% in 2003, reaching 814 by the end of the year. Moreover, the report evidences that there was a net increase of four AESs serving customers in Consumers' service territory during 2003.

The Commission's prior orders in this proceeding resolved the issues of whether the costs sought by Consumers were already included in the company's rates[5] and whether the costs were reasonable and prudently incurred[6]. However, in its brief, the Attorney General argues that the Commission has yet to rule on the issue of whether the reported costs were necessary to accomplish the changes required by electric restructuring. According to the Attorney General, although Consumers presented evidence stating that the utility's motive for the expenditures was to

[5]The Commission determined that proposed costs found to be covered by existing rates had to be disallowed.

[6]As noted by the Attorney General, "the Commission and its Staff found no disputes regarding reasonableness and prudence." Attorney General's June 25, 2004 brief, p. 5.

implement electric restructuring, the Attorney General insists that those witnesses failed to demonstrate that the expenditures were *necessary* to accomplish the changes required by restructuring. The Attorney General urges the Commission to review that issue in this proceeding.

In its brief, Consumers states that the expenditures at issue in these proceedings “were both necessary to facilitate the transition to competition and did facilitate that transition.” Consumers’ brief, p. 11. While Consumers contends that the success of the ROA program should not be a determinative factor, Consumers urges the Commission to “take notice from its records that the implementation of retail open access by Consumers Energy has been successful.” Consumers’ brief, p. 11.

At the time that the Commission first began consideration of Consumers’ recovery of its implementation expenditures, the ROA program was in its infancy and in significant peril of being snuffed out by the dominant, formerly monopolistic, public utility suppliers. Under such circumstances, the Commission found that additional scrutiny was required at a later date. As is shown by the records in these proceedings and the evidence submitted at the June 22 hearing, the progress that the Commission sought to encourage has developed. ROA load has steadily increased as has the number of participating customers. Just as important, the number of AESs is increasing, which demonstrates a market open to increased competition because competitors are entering the market rather than fleeing from it.

Likewise, the Commission is more comfortable at this time giving significant credence to Consumers’ claims that its implementation expenditures were necessary to accomplish the changes required by restructuring. The results observed and reported to the Legislature as shown in Exhibit A-1 bolster previous testimony presented by Consumers’ witnesses in these proceedings that the implementation expenditures have been effective and have produced positive results. For example, Ronald T. Carrier, then Consumers' Acting Electric Choice Program Manager, testified:

> In order to provide service, virtually every system, process and procedure included in the Electric Customer Choice implementation plan was utilized. In addition to being utilized, the systems, processes and procedures advanced the implementation of retail open access.

2 Tr. 52-53, Case No. U-13340.

Based on the foregoing information, the Commission finds that all prerequisites for recovery of the implementation costs previously reviewed and approved in these proceedings have been met. However, the Commission is approving the rate increases out of a recognitition that its hand has been forced by the circumstances of these cases.

Public Act 141 of 2000 establishes a right to recover implementation costs that are reasonable and prudently incurred. MCL 460.10(a). Making prudency determinations has proven to be a task fraught with difficulty, compounded in part by the highly technical nature of evaluating the expenditures in the context of the utility's computer and billing systems. As part of its annual reviews of implementation costs, the Commission issued a warning that eventual rate recovery would require Consumers to demonstrate that the costs were necessary for an efficient and successful transition of its systems to accommodate and facilitate customer choice. The Commission thus made cost recovery contingent upon a review of the implementation programs in their entirety, once Consumers had successfully managed the tasks related to implementation. To a large degree, this approach has been frustrated by the recent Court of Appeals decision, which directed the Commission to "issue an order which provides for full recovery for Consumers' implementation costs including a comprehensive and detailed analysis that supports its conclusions and findings and that permits informed judicial review." Consumer Energy Co, Slip opinion, p. 4. In addition, the Court imposed a tight deadline for making these determinations, truncating any further attempt to create an effective record on prudency issues. Id. The underlying records created in these cases prior to their appeals, as well as the abbreviated hearing conducted on June 22, 2004, provide scant basis for making searching prudency determinations regarding the implementation costs that Consumers reported.

Therefore, the determinations in this order reflect the Commission's best effort to comply at the same time with both its statutory obligations and the Court's mandate. A fuller prudency review would ideally be warranted. However, the Commission regrets that a fuller review would not meet the Court's strict timetable for a decision in these cases. In this regard, the Commission must settle on the factual determination that the implementation costs were prudently incurred and were necessary in order that customer choice would be effective for all customer classes.

It is the Commission's expectation that this order covers the vast bulk of Consumers' implementation efforts, so that it will not be forced to confront similar issues regarding substantial post-2001 costs.[7] Should such issues arise, the Commission expects the parties to devote more effort to prudency issues. The Commission will be vigilant in ensuring that Consumers continues to carry through on its statutory responsibilities to implement customer choice in as prudent a manner as possible.

Two other issues should be addressed. First, both ABATE and the Attorney General raise arguments in their June 25, 2004 briefs regarding the allocation of costs proposed by Consumers in its May 7, 2004 filing. ABATE maintains that Consumers' position, which calls for imposition of a per kWh usage surcharge on all rate and customer classes, treats commercial and industrial customers unfairly by moving them further away from cost of service rates. According to ABATE, the Commission should allocate Consumers' implementation costs on the basis of the

---

[7]In Case No. U-13715, Consumers reported that its 2002 and 2003 implementation costs were $2.2 million and $0.9 million, respectively.

average coincident peaks with 75% on demand and 25% on energy. ABATE insists that this method is fair, follows cost causation, and is consistent with traditional rate case allocation practices.

Citing the June 5, 1997 order in Case No. U-11290 and MCL 460.10a(5),[8] the Attorney General argues that Consumers' bundled customers should not be required to pay any portion of Consumers' implementation costs.

The Commission finds that the concerns expressed by ABATE and the Attorney General should be rejected. Cost allocation and rate design issues are within the Commission's discretion to determine. The Commission finds that Consumers' proposed surcharges are reasonable and should be approved.

Second, the Attorney General argues that MCL 460.10d(1), which provides for a rate freeze from June 5, 2000 until January 1, 2004, is in conflict with MCL 460.10a(1), which provides for a utility to fully recover its implementation costs. According to the Attorney General, MCL 460.10d(1) is "a very powerful statement that the rate freeze adopted by the statute must be applied notwithstanding any other provision of law or commission order." Attorney General brief, p. 6. The Attorney General insists that MCL 460.10d(1) should be interpreted to mean that Consumers' recovery of its 2000-2003 implementation costs is forever precluded.

The Commission finds that the Attorney General's position has no merit. MCL 460.10d(1) and MCL 460.10a(1) do not conflict in any regard. MCL 460.10d(1) froze rates until January 1, 2004. MCL 460.10d(1) does not address the issue of the recovery of implementation costs. Certainly, MCL 460.10d(1) does not state that a utility that incurs implementation costs during the interval from June 5, 2000 to January 1, 2004 may not recover such costs. Indeed, the recovery of

[8]Subject to passage of 2003 PA 214, MCL 460.10a(5) was numbered as MCL 460.10a(12).

such implementation costs is specifically provided for in MCL 460.10a(1). Reading these two provisions together, the Commission finds that the Legislature clearly and unambiguously intended for Consumers to be able to recover its approved implementation costs incurred from June 5, 2000 to January 1, 2004 after the end of the rate freeze and rate caps set forth in MCL 460.10d. Accordingly, the Attorney General's argument is rejected.

The Commission FINDS that:

a. Jurisdiction is pursuant to 1909 PA 106, as amended, MCL 460.551 et seq.; 1919 PA 419, as amended, MCL 460.51 et seq.; 1939 PA 3, as amended, MCL 460.1 et seq.; 1969 PA 306, as amended, MCL 24.201 et seq.; and the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, as amended, 1999 AC, R 460.17101 et seq.

b. Consumers should be authorized to collect its implementation costs on a service rendered basis in the manner approved by this order and as set forth in Attachment A.

c. Consumers should be ordered to file a reconciliation proceeding 90 days after expiration of all of the surcharges approved by this order.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that:

A. Consumers Energy Company is authorized to collect its implementation costs on a service rendered basis in the manner approved by this order and as set forth in Attachment A. The surcharge shall be applied for service rendered to large commercial and industrial customers on and after the first day after issuance of this order. Recovery for small commercial and industrial customers shall be for service rendered on and after January 1, 2005. Recovery for residential customers shall be for service rendered on and after January 1, 2006.

B. Consumers Energy Company shall file a reconciliation proceeding 90 days after expiration of all of the surcharges approved by this order.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

/s/ J. Peter Lark
Chair

(S E A L)

/s/ Robert B. Nelson
Commissioner

/s/ Laura Chappelle
Commissioner

By its action of June 29, 2004.

/s/ Mary Jo Kunkle
Its Executive Secretary

B. Consumers Energy Company shall file a reconciliation proceeding 90 days after expiration of all of the surcharges approved by this order.

The Commission reserves jurisdiction and may issue further orders as necessary.

Any party desiring to appeal this order must do so in the appropriate court within 30 days after issuance and notice of this order, pursuant to MCL 462.26.

MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

Chair

Robert B. Nelson
Commissioner

Laura Chappelle
Commissioner

By its action of June 29, 2004.

Mary Jo Kunkle
Its Executive Secretary

CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY
Implementation Cost Recovery (\$000)
Determination of Recoverable Implementation Charges

Line No.	Year (a)	1998 (b)	1999 (c)	2000 (d)	2001 (e)	2002 (f)	2003 (g)
1	1998	**$ 15,376**	$ 16,452	$ 17,604	$ 18,836	$ 20,155	$ 21,566
2	1999		**25,156**	26,917	28,801	30,817	32,974
3	2000			**19,587**	20,958	22,425	23,995
4	Sub-Total			**64,108**			**78,535**
5	2001				**7,947**	8,503	9,099
6	Total Recoverable Implementation Charges						**$87,633**

History:

7 Implementation costs for 1998-2001 are the MPSC approved amounts.

8 Carrying costs are calculated at the MPSC approved rate of 7.00%.

9 To calculate the effect of carrying costs, multiply the previous year amount by 1.07.
For example for 1998 Implementation Cost (Line 1), \$15,376 x 1.07 = \$16,452, \$16,452 x 1.07 = \$17,604

10 Implementation Costs of \$64,108,000 approved as Qualified Costs in Securitization Case No. U-13715.
The amount includes approved amounts with carrying costs as of December 31, 2000. See Order dated June 2, 2003 at p.35. To reflect the carrying costs through December 31, 2003, \$14,427,000 must be added, for a total of \$78,535,000. See December 18, 2003 Order on Rehearing, Case No. U-13715, p. 5.

Source:
7.00% Carrying Cost Factor, Case U-11955, Final Order, page 11
1998 Case No. U-11955, Final Order issued October 24, 2000, page 14
1999 Case No. U-12358, Final Order issued July 11, 2001, page 12
2000 Case No. U-12891, Final Order issued November 7, 2002, page 9
2001 Case No. U-13340, Final Order issued June 16, 2003, page 6

CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY
Implementation Cost Recovery (\$000)
Determination of Recoverable Implementation Charges
and Associated Surcharge

Explanation:

A: Surcharges are designed to recover approved costs over 36-month collection periods

B: Interest needs to be recovered from the end of 2003 until the period when recovery begins.
To do this, multiply the amount to be recovered by number of months until recovery by .5833% (7%/12 months)

C: The Company proposes that reconciliation occur following the three collection periods.

Line No.	Description	Large Commercial & Industrial	Small Commercial & Industrial	Residential
1	Total Amount To Be Recovered as of December 31, 2003	\$87,633	\$87,633	\$87,633
2	Allocation Factor (Page 4 of 4)	62.01%	4.07%	33.92%
3	Allocated Amount To Be Recovered as of December 31, 2003	\$54,346	\$3,566	\$29,722
4	Assumed date that Collection Begins	01-Jul-04	01-Jan-05	01-Jan-06
5	Months between December 31, 2003 and date collection begins	6	12	24
6	Monthly Interest Rate	0.5833%	0.5833%	0.5833%
7	Total Interest Rate (Line 5 x Line 6)[1]	3.500%	7.000%	14.490%
8	Interest from December 31, 2003 to date collection begins	1,902	250	4,307
9	Total Amount To Be Recovered as of Beginning of Collection Period[2]	\$56,248	\$3,815	\$34,029
10	Carrying Cost Over Recovery Period (Page 3 of 4)	\$7,875	\$534	\$4,764
11	Total Amount To Be Recovered Through End Of Recovery Period[3]	\$64,122	\$4,350	\$38,793
12	Total Jurisdictional Sales through 36-Month Period (page 4 of 4)	72,236,950	4,827,182	40,577,183
13	Surcharge (36-month collection period) \$/kWh	\$0.000888	\$0.000901	\$0.000956

NOTE:

[1] For Residential Customers, the Annual Rate is (1.07 x 1.07)-1 to account for annual compounding

[2] Line 1 + Line 8 (This assures that each group will pay appropriate carrying costs)

[3] Line 9 + Line 10

Large Commercial and Industrial customers are those customers with usage greater than or equal to 2,862 kwh/month
Small Commercial and Industrial customers are those customers with usage less than 2,862 kwh/month
Residential customers are those customers in rate classes A-1 through A-5

CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY
Implementation Cost Recovery (\$000)
Determination of Carrying Costs Over Recovery Period

Line No.	Description		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3
	Large Commercial & Industrial Recoverable Cost				
1	Beginning Balance		$56,248	$37,499	$18,749
2	Amortization		18,749	18,749	18,749
3	Ending Balance		$37,499	$18,749	$0
4	Beginning Balance		$56,248	$37,499	$18,749
5	Interest Rate		7.00%	7.00%	7.00%
6	Carrying Cost		$3,937	$2,625	$1,312
7	Total Carrying Cost	$7,875			
	Small Commercial & Industrial Recoverable Cost				
8	Beginning Balance		$3,815	$2,544	$1,272
9	Amortization		1,272	1,272	1,272
10	Ending Balance		$2,544	$1,272	$0
11	Beginning Balance		$3,815	$2,544	$1,272
12	Interest Rate		7.00%	7.00%	7.00%
13	Carrying Cost		$267	$178	$89
14	Total Carrying Cost	$534			
	Residential Recoverable Cost				
15	Beginning Balance		$34,029	$22,686	$11,343
16	Amortization		11,343	11,343	11,343
17	Ending Balance		$22,686	$11,343	$0
18	Beginning Balance		$34,029	$22,686	$11,343
19	Interest Rate		7.00%	7.00%	7.00%
20	Carrying Cost		$2,382	$1,588	$794
21	Total Carrying Cost	$4,764			

CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY
Implementation Cost Recovery (\$000)
Determination of MWH Sales For Allocation and for Recovery

2004 Breakout For Allocation Purposes	Sales	% of Total
Large Commercial & Industrial	23,415,871	62.01%
Small Commercial & Industrial	1,536,377	4.07%
Residential	12,806,289	33.92%
Total	37,758,537	100.00%

Large Commercial and Industrial

	2004/2005 Fiscal Year	2005/2006 Fiscal Year	2006/2007 Fiscal Year
July	2,059,210	2,104,832	2,139,389
August	2,034,328	2,079,274	2,115,813
September	2,101,240	2,146,207	2,181,534
October	1,974,117	2,014,769	2,051,660
November	1,954,411	1,999,529	2,036,058
December	1,979,061	2,019,804	2,057,519
January	1,903,066	1,951,938	2,001,227
February	1,879,208	1,928,255	1,978,387
March	1,891,264	1,903,112	1,952,064
April	1,907,248	1,941,019	1,989,515
May	1,900,387	1,937,954	1,986,883
June	2,002,657	2,037,152	2,096,859
Total	23,586,197	24,063,845	24,586,908
Cumulative Total	72,236,950		

	2005	2006	2007	2008
Small Comm and Ind	1,582,070	1,608,571	1,636,541	
Cumulative Total	4,827,182			
Residential		13,266,075	13,511,861	13,799,247
Cumulative Total		40,577,183		

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF MICHIGAN)

Case No. U-12891

County of Ingham)

Anita M. Castilla being duly sworn, deposes and says that on June 29th 2004, A.D. she served a copy of the attached Commission orders by first class mail, postage prepaid, or by inter-departmental mail, to the persons as shown on the attached service list.

Signature Not Verified

Anita M. Castilla

Digitally signed by Anita M. Castilla
DN: cn=Anita M. Castilla, o=MPSC, c=US
Date: 2004.07.02 16:49:11 -04'00'

Anita M. Castilla

Subscribed and sworn to before me
this 29th day of June 2004

Sharron Allen

Digitally signed by Sharron Allen
DN: CN = Sharron Allen, C = US, O = MPSC, OU = Case Management
Location: Lansing, Michigan
Date: 2004.07.02 17:06:10 -04'00'

Notary Public, Ingham, County, Michigan
My Commission expires August 16, 2004

SERVICE LIST FOR DOCKET # U – 12891 - CASE #
DATE OF PREPARATION: 06/08/2004

- -

MR. THOMAS MCNISH
CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY
212 W. MICHIGAN AVENUE
JACKSON MI 49201

MS. PATRICIA S. BARONE
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
6545 MERCANTILE WAY, 2ND FLOOR
LANSING MI 48910 **ID MAIL**

MR. RICHARD CHAMBERS
CONSUMERS ENERGY COMPANY
ONE ENERGY PLAZA
JACKSON MI 49201

MR. DONALD E. ERICKSON
ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL
SPECIAL LITIGATION DIVISION
525 W. OTTAWA, 6TH FLOOR
G. MENNEN WILLIAMS BLDG.
LANSING MI 48933 **ID MAIL**

MR. ROBERT A. STRONG
CLARK HILL PLC
255 S. WOODWARD AVE., SUITE 301
BIRMINGHAM MI 48009

MR. JAMES N. RIGAS
PSC-ALJ DIVISION
6545 MERCANTILE WAY
LANSING MI 48911 **ID MAIL**

SUBSCRIPTION LIST
ALL ELECTRIC ORDERS

Database Services
Lexis Nexis
P.O. Box 933
Dayton, OH 45401

Mr. Phillip Cross
Public Utilities Reports, Inc.
8229 Boone Blvd., Ste. 401
Vienna, VA 22182

Mr. John Pestle
Varnum, Riddering, Schmidt & Howlett
Bridgewater Place
P.O. Box 352
Grand Rapids, MI 49501-0352

Mr. Michael Peters
Michigan Electric Cooperative
2859 W. Jolly Rd.
Okemos, MI 48864

Ms. Monica Martinez
Senate Democratic Staff
Romney Building
Lansing, MI ID MAIL