

September 17, 2026

Ms. Lisa Felice
Michigan Public Service Commission
7109 W. Saginaw Hwy.
Lansing, MI 48909

Via E-File

RE: MPSC Case No. U-22061

Dear Ms. Felice:

Attached please find the enclosed documents for filing:

- Official Exhibit List and Exhibits of the Michigan Attorney General, Natural Resources Defense Council, and Sierra Club; and
- Proof of Service.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,



Digitally signed
by Sean C. Clark
Date: 2026.09.17
11:49:13 -04'00'

Sean C. Clark
sean@tropospherelegal.com

CC: Parties to Case No. U-22061

STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter of the application of **DTE
ELECTRIC COMPANY** for approval of Case No. U-22061
amendments to Rate D11 and related relief.

**OFFICIAL EXHIBIT LIST AND EXHIBITS OF
THE MICHIGAN ATTORNEY GENERAL,
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL, AND SIERRA CLUB**

AG-NS-1	CV of B. Havumaki
AG-NS-2	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-1.12
AG-NS-3	Company Response U-22061-AGNSDE-1.5b & c
AG-NS-4	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-1.4c
AG-NS-5	Company Response U-22061-AGNSDE-1.2a & b
AG-NS-6	Company Response U-22061-AGNSDE-1.7b & c
AG-NS-7	Company Response U-22061-AGDE 1.7e
AG-NS-8	Company Response U-22061-AGNSDE-1.3
AG-NS-9	Company Response U-22061-AGNSDE-1.1a & b
AG-NS-10	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-1.4a-c
AG-NS-11	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-1.7
AG-NS-12	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-1.8
AG-NS-13	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-1.9
AG-NS-14	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-1.10
AG-NS-15	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-2.1a-c
AG-NS-16	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-2.2
AG-NS-17	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-2.3a-c
AG-NS-18	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-2.4a, b
AG-NS-19	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-2.8a-c
AG-NS-20	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-2.9
AG-NS-21	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-2.13
AG-NS-22	Company Response U-22061-NRDCSCDE-2.14
AG-NS-23	Company Response U-22061-AGNSDE-1.2c
AG-NS-24	Company Response U-22061-AGNSDE-1.6a
AG-NS-25	Company Response U-22061-AGNSDE-1.10a-c
AG-NS-26	Company Response U-22061-AGDE-1.5b-f, n
AG-NS-27	Company Response U-22061-AGDE-1.8
AG-NS-28	Company Response U-22061-AGDE-1.11
AG-NS-29	Company Response U-22061-AGDE-1.12

AG-NS-30	Company Response U-22061-AGDE-1.13
AG-NS-31	Company Response U-22061-AGDE-1.14a-c
AG-NS-32	Company Response U-22061-AGDE-1.15a
AG-NS-33	Company Response U-22061-AGDE-1.16
AG-NS-34	Company Response U-22061-AGDE-1.20

Date: September 17, 2026

By:

Troposphere Legal
Counsel for AG-NS



Digitally signed by
Sean C. Clark
Date: 2026.09.17
11:54:46 -04'00'

Sean C. Clark (P88870)
Christopher M. Bzdok (P53094)
420 E. Front St.
Traverse City, MI 49686
Phone: 231-709-4000



Ben Havumaki, Principal Associate

Synapse Energy Economics | 485 Massachusetts Avenue, Suite 3 | Cambridge, MA 02139 | 617-453-7055
bhavumaki@synapse-energy.com

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Synapse Energy Economics, Inc., Cambridge, MA. *Principal Associate*, April 2024 – Present; *Senior Associate*, June 2021 – April 2024; *Associate*, July 2018 – June 2021.

- Provides research, analysis, and consulting services, frequently in the context of regulated proceedings, with expertise in the following topic areas:
 - Rate design and performance-based regulation: Evaluates utility proposals and formulates new recommendations based on best practices and informed by innovative emerging models. Evaluates rate designs for consistency with policy goals using quantitative modeling and jurisdictional data. Provides expert testimony and other formal input in the context of regulated proceedings.
 - Benefit-cost analysis: Evaluates utility BCAs with reference to best practices, including emerging standards for grid modernization and distributed energy resources. Engaged in the development of new BCA practices in the arenas of grid modernization and resilience.
 - Macroeconomic analysis: Uses the IMPLAN model in conjunction with primary research and analysis and core economic principles to evaluate the GDP, job, and income implications of major grid changes.
- Contributing author to reports covering a range of topics including plant decommissioning, transportation electrification, and distributed energy resources (DER) growth.

University of Massachusetts Boston, MA. *Graduate Teaching and Research Assistant*, 2017 – 2018

- Led ecosystem-valuation workshops for EPA-funded initiative to shape resilience policymaking in the Great Bay region of New Hampshire.
- Served as a teaching assistant in graduate econometrics course and undergraduate macroeconomics and urban economics courses.

Notre Dame Education Center and Jewish Vocational Service Boston, MA. *Math Instructor*, 2012 – 2017

- Taught foundational math to adult learners and standard high school math curriculum to students in non-traditional school program.

The City of New York New York, NY. *Senior Investigator*, 2007 – 2010

- Investigated complaints against officers of the New York City Police Department and issued disciplinary recommendations in formal reports to the agency board.

EDUCATION

University of Massachusetts, Boston, Boston, MA

Master of Arts in Applied Economics, 2018

Recipient of the Arthur MacEwan Award for Excellence in Political Economy

McGill University, Montreal, Quebec

Bachelor of Arts in History, 2007

PUBLICATIONS

Goldenberg, C., B. Havumaki, C. Lane, M. Whited, G. Wilson. *Fixing Multiyear Rate Plans: Building a firm foundation for cost control*. 2025. Rocky Mountain Institute and Synapse Energy Economics.

Havumaki, B., A. Fuzaylov, M. Whited. *Optimizing Incentives for Effective PIMs: Coordinating PIMs with Authorized ROE for Efficient and Effective Regulation*. 2025. Synapse Energy Economics for Clean Virginia.

Takahashi, K., A. Glaser Schoff, S. Sharaf, B. Havumaki. *Evidence Regarding Nova Scotia Power's 2025 Load Forecast: Evidence RE: M12349*. 2025. Synapse Energy Economics for the Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board.

Glaser Schoff, A., B. Havumaki, E. Borden, T. Nguyen. 2024. *Community Solar Garden Study, 2024*. Synapse Energy Economics with Great Plains Institute and the National Association of State Energy Offices for the Minnesota Commerce Department.

Havumaki, B., K. Takahashi, A. Glaser Schoff. 2024. *Evidence Regarding Nova Scotia Power's 2024 Load Forecast*. Prepared for the Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board.

Borden, E., B. Havumaki, A. Lawton, M. Whited. 2023. *Establishing Income Based Fixed Charges in California: A review of economic theory, policy tradeoffs, and practical considerations for fixed charge reform*. Synapse Energy Economics for The Utility Reform Network and Natural Resources Defense Council.

Knight, P., J. Frost, T. Fitch, E. Sinclair, J. Tabernero, O. Griot, B. Havumaki, J. Smith, L. Metz, S. Chavin. 2023. *TVA's Clean Energy Future: Charting a course to decarbonization in the Tennessee Valley*. Synapse Energy Economics for GridLab and Center for Biological Diversity.

Bhandari, D., A. Napoleon, B. Havumaki. 2022. *Reply Comments on the Grid Modernization Proposals in Xcel's 2021 IDP: Analysis of the proposals for Distributed Intelligence and the Resilient Minneapolis Program and recommendations on certification*. Synapse Energy Economics for Minnesota Department of Commerce.

D. Bhandari, A. Napoleon, B. Havumaki. 2022. *Comments on the Grid Modernization Proposals in Xcel's 2021 IDP: Analysis of the proposals for Distributed Intelligence and the Resilient Minneapolis Program and Recommendations on Certification*. Synapse Energy Economics for Minnesota Department of Commerce.

Havumaki, B., C. Lane, D. Bhandari. 2022. *Comments on AGIS Related Scoping & Procedures: In Response to the Notice of Comment in Docket No. E-002/M-21-814*. Synapse Energy Economics for Minnesota Department of Commerce.

Havumaki, B., T. Woolf, C. Lane, E. Sinclair, C. Roberto, P. Alvarez. 2022. *Review and Assessment of Grid Modernization Plans: Guidance for Regulators, Utilities, and Other Stakeholders*. Synapse Energy Economics for Minnesota Department of Commerce.

Knight, P., B. Havumaki, A. Takasugi, J. Frost. 2022. *Transforming Transportation in Michigan: A Roadmap to the State's 2050 Climate Target*. Synapse Energy Economics for Sierra Club.

Takahashi, K., T. Woolf, B. Havumaki, D. White, D. Goldberg, S. Kwok, A. Takasugi. 2021. *Missed Opportunities: The Impacts of Recent Policies on Energy Efficiency Programs in Midwestern States*. Synapse Energy Economics for the Midwest Energy Efficiency Alliance.

Kallay, J., A. Napoleon, J. Hall, B. Havumaki, A. Hopkins, M. Whited, T. Woolf, J. Stevenson, R. Broderick, R. Jeffers, B. Garcia. 2021. *Regulatory Mechanisms to Enable Investments in Electric Utility Resilience*. Synapse Energy Economics for Sandia National Laboratories.

Kallay, J., S. Letendre, T. Woolf, B. Havumaki, S. Kwok, A. Hopkins, R. Broderick, R. Jeffers, K. Jones, M. DeMenno. 2021. *Application of a Standard Approach to Benefit-Cost Analysis for Electric Grid Resilience Investments*. Synapse Energy Economics for Sandia National Laboratories.

Kallay, J., A. Napoleon, B. Havumaki, J. Hall, C. Odom, A. Hopkins, M. Whited, T. Woolf, M. Chang, R. Broderick, R. Jeffers, B. Garcia. 2021. *Performance Metrics to Evaluate Utility Resilience Investments*. Synapse Energy Economics for Sandia National Laboratories.

Woolf, T., D Bhandari, C. Lane, J. Frost, B. Havumaki, S. Letendre, C. Odom. 2021. *Benefit-Cost Analysis of the Rhode Island Community Remote Net Metering Program*. Synapse Energy Economics for the Rhode Island Division of Public Utilities and Carriers.

Woolf, T., B. Havumaki, S. Letendre, C. Odom, J. Hall. 2021. *Macroeconomic Impacts of the Rhode Island Community Remote Net Metering Program*. Synapse Energy Economics for the Rhode Island Division of Public Utilities and Carriers.

Kallay, J., A. Hopkins, A. Napoleon, B. Havumaki, J. Hall, M. Whited, M. Chang., R. Broderick, R. Jeffers, K. Jones, M. DeMenno. 2021. *The Resilience Planning Landscape for Communities and Electric Utilities*. Synapse Energy Economics for Sandia National Laboratories.

Woolf, T., L. Schwartz, B. Havumaki, D. Bhandari, M. Whited. 2021. *Benefit-Cost Analysis for Utility-Facing Grid Modernization Investments: Trends, Challenges, and Considerations*. Prepared by Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory and Synapse Energy Economics for the Grid Modernization Laboratory Consortium of the U.S. Department of Energy.

Letendre, S., E. Camp, J. Hall, B. Havumaki, A. Hopkins, C. Odom, S. Hackel, M. Koolbeck, M. Lord, L. Shaver, X. Zhou. 2020. *Energy Storage in Iowa: Market Analysis and Potential Economic*

Impact. Prepared by Synapse Energy Economics and Slipstream for Iowa Economic Development Authority.

Camp, E., B. Havumaki, T. Vitolo, M. Whited. 2020. *Future of Solar PV in the District of Columbia: Feasibility, Projections, and Rate Impacts of the District's Expanded RPS*. Synapse Energy Economics for the District of Columbia Office of the People's Counsel.

Whited, M., J. Frost, B. Havumaki. 2020. *Best Practices for Commercial and Industrial EV Rates*. A guide prepared by Synapse Energy Economics for Natural Resources Defense Council.

Knight, P., E. Camp, D. Bhandari, J. Hall, M. Whited, B. Havumaki, A. Allison, N. Peluso, T. Woolf. 2019. *Making Electric Vehicles Work for Utility Customers: A Policy Handbook for Consumer Advocates*. Synapse Energy Economics for the Energy Foundation.

Camp, E., A. Hopkins, D. Bhandari, N. Garner, A. Allison, N. Peluso, B. Havumaki, D. Glick. 2019. *The Future of Energy Storage in Colorado: Opportunities, Barriers, Analysis, and Policy Recommendations*. Synapse Energy Office for the Colorado Energy Office.

Napoleon, A., B. Havumaki, D. Bhandari, T. Woolf. 2019. *Review of New Brunswick Power's Application for Approval of an Advanced Metering Infrastructure Capital Project: In the Matter of the New Brunswick Power Corporation and Section 107 of the Electricity Act; Matter No. 452*. Synapse Energy Economics for the New Brunswick Energy and Utilities Board Staff.

Whited, M., B. Havumaki. 2019. *GD2019 04 M: DC DOEE Comments Responding to Notice of Inquiry*. Synapse Energy Economics for the District of Columbia Department of Energy and Environment.

Timmons, D., A.Z. Dhunny, K. Elahee, B. Havumaki, M. Howells, A. Khooaruth, A.K. Lema-Driscoll, M.R. Lollchund, Y.K. Ramgolam, S.D.D.V. Rughooputh, D. Surroop. 2019. *Cost Minimization for Fully Renewable Electricity Systems: A Mauritius Case Study*. Energy Policy. 133, 110895.

Napoleon, A., T. Woolf, K. Takahashi, J. Kallay, B. Havumaki. 2019. *Comments in the New York Public Service Commission Case 18-M-0084: In the Matter of a Comprehensive Energy Efficiency Initiative*. Comments related to NY Utilities report regarding energy efficiency budgets and targets, collaboration, heat pump technology, and low- and moderate-income customers and requests for approval. Synapse Energy Economics on behalf of Natural Resources Defense Council.

Havumaki, B., E. Camp, B. Fagan, D. Bhandari. 2019. *Planning for the Future at the CTGS Site: Report on the Decommissioning Proposal of Maritime Electric*. Synapse Energy Economics for Carr, Stevenson, and MacKay.

Havumaki, B., J. Kallay, K. Takahashi, T. Woolf. 2019. *All-Electric Solid Oxide Fuel Cells as an Energy Efficiency Measure*. Synapse Energy Economics for Bloom Energy.

Takahashi, K., B. Havumaki, J. Kallay, T. Woolf. 2019. *Bloom Fuel Cells: A Cost-Effectiveness Brief*. Synapse Energy Economics for Bloom Energy.

Havumaki, B., T. Vitolo. 2019. *Comments to the Mississippi Public Service Commission: In response to the report of Acadian Consulting LLC*. Synapse Energy Economics for Gulf States Renewable Energy Industries Association, Sierra Club, and 25 x '25.

Whited, M., J. Kallay, D. Bhandari, B. Havumaki. 2018. *Driving Transportation Electrification Forward in Pennsylvania: Considerations for Effective Transportation Electrification Ratemaking*. Synapse Energy Economics for Natural Resources Defense Council.

Havumaki, B. 2018. *Hydropower in the Decarbonized Mauritian Grid: A Prospective Study*. Master's Thesis.

Havumaki, B., G. Mavrommati, C. Makriyannis. 2018. *World Bank Water Management, Sanitation, and Conservation Projects in Developing Countries: A Guide to Cost-Benefit Analysis*. Report for the World Bank.

TESTIMONY

Michigan Public Service Commission (Case No. U-21986): Direct Testimony and Rebuttal Testimony of Ben Havumaki on behalf of Michigan Department of the Attorney General. February 13, 2026, and March 3, 2026.

Maryland Public Service Commission (Case No. 9820): Direct Testimony of Ben Havumaki on behalf of the Office of People's Counsel. January 30, 2026.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. R-2025-3057164): Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony of Ben Havumaki on behalf of the Coalition for Affordable Utility Services and Energy Efficiency in Pennsylvania. December 22, 2025, and February 9, 2025.

Nova Scotia Energy and Review Board (NSEB M12179): Expert Evidence of Ben Havumaki on behalf of Counsel to Nova Scotia Energy Board. May 29, 2025.

Public Utilities Commission of New Hampshire (Docket No. DE 24-070): Direct Testimony of Ben Havumaki. On behalf of the Office of the Consumer Advocate. January 23, 2025.

New York Public Service Commission (Cases 24-E-0322 and 24-G-0323): Direct Testimony of UIU Rate Panel. September 26, 2024.

Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission (Docket No. R-2023-3037933): Direct Testimony of Ben Havumaki on behalf of Power Interfaith. May 31, 2023.

Nova Scotia Utility and Review Board (NSEB M11199): Expert Evidence of Ben Havumaki on behalf of Counsel to Nova Scotia Energy Board. August 28, 2023.

New Brunswick Energy and Utilities Board (Matter 529): Expert Evidence of Synapse Energy Economics, Inc. On behalf of the New Brunswick Energy and Utilities Board. April 25, 2023.

Minnesota Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. E-002/GR-21-630): Direct and Surrebuttal Testimony of Ben Havumaki regarding Xcel Energy's application to increase rates. On behalf of the Division of Energy Resources of the Minnesota Department of Commerce. December 6, 2022, and October 3, 2022.

Public Utilities Commission of New Hampshire (Docket No. DE 20-161): Direct Testimony of Tim Woolf and Ben Havumaki regarding Eversource's 2020 least-cost integrated resource plan. On behalf of the Office of the Consumer Advocate. August 19, 2022.

Public Service Commission of West Virginia (Case No. 21-0857-E-CN): Direct Testimony of Ben Havumaki regarding the petition of Monongahela Power Company and the Potomac Edison Company for the issuance of a certificate of public convenience and necessity for environmental compliance and modernization, upgrade, and improvement program and related surcharge for coal-fired boilers at electric power plants. On behalf of Appalachian Mountain Associates. July 20, 2022.

Illinois Commerce Commission (Docket No. 22-0067): Direct and Rebuttal Testimony of Melissa Whited and Ben Havumaki regarding the performance incentive mechanisms and tracking metrics proposed by Commonwealth Edison Company and Ameren Illinois Company. On behalf of the State of Illinois. April 6, 2022.

Public Utilities Commission of New Hampshire (Docket DG 21-104): Direct Testimony of Ben Havumaki and Courtney Lane Regarding Northern Utilities' Proposed Rate Increase for the Residential Class and Multi-Year Rate Plan. On behalf of New Hampshire Office of the Consumer Advocate. April 1, 2022.

Illinois Commerce Commission (Docket No. 22-0063): Direct Testimony of Melissa Whited and Ben Havumaki regarding performance incentive mechanisms and tracking metrics proposed by Ameren Illinois Company. On behalf of the State of Illinois. March 30, 2022 and May 25, 2022.

Public Utilities Commission of New Hampshire (Docket DG 21-104): Direct Testimony of Courtney Lane and Ben Havumaki regarding Northern Utilities Inc.'s proposed multi-year rate plan, which includes a proposed residential customer charge, the company's reliance on the minimum-system method for classifying distribution mains costs and its implication for rate design and class cost allocation. On behalf of the Office of the Consumer Advocate. April 1, 2022.

Public Utilities Commission of New Hampshire (Docket No. DE 21-030): Direct testimony of Melissa Whited and Ben Havumaki regarding Until Energy Systems' multi-year rate plan, grid modernization proposal, overall rate increases for the residential class, allocation of costs among rate classes, increase to the residential customer charge, and revenue decoupling mechanism. November 23, 2021.

Rhode Island Division of Public Utilities & Carriers (Docket No. 5189): Direct Testimony of Tim Woolf and Ben Havumaki. November 17, 2021.

Hawaii Public Utilities Commission (Docket No. 2018-0088): Panel testimony by Ben Havumaki regarding performance incentive mechanisms. On behalf of the Division of Consumer Advocacy, Department of Commerce and Consumer Affairs. September 21, 2020.

Georgia Public Service Commission (Docket No. 42516): Direct Testimony of Melissa Whited and Ben Havumaki. On behalf of Sierra Club. October 17, 2019.

PRESENTATIONS

Woolf, T. B Havumaki. 2022. "Economic Assessment of Grid Modernization Plans." Presentation at the NASUCA 2022 Mid-Year Meeting.

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDCSC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-1.12

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 12. Please explain whether customers taking service under the Large Load Provision and Rate D11 will be able to reduce their Contracted Capacity during their contract term.

Answer: No, customers on the large load provision cannot reduce their contract capacity during the contract term.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.5b

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 5. Please refer to the discussion of customers with multiple sites in the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis at p. 9 lines 1-14:

b. For customers with multiple sites, does the Company propose to create a separate contract for each site, or a single contract for all sites?

Answer: While noting that the Company has not executed any contracts consistent with this element of the proposed Large Load Provisions, it intends that each site will have a separate service contract.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.5c

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 5. Please refer to the discussion of customers with multiple sites in the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis at p. 9 lines 1-14:

c. Did the Company consider lengths of time other than five years for this eligibility requirement? If so, please explain why the Company did not decide to use a different length of time. If not, please explain why not.

Answer: The Company considered an unbounded period such that 100 MW of load over any period of time (for example 20 years) would have triggered the large load provision. That option was deemed unreasonable and inconsistent with planning principles as described on Pg 9 Ln 12 of my testimony.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDCSC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-1.4c

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 4. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 9 lines 1-11 (“The Company proposes two thresholds for applicability: •100 MW or more of incremental load at a single site, or • 100 MW of incremental load across multiple sites if the average load of those sites is >20 MW. . . . [T]he Company proposes that any customer with an aggregate incremental load of >100 MW, or, alternatively, a customer with multiple smaller sites with a site average of >20 MW, and where each site begins service in a five-year period be required to adhere to the terms of the large load tariff”) and explain:
c. How DTE would determine Large Load Provision applicability if there is a single site at which multiple new customers are operating. For instance, if ten data center customers are operating at a single property or plot of land, and each of those customers has a load of 15 MW, would the Large Load Provision apply because the cumulative load at the site exceeds 100 MW?

Answer: Large load provision applicability would depend on the amount of load requested by the entity requesting service. For example, if the requesting entity is seeking load of >100 MW, the provision would apply, all else equal. If the requesting entity is seeking 15 MW of load, it would not apply, all else equal.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.2a

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 2. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 13 line 11 to p. 14 line 2 and the Company's responses to NRDCSCDE-1.9 and NRDCSCDE-1.10.
a. Will the Company apply specific standardized criteria to determine which default collateral requirement (or waiver of collateral requirements) is warranted for a particular customer? If no, please explain why not. If yes, please provide the standardized criteria.

Answer: The Company will assess credit and collateral requirements for each customer, there is no specific "standardized criteria".

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.2b

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 2. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 13 line 11 to p. 14 line 2 and the Company's responses to NRDCSCDE-1.9 and NRDCSCDE-1.10.
b. Explain specifically how the Company would assess creditworthiness, and how the Company would consider credit ratings in determining collateral requirements.

Answer: The assessment of creditworthiness will depend on multiple factors. For example, the Customer's load and the Customer's financial exposure would both inform the assessment of creditworthiness. As such, there is not a standard assessment of creditworthiness that the Company would use. Creditworthiness will be determined on a case-by-case basis informed by the details of the specific contractual arrangement being contemplated at that time.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.7b

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 7. Refer to the discussion of minimum billing demand in the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis at p. 11 line 10 to p. 12 line 4:

b. Does the Company recover any of its fixed costs (i.e., costs associated with undepreciated generation, transmission, and distribution plant) through its energy rates? Please explain in detail which fixed costs are recovered through energy rates and amount (cents per kWh) of fixed cost recovery through energy rates.

Answer: The Company's distribution revenue requirement for primary service customers is recovered entirely through demand charges and a small, fixed customer charge. The Company's production revenue requirement for primary service customers is recovered through a combination of demand charges and energy charges. There is no specific assignment of fixed or variable costs to demand or energy charges.

Attachment: None

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.7c

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 7. Refer to the discussion of minimum billing demand in the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis at p. 11 line 10 to p. 12 line 4:

c. Does the Company recover any of its fixed costs (i.e., costs associated with undepreciated generation, transmission, and distribution plant) through any of its other rate riders? Please explain in detail which fixed costs are recovered through rate riders and amount (cents per kWh) of fixed cost recovery through rate riders.

Answer: The Company recovers base rate costs through Riders 1.1, 1.2, 3, 7, 8, and 10. Consistent with the response to AGNSDE-1.7b, there is no specific assignment of fixed (or variable) costs to these riders.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.7e

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 7. Referring to the Application Testimony of witness Willis at 12:6 – 24 and Exhibit A-1 page 5 under the Company’s “Termination Fee” provisions:
e. Referring to the bulleted paragraph in Exhibit A-1, page 5, beginning “After the ramp period.... The termination fee is....”: Is the Company proposing that during any 5-year automatic contract extension the maximum exit fee would be the equivalent of “two years of MBD * prevailing demand charges”?

Answer: Yes.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.3

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 3. Please refer to the discussion of the termination fee in the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 12 lines 6-24. Would the termination fee be calculated differently if the Company were to enter into a contract of longer than fifteen years with a given large load customer? Please explain in detail.

Answer: As proposed, the termination payment is based on 15-years of minimum billing demand regardless of the contract length. The Company notes that this approach still requires a termination payment beyond 15-years given the tariff language: "After the ramp period. The termination fee is the greater of the remaining MBD * prevailing demand charges through year fifteen of the post ramp contract term, or two years of MBD * prevailing demand charges."

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.1a

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 1. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 5 lines 4-13.
a. Regarding the benefit of “protecting DTE’s Electric’s other customers from the risks, including potential cost subsidies, associated with serving large load customers,” in the Company’s view, would the proposed Large Load Provision fully protect other customers from cost shifting? Please explain in detail and provide any analysis supporting your response.

Answer: The Company objects to this request on the grounds that the phrase “fully protects” is vague, ambiguous, and subject to multiple reasonable meanings. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, the proposed Large Load Provision is a generally applicable set of minimum terms which, as described, provide protections to other customers, including proposed requirements for termination fees, minimum contract terms, and minimum billing demand. As applicable, the impact to other customers would be assessed by a case-by-case basis.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.1b

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 1. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 5 lines 4-13.
b. Referring to the referenced large load tariff for Consumers Energy, which requires that Consumers makes an ex parte filing for each new large load customer taking service that demonstrates that incremental costs caused by the large load customer are not being covered by other customers, does the Company intend to similarly track and report on cost shifting? Please explain in detail.

Answer: The Company will track and report on any given large load(s) requesting or contracting to take service as directed by the Commission. With respect to the Commission's order in Case No. U-21859, the Company is not aware of requirement in that order to "track and report on cost shifting".

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDCSC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-1.4a

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 4. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 9 lines 1-11 (“The Company proposes two thresholds for applicability: •100 MW or more of incremental load at a single site, or • 100 MW of incremental load across multiple sites if the average load of those sites is >20 MW. . . . [T]he Company proposes that any customer with an aggregate incremental load of >100 MW, or, alternatively, a customer with multiple smaller sites with a site average of >20 MW, and where each site begins service in a five-year period be required to adhere to the terms of the large load tariff”) and explain: a. How DTE defines a “site” for purposes of determining Large Load Provision applicability.

Answer: A “site” is generally understood as a single location or premise.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDCSC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-1.4b

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 4. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 9 lines 1-11 (“The Company proposes two thresholds for applicability: •100 MW or more of incremental load at a single site, or • 100 MW of incremental load across multiple sites if the average load of those sites is >20 MW. . . . [T]he Company proposes that any customer with an aggregate incremental load of >100 MW, or, alternatively, a customer with multiple smaller sites with a site average of >20 MW, and where each site begins service in a five-year period be required to adhere to the terms of the large load tariff”) and explain:
b. How DTE defines a “customer” for purposes of determining Large Load Provision applicability. For instance, in the case of a multi-tenant data center facility, would the “customer” be the owner of the multi-tenant data center facility or would each data center tenant be a separate customer?

Answer: A customer generally refers to the entity responsible for the associated DTE electric service and billing, or on a prospective basis, the entity requesting service from the Company.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDCSC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-1.4c

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 4. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 9 lines 1-11 (“The Company proposes two thresholds for applicability: •100 MW or more of incremental load at a single site, or • 100 MW of incremental load across multiple sites if the average load of those sites is >20 MW. . . . [T]he Company proposes that any customer with an aggregate incremental load of >100 MW, or, alternatively, a customer with multiple smaller sites with a site average of >20 MW, and where each site begins service in a five-year period be required to adhere to the terms of the large load tariff”) and explain:
c. How DTE would determine Large Load Provision applicability if there is a single site at which multiple new customers are operating. For instance, if ten data center customers are operating at a single property or plot of land, and each of those customers has a load of 15 MW, would the Large Load Provision apply because the cumulative load at the site exceeds 100 MW?

Answer: Large load provision applicability would depend on the amount of load requested by the entity requesting service. For example, if the requesting entity is seeking load of >100 MW, the provision would apply, all else equal. If the requesting entity is seeking 15 MW of load, it would not apply, all else equal.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDCSC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-1.7

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 7. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 12 lines 23-24 (“This termination fee is subject to negotiation and at the agreement of the Company and customer and may exceed the minimum of fifteen years of MBD”) Confirm that DTE and a customer may not negotiate and agree upon a termination fee that is less than the minimum of fifteen years of MBD. If not confirmed, explain under what circumstances DTE would agree to a termination fee that is less than fifteen years of MBD and whether DTE will seek Commission approval for a lower termination fee.

Answer: Confirmed. See also Q23 of my direct testimony.

Attachment: *None.*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDCSC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-1.8

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 8. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 13 lines 2-9 and explain why the Large Load Provision uses two years for termination notice and three years for notice of declining contract extension when the Commission approved four years notice in the Consumers' Rate GPD amendments (U-21859) because the period aligns with the SRM process. See Consumers' Order at 108.

Answer: A two-year termination notice and three-year notice for declining to extend the contract is consistent with the Company's currently executed large load contracts. In addition, Q24 of my direct testimony characterizes the termination notice as a minimum, saying "The Company and the large load customer may agree to a different termination notice period, that, in all cases, shall be no less than two years".

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDCSC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-1.9

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 9. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 13 lines 17-19 and explain why DTE retains “sole discretion [to] agree to a lower collateral requirement based on the specific risk profile of a given customer” when the Commission ordered that changes to collateral requirements require Commission review and approval in the Consumers’ Rate GPD amendments (U-21859). See Consumers’ Order at 113. Please also explain in detail how the Company would evaluate the specific risk profile of a given customer and under what circumstances the Company would agree to a lower collateral requirement based on the customer’s risk profile.

Answer: The Company’s proposal in this case has not been adjudicated by the Commission and therefore the Company is not requesting any “changes to collateral requirements” relative to an Order; it is proposing a prudent set of provisions to apply to its future large load customers.

The Company may require lower collateral if it determines that the applicable customer poses a credit risk commensurate with lower collateral. As indicated in Q25 of my direct testimony, one consideration may include “the risk level of the individual large load customer, including the credit rating of the customer and/or its parent company.”

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDCSC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-1.10

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 10. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 13 lines 21-24: Explain why DTE's Large Load Provision default collateral options include a parent guarantee when the Commission did not "approv[e] a parent guarantee as sufficient to meet this default collateral requirement" in the Consumers' Rate GPD amendments (U-21859). Consumers' Order at 112.

Answer: The Company's proposed default collateral options include "a letter of credit, cash, a parent guarantee, or a combination of the three". It is the Company's responsibility to determine the sufficiency of the collateral, as it is the contract counterparty, and therefore reasonable for the Company to determine the form of the collateral.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.1a

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 1. Please refer to the Rebuttal Testimony of Aaron Willis, p 6 (“A series of 10 MW loads with varying ownership and billing responsibility do not introduce risk consistent with new 100 MW loads under single ownership, and therefore there would be no basis to apply the extended contract term and more rigorous collateral requirements, minimum billing demand and other commercial protections of the Large Load Provision to them.”):

a. Please respond to the following hypothetical scenario. How will DTE prevent a single customer from creating ten separate “shell” companies, each requesting 90 MW of service through separate billing and metering, and effectively becoming a 900 MW large load customer at one site while avoiding the Large Load Provisions?

Answer: In general, the Company will conduct appropriate diligence of new requests for load such as the scenario described above.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.1b

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 1. Please refer to the Rebuttal Testimony of Aaron Willis, p 6 (“A series of 10 MW loads with varying ownership and billing responsibility do not introduce risk consistent with new 100 MW loads under single ownership, and therefore there would be no basis to apply the extended contract term and more rigorous collateral requirements, minimum billing demand and other commercial protections of the Large Load Provision to them.”):

b. In the above scenario, will DTE consolidate those contracts so that they are covered under the Large Load Provisions? If yes, please explain in detail the steps DTE will take to consolidate those contracts. If not, explain why not.

Answer: If a customer requests 900 MW of service such that the proposed Large Load Provision becomes applicable, the Company will require the customer to adhere to the terms of the Large Load Provision.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.1c

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 1. Please refer to the Rebuttal Testimony of Aaron Willis, p 6 ("A series of 10 MW loads with varying ownership and billing responsibility do not introduce risk consistent with new 100 MW loads under single ownership, and therefore there would be no basis to apply the extended contract term and more rigorous collateral requirements, minimum billing demand and other commercial protections of the Large Load Provision to them.):

c. Do the Large Load Provisions currently allow DTE to take the steps contemplated under 1(b) above?

Answer: Yes. The proposed Large Load Provision (Exhibit A-1, Pg 4) describes one of the conditions of applicability as incremental load "...greater than 100 MW across multiple sites in the Company's service territory, with an average site size of greater than 20 MW which will begin taking service within five years." A single customer requesting 90 MW at ten locations (i.e., "sites" in the preceding reference) would trigger applicability of the Large Load Provision.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.2

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 2. Please refer to Willis Rebuttal, p 14 ("The Company notes that its initial collateral proposal is more stringent than what was approved in Case No. U-21859 . . . The Company had the option to pursue a 50% default collateral requirement and did not as it believes that a default expectation of 100% collateral offers expanded protection to its other customers. Approving Company discretion in determining the amount of the collateral requirement is reasonable."): Please confirm that under the current proposed Large Load Provisions, DTE can set a collateral of below 50% of the termination fee without Commission review and approval. If not confirmed, explain why not.

Answer: Not confirmed. Refer to the rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Willis which says, "Consistent with the framework established and reaffirmed in Case No. U-21859, the Company does not oppose making an ex parte filing before each customer subject to the Large Load Provision begins taking service." (Pg 36, Lns 13-15)

The Company has indicated it takes no exception to the proposals made by certain intervenors that applicable contracts be filed for approval on an ex parte basis. These contract terms would include a collateral amount.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.3a

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 3. Please refer to Willis Rebuttal, p 15 (“Whether a parent guarantee is ultimately appropriate, and to what extent, will continue to be determined case-by-case.”):

a. Will DTE require a minimum credit rating for a parent guarantee? If so, what is it? If not, why not?

Answer: As referenced above, the form of collateral will be determined on a case by case basis using information available at that time. Refer also to AGNSDE-1.2b.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.3b

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 3. Please refer to Willis Rebuttal, p 15 (“Whether a parent guarantee is ultimately appropriate, and to what extent, will continue to be determined case-by-case.”):

b. Please explain whether DTE considered the approach ordered by the Wisconsin Public Service Commission that Very Large Customers of We Energies would need a minimum credit rating of A- from Standard & Poor’s Financial Services LLC and A3 from Moody’s Investors Service, Inc. in order to use a parent guarantee as collateral. See Public Service Commission of Wisconsin, Application of Wisconsin Electric Power Company for Approval of its Very Large Customer and Bespoke Resources Tariff, Docket 6630-TE-113, Final Decision, available at <https://apps.psc.wi.gov/ERF/ERFview/viewdoc.aspx?docid=591873>. If considered, explain why the Company rejected that approach and produce any analysis or documentation supporting such rejection.

Answer: The Company's position as described in the rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Willis (Pg 15) and as described in NRDCSCDE-2.3a is that the form of collateral should be determined on a case by case basis. The Company is unaware of the full suite of considerations contributing to the Wisconsin Commission's decision on this element or on the VLC tariff generally, including its interpretation of Wisconsin statute and regulatory precedent.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.3c

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 3. Please refer to Willis Rebuttal, p 15 (“Whether a parent guarantee is ultimately appropriate, and to what extent, will continue to be determined case-by-case.”):

c. Please explain whether DTE considered the additional requirement ordered by the Wisconsin Public Service Commission order that Very Large Customers of We Energies would also need either (i) Tangible Net Worth, net of its Commitments and Contingent Liabilities, of 2.0x the required [Very Large Customer Security/VLC Security] amount or (ii) liquidity, as calculated in a commercially reasonable manner at the discretion of the Company and as evidenced by providing quarterly financial statements and certifications, greater than 10x the required [Very Large Customer Security/VLC Security] amount, in order to use a parent guarantee as collateral. See *id.* If considered, explain why the Company rejected that approach and produce any analysis or documentation supporting such rejection.

Answer: Refer to NRDCSCDE-2.3b

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.4a

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 4. Please refer to Willis Rebuttal, p 25 ("The termination fee itself begins at a minimum of 15 years and gradually decreases to a minimum of two years. . . "):
a. Assuming the default termination fee in the proposed Large Load Provisions, if a large load customer enters into a twenty-five year contract and terminates service fifteen years after its ramp period ends, what is the termination fee?

Answer: Under the proposed minimum tariff terms, the termination fee would be two years for a termination occurring fifteen years or more after the ramp period. Therefore, the default termination fee in such a scenario would be two years. See also Exhibit A-1 Pg 5 which says of the termination fee "After the ramp period. The termination fee is the greater of the remaining MBD * prevailing demand charges through year fifteen of the post ramp contract term, or two years of MBD * prevailing demand charges."

The Company may agree to a termination fee greater than what is described above, which is the default expectation.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.4b

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 4. Please refer to Willis Rebuttal, p 25 (“The termination fee itself begins at a minimum of 15 years and gradually decreases to a minimum of two years. . . “):
b. Assuming the default termination fee in the proposed Large Load Provisions, if a large load customer automatically extends its contract for an additional five years, but terminates service shortly after the start of the extension period, what is the termination fee?

Answer: Two years. Refer also to NRDCSCDE-2.4a.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.8a

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 8. Refer to Willis Rebuttal, pp 17-18.

a. Please provide the contracted capacity for all data centers with existing or pending contracts with DTE.

Answer: Capacity approved in Case No. U-21990: 1383 MW
Capacity pending in Case No. U-22058: 1000 MW

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.8b

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 8. Refer to Willis Rebuttal, pp 17-18.

b. Please provide the median contracted capacity of all customers currently accepting service on Rate D11.

Answer: The median contract capacity is 685 kW.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.8c

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 8. Refer to Willis Rebuttal, pp 17-18.

c. Please provide the contracted capacity for the 10 largest non-data center customers accepting service on Rate D11.

Answer: The Company does not disaggregate "data center" and "non data center". The table below reflects the ten largest customers by contract capacity currently being served.

Customer	Contract Capacity (MW)
A	236
B	156
C	149
D	111
E	108
F	84
G	61
H	48
I	36
J	36

Attachment: None

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.9

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 9. Please refer to Willis Rebuttal, p 19 (“[T]he Kentucky order appears to have other substantially different requirements, including a collateral requirement of only 24 months of bills.”): Confirm that the Kentucky order requires a 20-year minimum contract term for large loads.

Answer: Assuming the "Kentucky Order" is the one referenced by AG-NS Witness Havumaki at footnote 21 (Pg 18), confirmed.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.13

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 13. Please refer to Willis Rebuttal, p 28 (“[T]he Commission . . . should in the alternative adopt ABATE’s recommendation to set the proposed fees as non-refundable with any excess costs being the responsibility of the requesting customer.”): Is it the Company’s position that administrative fees should never be less than \$100,000 for customers with contracted capacity of less than 200 MW and \$250,000 for customers with contracted capacity of 200 MW or greater?

Answer: The Company's position, as described in the rebuttal testimony of Company Witness Willis (Pg 28 Ln 13) is "The Company stands by its initial proposal of a fixed fee approach. However, should the Commission disagree, it should in the alternative adopt ABATE’s recommendation to set the proposed fees as non-refundable with any excess costs being the responsibility of the requesting customer."

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: NRDC

Question No.: NRDCSCDE-2.14

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 14. Refer to Willis Rebuttal, p 28 (“[T]he administrative fee’s ability to dissuade speculation is significantly reduced when the costs are subject to downward reconciliation” (emphasis added)): Would the Company object to a fixed administrative fee requirement that is subject only to upward reconciliation?

Answer: No. Refer to NRDCSCDE-2.13

Attachment: *None.*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.2c

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 2. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 13 line 11 to p. 14 line 2 and the Company's responses to NRDCSCDE-1.9 and NRDCSCDE-1.10.

c. Is there a specific credit rating below which the Company would: Require a cash deposit? Not permit a parent guarantee?

Answer: Refer to AGNSDE-1.2b

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.6a

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 6. Please refer to the Direct Testimony of Aaron Willis, p. 9 lines 8-11 (“Thus, the Company proposes that any customer with an aggregate incremental load of >100 MW, or, alternatively, a customer with multiple smaller sites with a site average of >20 MW, and where each site begins service in a five-year period be required to adhere to the terms of the large load tariff.”):

a. How will the Company ensure that multiple smaller sites <100 MW are appropriately aggregated for applicability under the proposed Large Load Provision?

Answer: The Company will track new load additions. Existing processes require an account manager for loads of that size (e.g., ~20 MW), which ensures visibility.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.10a

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 10. Referring to the Company's Exhibit A-1 at 5, specially at the section titled "TERMINATION FEE":

a. Confirm that the Company's proposed calculation for a termination fee does not include a component to account for or otherwise serve as a proxy for a PSCR surcharge amount.

Answer: Confirmed.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.10b

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 10. Referring to the Company's Exhibit A-1 at 5, specially at the section titled "TERMINATION FEE":

b. If not confirming in response to Question No. 10.a, explain how a component to account for or otherwise serve as a proxy for a PSCR surcharge amount is included in the Company's proposed termination fee calculation.

Answer: Refer to AGNSDE-1.10a.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AGNS

Question No.: AGNSDE-1.10c

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 10. Referring to the Company's Exhibit A-1 at 5, specially at the section titled "TERMINATION FEE":

c. To the extent confirming in response to Question No. 10.a, did the Company consider including a component to account for or otherwise serve as a proxy for a PSCR surcharge amount? If yes, explain why the Company did not include any such component in its proposed termination fee calculation. If no, explain why not.

Answer: The termination fee is based on the costs associated with the Customer's minimum billing demand. This is consistent with the basis for exit fee costs in the Commission order in Case No. U-21859 which says, in part, "the Commission..., in agreement with Consumers, the Staff, the Attorney General, and MNSC, approves an exit fee equal to the MBD multiplied by the number of months remaining on the contract term" (Pg 109).

In addition, the PSCR surcharge is not a demand-based charge. See also AGNSDE-1.7a

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.5b

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 5. Referring to the Company's Application and supporting testimony and exhibits, please provide all empirical analyses, studies, and other documents supporting the following proposed tariff provisions:

b. The use of "100MW or more of incremental load at a single site" as opposed to a lower threshold amount within the Company's proposed terms for assessing single-site eligibility (see, e.g., witness Willis' application testimony at 8:8 – 9:14);

Answer: The Company's proposed 100 MW applicability threshold for the Large Load Provision is consistent with the Commission's determination in the U-21859 Order; the Company has not prepared any additional studies or empirical analysis to support the reasonableness of this applicability provision.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.5c

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 5. Referring to the Company's Application and supporting testimony and exhibits, please provide all empirical analyses, studies, and other documents supporting the following proposed tariff provisions:

c. The use of 20MW of average-site incremental load "across multiple sites" as a threshold for assessing eligibility within the Company's proposed terms for assessing eligibility (see, e.g., witness Willis' application testimony at 8:8 – 9:14);

Answer: The Company's proposal is an eligibility threshold of 100 MW across multiple sites if the site average is >20MW and sites come online within five years. The Company determined 20 MW to be a reasonable size for this purpose. The Company has not prepared a formal study or empirical analyses to support this eligibility provision.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.5d

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 5. Referring to the Company's Application and supporting testimony and exhibits, please provide all empirical analyses, studies, and other documents supporting the following proposed tariff provisions:

d. A minimum billing demand of "80% of contract capacity" as described in witness Willis application testimony at 11:10 – 12:4, as opposed to a higher minimum billing demand;

Answer: The Company's proposal is consistent with the U-21859 Order and its executed contracts. Based on the regulatory and commercial alignment, the Company determined no additional analysis is necessary.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.5e

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 5. Referring to the Company's Application and supporting testimony and exhibits, please provide all empirical analyses, studies, and other documents supporting the following proposed tariff provisions:
e. The components and calculation of "minimum monthly charge" as described in witness Willis' application testimony at 11:10 – 12:4;

Answer: The Company has not conducted or prepared any "empirical analyses, studies, or other documents" with respect to calculating the proposed minimum monthly charge. The direct testimony at Q22 and Exhibit A-1 explain the calculation.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.5f

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 5. Referring to the Company's Application and supporting testimony and exhibits, please provide all empirical analyses, studies, and other documents supporting the following proposed tariff provisions:
f. A 15-year minimum contract term, as opposed to a longer minimum contract term;

Answer: The basis for the minimum contract period is described in testimony at Q19, which says "The Company proposes a fifteen-year minimum contract term following the completion of the ramp period. This term is designed to achieve an appropriate balance of risk mitigation and commercial viability. The Company additionally proposes a five-year automatic extension, with the customer able to opt out of an extension with three years' notice." (Pg 10, Lns 3-7)

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.5n

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 5. Referring to the Company's Application and supporting testimony and exhibits, please provide all empirical analyses, studies, and other documents supporting the following proposed tariff provisions:
n. DTE's proposed CIAC allowance provisions (as referenced in witness Willis' application testimony at 14:4 – 15:2), as opposed to a smaller CIAC allowance;

Answer: Refer to the Company's testimony at Pg 14, Lns 6-18.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.8

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 8. Referring to the Application Testimony of Company witness Willis at 10:1 – 7: in deciding to propose a 15-year minimum contract term, did the Company consider how such a 15-year term would compare to potential longer-term investments to serve Large Load Customers such as PPAs longer than 15 years or self-build generation assets with longer depreciation schedules? If so, explain why the Company decided to propose a 15-year minimum contract term as opposed to a longer minimum contract term. If no, explain why not.

Answer: The Company's filing is a generally applicable tariff which is agnostic to specific customers, potential resource requirements, specific contract terms, or other costs, revenues, or customer or asset specific considerations. As such, no, the Company did not consider hypothetical future PPA terms or hypothetical self-build generation asset characteristics. Fifteen years is consistent with the Company's filing in Case No. U-22058 and the Commission Order in Case No. U-21859.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.11

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 11. Please provide all analyses in the Company's possession estimating future revenues from new Large Load Customers, including as would be expected from exit fees, and expenses to serve the Large Load Customers. Please provide the requested documents in electronic form with all spreadsheet links and formulas intact, source data used, and explain all assumptions and calculations used. To the extent the data requested is not available in the form requested, provide the information in the form that most closely matches what has been requested.

Answer: The Company objects to the question on the basis that the request for "all analyses in the Company's possession estimating future revenues from new Large Load Customers" is not relevant to the Large Load Provision tariff changes presented in the Company's Application and is beyond the scope of the present proceeding. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, the Company has not prepared analyses estimating hypothetical future revenue or costs from as yet unknown customers taking service on yet to be determined contractual terms. Individual large load customers will be offered service consistent with the large load provisions proposed to be included in D11.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.12

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 12. Identify any estimates or projections for incremental generation investment costs the Company expects to incur to serve Large Load Customer load, either/both on a hypothetical individual customer basis, based on a certain MW incremental customer load (e.g., for each 50 MW of incremental load), or as to any aggregate incremental load. Further produce the Company's analyses and calculations on which it based any such estimates or projections and explain the inputs and assumptions behind any such analyses and calculations.

Answer: The Company objects to the question on the basis that the request to "identify any estimates or projections for incremental generation investment costs the Company expects to incur to serve Large Load Customer load" is not relevant to the Large Load Provision tariff changes presented in the Company's Application and is beyond the scope of the current proceeding. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, the Company states that it has not prepared estimates or projections of hypothetical future resource requirements from as yet unknown customers taking service on yet to be determined contractual terms. Individual large load customers will be offered service consistent with the large load provisions proposed to be included in D11, and the Company will plan future generation resources to reliably serve the system.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.13

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 13. Identify any estimates or projections for transmission upgrade costs associated with generation resource development the Company expects to incur to serve Large Load Customer load, either/both on a hypothetical individual customer basis, based on a certain MW incremental customer load (e.g., for each 50 MW of incremental load), or as to any aggregate incremental load. Further produce the Company's analyses and calculations on which it based any such estimates or projections and explain the inputs and assumptions behind any such analyses and calculations.

Answer: The Company objects to the question on the basis that the request to "identify any estimates or projections for transmission upgrade costs associated with generation resource development the Company expects to incur to serve Large Load Customer load" is not relevant to the Large Load Provision tariff changes presented in the Company's Application and is beyond the scope of the present proceeding. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, the Company states that it has not prepared estimates or projections of hypothetical future transmission requirements or costs from as yet unknown customers taking service on yet to be determined contractual terms utilizing resources that have not yet been identified. Individual large load customers will be offered service consistent with the large load provisions proposed to be included in D11.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.14a

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 14. Please produce estimates for all customer facility-interconnection costs (or range of such costs) the Company expects to incur to serve Large Load Customers, either/both on a hypothetical individual customer basis, based on a certain MW incremental customer load (e.g., for each 50 MW of incremental load), or as to any aggregate incremental load, including:

- a. All distribution interconnection costs, such as the costs of additional transformer substations to serve the customer;

Answer: The Company objects to the question on the basis that the request to “produce estimates for all customer facility-interconnection costs (or range of such costs) the Company expects to incur to serve Large Load Customers” is not relevant to the Large Load Provision tariff changes presented in the Company’s Application and is beyond the scope of the present proceeding. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, the Company states that it has not prepared estimates of hypothetical future facility interconnection requirements or costs from as yet unknown customers taking service on yet to be determined contractual terms. Individual large load customers will be offered service consistent with the large load provisions proposed to be included in D11.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.14b

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 14. Please produce estimates for all customer facility-interconnection costs (or range of such costs) the Company expects to incur to serve Large Load Customers, either/both on a hypothetical individual customer basis, based on a certain MW incremental customer load (e.g., for each 50 MW of incremental load), or as to any aggregate incremental load, including:

- b. The cost of transmission investments necessary to interconnect such a customer;

Answer: See AGDE-1.13 and AGDE 1.14a

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.14c

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 14. Please produce estimates for all customer facility-interconnection costs (or range of such costs) the Company expects to incur to serve Large Load Customers, either/both on a hypothetical individual customer basis, based on a certain MW incremental customer load (e.g., for each 50 MW of incremental load), or as to any aggregate incremental load, including:

- c. Any other categories of costs not captured within Sub-Questions No. 14.a-b above.

Answer: See AGDE-1.13 and AGDE 1.14a

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.15a

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 15. For any other categories of distribution costs not otherwise captured in response to the preceding questions that the Company expects to incur to serve Large Load Customers:
a. Please describe and identify the range of any other distribution costs not otherwise captured in response to the preceding questions that the Company expects to incur to serve Large Load Customers.

Answer: The Company objects to the question on the basis that the request for “any other categories of distribution costs . . . that the Company expects to incur to serve Large Load Customers” is not relevant to the Large Load Provision tariff changes presented in the Company’s Application and is beyond the scope of the present proceeding. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, the Company states that it has not prepared estimates of hypothetical future distribution requirements or costs from as yet unknown customers taking service on yet to be determined contractual terms. Individual large load customers will be offered service consistent with the large load provisions proposed to be included in D11.

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.16

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 16. Has the Company modelled the impact of any projected increase from Large Load Customers on its PA 235 compliance requirements and associated costs? If so, provide all such modelling, along with all analyses and calculations used in that modelling along with all inputs and assumptions. To the extent any such modelling was performed or produced as part of prior MPSC cases, please indicate at which material in such cases such modelling was performed or produced (e.g. by identifying exhibits, discovery responses, testimony, etc.).

Answer: The Company objects to the question on the basis that it is not relevant to the Large Load Provision tariff changes presented in the Company's Application and is beyond the scope of the present proceeding. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objection, the Company states that it has not completed any generic modeling of hypothetical future large load customers, which may have VGP contracts or other agreements which influence "compliance requirements and associated costs".

Attachment: *None*

MPSC Case No: U-22061

Requester: AG

Question No.: AGDE-1.20

Respondent: A. Willis

Page: 1 of 1

Question: 20. Confirm that DTE currently uses a 4CP 75-0-25 cost allocation method for allocating production costs.

Answer: Confirmed, however, the Company notes that questions of allocation methods and outcomes are addressed in general rate cases.

Attachment: *None*

STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter of the application of **DTE
ELECTRIC COMPANY** for approval of Case No. U-22061
amendments to Rate D11 and related relief.

Proof of Service

On the date below, an electronic copy of **Official Exhibit List and Exhibits of the Michigan Attorney General, Natural Resources Defense Council, and Sierra Club; and Proof of Service** was served on the following:

Name/Party	E-mail Address
ALJ. Hon. Sarah A. Stancati	stancatis@michigan.gov
DTE Electric Company John A. Janiszewski Andrea E. Hayden	mpscfilings_account@dteenergy.com john.janiszewski@dteenergy.com andrea.hayden@dteenergy.com
Counsel for MPSC Staff Adam M. Cozort Monica M. Stephens Lori Mayabb	cozortal@michigan.gov stephensm11@michigan.gov mayabbl@michigan.gov
Michigan Attorney General Joel B. King Lucas Wollenzien	ag-enra-spec-lit@michigan.gov kingj38@michigan.gov wollenzienl@michigan.gov
Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff Equity Michael J. Pattwell Stephen A. Campbell Benjamin Holwerda Lauren Degnan James Dauphinais Jessica York	mpattwell@clarkhill.com scampbell@clarkhill.com bholwerda@clarkhill.com jdauphinais@consultbai.com jyork@consultbai.com ldegnan@clarkhill.com
Counsel for Gerdau MacSteel, Inc. Jennifer U. Heston	jheston@potomacclaw.com
Natural Resources Defense Council and Sierra Club Chris Bzdok Sean Clark Natasha Fowles Sue Fruchey Ben Havumaki	chris@tropospherelegal.com sean@tropospherelegal.com natasha@tropospherelegal.com sue@tropospherelegal.com bhavumaki@synapse-energy.com

Great Lakes Renewable Energy Association Don L. Keskey Brian W. Coyer Carol Dane	donkeskey@publiclawresourcecenter.com bwcoyer@publiclawresourcecenter.com adminasst@publiclawresourcecenter.com
The Ecology Center, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Union of Concerned Scientists, and Vote Solar Daniel Abrams Katie Toolan Alondra Estrada Katie Duckworth Bradley Klein	mpscdockets@elpc.org dabrams@elpc.org ktoolan@elpc.org astrada@elpc.org kduckworth@elpc.org bklein@elpc.org

The statements above are true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Troposphere Legal
Counsel for AG-NS

Digitally signed by
Natasha Fowles
Date: 2026.09.17
11:49:52 -04'00'



Date: September 17, 2026

By: _____
Natasha Fowles, Legal Assistant
420 E. Front St.
Traverse City, MI 49686
Phone: 231-709-4000
Email: natasha@tropospherelegal.com