

<u>Line</u> <u>No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
		<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>	<u>2023</u>
1	Average Days Duration *	3.60	3.53	3.89	3.27	5.22	4.7	4.16**
2	Standard Events Completed	18,999	19,241	21,738	19,136	17,512	17,799	14,842
3	OK on Arrival	2,522	2,587	3,647	2,258	3,011	2,527	2,223
4	SL Knockdowns	285	209	313	265	161	428	355
5	Standard Events Adjusted	16,192	16,445	17,778	16,613	14,340	14,844	12,264
6	Long Duration Defects - Standard (> than 10 Days)	801	415	1,050	578	2,488	1,541	909***
7	# of Follow Up Events Completed	1,671	2,067	1,750	1,624	1,131	1,931	1,702***
8	Follow Up Outage Events Duration	35.81	56.32	65.49	29.99	30.07	33.2	18.3**
9	<b>Total Duration Days (Incl. Follow Up Events + Standard Events)</b>	<b>6.08</b>	<b>8.38</b>	<b>9.52</b>	<b>5.36</b>	<b>7.99</b>	<b>7.24</b>	<b>5.34**</b>
<b>Night Patrol Results</b>								
10	Night Patrols (Total Lights Canvassed)	N/A	N/A	62,002	178,498	223,364	173,998	91,782
11	Total Lights Identified as Non-Operational	N/A	N/A	1,614	7,578	9,082	6,215	4,012
12	% of Lights Confirmed as Non-Operational	N/A	N/A	2.60%	4.25%	4.07%	3.57%	4.37%

\* Average Outage Duration Cycle times are expressed in Days. Performance metrics do not include any patrol and fix activities. Outdoor Lighting Events include all underground fault repair times and 3rd party damage repairs. The total cycle time is measured from when the outage was first reported to when repaired and operating again. Metrics are specific to all Company owned, operated and maintained lights.

\*\*DTE - Community Lighting retired its Outage Management System (OMS) in January 2023 and migrated to a new OMS effective October 2023. Our interim OMS system was not able to calculate duration metrics and therefore duration metrics are reflective of only the new events created within the current OMS.

\*\*\*DTE - Community Lighting retired its Outage Management System (OMS) in January 2023 and migrated to a new OMS effective October 2023. Our interim OMS system was not able to uniquely identify long duration and follow-up events; DTE estimated both by using the counts from the new events created within the current OMS and extrapolating to the first nine months.

Michigan Public Service Commission  
DTE Electric Company  
Community Lighting Outage Cost  
2017 through 2023

Case No.: U-21534  
Exhibit: A-25  
Schedule: O2  
Witness: R. A. Bellini  
Page: 1 of 1

Line No.	Description	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
		<u>2017</u>	<u>2018</u>	<u>2019</u>	<u>Year 2020</u>	<u>2021</u>	<u>2022</u>	<u>2023</u>
1	<b>Total Outgace Cost (\$000)</b>	\$ 4,566	\$ 5,238	\$ 7,792	\$ 6,080	\$ 6,594	\$ 8,050	\$ 9,400
2	<b>Total Outage Events</b>	20,670	21,308	23,488	20,760	18,643	19,730	16,544
3	<b>Outage Cost Per Event</b>	\$ 221	\$ 246	\$ 332	\$ 293	\$ 354	\$ 408	\$ 568
4	<b>Total DTE-owned Assets</b>	191,795	193,334	194,698	196,936	197,560	199,085	199,490



November 29, 2023

Dear Community Lighting Customer,

We want to update you on a change to the streetlights and outdoor protective lights that DTE Energy currently offers and your municipality currently utilizes.

As consumer demand shifts from HID style luminaires, which includes High Pressure Sodium (HPS), to more energy efficient LED style options, DTE has been notified by our manufacturers that they will no longer produce HPS fixtures. The HPS lighting option will be phased out of their product lines throughout 2024.

Since your municipality still has HPS lighting, DTE will continue to replace any light fixture that fails with the equivalent HPS fixture until our inventory is depleted. After our HPS fixture inventory has been depleted, DTE will replace any failed HPS fixtures with the equivalent wattage LED fixture and the change in rates will be updated on your next monthly bill.

While this is a change, LEDs offer several benefits. If you are interested, DTE is able to proactively convert your HPS fixtures to LED. If this conversion is completed during the 2024 construction season, your municipality will be able to take advantage of a labor credit to offset the project cost. You may also be able to benefit from Energy Efficiency rebates.

We value your partnership and serving our communities. If you're interested in getting your municipality added to the 2024 conversion project list, please contact your assigned Account Manager.



**Schedule a time to speak with your account manager by scanning the QR code.**

As always, we appreciate being your streetlight provider.

Sincerely,

DTE Energy Community Lighting

**Note:** This exhibit is an excerpt from a workpaper prepared by Witness Bunch (MI-MAUI) as part of his direct testimony in Case No. U-21297; it is a calculation of DTE's overspend (columns P through U) resulting in a \$5.8M LED plant disallowance. The total overspend is summarized on the first line of this exhibit.

Line No.	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)
DTE LED Conversions vs Leotek Recommended											
Total Cost Difference (Overspend)											
Line No.	LookUp	Description	UG / OH	Lamp Type	LAMP WATTAGE	Original HID Fixture	Leotek Recommended Watts Medium	DTE Cost of Leotek Recommended LED	Cost of Actual DTE Choice	Unit Cost difference	Total Cost Difference (Overspend)
1											Total overspend (Leotek recommended vs DTE choice) \$ 5,838,950
2											Impact on required revenue at 5.6986% \$ 332,738
3	E1 SL - Option I-UG	De-Energized	UG	HPS	250						
4	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	HPS	70						
5	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	HPS	100						
6	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	HPS	150				25,355.0	24,415.00	
7	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	HPS	250					940.00	
8	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	HPS	400					0.04	
9	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	HPS	1,000				3,745.0	0.15	
10	E1 SL - Option I-UG	De-Energized	UG	LED	65						
11	E1 SL - Option I-UG	Dusk-Midnight	UG	LED	135				23,488.0	19,730.00	\$ 3,758
12	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	35	70	27	120.0	120.0	-	\$ -
13	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	45					-	\$ -
14	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	55	100	30	120.0	152.7	32.73	\$ 168,265
15	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	65	100	30	120.0	169.1	49.09	\$ 443,037
16	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	75	150	64	169.1	185.5	16.37	\$ 24,080
17	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	85	150	64	169.1	210.8	41.73	\$ 55,042
18	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	95					-	\$ -
19	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	105					-	\$ -
20	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	115					-	\$ -
21	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	125					-	\$ -
22	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	135	250	89	201.8	283.6	81.82	\$ 1,211,018
23	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	145	250	89	201.8	294.8	92.98	\$ 18,968
24	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	155	250	89	201.8	306.0	104.13	\$ 97,257
25	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	165					-	\$ -
26	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	175	310	123	267.3	328.3	60.98	\$ 43,357
27	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	185					-	\$ -
28	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	205	400	171	328.3	361.7	33.47	\$ 19,814
29	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	215					-	\$ -
30	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	235	400	171	328.3	395.2	66.94	\$ 37,486
31	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	245					-	\$ -
32	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	255					-	\$ -
33	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	265					-	\$ -
34	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	285	400	171	328.3	451.0	122.72	\$ 138,060
35	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	LED	295					-	\$ -
36	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	MH	70					-	\$ -
37	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	MH	100					-	\$ -
38	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	MH	150					-	\$ -

Line No.	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	
						DTE LED Conversions vs Leotek Recommended						
						DTE Cost						
	LookUp	Description	UG / OH	Lamp Type	LAMP WATTAGE	Original HID Fixture	Leotek Recommended Watts Medium	of Leotek Recommended LED	Cost of Actual DTE Choice	Unit Cost difference	Total Cost Difference (Overspend)	
1												
2	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	MH	175							
3	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	MH	250							
4	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	MH	400							
5	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	MV	100							
6	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	MV	175							
7	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	MV	250							
8	E1 SL - Option I-UG	NULL	UG	MV	400							
9	E1 SL - Option I-OH	De-Energized	OH	HPS	100							
10	E1 SL - Option I-OH	De-Energized	OH	HPS	250							
11	E1 SL - Option I-OH	Dusk-Midnight	OH	HPS	250							
12	E1 SL - Option I-OH	Dusk-Midnight	OH	HPS	400							
13	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	HPS	70							
14	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	HPS	100							
15	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	HPS	150							
16	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	HPS	250							
17	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	HPS	400							
18	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	HPS	1,000							
19	E1 SL - Option I-OH	Dusk-Midnight	OH	LED	135							
20	E1 SL - Option I-OH	Dusk-Midnight	OH	LED	285							
21	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	45							
22	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	55	100	30	120.0	152.7	32.73	\$ 374,333	
23	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	65	100	30	120.0	169.1	49.09	\$ 1,761,300	
24	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	75					-	\$ -	
25	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	85	150	64	169.1	201.8	32.73	\$ 33,810	
26	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	95	150	64	169.1	218.2	49.10	\$ 74,190	
27	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	105					-	\$ -	
28	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	115					-	\$ -	
29	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	125					-	\$ -	
30	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	135	250	89	201.8	283.6	81.82	\$ 1,258,964	
31	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	145					-	\$ -	
32	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	155					-	\$ -	
33	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	165					-	\$ -	
34	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	175					-	\$ -	
35	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	185					-	\$ -	
36	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	205					-	\$ -	
37	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	215					-	\$ -	
38	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	235					-	\$ -	
39	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	245					-	\$ -	
40	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	255					-	\$ -	
41	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	285	400	171	328.3	451.0	122.72	\$ 76,209	
42	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	295					-	\$ -	
43	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	305					-	\$ -	
44	E1 SL - Option I-OH	NULL	OH	LED	325					-	\$ -	

# DTE LED STREET LIGHT LUMINARE SELECTION PROCESS REVIEW

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**  
**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

## Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>TERMINOLOGY/DEFINITIONS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>REVIEW .....</b>	<b>4</b>
	100W HPS replacement .....	6
	27W LED .....	6
	30W LED .....	6
	37W LED .....	7
	58W LED .....	7
	Summary.....	7
	250W HPS replacement .....	7
	72W LED .....	8
	89W LED .....	8
	111W LED .....	8
	136W LED .....	8
	Summary.....	9
	Intersection Analysis (100W) – Existing Condition .....	9
	27W LED .....	9
	30W LED .....	10
	37W LED .....	10
	58W LED .....	10
	Summary.....	10
	Intersection Analysis (250W) – Existing Condition .....	10
	72W LED .....	11
	89W LED .....	11
	111W LED .....	11

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

---

136W LED .....	11
Summary.....	11
Intersection Analysis (100W) – Retrofitted Pole Arm.....	11
27W LED (90° Pole Arm).....	12
30W LED (90° Pole Arm).....	12
37W LED (90° Pole Arm).....	12
58W LED (90° Pole Arm).....	12
Summary.....	13
Intersection Analysis (250W) – Retrofitted Pole Arm.....	13
72W LED (90° Pole Arm).....	13
89W LED (90° Pole Arm).....	13
111W LED (90° Pole Arm).....	13
136W LED (90° Pole Arm).....	13
Summary.....	14
<b>4 CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>14</b>

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

The purpose of this report is to provide a review of DTE’s replacement LED roadway luminaire selection process and to provide an opinion as to whether the approach used by DTE is accurate and well-reasoned. This report applies to luminaire selection on the basis of selecting a new LED luminaire to replace an existing 100W and 250W high pressure sodium (HPS) luminaires while still maintaining existing lighting levels.

The scope of this assignment is therefore to review DTE selection methodology exclusive to HPS-LED conversions on existing roadways.

DMD were selected by DTE based on our extensive expertise with respect to street lighting design and HPS to LED conversions.

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

## **2 TERMINOLOGY/DEFINITIONS**

Terminologies defined and contained in this report are as follows:

- Average illuminance (Eav) – Over a surface, illuminance averaged over the specified surface, the amount of light falling incident to a surface.
- Footcandle (fc) The unit of illumination when the foot is taken as the unit of length. It is the illumination on a surface one square foot in area on which there is a uniformly distributed flux of one lumen, or the illumination produced on a surface, all points of which are at a distance of one foot from a directionally uniform point source of one candela.
- High pressure sodium (HPS) lamp – A high-intensity discharge (HID) screw-in lamp in which light is produced by radiation from sodium vapor source.
- Light-emitting diode (LED) – A solid-state diode whose radiated output is a function of its physical construction, material used, and exciting current.
- Lumen (lm) – The unit of luminous flux. It is equal to the flux through a unit solid angle (steradian) from a uniform point source of one candela (candle), or to the flux on a unit surface all points of which are at unit distance from a uniform point source of one candela.
- Luminance (L) - Luminance in a direction, at a point on the surface view at 83m from the point.
- Luminaire – Apparatus that distributes, filters or transforms the light.
- Photometry – Measurement of quantities referring to radiation as evaluated according to a given luminous efficiency function, e.g.  $V(\lambda)$  or  $V'(\lambda)$ .
- Watt – The unit of power produced by a current of one ampere across a potential difference of one volt.
- Uniformity Ratio– On a given plane. A measure of the variation of illuminance over the plane expressed as either – 1. The ratio of the minimum to the maximum illuminance. – 2. The ratio of the minimum to the average illuminance.

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

### **3 REVIEW**

Prior to starting the review, DMD had a meeting with DTE to review processes and discuss the scope. A number of additional meetings were held to respond to questions and clarify where required.

The following documentation materials were provided by DTE:

- Work Paper A - AGI32 simulation files for 7 road type templates traditionally lit with 100 Watt HPS Luminaires previously analyzed by DTE Energy (7 files)
- Work Paper B - AGI Simulation files for 4 potential solid state replacements for the 7 “100” Watt templates” (28 files)
- Work Paper C - AGI32 simulation files for 4 road type templates traditionally lit with 250 Watt HPS Luminaires previously analyzed by DTE Energy (4 files)
- Work Paper D - AGI Simulation files for 4 potential solid-state replacements for the 4 “250” Watt templates” (16 files)
- Work Paper E - Format Intensity Distribution files for Leotek potential replacement luminaires 100Watt HPS
- Work Paper F - Format Intensity Distribution files for Leotek potential replacement luminaires 250 Watt HPS
- Work Paper G – DTE Roadway Typical Master Table 02 01 18
- Work Paper H – Application Performance Results 100 HPS ALL LED to HPS 11 11 22
- Work Paper I – Application Performance Results 100 HPS DTE LED to Leotek LED’s 11 11 22
- Work Paper J – Application Performance Results 250 HPS ALL LED to HPS 11 11 22
- Work Paper K – Application Performance Results 250 HPS DTE LED to Leotek LED’s 11 11 22
- Work Paper L - 100 Watt HPS to LED Equivalent – Rendered Performance Comparison
- Work Paper M - 250 Watt HPS to LED Equivalent – Rendered Performance Comparison
- Work Paper N – Local Local Intersections
- Work Paper O – Collector Collector Intersections

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

- Work Paper P – HPS IES Files (2 files)
- Work Paper Q – Leotek LED IES Files (8 files)

Documentation was generally reviewed which was applicable to the analysis. Note our review was based solely on the luminaires and wattages provided by DTE.

We reviewed the LED replacement luminaires defined by DTE for the 100W and 250W HPS.

For the purpose of this LED conversion, DTE compared luminaires in their opening day condition where they would have maximum light output. This seems to be reasonable approach to an HPS to LED luminaire comparison.

DMD's review consisted of performing spot checks of the lighting asset data defined in Work Paper G – DTE Roadway Typical Master Table 02 01 18 against the lighting calculations performed by DTE. The spot check also included a review of the lighting calculation target levels summaries. DMD then reviewed the various calculation summaries for each LED option against the HPS baseline, see below for our review.

We understand DTE requires all IES photometric files furnished from lighting manufacturers for assessment must be goniophotometer tested by an NVLAP-accredited testing and calibration laboratory. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) administers the National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program (NVLAP). NVLAP provides accreditation in testing and calibration laboratory used for Caliper LM-79 testing in solid-state lighting (SSL) products. This is in line with industry practice.

DMD noted two minor errors in DTE's calculation files. The first being in roadway 100 D (as defined in Work Paper G – DTE Roadway Typical Master Table 02 01 18, which listed an arm length of 7.5' when a 6' arm was used in the calculations. The second error was found in roadway 250 F (as defined in Work Paper G), which listed a pavement classification value of R2 when R3 was used in the calculations. Additionally, for roadway 250 F, a setback of 3' and 10' was listed in Work Paper G, when the calculations showed 3' pole setbacks for both sides of the street. DMD ran our own calculations in these scenarios to accurately reflect the data in Work Paper G, and updated the averaged luminaire performance for both 100W and 250W HPS luminaire replacements which we reference in this section of the report.

Our revised calculation summary is found in our "Revised Performance Summary.xlsx" spreadsheet we provided to DTE. Our corrections did not produce significant differences in results to DTE's original analysis. DMD also conducted local-local and collector-collector intersection lighting analysis for the same fixtures DTE selected for comparison in the 100W and 250W HPS roadway replacements.

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

DMD documentation included in this report and provided to DTE:

- “Revised Rdwy Performance Summary.xlsx” This document corrects the errors found in roadways 100 D and 250 F, and acts as an updated Work Paper I and Work Paper K for Illuminance, Luminance and spill lighting.
- “Intersection Performance Summary.xlsx”

DMD has summarized the data provided by DTE (incorporating our updated calculations) for the 100W and 250W HPS fixtures to be replaced. The comparison data includes a baseline calculation for the existing HPS luminaire and the 4 LED luminaires DTE used in the conversion analysis.

### **100W HPS replacement**

“Revised Rdwy Performance Summary.xlsx” contains Target Roadway lighting calculation summaries for Roadways 100A through 100G as they are described in Work Paper G - Roadway Typical Master Table 02 01 18. These 7 roadways pertain to 100W HPS replacements only. The calculation summaries contain roadway Luminance and Illuminance metrics for the existing 100W HPS and the 4 LED luminaires DTE used in the conversion analysis.

“Revised Rdwy Performance Summary.xlsx” then takes the calculation summaries for each of the 4 LED models considered in the analysis and compares the average values for Luminance and Illuminance to the average values for the HPS luminaire as HPS is taken as the baseline. See below for a summary of the performance comparisons between HPS (baseline) and the LED luminaires:

#### **27W LED**

The 27W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 36.9% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 27W LED provides an average Luminance level that is 31.3% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline.

The 27W LED does not adequately perform to the same level as the existing HPS luminaire.

#### **30W LED**

The 30W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 29.5% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 30W LED provides an average Luminance level that is 20.5% below the average level achieved by the HPS Baseline.

The 30W LED does not adequately perform to the same level as the existing HPS luminaire.

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

**37W LED**

The 37W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 13.4% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 37W LED provides an average Luminance level that is 3.0% below the average level achieved by the HPS Baseline.

The 37W LED does not adequately perform to the same level as the existing HPS luminaire.

**58W LED**

The 58W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 6.5% higher than the HPS baseline and the 58W LED provides an average Luminance level that is 27.7% higher than the HPS baseline.

The 58W LED maintains the minimum Luminance and Illuminance target levels defined by the HPS baseline.

**Summary**

We have reviewed DTE's LED luminaire assessment process based on files provided (AGi32 files, analysis spreadsheet, etc.) for the HPS to LED comparison. We confirm that the data matches calculations DTE provided for the seven sample straight continuously lighted roadway configs for the 100W HPS evaluation. Where DMD found errors in DTE's initial analysis, we corrected the calculations and based our luminaire evaluation on an updated comparison summary. Our findings arrived at the same luminaire selection as DTE's original evaluation.

Typically recommended lighting levels are treated as a minimum maintained requirement, there are no strict guidelines regarding over lighting or ranges associated with over lighting.

Of the 4 LED luminaires compared in this analysis, the 58W LED luminaire is the only fixture that is capable of meeting Average Luminance and Illuminance of the 100W HPS baseline opening day light levels calculated over the 7 roadway types.

The 58W luminaire meets off target max spill lighting values along the property frontages when compared to the 100W HPS baseline. The 37W and 30W fixtures fail spill lighting target levels.

Based on many recent LED conversions, we have found that the actual energy reduction to be around 50% to 60% based on HPS input watts. In this case the input watts, including ballast loss (130W) divided by the LED input wattage (58W) resulting in a 55% decrease in wattage.

**250W HPS replacement**

"Revised Rdwy Performance Summary.xlsx" contains Roadway lighting calculation summaries for Roadways 250A, 250B, 250C AND 250F as they are described in Work Paper G - Roadway

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

Typicals Master Table 02 01 18. These roadways pertain to 250W HPS replacements only. The calculation summaries contain roadway Luminance and Illuminance metrics for the existing 250W HPS and the 4 LED luminaires used in the analysis.

“Revised Rdwy Performance Summary.xlsx” then takes the calculation summaries for each of the 4 LED models considered in the analysis and compares the average values for Luminance and Illuminance to the Average values for the HPS luminaire as HPS is taken as the baseline. See below for a summary of the performance comparisons between HPS (baseline) and the LED luminaires:

**72W LED**

The 72W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 30.2% below the average level achieved by the HPS base line and the 72W LED provides an average Luminance level that is 35.2% below the average level achieved by the HPS Baseline.

The 72W LED does not adequately perform to the same level as the existing HPS luminaire.

**89W LED**

The 89W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 19.3% below the average level achieved by the HPS base line and the 89W LED provides an average Luminance level that is 19.9% below the average level achieved by the HPS Baseline.

The 89W LED does not adequately perform to the same level as the existing HPS luminaire.

**111W LED**

The 111W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 13.8% below the average level achieved by the HPS base line and the 111W LED provides an average Luminance level that is 3.0% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline.

The 111W LED does not adequately perform to the same level as the existing HPS luminaire.

**136W LED**

The 136W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 1% below the HPS baseline and is within a reasonable level of tolerance to be considered acceptable. The 136W LED provides an average Luminance level that is 10.8% more than the HPS Baseline.

The 136W LED performs to nearly the same level as the existing HPS luminaire.

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

**Summary**

We have reviewed DTE's LED luminaire assessment process based on files provided (AGi32 files, analysis spreadsheet, etc.) for the HPS to LED comparison. We confirm that the data matches calculations DTE provided for the four sample straight continuously lighted roadway configs for the 250W HPS evaluation. Where DMD found errors in DTE's initial analysis, we corrected the calculations and based our luminaire evaluation on an updated comparison summary. Our findings arrived at the same luminaire selection as DTE's original evaluation.

Out of the 4 LEDs the 136W luminaire had the highest Average Illuminance value, only 1% short of the target value set out by the 250W HPS baseline which we deem a reasonable level of tolerance for a replacement. The 136W LED exceeded Average Luminance by 10.3% more than the 250W HPS.

The off target light levels produced by the 136W LED Luminaire showed a significant 49% reduction in the calculated maximum spill light values along the property frontages compared to the 250W HPS baseline.

Based on many recent LED conversions have found that the actual energy reduction to be around 50% to 60% based on HPS input watts. In this case the input watts, including ballast loss (300W) divided by the LED input wattage (136W) resulting in a 55% decrease in wattage.

**Intersection Analysis (100W) – Existing Condition**

DTE provided 3 typical local-local intersections which DMD defined in "*Intersection Performance Summary.xlsx*". DMD conducted independent lighting calculations for each, including the same 4 LED luminaires used in the 100W roadway analysis and compared the results to the lighting levels of the existing HPS luminaire. The average calculated values of the 3 intersections were used to compare each of the 4 LED luminaires to the baseline 100W HPS fixture.

**27W LED**

The 27W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 39.0% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 27W LED provides a 26.2% reduction in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 27W LED does not maintain all HPS baseline lighting metrics.

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

**30W LED**

The 30W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 31.1% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 30W LED provides an 17.8% reduction in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 30W LED does not maintain all HPS baseline lighting metrics.

**37W LED**

The 37W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 17.4% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 37W LED provides a 1.0% increase in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 37W LED does not maintain all HPS baseline lighting metrics.

**58W LED**

The 58W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 5.5% above the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 58W LED provides a 51.2% increase in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 58W LED does not maintain all HPS baseline lighting metrics.

**Summary**

The light levels produced by the 58W LED Luminaire showed an increase in Average Illuminance. The 58W fixture failed to meet spill light targets at surrounding property lines with a 51.2% increase compared to the 100W HPS baseline. While the 37W, 30W and 27W fixtures meet spill lighting targets within a reasonable tolerance, the 58W luminaire is the only fixture that was able to maintain the minimum Average Illuminance of the HPS baseline.

**Intersection Analysis (250W) – Existing Condition**

DTE provided 3 typical collector-collector intersections which DMD defined in “*Intersection Performance Summary.xlsx*”. DMD conducted independent lighting calculations for each, including the same 4 LED luminaires used in the 250W roadway analysis and compared the results to the lighting levels of the existing HPS luminaire. The average calculated values of the 3 intersections were used to compare each of the 4 LED luminaires to the baseline 250W HPS fixture.

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

**72W LED**

The 72W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 39.8% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 72W LED provides a 6.6% increase in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 72W LED does not maintain all HPS baseline lighting metrics.

**89W LED**

The 89W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 25.4% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 89W LED provides a 31.3% increase in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 89W LED does not maintain all HPS baseline lighting metrics.

**111W LED**

The 111W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 9.8% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 111W LED provides a substantial 134.7% increase in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 111W LED does not maintain all HPS baseline lighting metrics.

**136W LED**

The 136W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 3.5% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 136W LED provides a 27.3% reduction in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 136W LED meets HPS baseline lighting metrics to a reasonable level of tolerance.

**Summary**

The 136W luminaire had the highest Average Illuminance out of the 4 LEDs at only 3.5% below the target HPS baseline levels, which we would deem to be within a reasonable level of tolerance. The 136W LED luminaire was the only luminaire to maintain baseline spill light levels, with a 27.3% reduction in max spill light levels at property frontages compared to the 250W HPS baseline.

**Intersection Analysis (100W) – Retrofitted Pole Arm**

DTE provided 3 typical local-local intersections, defined in “*Intersection Master Table.xlsx*” each of which DMD conducted independent lighting calculations for. Our analysis included the same

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

4 LED luminaires used in the 100W roadway analysis and compared the results to the lighting levels of the existing HPS luminaire. The average calculated values of the 3 intersections were used to compare each of the 4 LED luminaires to the baseline 100W HPS fixture.

DTE has stated they often replace pole arms at intersections lit by a single luminaire, with a pole arm at 45° to the intersection. Their replacement procedure involves replacing the existing pole arm with a 6' pole arm, and mounting it at the same mounting height and orienting it 90° to the intersection to cast more light parallel to the roadway, and mitigate off target light spill. DMD ran calculations at each of the 3 provided local-local intersections with these lighting configurations.

**27W LED (90° Pole Arm)**

The 27W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 39.2% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 27W LED provides a 22.4% increase in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 27W LED does not maintain all HPS baseline lighting metrics.

**30W LED (90° Pole Arm)**

The 30W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 32.0% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 30W LED provides an 40.6% increase in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 30W LED does not maintain all HPS baseline lighting metrics.

**37W LED (90° Pole Arm)**

The 37W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 16.9% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 37W LED provides a 68.4% increase in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 37W LED does not maintain all HPS baseline lighting metrics.

**58W LED (90° Pole Arm)**

The 58W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 13.1% above the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 58W LED provides a 19.5% reduction in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 58W LED meets all HPS baseline lighting metrics.

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

## **Summary**

After reorienting the luminaire arm, the light levels produced by the 58W LED Luminaire showed both increase in Average Illuminance and a reduction in spill lighting at surrounding property lines. All other LED fixtures fail both criteria.

## **Intersection Analysis (250W) – Retrofitted Pole Arm**

The same procedure detailed in the 100W retrofitted pole arm analysis was repeated for the 3 collector-collector intersections.

### **72W LED (90° Pole Arm)**

The 72W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 40.6% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 72W LED provides a 14.5% increase in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 72W LED does not maintain all HPS baseline lighting metrics.

### **89W LED (90° Pole Arm)**

The 89W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 26.5% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 89W LED provides a 41.3% increase in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 89W LED does not maintain all HPS baseline lighting metrics.

### **111W LED (90° Pole Arm)**

The 111W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 11.2% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 111W LED provides a substantial 146.6% increase in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

### **136W LED (90° Pole Arm)**

The 136W LED luminaire provides an average Illuminance level that is 1% below the average level achieved by the HPS baseline and the 136W LED provides a 62.1% reduction in spill lighting at surrounding property lines.

The 136W LED meets HPS baseline lighting metrics to a reasonable level of tolerance.

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

## Summary

After reorienting the luminaire arm the 136W luminaire had the highest Average Illuminance value, only 1% short of the target value set out by the 250W HPS baseline, which we deem to be within a reasonable level of tolerance.

The off target light levels produced by the 136W LED Luminaire showed the most significant reduction in the calculated maximum spill light values along the property frontages and showed a 62.1% improvement compared to the 250W HPS baseline. None of the other LED luminaires met off target spill levels set out by the 250W HPS baseline.

The light levels produced by the 136W LED luminaire was only 1% short Average Illuminance HPS baseline levels, which we deem to be within a reasonable level of tolerance. The 136W fixture resulted in a significant improvement in max spill lighting. All other LED fixtures fail both criteria.

## 4 CONCLUSION

From a comparison standpoint, matching published lumens from luminaire to luminaire is not always the best method. It is more important to assess lighting levels on the roadway, which was undertaken by DTE. DTE reviewed both roadway lighting levels on and off the roadway defining lighting Luminance and Illuminance metrics in the analysis, including spill lighting. In our opinion, what DTE have provided is reasonable for an HPS to LED conversion given they have focused on calculated lighting levels on the roadway vs simply using lumen values.

DTE's use of multiple roadway types and averaging the results of these roadways is a reasonable methodology to use in comparing luminaires and as a luminaire selection guide in large scale retrofit HPS-LED conversions.

Based on the criteria and approach defined by DTE, DMD is in agreement with the conversion methods and LED luminaires chosen to replace the incumbent 100W and 250W HPS luminaires.

Report Prepared by:



Donato Speidel, PEng

**DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd**

**DTE LED Luminaire Process Review**

---

Review by:



Don McLean, PLEng

**Note:** This exhibit represents Don McLeans intersection summary of his intersection analysis of various LED comparisons for replacements of both the 100W and 250W HPS luminaires.

**Line No.** (a) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) (g) (h) (i) (j) (k) (l) (m)

1 **README**  
2 The following tables show percent increases in calculation values of the LED fixtures as compared to the incumbent HPS baseline  
3 (See "Intersection Summary" tab)  
4 **Cell highlight legend**  
5 **Green** LED out performs HPS baseline levels  
6 **Yellow** LED is within 5% of meeting levels of HPS baseline (DMD deems this to be an acceptable level of tolerance)  
7 **Red** LED fails to meet HPS baseline lighting levels

100W HPS REPLACEMENT	Existing Intersection Condition					90° Orientation On 6' Arm				
	HPS	58W	37W	30W	27W	HPS	58W	37W	30W	27W
Avg Illuminance	-	5.5%	-17.4%	-31.1%	-39.0%	-	13.1%	-16.9%	-32.0%	-39.2%
Max spill	-	51.2%	1.0%	-17.8%	-26.2%	-	-19.5%	68.4%	40.6%	22.4%

12 \*Intersection summaries averaged for the 3 local-local intersections

250W HPS REPLACEMENT	%250W HPS					%250W HPS				
	HPS	136W	111W	89W	72W	HPS	136W	111W	89W	72W
Avg Illuminance	-	-3.5%	-9.8%	-25.4%	-39.8%	-	-1.0%	-11.2%	-26.5%	-40.6%
Max spill	-	-27.3%	134.7%	31.3%	6.6%	-	-62.1%	146.6%	41.3%	14.5%

17 \*Intersection summaries averaged for the 3 collector-collector intersections

Line No.	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)	(o)	(p)	(q)	(r)	(s)	(t)	(u)	(v)	(w)	(x)	(y)	
1	100W HPS						58W LED (GCM2-30H-MV-NW-2R-XX-610)				37W LED (GCJ2-30J-MV-40K-2R-XX-060 S)				30W LED (GCJ1-30J-MV-40K-2R-XX-050 S)				27W LED (GCJ1-30J-MV-40K-2R-XX-045 S)							
2	Location	Mounting Height (ft)	Arm length	Arm Orientation	Avg (Fc)	Max Spill	Avg	%HPS	Max Spill	%HPS	Avg	%HPS	Max Spill	%HPS	Avg	%HPS	Max Spill	%HPS	Avg	%HPS	Max Spill	%HPS	Avg	%HPS	Max Spill	%HPS
3	S Linville Ave St & Hazelwood St, Westland, Michigan 48186	28'	18'	45	1.14	1.4	1.21	6%	2.1	50%	0.94	-18%	1.5	7%	0.78	-32%	1.2	-14%	0.69	-39%	1.1	-21%				
4	Griffith Ave & Wiltshire Rd, Berkley, Michigan 48072	28'	18'	45	1.23	1.7	1.25	2%	2.69	56%	1.03	-16%	1.69	-2%	0.86	-30%	1.39	-19%	0.76	-38%	1.2	-28%				
5	Pine St & 9th St, Port Huron, Michigan 48060	28'	18'	45	1.04	1.3	1.13	9%	1.84	47%	0.85	-18%	1.22	-2%	0.71	-32%	1	-20%	0.63	-39%	0.9	-29%				
6								5.5%		51.2%			-17.4%		1.0%			-31.1%		-17.8%			-39.0%		-26.2%	
7	100W HPS						58W LED (GCM2-30H-MV-NW-2R-XX-610)				37W LED (GCJ2-30J-MV-40K-2R-XX-060 S)				30W LED (GCJ1-30J-MV-40K-2R-XX-050 S)				27W LED (GCJ1-30J-MV-40K-2R-XX-045 S)							
8	Location	Mounting Height (ft)	Arm length	Arm Orientation	Avg (Fc)	Max Spill	Avg	%HPS	Max Spill	%HPS	Avg	%HPS	Max Spill	%HPS	Avg	%HPS	Max Spill	%HPS	Avg	%HPS	Max Spill	%HPS	Avg	%HPS	Max Spill	%HPS
9	Same roadway geometries used in 100W calcs, re-orient pole arms to 90 deg	6'	6'	90 - arm over Linville Ave	0.92	0.4	1.03	12%	0.3	-25%	0.76	-17%	0.7	75%	0.61	-34%	0.6	50%	0.55	-40%	0.5	25%				
10				90 - arm over Wiltshire	0.97	0.6	1.07	10%	0.7	21%	0.8	-18%	0.91	57%	0.66	-32%	0.75	29%	0.59	-39%	0.7	16%				
11				90 - arm over 9th st	0.76	0.9	0.89	17%	0.43	-54%	0.64	-16%	1.63	73%	0.53	-30%	1.34	43%	0.47	-38%	1.2	27%				
12								13.1%		-19.5%			-16.9%		68.4%			-32.0%		40.6%			-39.2%		22.4%	



**Note:** This exhibit represents Don McLeans roadway performance summary of his intersection analysis of various LED comparisons for replacements of both the 100W and 250W HPS luminaires.

**Line**  
**No.** (a) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) (g) (h) (i) (j) (k) (l) (m)

1 **README**  
2 The following tables show percent increases in calculation values of the LED fixtures as compared to the incumbent HPS baseline  
3  
4 **Cell highlight legend**  
5 **Green** LED out performs HPS baseline levels  
6 **Yellow** LED is within 5% of meeting levels of HPS baseline (DMD deems this to be an acceptable level of tolerance)  
7 **Red** LED fails to meet HPS baseline lighting levels

8 9	100W HPS REPLACEMENT	Exhibit C Performance Summary					Revised Performance Summary*				
		HPS	58W	37W	30W	27W	HPS	58W	37W	30W	27W
10	Luminance	-	23.0%	-5.1%	-20.0%	-31.1%	-	27.7%	-3.0%	-20.5%	-31.3%
11	Illuminance	-	6.1%	-13.7%	-29.4%	-36.8%	-	6.5%	-13.4%	-29.5%	-36.9%
12	North Spill	-	-54.8%	18.7%	-2.4%	-14.3%	-	-54.3%	22.1%	0.5%	-11.3%
13	South Spill**	-	-10.4%	-24.7%	-36.9%	-45.4%	-	-10.4%	-24.7%	-36.9%	-45.4%

14 \* For roadway 100 D, an arm length discrepancy was found in Exhibit G to what was used in the calcs.  
15 \*\* South side spill lighting does not apply to 100 D, and therefore there is no observed change in the revised summary (see "100W" sheet tab).

16 17	250W HPS REPLACEMENT	Exhibit E Performance Summary					Revised Performance Summary*				
		HPS	136W	111W	89W	72W	HPS	136W	111W	89W	72W
18	Luminance	-	12.6%	-0.6%	-13.4%	-33.6%	-	10.3%	-3.0%	-19.9%	-35.2%
19	Illuminance	-	-0.8%	-12.6%	-24.2%	-38.8%	-	-1.0%	-13.8%	-19.3%	-30.2%
20	North Spill	-	-66.3%	14.5%	-6.0%	-23.8%	-	-65.8%	35.5%	11.5%	-9.5%
21	South Spill	-	-49.4%	-37.0%	-43.8%	-54.6%	-	-49.0%	-34.9%	-41.8%	-53.4%

22 \* For roadway 250 F, a setback and pavement classification discrepancy was found to what was listed in Exhibit G and to what was observed on Google Maps. DMD ran revised calcs for this roadway and updated the overall performance summary.

<u>Line</u>											
No.	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)
1			<b>HPS</b>	<b>58W</b>	<b>% HPS</b>	<b>37W</b>	<b>% HPS</b>	<b>30W</b>	<b>% HPS</b>	<b>27W</b>	<b>% HPS</b>
2	<b>Luminance (Cd/SqM)</b>	100 A	0.72	0.94	30.6%	0.7	-2.8%	0.51	-29.2%	0.51	-29.2%
3	<b>Average</b>	100 B	0.43	0.52	20.9%	0.43	0.0%	0.35	-18.6%	0.26	-39.5%
4		100 C	0.51	0.59	15.7%	0.46	-9.8%	0.44	-13.7%	0.33	-35.3%
5		100 D	0.34	0.32	-5.9%	0.26	-23.5%	0.26	-23.5%	0.23	-32.4%
6		100 E	0.66	0.87	31.8%	0.64	-3.0%	0.53	-19.7%	0.47	-28.8%
7		100 F	0.33	0.45	36.4%	0.36	9.1%	0.29	-12.1%	0.26	-21.2%
8		100 G	0.35	0.46	31.4%	0.33	-5.7%	0.27	-22.9%	0.24	-31.4%
9					<b>23.0%</b>		<b>-5.1%</b>		<b>-20.0%</b>		<b>-31.1%</b>
10	<b>Illuminance (Fc)</b>	100 A	0.87	0.93	6.9%	0.75	-13.8%	0.62	-28.7%	0.55	-36.8%
11	<b>Average</b>	100 B	0.42	0.44	4.8%	0.39	-7.1%	0.32	-23.8%	0.28	-33.3%
12		100 C	0.49	0.52	6.1%	0.42	-14.3%	0.34	-30.6%	0.31	-36.7%
13		100 D	0.45	0.48	6.7%	0.36	-20.0%	0.3	-33.3%	0.27	-40.0%
14		100 E	0.84	0.9	7.1%	0.71	-15.5%	0.58	-31.0%	0.52	-38.1%
15		100 F	0.39	0.4	2.6%	0.36	-7.7%	0.29	-25.6%	0.26	-33.3%
16		100 G	0.46	0.5	8.7%	0.38	-17.4%	0.31	-32.6%	0.28	-39.1%
17					<b>6.1%</b>		<b>-13.7%</b>		<b>-29.4%</b>		<b>-36.8%</b>
18	<b>North Spill (Fc)</b>	100 A	0.11	0.06	-45.5%	0.14	27.3%	0.12	9.1%	0.1	-9.1%
19	<b>Max</b>	100 B	0.15	0.09	-40.0%	0.06	-60.0%	0.05	-66.7%	0.04	-73.3%
20		100 C	0.1	0.05	-50.0%	0.04	-60.0%	0.03	-70.0%	0.03	-70.0%
21		100 D	0.17	0.07	-58.8%	0.28	64.7%	0.23	35.3%	0.2	17.6%
22		100 E	0.15	0.06	-60.0%	0.21	40.0%	0.17	13.3%	0.15	0.0%
23		100 F	0.21	0.08	-61.9%	0.35	66.7%	0.29	38.1%	0.26	23.8%
24		100 G	0.46	0.15	-67.4%	0.7	52.2%	0.57	23.9%	0.51	10.9%
25					<b>-54.8%</b>		<b>18.7%</b>		<b>-2.4%</b>		<b>-14.3%</b>
26	<b>South Spill (Fc)</b>	100 A	0.16	0.06	-62.5%	0.05	-68.8%	0.04	-75.0%	0.04	-75.0%
27	<b>Max</b>	100 B	0.08	0.04	-50.0%	0.07	-12.5%	0.06	-25.0%	0.05	-37.5%
28		100 C	0.13	0.05	-61.5%	0.2	53.8%	0.16	23.1%	0.14	7.7%
29		100 D									
30		100 E									
31		100 F	0.27	0.63	133.3%	0.16	-40.7%	0.13	-51.9%	0.12	-55.6%
32		100 G	0.09	0.08	-11.1%	0.04	-55.6%	0.04	-55.6%	0.03	-66.7%
33					<b>-10.4%</b>		<b>-24.7%</b>		<b>-36.9%</b>		<b>-45.4%</b>

Line No.	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)
1			HPS	58W	% HPS	37W	% HPS	30W	% HPS	27W	% HPS			
2	Luminance (Cd/SqM)	100 A	0.72	0.94	30.6%	0.7	-2.8%	0.51	-29.2%	0.51	-29.2%			
3	Average	100 B	0.43	0.52	20.9%	0.43	0.0%	0.35	-18.6%	0.26	-39.5%			
4		100 C	0.51	0.59	15.7%	0.46	-9.8%	0.44	-13.7%	0.33	-35.3%			
5		100 D	0.33	0.42	27.3%	0.3	-9.1%	0.24	-27.3%	0.22	-33.3%			
6		100 E	0.66	0.87	31.8%	0.64	-3.0%	0.53	-19.7%	0.47	-28.8%			
7		100 F	0.33	0.45	36.4%	0.36	9.1%	0.29	-12.1%	0.26	-21.2%			
8		100 G	0.35	0.46	31.4%	0.33	-5.7%	0.27	-22.9%	0.24	-31.4%			
9					27.7%		-3.0%		-20.5%		-31.3%			
10	Illuminance (Fc)	100 A	0.87	0.93	6.9%	0.75	-13.8%	0.62	-28.7%	0.55	-36.8%			
11	Average	100 B	0.42	0.44	4.8%	0.39	-7.1%	0.32	-23.8%	0.28	-33.3%			
12		100 C	0.49	0.52	6.1%	0.42	-14.3%	0.34	-30.6%	0.31	-36.7%			
13		100 D	0.44	0.48	9.1%	0.36	-18.2%	0.29	-34.1%	0.26	-40.9%			
14		100 E	0.84	0.9	7.1%	0.71	-15.5%	0.58	-31.0%	0.52	-38.1%			
15		100 F	0.39	0.4	2.6%	0.36	-7.7%	0.29	-25.6%	0.26	-33.3%			
16		100 G	0.46	0.5	8.7%	0.38	-17.4%	0.31	-32.6%	0.28	-39.1%			
17					6.5%		-13.4%		-29.5%		-36.9%			
18	North Spill (Fc)	100 A	0.11	0.06	-45.5%	0.14	27.3%	0.12	9.1%	0.1	-9.1%			
19	Max	100 B	0.15	0.09	-40.0%	0.06	-60.0%	0.05	-66.7%	0.04	-73.3%			
20		100 C	0.1	0.05	-50.0%	0.04	-60.0%	0.03	-70.0%	0.03	-70.0%			
21		100 D	0.18	0.08	-55.6%	0.34	88.9%	0.28	55.6%	0.25	38.9%			
22		100 E	0.15	0.06	-60.0%	0.21	40.0%	0.17	13.3%	0.15	0.0%			
23		100 F	0.21	0.08	-61.9%	0.35	66.7%	0.29	38.1%	0.26	23.8%			
24		100 G	0.46	0.15	-67.4%	0.7	52.2%	0.57	23.9%	0.51	10.9%			
25					-54.3%		22.1%		0.5%		-11.3%			
26	South Spill (Fc)	100 A	0.16	0.06	-62.5%	0.05	-68.8%	0.04	-75.0%	0.04	-75.0%			
27	Max	100 B	0.08	0.04	-50.0%	0.07	-12.5%	0.06	-25.0%	0.05	-37.5%			
28		100 C	0.13	0.05	-61.5%	0.2	53.8%	0.16	23.1%	0.14	7.7%			
29		100 D												
30		100 E												
31		100 F	0.27	0.63	133.3%	0.16	-40.7%	0.13	-51.9%	0.12	-55.6%			
32		100 G	0.09	0.08	-11.1%	0.04	-55.6%	0.04	-55.6%	0.03	-66.7%			
33					-10.4%		-24.7%		-36.9%		-45.4%			

Error found in DTE calculation for 100 D. DMD corrected the calculations and showed corrected values here

<u>Line</u> No.	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)
1			<b>HPS</b>	<b>136W</b>	<b>% HPS</b>	<b>111W</b>	<b>% HPS</b>	<b>89W</b>	<b>% HPS</b>	<b>72W</b>	<b>% HPS</b>
2	<b>Luminance (Cd/SqM)</b>	250 A	2.22	2.62	18.0%	2.19	-1.4%	1.81	-18.5%	1.46	-34.2%
3	<b>Average</b>	250 B	1.36	1.43	5.1%	1.39	2.2%	1.15	-15.4%	0.93	-31.6%
4		250 C	1.57	1.66	5.7%	1.52	-3.2%	1.26	-19.7%	1.02	-35.0%
5		250 F	2.13	2.59	21.6%	2.13	0.0%	2.13	0.0%	1.42	-33.3%
6					<b>12.6%</b>		<b>-0.6%</b>		<b>-13.4%</b>		<b>-33.6%</b>
7	<b>Illuminance (Fc)</b>	250 A	2.98	3.03	1.7%	2.64	-11.4%	2.18	-26.8%	1.76	-40.9%
8	<b>Average</b>	250 B	1.29	1.21	-6.2%	1.04	-19.4%	1.04	-19.4%	0.84	-34.9%
9		250 C	1.51	1.44	-4.6%	1.39	-7.9%	1.15	-23.8%	0.93	-38.4%
10		250 F	2.94	3.12	6.1%	2.6	-11.6%	2.15	-26.9%	1.74	-40.8%
11					<b>-0.8%</b>		<b>-12.6%</b>		<b>-24.2%</b>		<b>-38.8%</b>
12	<b>North Spill (Fc)</b>	250 A	0.54	0.21	-61.1%	0.79	46.3%	0.65	20.4%	0.53	-1.9%
13	<b>Max</b>	250 B	0.32	0.11	-65.6%	0.27	-15.6%	0.22	-31.3%	0.18	-43.8%
14		250 C	0.55	0.18	-67.3%	0.86	56.4%	0.71	29.1%	0.57	3.6%
15		250 F	0.45	0.13	-71.1%	0.32	-28.9%	0.26	-42.2%	0.21	-53.3%
16					<b>-66.3%</b>		<b>14.5%</b>		<b>-6.0%</b>		<b>-23.8%</b>
17	<b>South Spill (Fc)</b>	250 A	0.64	0.22	-65.6%	0.67	4.7%	0.67	4.7%	0.54	-15.6%
18	<b>Max</b>	250 B	0.72	0.72	0.0%	0.33	-54.2%	0.27	-62.5%	0.22	-69.4%
19		250 C	0.31	0.12	-61.3%	0.11	-64.5%	0.09	-71.0%	0.07	-77.4%
20		250 F	0.41	0.12	-70.7%	0.27	-34.1%	0.22	-46.3%	0.18	-56.1%
21					<b>-49.4%</b>		<b>-37.0%</b>		<b>-43.8%</b>		<b>-54.6%</b>

Line No.	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(n)
1			<b>HPS</b>	<b>136W</b>	<b>% HPS</b>	<b>111W</b>	<b>% HPS</b>	<b>89W</b>	<b>% HPS</b>	<b>72W</b>	<b>% HPS</b>			
2	<b>Luminance (Cd/SqM)</b>	250 A	2.22	2.62	18.0%	2.19	-1.4%	1.81	-18.5%	1.46	-34.2%			
3	<b>Average</b>	250 B	1.36	1.43	5.1%	1.39	2.2%	1.15	-15.4%	0.93	-31.6%			
4		250 C	1.57	1.66	5.7%	1.52	-3.2%	1.26	-19.7%	1.02	-35.0%			
5		250 F	1.63	1.83	12.3%	1.47	-9.8%	1.21	-25.8%	0.98	-39.9%			
6					<b>10.3%</b>		<b>-3.0%</b>		<b>-19.9%</b>		<b>-35.2%</b>			
7	<b>Illuminance (Fc)</b>	250 A	2.98	3.03	1.7%	2.64	-11.4%	2.18	-26.8%	1.76	-40.9%			
8	<b>Average</b>	250 B	1.29	1.21	-6.2%	1.04	-19.4%	1.04	-19.4%	0.84	-34.9%			
9		250 C	1.51	1.44	-4.6%	1.39	-7.9%	1.15	-23.8%	0.93	-38.4%			
10		250 F	2.27	2.39	5.3%	1.9	-16.3%	2.11	-7.0%	2.12	-6.6%			
11					<b>-1.0%</b>		<b>-13.8%</b>		<b>-19.3%</b>		<b>-30.2%</b>			
12	<b>North Spill (Fc)</b>	250 A	0.54	0.21	-61.1%	0.79	46.3%	0.65	20.4%	0.53	-1.9%			
13	<b>Max</b>	250 B	0.32	0.11	-65.6%	0.27	-15.6%	0.22	-31.3%	0.18	-43.8%			
14		250 C	0.55	0.18	-67.3%	0.86	56.4%	0.71	29.1%	0.57	3.6%			
15		250 F	1.04	0.32	-69.2%	1.61	54.8%	1.33	27.9%	1.08	3.8%			
16					<b>-65.8%</b>		<b>35.5%</b>		<b>11.5%</b>		<b>-9.5%</b>			
17	<b>South Spill (Fc)</b>	250 A	0.64	0.22	-65.6%	0.67	4.7%	0.67	4.7%	0.54	-15.6%			
18	<b>Max</b>	250 B	0.72	0.72	0.0%	0.33	-54.2%	0.27	-62.5%	0.22	-69.4%			
19		250 C	0.31	0.12	-61.3%	0.11	-64.5%	0.09	-71.0%	0.07	-77.4%			
20		250 F	0.39	0.12	-69.2%	0.29	-25.6%	0.24	-38.5%	0.19	-51.3%			
21					<b>-49.0%</b>		<b>-34.9%</b>		<b>-41.8%</b>		<b>-53.4%</b>			

Error found in DTE calculation for 250 F. DMD corrected the calculations and showed corrected

**Don McLean, PL Eng, FIES**

Don is a founder and senior partner in DMD and Associates. He has over 42 years of experience in the design of electrical engineering projects, including roadway lighting, control systems, power distribution, traffic signals and related traffic engineering. Don has managed electrical and lighting for thousands of electrical projects ranging in values over \$35M. Don has participated in major road transportation projects valued at well over \$2.4B. His experience includes turnkey, bid-build, design-build, design-build-finance-operate and P3 methods of project delivery. Don's experience, knowledge and attention to detail have led to ongoing successful projects.

Don typically undertakes a senior management role, and his varying tasks may include work planning & scheduling, product review, standards development, design, and reviews. His role as a project manager includes managing larger and more complex projects.

Don is very active design engineer who specializes in roadway lighting. Over his career it is estimated Don has been involved in over 3,000 projects involving:

- Electrical and control systems.
- Roadway and related outdoor lighting.
- Bridges and tunnels.
- Traffic signals.
- Hydro, Tel and Communications systems.
- Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS).

As an industry expert, Don has also undertaken numerous presentations and seminars across North America on various topics related to the roadway lighting industry. He has mentored and trained over 30 designers and engineers over his career. In addition, Don has authored numerous standards and publications and is active in numerous safety based research projects. Don has written electrical standards and lighting policies which define where and how to light for over 30 cities and numerous transportation organizations.

Don has authored/co-authored/contributed to a number of nationally used publications including:

- FHWA Lighting Handbook
- AASHTO Solid State Lighting Guide
- Transportation Association of Canada Roadway Lighting Design Guide
- International Signal Association Level 2 Roadway Lighting Certification.
- Illuminating Engineering Society (IES) RP-8

Don is a Fellow with the IES. Don is active on over eight IES outdoor lighting committees and is the lead for the IES Application Advisory Panel who advises the IES on lighting applications and a member of the IES Standards Committee who oversees all standard lighting publications.

Don is well experienced with street lighting design, cost estimates, calculations, and standards for LED street light conversion designs that maximize night-time visibility while at the same time conserving power. Don has a thorough understanding of costs (operation and capital), financial assessments, feasibility studies, current and ongoing research, best practices, principals, concepts, standards, photometry and design software, electrical code(s) and standards, lighting

controls, products and construction related to roadway lighting. As such, he is able to provide a truly unique value proposition and add value while reducing risk to our clients.

Don has also undertaken numerous projects involving various types of lighting including parking lot lighting, park and plaza lighting, sports and area lighting, decorative and streetscape lighting, freeway and interchange lighting (including high mast), sign lighting, feature lighting such as walls and sculpture and water features, bikeways, bridges and tunnels, transit platforms and bus loops. Don expertise includes adaptive lighting controls and smart city lighting technologies. Don stays on top of the technology curve by working closely with manufacturers and industry committees.

Don is actively involved with the environmental elements and impacts of roadway lighting and is active with the International Dark Sky Association.

Don has worked with VTTI for over 10 years. He is currently involved with NCHRP 05-22A providing input to VTTI research. Don has worked with VTTI on numerous past projects in NCHRP 05-22, and FHWA Lighting workshops and the FHWA Lighting Handbook and are teamed with VTTI on NCHRP 05-26.

**Don McLean CET**

*Senior Manager / Principal - DMD*

---

**EDUCATION / REGISTRATIONS**

---

British Columbia Institute of Technology: Certified Engineering Technologist, 1979  
Engineers and Geoscientists of BC (EGBC)  
Association of Professional Engineers and Geoscientists of Alberta (APEGA)  
Transportation Association of Canada Road Safety Committee

---

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

---

**President DMD Consulting Engineers Ltd (2001 – Current)**  
**President DMD and Associates Electrical Consultants Ltd (2000-Current)**  
**Engineer, Shaflik Engineering Ltd, (1980-2000)**

---

**SELECTED PUBLICATIONS**

---

Co-author – FHWA Lighting Handbook (2023)  
Contributor – AASHTO Solid State Lighting Guide  
Co-author NCHRP 5-22 - GUIDELINES FOR SOLID STATE ROADWAY LIGHTING  
Lead Author - Transportation Association of Canada Guide for the Design of Roadway Lighting – 500+ page National Publication (2006) – Converted to IESNA RP-8-18  
Lead Author - Transportation Association of Canada Light Reduce and Energy Efficiency Guide – National Publication (2012) <https://www.tac-atc.ca/en/publications/ptm-rlepr-e>  
Lead Author - BC Ministry of Transportation Electrical and Traffic Engineering Manual (1995-2013)  
[http://www.th.gov.bc.ca/publications/eng\\_publications/electrical/electrical\\_and\\_traffic\\_eng/Electrical\\_Signing\\_Design\\_Manual/tableofcontents.htm](http://www.th.gov.bc.ca/publications/eng_publications/electrical/electrical_and_traffic_eng/Electrical_Signing_Design_Manual/tableofcontents.htm)  
Lead Author – BC Ministry Electrical and Signing Material Standards (1995-2003)  
[http://www.th.gov.bc.ca/publications/eng\\_publications/electrical/electrical\\_and\\_traffic\\_eng/2003\\_material\\_standards/2003\\_material\\_standards.htm](http://www.th.gov.bc.ca/publications/eng_publications/electrical/electrical_and_traffic_eng/2003_material_standards/2003_material_standards.htm)  
Co-author - International Signal Association Level II Lighting Certification Program (2008)  
Co-author US Federal Lighting Handbook (2012)  
[https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/roadway\\_dept/night\\_visib/lighting\\_handbook/](https://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/roadway_dept/night_visib/lighting_handbook/)  
Contributor – IESNA RP-8, RP-22, RP-6, RP-33, etc  
City of Edmonton Street and Walkway Lighting Design and Construction Standards (2016)

---

**SELECTED RESEACH / PROJECTS**

---

#### NCHRP 05-22 Guidelines for Solid-State Roadway Lighting

Sponsor: NCHRP

Value: \$400,000

Co-author

The lighting industry has changed dramatically over the past decade. The optics of legacy HID, full-cutoff luminaires were restricted to the lamp and reflector design; these lamps emit light in almost every direction, which must then be reflected to the roadway. Roadway luminaires have moved beyond this design through the vast possibilities presented by solid-state lighting (SSL)—at present, in the form of light emitting diodes (LED)—which also boasts lower energy usage, reduced maintenance, and improved color. AASHTO target light levels are calculated over a grid limited to the traveled roadway. Any light that lands outside of the calculation grid is not quantified in the average and uniformity results but is still present with roadway luminaires and may provide a safety benefit. With the greater ability to control the distribution and the sharp cutoff at the edges with SSL luminaires, light levels beyond the calculation grid may be dramatically reduced, but a design may still meet the AASHTO criteria. The goal of this research is to investigate the application of AASHTO criteria to SSL roadway lighting and provide guidance for light level criteria for areas immediately adjacent to the traveled roadway when using SSL luminaires. This research will also explore the benefits and challenges of adaptive lighting and provide further guidelines for its use, as well as the environmental and health effects of roadway lighting. One significant outcome was new design criteria referred to as surround ratio which showed significant object detection benefit.

#### FHWA Lighting Handbook

Sponsor: FHWA

Value: \$300,000

Co-author

The work under this contract was to provide and major update to the 2012 FHWA Roadway Lighting Handbook. The first handbook was published in 1978 and it was decided that an update was needed to inform practitioners of the fundamentals such as theory, technology, standards, and Federal-Aid guidance pertaining to roadway lighting.

The updated handbook provides:

- A basic understanding of the roadway lighting process from a federal and state perspective.
- Discussion of the limits of scope between this handbook and criteria documents developed by AASHTO and the IES
- Discussion of the safety aspects of roadway lighting citing research on the topic and summarizing results
- Discussion of vision and fundamental concepts including spectrum/wavelength and other properties, structure of the eye including photoreceptors and their properties, and function of the pupil, adaptation, accommodation, and visual acuity
- Various lighting metrics including illuminance, luminance, veiling luminance, uniformity and contrast models.
- Various warranting systems for lighting
-

- Environment considerations for lighting systems including skyglow, light trespass, glare, wildlife impacts, and related health studies.
- Lighting system selection elements
- Lighting applications and examples for various roadway types

#### Transportation Association of Canada Roadway Lighting Design Guide

Transportation Association of Canada

Value: \$200K

#### Lead Author

The Transportation Association of Canada Roadway Lighting Design Guide was originally published in 1983 and was deemed in early 2000 to be outdated and in need of replacement. Through a Canada wide competitive selection process, DMD was selected to prepare the new Roadway Lighting Design Guide. The nearly 500-page design guide covers all aspects of roadway lighting design including vision fundamentals and concepts, obtrusive lighting, planning and design process, system components and common elements, standards and codes, computer applications, maintenance, roadways and interchanges, intersections, roundabouts, crosswalks, tunnels, toll plazas, off roadway facilities (parking lots, pathways, etc.), signs, streetscapes, and work zone/temporary lighting. In preparing the document, design standards and design practices from North America, Australia, New Zealand and Europe were researched. The majority of the Guide is, therefore, based on existing recommended practices of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IESNA) and the Commission Internationale De l'Eclairage (CIE). The document featured a warranting system for various road types which has been applied to the 2012 FHWA Handbook. One of the features was an innovative warranting system for intersections using point score system based on various factors to define full, partial or delineation lighting. The document was groundbreaking as it defined many new and evolving design methods which were applied throughout North America and today the majority of this document was used to form IES RP-8-18.

#### FHWA Lighting Workshop

FHWA

Value: \$155K

#### Co-Author/Presenter

Developed and presented a comprehensive 3-day lighting workshop for FHWA Safety Engineers. The workshop featured extensive educational materials focused on lighting fundamentals, components, visibility concepts, environmental impacts, warranting systems, research, and cost benefit. Current warranting systems were explained and discussed in detail. The workshop featured night-time demonstrations and Virginia Tech Smart Road. The session was very collaborative and informative for both the presenters and attendees.

502 FLOYD ST.  
BLACKSBURG, VA 24060

February 24, 2024

Mr. Robert Bellini  
Manager, Community Lighting  
DTE Energy

RE: Review of the DTE Energy Luminaire Selection Process

Dear Mr. Bellini,

Please find my discussion and opinions on my review of the DTE Luminaire Selection Process below.

## PRELIMINARY OPINION

Based upon my review of the material provided and my own work in the selection of an appropriate solid state replacement luminaire for existing High Pressure Sodium (HPS) luminaires, I find that the methodology chosen is both aligned with the current methods in the industry and that the selected luminaires are appropriate for the application.

## MY BACKGROUND:

The opinions expressed in this document reflect my personal training and experience as an illumination engineer specializing in the area of transportation lighting and visibility. As shown in the attached curriculum vitae, I have a B.A.Sc., an M.A.Sc., and a Ph.D. from the University of Waterloo in System Design Engineering specializing in lighting. My dissertation considered the reflection properties of pavement surfaces and their influence on roadway object visibility. In addition, I have approximately 30 years of professional experience, specifically in the field of illumination engineering as it relates to roadway lighting and visibility. I have been the author or co-author of over 80 papers and scientific publications discussing object visibility, pedestrian visibility, roadway lighting, visibility in adverse weather conditions, and headlamp performance.

Given my experience and my education, I feel that I am well qualified to provide the opinions expressed herein as they pertain to the selection of luminaires for an application. These opinions,

which are based upon a reasonable degree of engineering probability, are provided in the sections that appear below.

## Activity Performed

During the course of this project, I was asked to:

- 1) Review the status in the industry on the current practices used in the selection of solid-state replacement luminaires.
- 2) Evaluation of DTE Energy's LED selection methodology for HPS to LED conversions on existing streetlighting systems
- 3) Independently verify the previous replacement selections made by DTE Energy
- 4) Provide additional analysis on individual intersections to provide a recommendation for luminaires in these applications.

## Provided Materials

The following materials were provided:

- AGI32 simulation files for 7 road type templates traditionally lit with 100 Watt HPS Luminaires previously analyzed by DTE Energy
- AGI Simulation files for 4 potential solid state replacements for the 7 “100” Watt templates”
- AGI32 simulation files for 4 road type templates traditionally lit with 250 Watt HPS Luminaires previously analyzed by DTE Energy
- AGI Simulation files for 4 potential solid-state replacements for the 4 “250” Watt templates”
- IES Format Intensity Distribution files for Leotek potential replacement luminaires and 100Watt and 250 Watt HPS
- Master Table of DTE Energy Selected Templates for Roadway Analysis
- Calculation spreadsheets for the DTE Energy 2021 Luminaire Selection
- Calculation spreadsheets and exhibits (A through I) developed as background information for the 2021 DTE Rate Submission

## Review of Industry Practice

The selection of a solid-state (LED) luminaire to replace an existing technology is a complicated process. LED luminaires are unlike traditional light source luminaires in that the lighting distribution can vary significantly from one luminaire manufacturer to another. As a result, the typical process for the selection of luminaires is based on performance in a given test street area.

The process using the test street method would be to select a given street and develop the required specification defining the roadway characteristics. Potential luminaires are then selected

and either modelled in lighting design software or in a physical test installation. This design simulation process can either be performed by the purchasing agency or through submission made by luminaire manufacturers. The selection of the luminaire from potential options is generally made through an evaluation of design criteria and national standards or in comparison to the incumbent technologies.

This methodology has been used in a variety of applications and documented. Example projects and case studies which use this methodology are documented in Pacific Northwest National Labs documents featuring work from the Detroit lighting system revitalization, the relighting of the streets in Kansas City, and the relighting of Princeton University. In my role at the Virginia Tech Transportation Institution, I have been involved in this process for the District of Columbia and the Virginia Department of Transportation.

The two selection methods, comparison to design standards and comparison to incumbent technology, differ in the application of corrections to the design simulations.

Comparison to the design standards requires the application of light loss factors to calculate the maintained lighting levels. There is the potential for variability in the factors applied as luminaires of different designs and different light delivery methods have different light level maintenance distributions.

The comparison to the incumbent technology method does not use light loss factors but rather compares the potential replacement luminaire to the existing luminaires as if they were new and out of the box. This method reduces the potential variability that can exist in the selection and application of the luminaires. It is noteworthy that this method of comparing to incumbent technology assumes that the existing technology does not over- or under-light the roadway.

## Review of the DTE Methodology

In 2021, the process used by DTE Energy was to compare to the incumbent technology. This is valid. In this instance, as the manufacturer was already selected, it would be expected that the maintenance factor would be similar across the potential replacement luminaires. Thus, the selection of the luminaire is based on the various available luminaire options within the manufacturers catalog. Thus, the comparison for the 2021 submittal was to compare new LED luminaires to new HPS luminaires.

In the review of the DTE methodology, I opened the AGI32 Simulation packages for the 100 Watt HPS replacement comparisons and the 250 Watt HPS comparisons. In all there were 8 comparison templates for 100 Watt selection process and 4 templates for the 250 Watt comparisons. In each of the simulations, I verified the parameters placed in the simulation

including luminaire type, location, and tilt angle. I then calculated the lighting levels within each model. Using this data, I compared the calculated results to the incumbent HPS technology where the roadway illuminance, luminance, glare, sidewalk illuminance and light trespass values were reviewed. In the analysis, the result criteria were established that the luminaire had to increase the luminance and the illuminance on the roadway with the desire to increase the sidewalk illuminance while reducing glare and the light trespass.

A weighting function was developed to assist in the selection of a replacement luminaire where if the illuminance and luminance was not increased, the option was not considered viable. Then the viable replacement luminaires were weighted in terms of the other factors of glare, light trespass, sidewalk illuminance and maximum illuminance. The weights used in the weighting function are shown in Table 1. In the table, the measures represent the calculated values and the criteria for each of the measures is the average, maximum and uniformity (Avg/Min). During the weighting process, the criteria was assigned 2 if it was in the desired direction of change, assigned a 1 if it was within 5% of the incumbent and assigned a 0 if the criteria did not change in the desired direction. The values were then weighted by the values in Table 1 and summed. The north and south criteria on the light trespass and the sidewalk illuminance criteria represent each side of the roadway. The desired direction for the measured is also shown for each calculation.

*Table 1 System Analysis Weighting Functions*

Measure	Criteria	Weighting Function	Desired Direction
Roadway Illuminance	Average	1	Increase
	Maximum	0.25	Decrease
	Avg/Min	0.25	Decrease
Roadway Luminance	Average	1	Increase
	Maximum	0.25	Decrease
	Avg/Min	0.25	Decrease
Veiling Luminance	Average	0.25	Decrease
	Maximum	0.5	Decrease
Visibility Level	Average	0.25	Increase
House Side	North	0.25	Decrease
	South	0.25	Decrease
Sidewalk	North	0.25	Increase
	South	0.25	Increase

The analysis results are shown in Table 2 for the 100 Watt Incumbent technology and Table 3 for the 250 Watt incumbent technology. In these tables, a green square represents a light source that

provides the desired direction of change in the measure and a red square represents an option that fails the criteria. The number represented in the square is the weighted percentage according to the weighting function. The table lists the template for each of the alternative design considered.

*Table 2 100 Watt HPS Replacement Summary*

<b>Template A</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>
58 W	79
37 W	Fail
30W	Fail
27 W	Fail
<b>Template B</b>	
58 W	71
37 W	Fail
30W	Fail
27 W	Fail
<b>Template C</b>	
58 W	84
37 W	Fail
30 W	Fail
27 W	Fail
<b>Template D</b>	
58 W	72
37 W	Fail
30W	Fail
27 W	Fail
<b>Template E</b>	
58 W	78
37 W	Fail
30 W	Fail
27W	Fail
<b>Template F</b>	
58 W	60
37 W	Fail
30 W	Fail
27 W	Fail
<b>Template G</b>	
58 W	65
37 W	62.5
30 W	50
27W	Fail

*Table 3 250 Watt HPS Replacement Summary*

<b>Template A</b>	<b>Pass/Fail</b>
136 W	68
111 W	Fail
89 W	Fail
72 W	Fail
<b>Template B</b>	
136 W	Fail
111 W	63
89 W	Fail
72 W	Fail
<b>Template C</b>	
136 W	74
111 W	Fail
89 W	Fail
72 W	Fail
<b>Template F</b>	
136 W	75
111 W	Fail
89 W	Fail
72 W	Fail

From this analysis, the results indicate that 58 Watt LED solution for the 100 Watt HPS is the only solution that meets the criteria for Template A through F and is the highest ranking luminaire for Template G. Similarly, for the 250 Watt Comparisons the 136 Watt LED replacement solution is suitable for Templates A, B and F. The 111 Watt solution is most appropriate for Template B.

Based on this analysis, I would recommend the Leotek 58W to replace the 100W HPS and the Leotek 136W to replace the 250W HPS.




### **Additional Analysis**

In addition to the review of the current methods, 6 additional intersections were considered for analysis. Based on the AASHTO roadway categorization, three of the intersections were Collector/Collector intersections and three were Local/Local type intersections. In general, the intersection were standalone with one or possibly two luminaires lighting the intersections.

The test locations requested for Analysis are shown in Table 4 and Table 5. Each intersection was modelled in the AGI32 lighting analysis software. In the simulation, for each location,

calculations were located at the intersection box (the area within the crosswalks), illuminance calculation grids were also placed on each of the roadways to the north, east, west and south of the roadway, crosswalk calculations (vertical grids at 5ft high) at each crosswalk and finally sidewalk and light trespass grids at each corner of the intersections. The layout for the calculations is shown in Figure 1. Note that Roadway Luminance is not considered in these evaluations as the criteria for this category of roadway is typically illuminance only and roadway luminance is not appropriate.

*Table 4 Collector/Collector Analysis Locations*

<p>Sheldon Rd &amp; Saltz Rd, Canton, Michigan 48187 UG Street Light Post_30' mount height_6' support arm 1 Luminaire on the corner parallel to cross street aiming North</p> 
<p>Avondale Rd &amp; Wildwood Ave, Westland, Michigan 48186 UG Street Light Post_28.75' mount height_6' support arm\ One Luminaire on both roads perpendicular to the roadway at corner</p> 
<p>13th St &amp; Court St, Port Huron, Michigan 48060 OH Street Light Pole_28' mount height_18' support arm One Beacon Luminaire at 45 degrees to roadway</p> 

*Table 5 Local/Local Analysis Locations*

S Linville Ave St & Hazelwood St, Westland, Michigan 48186  
OH Street Light Post, 28' mount height, 18' support arm  
One Beacon Luminaire at 45 degrees




Griffith Ave & Wiltshire Rd, Berkley, Michigan 48072  
OH Street Light Pole, 28' mount height, 18' support arm  
One Beacon Luminaire at 45 Degrees



Pine St & 8th St, Port Huron, Michigan 48060  
OH Street Light Pole, 28' mount height, 18' support arm  
100W at 45 degrees





*Figure 1 Calculation Area Layout for Sample Intersection*

Using the same approach to the analysis as in the review of the DTE Energy effort, the illuminance grids were evaluated in terms of their performance. For the analysis, the desired change in the illuminance criteria as compared to incumbent is an increase in the average illuminance while the maximum illuminance and the uniformity (Avg/Min) are either reduced or maintained. In each of the illuminance grids was assess In general, it was desired that the average illuminance requirements were increased while the maximum values were maintained or decreased.

The results of the analysis is shown in Table 6. The data is interpreted in the same manner as the previous analysis with the requirement being that the illuminance in the test be equal to or higher than with the current technology.

*Table 6 Intersection Analysis Results*

<b>Collector / Collector</b>	
Sheldon Saltz	
136 W	47.5
111 W	Fail
89 W	Fail
72 W	Fail
Avondale and Wildwood	
136 W	63.5
111 W	47
89 W	Fail
72 W	Fail
13th and Court	
136 W	Fail
111 W	Fail
89 W	Fail
72 W	Fail
<b>Local/Local</b>	
S. Linville and Hazelwood	
58 W	43.5
37 W	Fail
30 W	Fail
27 W	Fail
Griffith and Wiltshire	
58 W	48
37 W	Fail
30 W	Fail
27 W	Fail
8th and Pine	
58 W	55
37 W	Fail
30 W	Fail
27 W	Fail

From this analysis, the results indicate that 58 Watt LED solution for the 100 Watt HPS is the only solution that meets the criteria for Local / Local intersections. Similarly, for the 250 Watt Comparisons the 136 Watt LED replacement solution is suitable for Sheldon and Shantz Intersection and the leading luminaire for the Avondale and Whitlock intersection utilizes 2 luminaires instead of a single luminaire. It is noteworthy that the Avondale and Whitlock

intersection is the only one with 2 luminaires and also note that no luminaire meets all of the criteria for the 13<sup>th</sup> and Court intersection.

Based on the intersection analyses, I would recommend the Leotek 58W to replace the 100W HPS and the Leotek 136W to replace the 250W HPS.

## Summary of Conclusions

A summary of my conclusions from the analysis is:

- The approach DTE Energy used for the selection of luminaires is valid and aligns with the state of the art in the industry
- The luminaires selected by DTE energy were appropriate for the template roadways considered in their analysis.
- The appropriate luminaires for intersection evaluations selected through analysis are Leotek 136W and the Leotek 58W for the 250Watt HPS and for the 100 Watt HPS respectively.

It is important to note that this report is preliminary, and my opinions are subject to change should additional materials be supplied or facts become known. Please contact me at the above address, rgibbons@vtti.vt.edu, 540-231-1581 (W) or 540-818-3370 (C), if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Ronald B. Gibbons, Ph.D., FIES

**RONALD B. GIBBONS, PH.D., FIES**

*Director, Center for Infrastructure Based Safety Systems*

*Virginia Tech Transportation Institute*

---

**EDUCATION**

---

Ph.D., Systems Design Engineering, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 1998

M.A.Sc., Systems Design Engineering, University of Waterloo, 1993

B.A.Sc., Systems Design Engineering, University of Waterloo, 1991

---

**KEY QUALIFICATIONS**

---

Ron Gibbons is the Director of the Center for Infrastructure Based Safety Systems (CIBSS) at the Virginia Tech Transportation Institute (VTTI). He is also the Institute's lead lighting research scientist. He is currently the PI on projects investigating the Spectral Effects of new light sources on roadways, the visibility of police vehicles and on an investigation into the adaptive lighting of roadways. Gibbons is the author of over 80 published papers on roadway lighting, photometry, and target visibility. He is a past Director of Division 4 of the International Commission on Illumination (CIE) and a past president of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America. Dr. Gibbons joined the Philips Lighting Company in 1995 as the manager of the Corporate Calibration and Standards Laboratory where he was responsible for the measurement and calibration of light sources for the entire North American region. He has also worked as a luminaire designer, operations manager, and project engineer. Dr. Gibbons earned his Ph.D. from the University of Waterloo, Canada, in 1997. His field of research involved the reflection properties of pavement surfaces and the impact on target visibility. He also worked on several projects studying visual performance, visual acuity, and peripheral vision.

---

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

---

**Director**, Center for Infrastructure Based Safety Systems, VTTI, Blacksburg, VA (August 2001 – Present)

**Associate Professor**, Virginia Tech, School of Architecture and Design, Blacksburg, VA (August 2018 – present)

**Manager**, Corporate Calibration and Standards Laboratory, Philips Lighting Company, Fairmont, WV (May 1995 – August 2001)

**Research Assistant**, University of Waterloo, School of Optometry (April 1991 - August 1992 and September 1993 - April 1995)

**Lighting Engineering Manager**, Vision Unlimited Equipment, Inc., Guelph, Ontario (February 1992 - September 1993)

---

**SELECTED PUBLICATIONS**

---

- Bhagavathula, Rajaram, Gibbons, Ronald B., Light Levels for Parking Facilities Based on Empirical Evaluation of Visual Performance and User Perceptions, LEUKOS, 1, 22, doi: 10.1080/15502724.2018.1551724
- Bhagavathula, Rajaram. Gibbons, Ronald, Nussbaum, Maury A., Effect of Intersection Lighting Design on Drivers' Perceived Visibility and Glare. TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH RECORD, FEB 2019
- Bhagavathula, Rajaram, Gibbons, Ronald B., Effects of Mounting Height, Offset Distance, and Number of Light Towers on Drivers' Visual Performance and Discomfort Glare in Work Zones SO TRANSPORTATION RESEARCH RECORD DEC 2018
- Bhagavathula, Rajaram, Gibbons, Ronald B. Nussbaum, Maury A., Effects of Intersection Lighting Design on Nighttime Visual Performance of Drivers, LEUKOS, 2018, 14, 1
- Fotios, S. Gibbons, R., Road lighting research for drivers and pedestrians: The basis of luminance and illuminance recommendations, LIGHTING RESEARCH & TECHNOLOGY, JAN 2018, 50, 1
- Palmer, Matthew; Gibbons, Ronald; Bhagavathula, Rajaram; Holshouser, David. Roadway Lighting's Impact on Altering Soybean Growth – Volume 2: LED versus HPS Color Spectral Impact. Civil Engineering Studies, Illinois Center for Transportation Series, Virginia Tech Transportation Institute; Illinois Department of Transportation; Federal Highway Administration, Issue 18-011, 2018, 68p
- Gibbons, Ronald; Flintsch, Alejandra Medina; Williams, Brian; Li, Yingfeng Eric; Machiani, Sahar Ghanipoor; Bhagavathula, Rajaram. Evaluation of Innovative Approaches to Curve Delineation for Two-Lane Rural Roads. Virginia Transportation Research Council; Virginia Department of Transportation; Federal Highway Administration, 2018, 74p
- Bhagavathula, Rajaram; Gibbons, Ronald B. Effects of Mounting Height, Offset Distance, and Number of Light Towers on Drivers' Visual Performance and Discomfort Glare in Work Zones. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, Transportation Research Board, 2018, 8p
- Bhagavathula, Rajaram; Gibbons, Ronald; Medina, Alejandra; Terry, Travis. Examination of the Current Practice of Lighting in Virginia: Nighttime Work Zones and Improving Safety Through the Development of Nighttime Lighting Specifications. Virginia Transportation Research Council; Virginia Department of Transportation; Federal Highway Administration, 2017, 87p
- Palmer, Matthew; Gibbons, Ronald; Bhagavathula, Rajaram; Holshouser, David; Davidson, Daniel. Roadway Lighting's Impact on Altering Soybean Growth. Civil Engineering Studies, Illinois Center for Transportation Series, Virginia Tech Transportation Institute; Illinois Department of Transportation; Federal Highway Administration, Issue 17-014, 2017, 106p
- Palmer, Matthew E; Gibbons, Ronald. Fog Measurement Using a Traffic Camera in a Real-World Environment. Transportation Research Board 97th Annual Meeting, 2018, 17p

- Bhagavathula, Rajaram; Gibbons, Ronald B. Effect of Work Zone Lighting on Drivers' Visual Performance and Perceptions of Glare. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, Issue 2617, 2017, pp 44–51
- Bhagavathula, R, Gibbons, RB, Nussbaum, MA, Effects of Intersection Lighting Design on Nighttime Visual Performance of Drivers, *LEUKOS* Volume 14, Issue 1, pp 25- 43, 2018
- Steve Fotios, Ronald Gibbons, Road lighting research for drivers and pedestrians: The basis of luminance and illuminance recommendations, *Lighting Research & Technology*, vol. 50, 1: pp. 154-186. , First Published January 9, 2018
- Gibbons, R. B., Terry, T., Bhagavathula, R., Meyer, J., & Lewis, A. (2015). Applicability of mesopic factors to the driving task. *Lighting Research and Technology*.
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Li, Yingfeng "Eric"; Meyer, Jason E. Assessment of the Performance of Light-Emitting Diode Roadway Lighting Technology. Virginia Tech Transportation Institute; Virginia Department of Transportation; Federal Highway Administration, 2015, 75p
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Meyer, Jason; Terry, Travis; Bhagavathula, Rajaram; Lewis, Alan; Flanagan, Michael; Connell, Caroline. Evaluation of the Impact of Spectral Power Distribution on Driver Performance. Virginia Tech Transportation Institute; Federal Highway Administration, 2015, 240p
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Palmer, Matthew E; Connell, Caroline; Jahangiri, Arash; Lutkevich, Paul; Weaver, Jonathan; Berg, Jeffrey; Karlsson, Joakim; Slocum, Doug. Airport Parking Garage Lighting Solutions. ACRP Report, Issue 124, 2015, 76p
- Li, Yingfeng; Gibbons, Ronald; Medina, Alejandra. Integrating Adaptive Lighting Database with SHRP 2 Naturalistic Driving Study Data. *Transportation Research Board 94th Annual Meeting*, Transportation Research Board, 2015, 16p
- Terry, Travis N; Gibbons, Ronald B. Road-Surface Contrast and Adaptation of Visibility of Low-Contrast Targets. *Transportation Research Board 94th Annual Meeting*, Transportation Research Board, 2015, 14p
- Gibbons, Ronald; Guo, Feng; Du, Jianhe; Medina, Alejandra; Lutkevich, Paul; Terry, Travis; Li, Qing. Linking Roadway Lighting and Crash Safety. *Transportation Research Board 94th Annual Meeting*, Transportation Research Board, 2015, 15p
- Palmer, Matthew E; Gibbons, Ronald; Jahangiri, Arash. An Experimental On-Demand Roadway-Lighting System. *Transportation Research Board 94th Annual Meeting*, Transportation Research Board, 2015, 13p
- Saraiji, R., Younis, D., Madi, M. T., & Gibbons, R. B. (2015). Pedestrian visibility at night: The effect of solid state streetlights. *Lighting Research and Technology*
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Guo, Feng; Medina, Alejandra; Du, Jianhe; Terry, Travis; Lutkevich, Paul; Li, Qing. Approaches to Adaptive Lighting on Roadways. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, Issue 2485, 2015, pp 26-32
- Medina, Alejandra; Gibbons, Ronald; Du, Jianhe; Guo, Feng; Terry, Travis. Moving Towards MAP-21 and Beyond: Creating a GIS Multistate Database to Support Safety Analyses.

- Transportation Research Board 94th Annual Meeting, Transportation Research Board, 2015, 18p
- Williams, Brian; Gibbons, Ronald; Medina, Alejandra; Connell, Caroline. Visibility of a Color Variable Message Sign in the Fog. Transportation Research Board 94th Annual Meeting, Transportation Research Board, 2015, 14p
- Bhagavathula, Rajaram; Gibbons, Ronald B; Edwards, Christopher J. Relationship Between Roadway Illuminance Level and Nighttime Rural Intersection Safety. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, Issue 2485, 2015, pp 8-15
- Gibbons, Ronald; Guo, Feng; Medina, Alejandra; Terry, Travis; Du, Jianhe; Lutkevich, Paul; Li, Qing. Design Criteria for Adaptive Roadway Lighting. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg; Federal Highway Administration, 2014, Report no. FHWA HRT 14 051, 72p
- Gibbons, Ronald; Guo, Feng; Medina, Alejandra; Terry, Travis; Du, Jianhe; Lutkevich, Paul; Corkum, David; Vetere, Peter. Guidelines for the Implementation of Reduced Lighting on Roadways. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg; Federal Highway Administration, 2014, Report no. FHWA HRT 14 050, 46p
- Terry, Travis; Gibbons, Ronald B. Evaluation of Guardrail Embedded Lighting System in Trinidad, Colorado. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg; Colorado Department of Transportation; Federal Highway Administration, 2014, 59p
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Edwards, Christopher J; Bhagavathula, Rajaram; Owens, D Alfred. Development of Visual Model for Exploring Relationship Between Nighttime Driving Behavior and Roadway Visibility Features. Accident Reconstruction Journal, Volume 23, Issue 6, 2013, pp 11-16
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Meyer, Jason; Rau, Paul S; Price, Markus L. Impact of Correlated Color Temperature of Headlamps on Visibility. 23rd International Technical Conference on the Enhanced Safety of Vehicles (ESV), National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, 2013, 11p
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Williams, Brian; Cottrell, Benjamin. Assessment of Durability of Wet Night Visible Pavement Markings: Visibility Experiment. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, Issue 2337, 2013, pp 67-73
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Meyer, Jason. Exploratory Evaluation of the Impact of Spectral Power Distributions on Driver Performance. Transportation Research Board 92nd Annual Meeting, Transportation Research Board, 2013, 18p
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Flintsch, Alejandra Medina; Williams, Brian; Du, Jianhe; Rakha, Hesham. Evaluation of Impact of Modern Headlamp Technology on Design Criteria for Sag Vertical Curves. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, Issue 2384, 2013, pp 65-73
- Saraiji, R., Younis, D., Madi, M., Gibbons, R. B., & Cie. (2013b). The effect of oncoming car headlights on pedestrian visibility. Proceedings of the Cie Centenary Conference Towards a New Century of Light, 1044-1050.

- Terry, Travis; Gibbons, Ronald B. Comparison of LED Luminaires for Roadway Lighting Using Object Detection and Color Recognition Distances. Transportation Research Board 92nd Annual Meeting, Transportation Research Board, 2013, 19p
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Williams, Brian; Cottrell Jr., Benjamin H. Assessment of the Durability of Wet Night Visible Pavement Markings: Retroreflectivity Experiment. Transportation Research Board 92nd Annual Meeting, Transportation Research Board, 2013, 20p
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Medina, Alejandra; Williams, Brian; Du, Jianhe; Rakha, Hesham. Sag Vertical Curve Design Criteria for Headlight Sight Distance. NCHRP Web Document, Issue 198, 2012, 112p
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Williams, Brian M. Assessment of the Durability of Wet Night Visible Pavement Markings: Wet Visibility Project Phase IV. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg; Virginia Department of Transportation; Virginia Center for Transportation Innovation and Research, 2012, 52p
- Flintsch, Gerardo W; Williams, Brian; Gibbons, Ronald; Viner, Helen. Assessment of Impact of Splash and Spray on Road Users: Results of Controlled Experiment. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, Issue 2306, 2012, pp 151-160
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Edwards, Christopher J; Bhagavathula, Rajaram; Carlson, Paul; Owens, D Alfred. Development of Visual Model for Exploring Relationship Between Nighttime Driving Behavior and Roadway Visibility Features. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, Issue 2298, 2012, pp 96-103
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Williams, Brian; Cottrell, Benjamin. Refinement of Drivers Visibility Needs During Wet Night Conditions. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, Issue 2272, 2012, pp 113-120
- Bhagavathula, Rajaram; Gibbons, Ronald B; Edwards, Christopher J. Effect of Static and Moving Objects on Driver Eye Movements and Detection Distances. Transportation Research Board 91st Annual Meeting, Transportation Research Board, 2012, 15p
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Williams, Brian M. The Refinement of Driver's Visibility Needs During Wet Night Conditions: Wet Visibility Project Phase III. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg; Virginia Center for Transportation Innovation and Research; Virginia Department of Transportation; Federal Highway Administration, 2011, 66p
- Meyer, J., Gibbons R. (2011), "Luminance Metrics for Roadway Lighting", National Surface Transportation Safety Center of Excellence, Blacksburg, VA
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Edwards, Christopher J; Trani, Antonio A. Approach Lighting System Safety. International Airport Review, Volume 14, Issue 1, 2010, pp 34-38
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Edwards, Christopher J; Clanton, Nancy; Mutmansky, Michael. Alternative Lighting Evaluations in Municipality of Anchorage. Transportation Research Board 89th Annual Meeting, Transportation Research Board, 2010

- Gibbons, R., Clanton, N., Edwards, C., and Mutmansky, M. (2009). Alternative Lighting Evaluations: Municipality of Anchorage. Poster Presentation at the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America Annual Conference. Seattle:WA.
- Owens, D Alfred; Hunter, Megan; Zhang, Xiaoyu; Gibbons, Ronald B; Edwards, Christopher J; Viita, Derek. Assessment of Nighttime Visibility of Realistic Targets Using a Video-Based Simulation of Virginia Smart Road. Transportation Research Board 89th Annual Meeting, Transportation Research Board, 2010, 19p
- Gibbons, R.B., Edwards, C.J., and Meyer, J.E. (2009). Municipality of Anchorage: Alternative Lighting Evaluations. Final Report.
- Gibbons, R.B. and Edwards, C.J. (2009). Emerging Broad-Spectrum Lighting Technology Survey for Sixth Avenue in the City of San Diego. Final Report.
- Gibbons, R.B., Edwards, C.J., Viita, D., and Meyer, J.E. (2009). Marine Corps Base Hawaii: Alternative Lighting Evaluation. Final Report. Magnaray International.
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Edwards, Christopher J; Trani, Antonio A. Guidance for Identifying and Mitigating Approach Lighting System Hazards. ACRP Research Results Digest, Issue 6, 2009, 14p
- Pike, Adam M; Carlson, Paul J; Meyer, Jason E; Gibbons, Ronald B. Florida's Wet Weather Demonstration Project. Texas Transportation Institute; Florida Department of Transportation, 2009, 112p
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Edwards, Christopher J; Trani, Antonio A. Guidance for Identifying and Mitigating Approach Lighting System Hazards. ACRP Web-Only Document, Issue 4, 2008, 88p
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Edwards, Christopher J; Williams, Brian; Andersen, Carl K. Informational Report on Lighting Design for Midblock Crosswalks. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg; Federal Highway Administration, 2008, 32p (Report no. FHWA HRT 08 053)
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Lee, Suzanne E; Williams, Brian; Miller, C Cameron. Selection and Application of Warning Lights on Roadway Operations Equipment. NCHRP Report, Issue 624, 2008, 48p
- Edwards, Christopher J; Gibbons, Ronald B. Relationship of Vertical Illuminance to Pedestrian Visibility in Crosswalks. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, Issue 2056, 2008, pp 9-16
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Edwards, Christopher J. A Review of Disability and Discomfort Glare Research and Future Direction. 18th Biennial TRB Visibility Symposium, Transportation Research Board, 2007, 13p
- Edwards, Christopher J; Gibbons, Ronald B. The Relationship of Vertical Illuminance to Pedestrian Visibility in Crosswalk. 18th Biennial TRB Visibility Symposium, Transportation Research Board, 2007, 15p
- Lee, S E; McElheny, M J; Gibbons, R. Driving performance and digital billboards. Virginia Tech Transportation Institute. Center for Automotive Safety Research, 2007, 89p

- Gibbons, Ronald B; Hankey, Jonathan. Wet Night Visibility of Pavement Markings: Dynamic Experiment. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, Issue 2015, 2007, pp 73-80
- Gibbons, R.B. (2006). Pavement Marking Visibility Requirements During Wet Night Conditions Virginia Transportation Research Council, VTRC 07-CR7. (64p)
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Hankey, Jonathan. Influence of Vertical Illuminance on Pedestrian Visibility in Crosswalks. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, Issue 1973, 2006, pp 105-112
- Gibbons, Ronald B; McElheny, Melinda J; Edwards, Christopher J. Impact of Pavement Marking Width on Visibility Distance. Transportation Research Board 85th Annual Meeting, Transportation Research Board, 2006, 19p
- Clark, J., Gibbons, R. B., & Hankey, J. M. (2005). Enhanced Night Visibility Series, Volume XV: Phase III—Study 3: Influence of Beam Characteristics on Discomfort and Disability Glare (Report no. FHWA-HRT-04-146). Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration.
- Hankey, J. M., Blanco, M., Neurauter, M. L., Gibbons, R. B., Porter, R. J., & Dingus, T. A. (2005). Enhanced Night Visibility Series, Volume XII: Overview of Phase II and Development of Phase III Experimental Plan (Report no. FHWA-HRT-04-143). Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration.
- Gibbons, R. B., Edwards, C. J., & Gupta, S. (2005). Enhanced Night Visibility Series, Volume XVI: Phase III—Characterization of Experimental Objects (Report no. FHWA-HRT-04-147). Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration.
- Gibbons, R. B., & Hankey, J. M. (2005). Enhanced Night Visibility Series, Volume IX: Phase II—Characterization of Experimental Objects (Report no. FHWA-HRT-04-140). Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration.
- Williams, V. H., Gibbons, R. B., & Hankey, J. M. (2005). Enhanced Night Visibility Series, Volume XIV: Phase III—Study 2: Comparison of Near Infrared, Far Infrared, and Halogen Headlamps on Object Detection in Nighttime Rain (Report no. FHWA-HRT-04-145). Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration.
- Gibbons, R. B., & Moulton, C. (2005). Enhanced Night Visibility Series, Volume XVII: Phases II and III—Characterization of Experimental Vision Enhancement Systems (Report no. FHWA-HRT-04-148). Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration.
- Hankey, J. M., McLaughlin, S. B., Gibbons, R. B., Williams, V. H., Clark, J., & Dingus, T. A. (2005). Enhanced Night Visibility Series, Volume XVIII: Overview of Phase III (Report no. FHWA-HRT-04-149). Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration.
- Edwards, C. J., Binder, S. C., Dingus, T. A., Gibbons, R. B., & Hankey, J. M. (2005). Enhanced Night Visibility Series, Volume VIII: Phase II—Study 6: Detection of Pavement Markings During Nighttime Driving in Clear Weather (Report no. FHWA-HRT-04-139). Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration.

- Hankey, J. M., Blanco, M., Gibbons, R. B., McLaughlin, S. B., & Dingus, T. A. (2005). Enhanced Night Visibility Series, Volume I: Executive Summary (Report no. FHWA-HRT-04-132). Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration.
- Gibbons, Ronald B; Andersen, Carl; Hankey, Jonathan. Wet Night Visibility of Pavement Markings: A Static Experiment. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, Issue 1911, 2005, pp 113-122
- Gibbons, R B; Hankey, J; Pashaj, I. Wet Night Visibility Of Pavement Markings. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg; Virginia Transportation Research Council; Virginia Department of Transportation; Federal Highway Administration, 2004, 108 p.
- Gibbons, R B; Hankey, J; Pashaj, I. Wet Night Visibility Of Pavement Markings: Executive Summary. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg; Virginia Transportation Research Council; Virginia Department of Transportation; Federal Highway Administration, 2004, 18 p.
- International Commission on Illumination. (2002). The Correlation of Models for Vision and Visual Performance (Technical Report, drafted by W. Adrian and R. Gibbons, University of Waterloo, Canada). Vienna, Austria: author.
- Houser, K. and Gibbons, R. B. (2000). Composite CRI. Journal of the Illuminating Engineering Society, 29(2), 119-134. (Also presented at the 1999 IESNA Annual Conference.)
- Gibbons, R. B., and Adrian, W. K. (1999). Influence of pavement reflection on target visibility. Journal of the Illuminating Engineering Society, 28(2), 102-112. (Also Presented at the 1998 IESNA Annual Conference.)
- Gibbons, R. B., & Lighting, P. (1998). High illuminance calibration facility and procedures - Discussion. Journal of the Illuminating Engineering Society, 27(2), 139-139.
- Gibbons, R. B. (1997a). A sphere photometry system for the nineties - Discussion. Journal of the Illuminating Engineering Society, 26(1), 54-55.
- Gibbons, R. B. (1997b). Analysis of integrating sphere errors for lamps having different angular intensity distributions - Discussion. Journal of the Illuminating Engineering Society, 26(2), 113-113.
- Gibbons, R. B. (1997c). The photometric effect of lamp/ballast configurations in multiple-lamp fluorescent luminaires - Discussion. Journal of the Illuminating Engineering Society, 26(2), 48-48.
- Gibbons, R. B., & Lighting, P. (1998). High illuminance calibration facility and procedures - Discussion. Journal of the Illuminating Engineering Society, 27(2), 139-139.
- Georgalas, A. M. and Gibbons, R. B. (1997). Sphere photometry correction factors. Proceedings of the 1997 IESNA Annual Conference.
- Gibbons R. B. and Adrian, W. K. (1997). Influence of observation angles on road surface reflection characteristics. Journal of the Illuminating Engineering Society, 26(2), 139-149. (Also Presented at the 1996 IESNA Annual Conference.)

- Adrian, W. K. and Gibbons, R. B. (1997). Fields of visibility for the night time driver. Proceedings of PAL 97, Progress in Automotive Lighting, 8-23.
- Adrian, W. K. and Gibbons, R. B. (1994). Visual performance and its metric. Lighting and Engineering, 2(3), 1-34, 1994. (Also published in Russian in Svetotekhnika, 10, 2-17, 1994.)
- Gibbons, R. B. and Adrian, W. K. (1994). Reflection properties of pavement surfaces for observation angles greater than 1° (DTFH 61-93-P-01429). Washington, DC: Federal Highway Administration.
- Gibbons, R. B., Adrian, W. K., and Thomas, L. (1993, October). Amendments in calculating STV: Influence of light reflected from the road surface. Proceedings of the 2nd International Symposium on Visibility and Luminance in Roadway Lighting, Lighting Research Institute.
- Adrian, W. K. and Gibbons, R. B. (1993). Visibility level und die sichtbarkeit in der strassenbeleuchtung. [Visibility level and visibility for street lighting.] Licht, 45(10), 734-739.

---

**PRESENTATIONS AND RECOGNITION**

---

- AASHTO Summer Meeting. LED Lighting and the AMA, July 2017
- 2017 Street and Area Lighting Conference - Lighting Needs for the Future of Transportation, September 13, 2017,
- Lighting and Safety, AARP, Blacksburg, January 2018
- 2018 Better Buildings by Design, Lighting in the Connected Transportation Environment, Burlington Vermont, February 2018
- 2018 Light and Human Health Conference, The Precious Balance of Roadway Lighting, April 12, Atlanta, GA
- CIE Workshop on Roadway Lighting, Taiwan, April 2018
- CIE Workshop on Visibility, Impact of Lighting on Safety, May 24 2018, Berlin, Germany
- CIE Workshop on Visibility, Distribution Analysis of Detection Distances: A New Approach to Analyze Nighttime Roadway Visibility, May 24 2018, Berlin, Germany
- Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, October 2015
- Dirt Depreciation on LED Luminaires – Street and Area Lighting Conference, Savannah, GA  
September 2015
- Adaptive lighting Workshop Moderator – CIE Quadrennial Meeting – Manchester June 2015

Lessons Learned from the Next Generation Luminaire Competition: LightFair 2015

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, April 2015

The safety effects of road lighting – what international research tells us, Auckland, New Zealand,  
March 2015

FHWA Advanced Roadway Lighting, Chicago, Saratoga Springs, Olympia, Phoenix, Atlanta,  
October 2014 – January 2015

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, October 2014

Adaptive Roadway Lighting, Street and Area Lighting Conference, Nashville, 2014

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, April 2014

Quantifying the impact of road lighting on safety: Guidance for implementation, Sydney  
Australia, March 2014

Quantifying the impact of road lighting on safety: Guidance for implementation, Auckland, New  
Zealand, March 2014

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, October 2013

Guidelines for Crosswalk Lighting, Commission Internationale D'Eclairage Symposium, October  
2010

Adaptive Roadway Lighting, IES Maritime Conference, June 2013

Roadway Lighting Design Approaches: Intermediate and Advanced Courses, Lightfair May  
2013

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, April 2013

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, October 2012

21 Days in a Bucket Truck – IES Maritime Conference, June 2012

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, April 2012

Nighttime Lighting Research – Cooper Lighting, Peachtree City, GA, November 2011

A tale of Three Cities, Applying Led in the Real World, Illuminating Engineering Society of  
North America, November 2011

Roadway Lighting Applications Panel, Illuminating Engineering Society of North America,  
November 2011

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, October 2011

Spectral Impacts of Solid State Lighting – IES Street and Area Lighting Conference, New  
Orleans, LA, September 2011

A tale of Three Cities, Applying Led in the Real World, Commission Internationale d’Eclairage,  
26th Quadrennial Session, Sun City, South Africa, June 2011

Applications of LED Lighting – Canadian Regional IES Conference, Moncton, New Brunswick,  
June 2011

LED Applications – LightFair International, Philadelphia, PA, May 2011

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, April 2011

LED Applications – Municipal Solid State Lighting Consortium, Kansas City, KS, March 2011

Spectral Impacts of Solid State Lighting – CIE United States National Committee Symposium,  
Toronto, Ontario, March 2011

Spectral Impacts of Solid State Lighting – CIE United States National Committee Symposium,  
Philadelphia, PA, May 2011

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, November 2010

Spectral Impacts of Solid State Lighting – CIE United States National Committee Symposium,  
Toronto, ON, November 2010

Spectral Impacts of Solid State Lighting – IES Street and Area Lighting Conference, Huntington  
Beach, CA, September 2010

LED Applications – Department of Energy Symposium, Philadelphia, PA, August 2010

Alternative Lighting Systems in Roadway, Commission Internationale D’Eclairage Symposium,  
March 2010, Vienna, Austria

Lighting on the Minneapolis I-35 West Bridge, Commission Internationale D’Eclairage  
Symposium, March 2010, Vienna, Austria

Alternative Light Sources in Roadway lighting, IES Maritime Regional Conference, Badek,  
Nova Scotia, June 2010

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, April 2010

Alternative Light Sources in Roadway lighting, IES Washington DC Section, January 2010

Alternative Light Sources in Roadway lighting, IES Grand Rapids Section, January 2010

Impact of Glare on Driver Performance, Illuminating Engineering Society of North America (IES), Annual Conference, Seattle, November 2009

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, November 2009

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, April 2009

Daily Planet - Discovery Channel Canada, February 2009

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, November 2008

Keynote Speaker – East Regional IES Conference, May 1, 2008

Crosswalk Lighting – East Regional IES Conference, May 1, 2008

Crosswalk Lighting – Canadian Regional IES Conference, Hamilton, Bermuda, April 2008

Warning Lights on Maintenance Vehicles, South Eastern Equipment Managers Conference, Asheville, NC, June, 2007

Impact of Weather on Infrared Vision Systems - Intelligent Lighting Systems for the Automotive Industry, Detroit MI, May 2007

Nighttime Lighting Research – Holophane Lighting, Newark, OH, April 2007

International Dark Sky Association Meeting – “Roadway lighting and Driver Safety”, Washington, DC, February 2007

Nighttime Lighting Research – Illuminating Engineering Society of Blue Ridge Section, Roanoke, VA January 2007

“Human Factors Workshop 145 – Driving at Dusk”, - Transportation Research Board Annual Meeting January 2007

Nighttime Lighting Research – Illuminating Engineering Society of North America Golden Gate Section, San Francisco, CA, November 2006

Dateline NBC – Getting out alive, Driving in Fog, original air date December 10, 2004

---

**SELECTED RESEARCH**

---

*CHS: SMALL: Methods to Assess Automotive Augmented Reality Head-up Display Effects on Driver Performance* (Co-PI) Sponsored By the National Science Foundation (2018-08-10 - 2021-07-31) Total: \$499,996

*Considering the Health Effects of Outdoor Lighting* (PI) Sponsored By the US Department of Energy (2017-09-01 - 2019-10-31) Total: \$1,214,625

*Solid-State Roadway Lighting* (PI) Sponsored By the WSP USA Inc (2017-06-01 - 2019-03-31) Total: \$160,013

*Sensor Activated Pavement Markings* (PI) Sponsored By the Virginia Transportation Research Council (2016-09-28 - 2017-05-31) Total: \$69,883

*CMS Message Phrasing* (PI) Sponsored By the Virginia Transportation Research Council (2016-09-01 - 2016-11-30) Total: \$24,849

*Weather Camera Positional Sensitivity Study* (Co-PI) Sponsored By the Virginia Transportation Research Council (2016-09-01 - 2017-03-31) Total: \$7,575

*Evaluation of Lighting for Hawai' DOT* (PI) Sponsored By the Johnson Controls, Inc. (2016-01-01 - 2016-06-30) Total: \$34,079

*NGL 2015 Outdoor Judging Event* (PI) Sponsored By the Battelle Memorial Institute (2015-03-02 - 2015-04-30) Total: \$2,500

*Evaluation of Lighting in the Fort Pitt Tunnels* (PI) Sponsored By the Sargent Electric Company (2014-12-20 - 2016-07-31) Total: \$12,695

*Evaluating the Efficacy of Lighting, Markings, and Paint Schemes in Reducing in the Incidence of Law Enforcement Vehicle Crashes* (PI) Sponsored By the US Department of Justice (2013-10-01 - 2019-12-31) Total: \$1,159,508

*NGL Outdoor Judging Event* (PI) Sponsored By the Battelle Memorial Institute (2013-08-15 - 2014-02-28) Total: \$60,000

*Mobile System Development* (PI) Sponsored By the Minnesota Department Of Transportation (2013-06-12 - 2014-01-15) Total: \$65,000

*Develop Alternative Intersections Informational Guides* (Co-PI) Sponsored By the Federal Highway Administration (2013-06-07 - 2014-04-30) Total: \$495,066

*Trinidad Nights* (PI) Sponsored By the Colorado Department Of Transportation (2013-02-01 - 2013-09-01) Total: \$60,000

*Project Management* (PI) Sponsored By the Federal Highway Administration (2013-02-01 - 2014-01-31) Total: \$23,041

*NGL Judging* (PI) Sponsored By the Battelle Memorial Institute (2012-10-09 - 2013-01-31) Total: 50000

*Visibility Support* (PI) Sponsored By the Federal Highway Administration (2012-09-30 - 2015-08-31) Total: \$245,792

*Airport Garage Lighting* (PI) Sponsored By the National Academy of Sciences (2012-06-04 - 2014-10-31) Total: \$300,000

*Accelerating Roundabout Implementation* (PI) Sponsored By the Federal Highway Administration (2011-08-18 - 2015-09-30) Total: \$1,179,302

*Adaptive Lighting* (PI) Sponsored By the Federal Highway Administration (2011-08-08 - 2014-03-31) Total: \$886,542

*VCTIR Vehicle Detection* (Co-PI) Sponsored By the Virginia Transportation Research Council (2011-04-16 - 2011-08-31) Total: \$36,655

*Shiny Sign* (PI) Sponsored By the Texas A&M Research Foundation (2011-04-01 - 2015-04-30) Total: \$223,838

*Roadway lighting Safety* (09/01/2008 - Present), (PI) sponsored by the Surface Transportation Safety Center of Excellence

*Rural Intersection Lighting* (03/01/2009 - Present), (PI) sponsored by the Surface Transportation Safety Center of Excellence

*Spectral Effects* (PI) Sponsored By the Federal Highway Administration (2010-09-24 - 2015-01-31) Total: \$1,612,871

*Strategic Initiative For Evaluation Of Reduced Lighting On Roadways* sponsored by FHWA (September 2011-January 2015)

*FHWA Safety IDIQ* (PI) Sponsored By the Federal Highway Administration (2010-07-21 - 2013-01-31) Total: \$133,333

*NCHRP Project 15-41, "Implications of Headlamps Visibility on Design of SAG vertical curves"*  
(PI) Sponsored by the National Cooperative Highway Research Program. (07/01/10-12/31/2011)

*Disability and Discomfort Glare Modeling*, (PI) Sponsored by the National Surface Transportation Safety Center of Excellence

*Development of a Luminance Camera for In-Vehicle Lighting Assessment*, (PI) Sponsored by the National Surface Transportation Safety Center of Excellence

*Development of a Luminance Metrics for Roadway Lighting*, (PI) Sponsored by the National Surface Transportation Safety Center of Excellence

*Development of a Roadway Lighting Mobile Measurement System*, (PI) Sponsored by the National Surface Transportation Safety Center of Excellence

*Application of Alternative Light Sources to Roadway Lighting in Anchorage AK* Sponsored by the City of Anchorage (11/2008 – 6/2009)

*Application of Alternative Light Sources to Roadway Lighting in San Diego, CA* Sponsored by the City of San Diego (3/2009 – 11/2009)

*Application of Alternative Light Sources to Roadway Lighting in San Jose, CA* (PI) Sponsored By the Clanton & Associates Inc (2010-01-01 - 2010-05-31) Total: \$34,000

*Bright Billboard* (PI) Sponsored By the Science Applications International Corporation (2009-10-15 - 2011-03-30) Total: \$19,212

*Wet Vis IV* (PI) Sponsored By the Virginia Transportation Research Council (2009-03-01 - 2011-12-31) Total: \$,301719

*Wet Vis III* (PI) Sponsored By the Virginia Transportation Research Council (2009-03-01 - 2011-04-30) Total: \$210,000

*Aloha Nights* (PI) Sponsored By the Magnaray International (2008-11-01 - 2009-09-01) Total: \$25,000

*Visibility Model* (PI) Sponsored By the Federal Highway Administration (2008-10-01 - 2011-03-31) Total: \$700,000

*Splash & Spray* (Co-PI) Sponsored By the Federal Highway Administration (2008-10-01 - 2013-09-30) Total: \$794,749

*Guidebook for approach light system hazard assessment and mitigation* (PI) Sponsored By The National Academies (2007-10-03 - 2009-04-30) Total: \$300,000

*Support to Florida dot wet pavement marking visibility research* (PI) Sponsored By the Texas Transportation Institute (2007-08-16 - 2008-11-30) Total: \$65,000

*Street lighting design* (PI) Sponsored By the Fairfax County (2007-02-22 - 2007-06-30) Total: \$25,000

*Glare* (PI) Sponsored By the University of Michigan - Ann Arbor (2006-08-02 - 2010-06-30) Total: \$263,230

*Rulemaking support-rewrite of FMVSS 108* (PI) Sponsored By the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (2006-01-04 - 2008-01-03) Total: \$259,950

*NTP* (Co-PI) Sponsored By the GM NAO Technical Center (2005-11-10 - 2006-11-15) Total: \$190,549

*Foare cleveland study* (Co-PI) Sponsored By the Rubin, Winston, Diercks, Harris & Cooke LLP (2005-10-01 - 2006-11-15) Total: \$113,620

*Lighting testing* (PI) Sponsored By the University of Iowa (2004-09-01 - 2004-09-30) Total: \$4,125

*Rulemaking support-rewrite of fmvss 108-task order 22* (PI) Sponsored By the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (2004-08-16 - 2005-09-30) Total: \$89,819

*Guidelines for selection and application of warning lights on roadway-operations equipment* (PI) Sponsored By The National Academies (2004-07-29 - 2007-12-31) Total: \$300,000

*Visibility needs of motorists during wet night conditions-phase iii* (PI) Sponsored By the Virginia Transportation Research Council (2004-07-01 - 2006-08-31) Total: \$505,088

*All weather lights* (PI) Sponsored By the FIAMM SpA (2004-06-25 - 2004-07-24) Total: \$7,508

*Develop design guidelines for "crosswalk lighting"* (PI) Sponsored By the University of Michigan - Ann Arbor (2002-07-03 - 2006-07-31) Total: \$295,096

*Symposium* (PI) Sponsored By the Federal Highway Administration (2002-02-25 - 2002-05-31) Total: \$8,058

*Wet Visibility* (Co-PI) Sponsored By the Virginia Transportation Research Council (2001-11-01 -  
2004-08-31) Total: \$300,000

*Adaptive Lighting* (project researcher), sponsored by a major automobile company, 01/25/02 –  
01/24/03 and (PI) (09/01/03 – 09/01/04)

*Enhanced Night Visibility* (project researcher), sponsored by the Federal Highway  
Administration, (03/01/98 – 02/28/06)

---

**SERVICE TO INDUSTRY**

---

Illuminating Engineering Society, Board of Directors (2001 – 2010), President (2008-2009),  
Member Roadway Lighting Standard Practice Committee,  
Chair Roadway Sign Lighting Committee

Commission Internationale de l'Eclairage,  
Associate Director Division 4  
Chairperson TC 4-33 – Roadway Safety and Glare

Transportation research Board  
Visibility Committee  
Sign and Marking Materials Committee

Michigan Public Service Commission  
DTE Electric Company  
Projected 2025 PURPA Capacity-Related Generation Cost

Case No.: U-21534  
Exhibit: A-26  
Schedule: P1  
Witness: S. D. Burgdorf  
Page: 1 of 1

Line No.	(a) Description	(b) Gen Forecast (MWh)	(c) Contract Fixed Price Component (\$/MWh)	(d) Contract O&M Price Component (\$/MWh)	(e) Total Capacity Related Generation Cost (\$1,000)	(f) Total Fuel-Related Generation Cost <sup>1</sup> (\$1,000)
1	<b>PURPA/PA2 Contracts</b>					
2	Ann Arbor - Barton Dam	3,408	\$ 35.00	\$ -	\$ 119	
3	Ann Arbor - Superior	1,879	\$ 35.00	\$ -	\$ 66	
4	STS French Landing	7,161	\$ 35.00	\$ -	\$ 251	
5	Charter Township of Ypsilanti - Ford Lake (JYRO)	11,000	\$ 29.80	\$ 4.06	\$ 372	
6	BFI - Arbor Hills				\$ 1,597	
7	Ann Arbor Landfill, Michigan Cogen. Sys.	3,559	\$ 15.20	\$ 6.96	\$ 79	
8	Riverview Energy #1				\$ 491	
9	Sumpter Energy Assoc. - City Sand and Carleton Farms	73,016	\$ 33.90	\$ 6.96	\$ 2,983	
10	Sumpter Energy Assoc. - Pine Tree Acres Landfill	69,258	\$ 35.40	\$ 6.96	\$ 2,934	
11						
12	<b>Total PURPA/PA2</b>	<u>169,282</u>			<u>\$ 8,892.095</u>	<u>\$ 2,925</u>

Note 1: Fuel-Related Generation Cost based on difference of total projected PURPA PSCR Cost and the Capacity Related Generation Cost.  
Note 2: BFI - Arbor Hills annual capacity cost in column (e) based on a fixed contract capacity and capacity rate, rather than actual generation.

Michigan Public Service Commission  
DTE Electric Company  
Projected 2025 PA295/PA342 Capacity-Related Generation Cost

Case No.: U-21534  
Exhibit: A-26  
Schedule: P2  
Witness: S. D. Burgdorf  
Page: 1 of 1

(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	
Line No.	Description	Source of Transfer Price	Gen Forecast (MWh)	LCOE/ Contract Price (\$/MWh)	Transfer Price (\$/MWh)	Transfer Price Fixed Price Component (\$/MWh)	Transfer Price Variable Price Component (\$/MWh)	Price Recovered in PSCR (\$/MWh)	Total Capacity-Related Generation Cost (\$1,000)	Total Fuel-Related Generation Cost <sup>1</sup> (\$1,000)
1	<b>Renewable - Company Owned</b>									
2	Gratiot 2	U-15806	247,084	\$ 93.93	\$ 118.28	\$ 10.60	\$ 107.68	\$ 118.28	\$ 2,619	\$ 26,606
3	Minden	U-15806	112,210	\$ 66.50	\$ 118.28	\$ 10.60	\$ 107.68	\$ 118.28	\$ 1,189	\$ 12,083
4	Sigel	U-15806	251,887	\$ 66.50	\$ 118.28	\$ 10.60	\$ 107.68	\$ 118.28	\$ 2,670	\$ 27,123
5	McKinley	U-15806	51,410	\$ 66.50	\$ 118.28	\$ 10.60	\$ 107.68	\$ 118.28	\$ 545	\$ 5,536
6	Echo	U-16656	390,309	\$ 58.50	\$ 82.31	\$ 31.35	\$ 50.96	\$ 82.31	\$ 12,237	\$ 19,891
7	Brookfield	U-16656	251,734	\$ 51.75	\$ 82.31	\$ 31.35	\$ 50.96	\$ 82.31	\$ 7,893	\$ 12,829
8	Pinnebog	U-17632	174,179	\$ 54.75	\$ 82.80	\$ 35.80	\$ 47.00	\$ 82.80	\$ 6,235	\$ 8,187
9	Pine River	U-17804	408,495	\$ 52.00	\$ 86.71	\$ 39.01	\$ 47.70	\$ 86.71	\$ 15,934	\$ 19,486
10	Polaris	U-18082	502,158	\$ 46.00	\$ 93.48	\$ 40.07	\$ 53.41	\$ 93.48	\$ 20,124	\$ 26,819
11	Meridian	U-20484	564,125	\$ 49.13	\$ 73.52	\$ 34.73	\$ 38.78	\$ 73.52	\$ 19,594	\$ 21,879
12	DTE Solar Currents	U-15806	14,580	N/A	\$ 309.88	\$ 202.20	\$ 107.68	\$ 309.88	\$ 2,948	\$ 1,570
13	Romulus/Brownstown Solar	U-16656	1,340	N/A	\$ 82.31	\$ 31.35	\$ 50.96	\$ 82.31	\$ 42	\$ 68
14	Demille/Turrill/O'Shea Solar	U-17632	66,155	N/A	\$ 82.80	\$ 35.80	\$ 47.00	\$ 82.80	\$ 2,368	\$ 3,110
15	Ford	U-20484	979	N/A	\$ 73.52	\$ 34.73	\$ 38.78	\$ 73.52	\$ 34	\$ 38
16	Selfridge	U-21353	19,786	N/A	\$ 62.50	\$ 35.07	\$ 27.43	\$ 62.50	\$ 694	\$ 543
17										
18	<b>Total Renewable - Co-Owned</b>		<u>3,056,431</u>						<b>\$ 95,126</b>	<b>\$ 185,767</b>
19										
20	<b>Renewable - PPA Wind &amp; Solar</b>									
21	DTE Renewable Generation, LLC - Stoney Corners / Garden	U-15806	76,089	\$ 116.00	\$ 118.28	\$ 10.60	\$ 107.68	\$ 116.00	\$ 806	\$ 8,020
22	Invenergy - Gratiot 1	U-15806	271,880	\$ 91.43	\$ 118.28	\$ 10.60	\$ 107.68	\$ 91.43	\$ 2,882	\$ 21,976
23	NextEra - Tuscola Bay	U-15806	364,755	\$ 60.90	\$ 118.28	\$ 10.60	\$ 107.68	\$ 60.90	\$ 3,866	\$ 18,347
24	NextEra - Tuscola Wind II	U-16656	299,365	\$ 49.25	\$ 82.31	\$ 31.35	\$ 50.96	\$ 49.25	\$ 9,386	\$ 5,358
25	NextEra - Pheasant Run	U-16656	254,536	\$ 49.25	\$ 82.31	\$ 31.35	\$ 50.96	\$ 49.25	\$ 7,980	\$ 4,556
26	Heritage - Big Turtle	U-16656	66,970	\$ 53.00	\$ 82.31	\$ 31.35	\$ 50.96	\$ 53.00	\$ 2,100	\$ 1,450
27	River Fork - Ranger Power	U-20484	100,282	\$ 42.90	\$ 73.52	\$ 34.73	\$ 38.78	\$ 42.90	\$ 3,483	\$ 819
28										
29	<b>Total PPA Wind &amp; Solar</b>		<u>1,433,876</u>						<b>\$ 30,503</b>	<b>\$ 60,525</b>
30										
31										
32	<b>Renewable - PPA LFG/Biomass</b>									
33	L'Anse Warden	U-15806	115,385	\$ 102.00	\$ 136.89	\$ 29.21	\$ 107.68	\$ 102.00	\$ 3,370	\$ 8,399
34	Blue Water Renewables	U-15806	25,943	\$ 99.00	\$ 136.89	\$ 29.21	\$ 107.68	\$ 99.00	\$ 758	\$ 1,811
35	Waste Management	U-15806	24,378	\$ 85.00	\$ 136.89	\$ 29.21	\$ 107.68	\$ 85.00	\$ 712	\$ 1,360
36										
37	<b>Total PPA LFG/Biomass</b>		<u>165,706</u>						<b>\$ 4,840</b>	<b>\$ 11,570</b>
38										
39	<b>Total PA295/PA342 Capacity-Related Generation Cost</b>								<b>\$ 130,469,507</b>	
40	<b>Total PA295/PA342 Fuel-Related Generation Cost</b>									<b>\$ 257,862</b>

Note: 1. Fuel-Related Generation Cost based on difference of total projected PA295 PSCR Cost and the Capacity Related Generation Cost.

Michigan Public Service Commission  
DTE Electric Company  
**Projected 2025 Capacity-Related Generation Cost & Energy Sales Revenue Net of Fuel Cost**  
(in \$000's)

Case No.: U-21534  
Exhibit: A-26  
Schedule: P3  
Witness: S. D. Burgdorf  
Page: 1 of 1

Line No.	(a) Description	(b)
1	<b>Capacity-Related Generation Cost</b>	
2	PURPA/PA2 Contracts	\$ 8,892
3	PA295/342 Renewable - Company Owned	\$ 95,126
4	PA295/342 Renewable - PPA Wind	\$ 30,503
5	PA295/342 Renewable - PPA LFG/Biomass	\$ 4,840
6	Capacity Purchases	\$ (1,308)
7	<b>Total 2025 Projected Capacity-Related Generation Costs in PSCR</b>	<b>\$ 138,054</b>
8		
9		
10	<b>Energy Sales Revenue</b>	
11	Projected 2025 Energy Market Sales	\$ 2,180,036
12	Projected 2025 Off-System Energy Sales	\$ -
13	Projected 2025 Unit Specific Bilateral Energy Sales	\$ -
14	Projected 2025 Regulation, Spinning, and Supplemental Ancillary Services Sales	\$ 4,343
15	Projected 2025 Schedule 2 Reactive Ancillary Services Revenue	\$ -
16	Total Projected 2025 Energy Sales Revenue	\$ 2,184,379
17		
18		
19	<b>Fuel Cost</b>	
20	Fuel	\$ 1,201,032
21	Total Projected 2025 Fuel Generation Expense	\$ 1,201,032
22		
23	<b>Projected 2025 Energy Sales Revenue Net of Fuel Costs</b>	<b>\$ 983,347.023</b>

LINE NO.	(a) ORGANIZATION	(b) DESCRIPTION	(c) BENEFITS	(d) BUSINESS UNIT(S)	(e) MEMBERSHIP COSTS
<b><i>NONDISCRETIONARY</i></b>					
1	Institute of Nuclear Power Operators (INPO)	INPO's mission is to promote the highest levels of safety and reliability in the operation of nuclear electric generating plants. All U.S. organizations that operate commercial nuclear power plants are INPO members. For U.S. Commercial Nuclear Assets, which includes Fermi 2, being a member of INPO is not a discretionary option. INPO is nondiscretionary for Nuclear operations.	Nondiscretionary for Nuclear Operations	Nuclear	\$1,513,128
2	US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)	The United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is the independent federal agency responsible for ensuring the safe use of radioactive materials for beneficial civilian purposes while protecting people and the environment. The NRC regulates commercial nuclear plants, including the Fermi 2 Power Plant, through licensing, inspection, and enforcement of its requirements. NRC licensing and assessment fees are regulated at 10 CFR 170 and 10 CFR 171 and payment of these fees is not a discretionary option.	Nondiscretionary for Nuclear Operations	Nuclear	\$7,958,545

LINE NO.	(a) ORGANIZATION	(b) DESCRIPTION	(c) BENEFITS	(d) BUSINESS UNIT(S)	(e) MEMBERSHIP COSTS
<b><i>NONDISCRETIONARY continued</i></b>					
3	North American Electric Reliability (NERC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposes, supports the development of, monitors compliance with, and enforces mandatory Reliability Standards for the North American Bulk Electric System (BES), subject to regulatory oversight and approvals from FERC in the U.S. and applicable authorities in Canada.</li> <li>• Conducts near-term and long-term reliability assessments of the North American Bulk Power System (BPS).</li> <li>• Certifies BPS operators as having and maintaining the necessary knowledge and skills to perform their reliability responsibilities.</li> <li>• Maintains situational awareness of events and conditions that may threaten BPS reliability.</li> <li>• Coordinates efforts to improve physical and cyber security for the BPS of North America.</li> <li>• Conducts detailed analyses and investigations of system disturbances and unusual events as well as measuring ongoing system trends to determine root causes, uncovering lessons learned, and issuing relevant findings as advisories, recommendations, guidelines, and essential actions to the industry to mitigate and control risks to reliability.</li> <li>• Identifies and prioritizes risks to reliability and uses a broad toolkit to mitigate and control risks to reliability, including the potential need for new or modified Reliability Standards, improved compliance monitoring and enforcement methods, or other initiatives.</li> </ul>	Nondiscretionary for Generator and Distribution Owners	Distribution Operations	\$2,978,713

LINE NO.	ORGANIZATION	DESCRIPTION	BENEFITS	CUSTOMER BENEFITS	BUSINESS UNIT(S)	MEMBERSHIP COSTS
<b><i>DISCRETIONARY</i></b>						
1	American Society of Employers (ASE)	The American Society of Employers (ASE) is a not-for-profit employer association serving Michigan's business community. Member organizations rely on ASE as a source for information and support on all matters affecting the employment relationship. ASE provides compensation and benefits data.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmarking</li> <li>• Research</li> </ul>	DTE's membership with ASE is a cost-effective way to gain information and support regarding benefit and compensation practices.	Human Resources	\$19,011
2	Center for Energy Workforce (CEWD)	The Center for Energy Workforce or (CEWD) is a non-profit consortium of more than 120 energy companies, associations, unions, educational institutions, and government entities working in partnership to ensure a skilled, diverse workforce pipeline for the energy industry.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmarking</li> <li>• Research</li> <li>• Best practices</li> <li>• Networking</li> </ul>	See link for more information:  <a href="https://cewd.org/membership/membership-benefits/">https://cewd.org/membership/membership-benefits/</a>	Human Resources	\$14,840
3	Conference Board Inc.	The Conference Board is a non-advocacy, not-for-profit entity holding 501 (c)(3) tax-exempt status in the United States. The Conference Board conducts economic and business research and convenes business leaders in various forums. Membership with The Conference Board gives us research and insights on key topics and upcoming challenges in the areas of employee compensation, economics, and finance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Networking</li> <li>• Research</li> </ul>	See link for more information:  <a href="https://www.conference-board.org/membership##">https://www.conference-board.org/membership##</a>	Corporate	\$37,464
4	Edison Electric Institute (EEI)	EEI provides strategic business intelligence, and essential conferences and forums. The EEI facilitates collaboration regarding emerging issues facing the industry. The EEI also provides a forum to ask industry related questions to other utilities and provides invaluable resource information about the utility industry and other issues that are important to DTE Electric.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmarking</li> <li>• Best Practices</li> <li>• Networking</li> <li>• Research</li> </ul>	Please refer to the testimony of Witness Crozier.	Various	\$1,435,103
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)

LINE NO.	ORGANIZATION	DESCRIPTION	BENEFITS	CUSTOMER BENEFITS	BUSINESS UNIT(S)	MEMBERSHIP COSTS	
		<b><i>DISCRETIONARY continued</i></b>					
5	Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI)	The Electric Power Research Institute, Inc. conducts research, development and demonstration relating to the generation, delivery and use of electricity for the benefit of the public. An independent, nonprofit organization, they bring together scientists and engineers as well as experts from academia and the industry to help address challenges in electricity. Their work spans nearly every area of electricity generation, delivery and use, management, and environmental responsibility. They provide both short- and long-term solutions in these research areas for the electricity industry, its customers and society.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmarking</li> <li>• Best practices</li> <li>• Networking</li> <li>• Research</li> </ul>	<p>Please refer to the testimony of Witness Davis.</p> <p>Please refer to the testimony of Witness Guillaumin.</p>	<p>Nuclear</p> <p>Energy Supply</p>	\$1,976,555	
6	Gartner	Works with companies to share, analyze, and apply proven practices. Every year they equip over 20,000 senior leaders from more than 10,000 organizations across 110 countries with the intelligence they need to respond quickly to evolving business conditions. Gartner helps businesses effectively manage their talent, customers, and operations to exceed business objectives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmarking</li> <li>• Best practices</li> <li>• Networking</li> </ul>	Gartner provides research at a lower cost than DTE could do on its own. Gartner also provides industry wide expertise that DTE may not otherwise have access to.	Internal Audit	\$43,939	

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

(e)

(f)

LINE NO.	ORGANIZATION	DESCRIPTION	BENEFITS	CUSTOMER BENEFITS	BUSINESS UNIT(S)	MEMBERSHIP COSTS	
		<b><i>DISCRETIONARY continued</i></b>					
7	HR Policy Association	The association represents the largest employers doing business in the United States and globally. The Association brings these executives together not simply to discuss how human resource practices and policies should be improved, but also to create a vision for successful HR strategies and pursue initiatives that promote job growth, employment security and competitiveness.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmarking</li> <li>• Best practices</li> </ul>	DTE uses the information to help improve HR operations and policies, manage costs, and sustain a skilled workforce.	Human Resources	\$10,194	
8	Human Capital Institute (HCI)	HCI's extensive library spans the full spectrum of talent management from candidate experience to acquisition, engagement, and more to foster growing HR skills, build business acumen, and acting more strategically.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best Practices</li> <li>• Research</li> </ul>	HCI provides DTE with access to strategic talent management content including research reports and articles, webcasts, etc.	Human Resources	\$19,680	
9	Institute for Corporate Productivity	Purpose is to discover and advance next practices in human capital. Produces research on human capital and HR best practices and emerging workforce trends.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Practices</li> <li>• Research</li> </ul>	The Institute for Corporate Productivity is a human capital focus research organization that provides the Company insights on topics related to organizational culture change, employee collaboration, the attraction and retention of talent and diversity, equity and inclusion issues. The importance of these topics was amplified during the COVID-19 pandemic and its after affects.	Human Resources	\$57,856	

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

(e)

(f)

LINE NO.	ORGANIZATION	DESCRIPTION	BENEFITS	CUSTOMER BENEFITS	BUSINESS UNIT(S)	MEMBERSHIP COSTS	
		<b><i>DISCRETIONARY continued</i></b>					
10	National Safety Council (NSC)	The NSC is a nonprofit organization whose mission is to save lives by preventing injuries and deaths at work, in homes and communities and on the road through leadership, research, education and advocacy. This membership provides access to online learning, practical tips, training tools, publications, libraries, original research, networking, and educational events to further support workforce safety, especially the high-risk jobs DTE Electric employees perform.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Best Practices</li> <li>• Benchmarking</li> <li>• Research</li> </ul>	See link for more information:  <a href="https://www.nsc.org/company">https://www.nsc.org/company</a>	Corporate Safety	\$43,709	
11	Neuroleadership Institute (NLI)	NLI provides research-based consultancy that uses science to make a company's culture more societal and transforms the way their organizations think, grow and perform.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research</li> </ul>	NLI provides research-based consultancy that uses science to make a company's culture more societal and transforms the way their organizations think, grow and perform.	Human Resources	\$7,478	
12	Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI)	Membership with NEI includes access to NEI's Personnel Access Data System (PADS) which allows NEI members to share security background check information with each other resulting in significant security efficiencies. NEI also provides members, including DTE Electric, with support required to demonstrate compliance with NRC security regulations. NEI is also responsible for industry initiatives to improve safety and operational efficiencies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benchmarking</li> <li>• Best Practices</li> </ul>	Please refer to the testimony of Witness Davis.	Nuclear	\$759,515	

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

(e)

(f)

LINE NO.	ORGANIZATION	DESCRIPTION	BENEFITS	CUSTOMER BENEFITS	BUSINESS UNIT(S)	MEMBERSHIP COSTS	
		<b><i>DISCRETIONARY continued</i></b>					
13	Nuclear Procurement Issues Corporation (NUPIC)	Nuclear Procurement Issues Corporation (NUPIC) NUPIC was formed in 1989 by a partnership involving all domestic and several international nuclear utilities. The NUPIC program evaluates suppliers furnishing safety-related components and services and commercial-grade items to nuclear utilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research</li> </ul>	<p>Suppliers furnishing safety-related components and services and certain commercial-grade items must be evaluated by qualified nuclear evaluators. NUPIC participation allows DTE Electric to accept the valuations of other members to maintain the Fermi 2 Approved Suppliers List; Otherwise, DTE Electric would have to separately and independently inspect and evaluate each supplier which would not be reasonable nor prudent.</p> <p>Please refer to the testimony of Witness Davis.</p>	Nuclear	\$12,894	



Coleman A. Young Municipal Center  
2 Woodward Avenue, Suite 1126  
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Phone 313•224•3400  
Fax 313•224•4128  
www.detroitmi.gov

Satvir Deol  
Director, DO Engineering and Planning  
DTE Energy  
1 Energy Plaza  
Detroit MI 48226

Dear Mr. Deol,

The City of Detroit welcomes DTE's underground pilot to the Buffalo Charles/Davison neighborhoods. The City supports any projects that will improve the quality of life for its residents, including improved safety and reliability that is expected to be delivered through this pilot. DTE reached out and worked with City Departments prior to starting the project for input on location and scope, and we continue to coordinate as the project progresses. We also acknowledge that DTE engaged with local leaders and residents before the project launched and they continue to communicate status updates and respond to inquiries.

The City of Detroit is looking forward to improved safety and reliability for our residents in this project area.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sam Krassenstein'.

Sam Krassenstein  
Chief of Infrastructure, Mayor's Office  
[krassensteins@detroitmi.gov](mailto:krassensteins@detroitmi.gov)

# EV Status Report

## 2023




**DTE**


# Table of Contents

- Executive Summary** ..... 3
- Background** ..... 5
  - Company Overview ..... 5
  - Report Purpose..... 5
  - Industry Updates ..... 5
  - Michigan Trends..... 6
- Charging Forward Overview** ..... 7
  - Approvals and Objectives ..... 7
  - Budget and Spend ..... 8
  - Stakeholder Engagement ..... 8
  - Long-Term Strategy ..... 9
- Customer Outreach** ..... 10
  - Education and Outreach ..... 10
  - eFleet Advisory Services ..... 13
- Residential Customer Programs** ..... 15
  - Home Charger Rebates ..... 15
  - Home Charger Installation ..... 16
  - EV Rebates ..... 16
  - EV Data Sharing and Demand Response .. 17
- Business Customer Programs** ..... 18
  - Network Provider Qualification ..... 18
  - Business Charger Rebates..... 19
  - eFleet Charger Rebates ..... 21
  - New Expansion Elements ..... 22
- Additional Key Learnings** ..... 23
  - Charging Profiles & Utilization ..... 23
  - Benefit-Cost Analysis ..... 24

# List of Figures and Tables

- Figure 1:** Total Approved Budget by Category (in millions) .. 8
- Table 1:** Charging Forward Spend to Date (in millions)..... 8
- Table 2:** Key Customer Education and Outreach Goals by Segment..... 10
- Figure 2:** Customer Education & Outreach Impressions Overview ..... 10
- Figure 3:** DTE EV Advertising Recall..... 10
- Figure 4:** Recent EV Connections eNewsletter Road Map ... 11
- Figure 5:** Sample Images from 2022 EV Ride and Drives .. 12
- Figure 6:** EV Underpass ..... 13
- Figure 7:** EPA's 2022 CSB Rebate Awards in DTEE Service Territory ..... 14
- Table 3:** Top Three Home Charger Rebate Network Providers..... 15
- Figure 8:** Heat Map of Approved Home Charger Rebates .. 15
- Figure 9:** EV Data Sharing Example of Customer Dashboard ..... 17
- Table 4:** Business Charger Rebate Application Statuses. ... 19
- Figure 10:** Average Power Output of Approved DCFCs by Year (kW) ..... 20
- Table 5:** Average Business Charger Rebate Installation Costs ..... 20
- Figure 11:** Map of Business Charger Rebate Sites by Charger Type..... 20
- Table 6:** eFleet Charger Rebate Application Statuses..... 21
- Table 7:** Average eFleet Charger Rebate Installation Costs ..... 22
- Figure 12:** Average Daily Home Charger Usage (Jun 2019 - Apr 2023) ..... 23
- Table 8:** Business Charging Session Characteristics (Jun 2019 - Apr 2023) ..... 24
- Table 9:** Overview of NPV Gross Margin Calculation ..... 24





## Executive Summary

In 2022, low vehicle inventory coupled with rising vehicle prices resulted in the lowest number of new vehicle sales nationwide in over a decade. However, electric vehicle (EV) sales continued to show record growth, accounting for almost 7% of the light-duty market share - an increase of over 60% from 2021. In Michigan, EV sales increased over 50% to approximately 15,500 in 2022, with nearly 75%, or 11,500, of those EVs sold in DTE Electric service territory. There will be almost 120 EV models available by the end of this year, and, in combination with federal funding opportunities, the EV market is poised to accelerate.

DTE Electric (DTEE or the Company) received approval for its first EV pilot, Charging Forward, in May 2019. The Charging Forward program has since grown with two additional approved filings, Charging Forward eFleets and the Charging Forward Expansion in 2021 and 2022, respectively. The total approved budget for all Charging Forward programs is now \$46.1 million, with a total spend of \$13.2 million as of April 30, 2023.

The Company's five guiding principles for Charging Forward are to reduce barriers to EV adoption, efficiently integrate EV load with its distribution system, help enable equitable access to EVs, test new technologies to prepare for widespread adoption in the future, and support the State of Michigan's transportation electrification goals. Charging Forward is making progress toward achieving all goals.

Charging Forward is reducing barriers to EV adoption by addressing lack of awareness of EVs through its Education and Outreach and eFleet Advisory Services components and lack of confidence in the refueling infrastructure by facilitating charger deployment with rebates. DTEE is efficiently integrating the EV load with its distribution system by requiring Time of Day rates and prioritizing business applications with available capacity. Through new offerings such as its EV Rebate and Business Charger Installation programs, Charging Forward is also helping enable equitable access to EVs. Additionally, the Company continues to test new technologies through innovative new programs such as the Emerging Technology Fund and EV Data Sharing. Lastly, Charging Forward is supporting the State of Michigan's transportation electrification goals by aligning its program requirements with those of state and federal EV programs as applicable and supporting business customers who want to combine funding from DTE with funding from other stakeholders (government or otherwise).

As of April 30, 2023, Charging Forward as a whole has achieved almost 140 million customer impressions to date through its various Education & Outreach campaigns. Additionally, the eFleets team has reached out to over 5,300 leads, conducted 600 consultations, and completed about 170 Total Cost of Ownership analyses, resulting in fleet owner commitments to electrify over 2,100 vehicles through 2026. DTEE has approved 3,145 Home Charger Rebates to date and recently launched three new residential customer offerings: Home Charger Installation, EV Rebates, and EV Data Sharing. Charging Forward has approved Business Charger Rebates for 1,297 Level 2 ports and 135 fast chargers, and has approved eFleet Charger Rebates for 178 Level 2 ports and 46 fast chargers. The Company is also launching three new business customer offerings: Business Charger Installation, Charging Hubs, and eFleet Battery Support. Based on the installation of 3,145 residential Level 2 chargers, 872 business Level 2 ports, and 51 DCFCs in Charging Forward, 9.2 Gigawatt-hours have been consumed to date. This is the equivalent of approximately 30.1 million electric miles powered by DTE, translating to 7,300 metric tons of carbon emissions eliminated and almost 860 thousand gallons of gasoline avoided. Across both residential and business chargers, 90% of consumption fell outside the coincident peak hours of 3pm-7pm.

Additionally, DTEE is developing a comprehensive Transportation Electrification Plan that will detail the company's market assessment, investment plans, and benefit-cost analysis and tie closely to its Distribution Grid Plan. The Company is in the process of evaluating its five-year investment strategy by charging segment while maintaining an overall focus on customer affordability at the portfolio level. DTEE will engage stakeholders before filing the Transportation Electrification Plan by year end.

Playing an active role in these early adoption years to ensure DTEE is learning about EV charging behavior, piloting new technologies, and efficiently integrating charging infrastructure with the distribution system is important now to ensure the benefits of added EV load accrue to all DTEE customers in the future.



30.1 million electric miles  
powered by DTE = 7,300  
metric tons of carbon  
emissions eliminated and  
almost 860 thousand gallons  
of gasoline avoided.



# Background

## Company Overview

DTE Energy (NYSE: [DTE](#)) is a Detroit-based diversified energy company involved in the development and management of energy-related businesses and services nationwide. Its operating units include an electric company serving 2.3 million customers in Southeast Michigan and a natural gas company serving 1.3 million customers in Michigan. The DTE portfolio also includes non-utility businesses focused on industrial energy services, renewable natural gas, and energy marketing and trading. As an environmental leader, DTE utility operations will reduce carbon dioxide and methane emissions by 90% by 2040 to produce [cleaner energy](#) while keeping it safe, reliable and affordable. DTE Electric and Gas aspire to achieve [net zero](#) carbon and greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. DTE is committed to [serving with its energy](#) through volunteerism, education and employment initiatives, [philanthropy](#) and economic progress. Information about DTE is available at [dteenergy.com](#), [empoweringmichigan.com](#), [twitter.com/dte\\_energy](#) and [facebook.com/dteenergy](#).

## Report Purpose

The purpose of the Charging Forward Annual Status Report is to provide a detailed update on DTE's EV programs, including residential, business, and fleet offerings. As agreed in previous regulatory proceedings, the Company will provide key learnings regarding charging behavior and benefit-cost analysis with each of its annual reports. Where applicable, DTE will also describe any design modifications with supportive reasoning. The Company has filed four status reports to date: a Pre-Implementation Status Report filed [May 2019](#) and three subsequent Annual Status Reports filed [May 2020](#), [June 2021](#), and [June 2022](#). Unless otherwise specified, all numbers throughout the remainder of this report reflect Charging Forward's status as of April 30, 2023.

## Industry Updates

In 2022, the automotive industry overall began to overcome pandemic-related supply shortages, but low vehicle inventory coupled with rising vehicle prices resulted in the lowest number of new vehicle sales in over a decade. About 13.7 million new vehicles were sold in the United States (US) in 2022, a decline of about 9% from the 15.0 million sold in 2021.<sup>1</sup> However, EV sales continued to show record growth and once again outperformed the overall automotive industry market. In 2022, EVs accounted for almost 7% of the light-duty market share, an increase of over 60% from 2021, with all-electric EVs also known as Battery Electric Vehicles, or BEVs making up 80% of that share.<sup>2</sup> In December 2022, EVs accounted for 10% of the light-duty market share – the highest percentage to date and the first time EV market share moved into double digits.<sup>3</sup> This growth has continued into the first quarter of 2023, with BEV sales up over 60% and plug-in hybrid EV (PHEV) sales up almost 30% as compared to the first quarter of 2022.<sup>4</sup>

Increased EV model availability continues to be a key driver of sales. The combined number of BEV and PHEV models available has doubled from 44 in 2019 to 88 in 2022, and that's expected to grow to almost 120 by the end of 2023. The majority of new model launches are BEVs, with an average electric range of over 270 miles, compared to 204 miles in 2019.<sup>5</sup> However, dealership inventory remains a critical bottleneck to EV adoption. A recent Sierra Club study found that only one-third of dealers nationwide had an EV available for sale. This availability barrier is attributed to both the industry-wide supply chain issues discussed earlier and automaker allocation of EVs to dealerships.<sup>6</sup>

Two legislative bills are also making a big impact on the EV market: the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL, signed into law November 2021) and the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA, signed into law August 2022). Through the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (NEVI) portion of the BIL, a minimum of \$7.5 billion will be deployed over the next five years to fund a direct current fast charging (DCFC) network. The BIL includes an additional \$32.5 billion eligible to support EVs, plus \$10.5 billion for grid upgrades and battery development. The IRA includes \$47 billion eligible to support EVs, not including funding to support the \$7,500 consumer tax credit for light-duty EVs. These BIL and IRA investments in EVs and EV infrastructure over the next five years dwarf the \$3.3 billion awarded by the US government for EVs and EV infrastructure across 16 prior programs.<sup>7</sup>

## Michigan Trends

In Michigan, EV sales increased over 50% to approximately 15,500 in 2022, compared to about 10,100 in 2021. Nearly 75%, or 11,500, of those EVs were sold in DTEE service territory. The portion of EV sales that were PHEVs rose from 18% in 2020 to 38% in 2021 with the popularity of the Jeep Wrangler 4xe, and that continued in 2022 with 37% of EV sales being PHEVs. However, that trend seems to be beginning to reverse again: the first two months of sales in 2023 show BEVs averaging about 75% of sales. As of February 2023, Michigan now has approximately 48,000 EVs in the state, with about 33,000 (69%) of them in DTEE service territory.<sup>8</sup>

Although the rate of adoption varies significantly across forecasts, both near- and long-term forecasts for EV sales in Michigan show increasing levels of adoption. DTEE is projecting that EVs will be approximately 30% of new sales and 13% of vehicles on the road in Michigan by 2030 (up from 22% and 10%, respectively, in the 2022 Annual Status Report). This new adoption curve estimates nearly 900,000 EVs in Michigan by the end of 2030.

Michigan continues to enact policy and execute programs to support the EV market. As part of the BIL, the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) will receive and distribute \$110 million in NEVI funds over the next five years. MDOT is making nearly \$38 million available in the first round to build out high-powered DCFC infrastructure along designated alternative fuel corridors in the state. Michigan also outperformed expectations in the 2022 Clean School Bus (CSB) Rebate program (funded by BIL), by receiving the fifth-highest number of awards in the country, with 24 districts winning a total of 133 electric buses. Regarding state funding, Governor Whitmer recommended \$170 million in the fiscal year 2024 state budget to support the [Michigan Future Mobility Plan](#), including \$65 million to expand EV charging infrastructure, \$48 million to temporarily exempt EVs from the state's sales and use taxes, \$45 million to support the transition to climate-friendly vehicles for local governments and agencies, and \$10 million to electrify the state's fleet.

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.cnn.com/2023/01/06/2022-us-auto-sales-are-worst-in-more-than-a-decade.html>

<sup>2</sup> Automotive Communities Partnership

<sup>3</sup> Atlas Public Policy EV Hub

<sup>4</sup> Automotive Communities Partnership

<sup>5</sup> Electric Power Research Institute

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.sierraclub.org/sites/www.sierraclub.org/files/2023-05/SierraClubRevUpReport2023.pdf>

<sup>7</sup> Atlas Public Policy

<sup>8</sup> S&P Global



## Charging Forward Overview

### Approvals and Objectives

Since its initial approval from the Michigan Public Service Commission (MPSC) with [Order U-20162](#) in May 2019, the Charging Forward program has continued to grow and evolve. The original pilot, proposed in Case Number [U-20162](#), was approved for \$13.1 million with modifications, guidance, and recommendations. Including other EV-related pilots folded into Charging Forward as supported by stakeholders, the Charging Forward spend estimate increased to \$14.1 million. Building on the momentum of the fleet element in the initial filing, the Company proposed Charging Forward eFleets (eFleets) in 2020. The \$13.4 million pilot was approved in March 2021 in Case Number [U-20935](#). Most recently, in November 2022, the MPSC approved \$18.6 million for the Charging Forward Expansion (Expansion) in Case Number [U-20836](#).

As part of Order U-20162, the MPSC established three objectives for utilities in the transportation electrification space as follows:

1. Maximize pilot program participation at minimum cost,
2. Aggressively test new and novel practices and technologies to ensure that new load associated with EV charging maximizes net benefits to all ratepayers, and
3. Ensure that investments in make-ready infrastructure serve double duty by directly addressing core barriers (such as range anxiety), and by enabling the Company to learn reasonable and practicable ways to actively manage charging times and locations, to minimize required investment in new distribution infrastructure, and to obviate adverse grid impacts related to uncontrolled charging.


DTEE adopted these overarching objectives and has evolved them over the last four years into five guiding principles for its Charging Forward programs:

1. Reduce barriers to EV adoption,
2. Efficiently integrate EV load with its distribution system,
3. Help enable equitable access to EVs,
4. Test new technologies to prepare for widespread adoption in the future, and
5. Support the State of Michigan's transportation electrification goals.

## Budget and Spend

The total approved budget for Charging Forward, including the initial filing, eFleets, and the Expansion, is \$46.1 million as shown in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1: Total Approved Budget by Category (in millions)



Business Expansion Elements include the following business customer offerings that were recently approved in the Expansion: Business Charger Installation, Charging Hubs, eFleet Battery Support, and the Emerging Technology Fund. Customer Outreach includes the Education and Outreach approved with each program plus eFleet Advisory Services. Residential Programs include Home Charger Rebates, Home Charger Installation, and EV Rebates. The total spend to date is \$13.2 million as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Charging Forward Spend to Date (in millions)

	Initial Filing	eFleets	Expansion	Total
Business / eFleet Charger Rebates	\$4.9	\$0.5	-	\$5.4
Business Expansion Elements	-	-	\$0.1	\$0.1
Customer Outreach	\$1.9	\$0.6	\$0.1	\$2.6
Program Admin / Costs	\$2.6	\$0.7	\$0.3	\$3.6
Residential Programs	\$1.1	-	\$0.4	\$1.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$10.5</b>	<b>\$1.8</b>	<b>\$0.9</b>	<b>\$13.2</b>

## Stakeholder Engagement

DTEE engages a variety of stakeholders to evolve with market dynamics and integrate lessons learned as applicable, starting with its own customers. The EV team engages with DTEE residential customers (regardless of Charging Forward program participation or not) through an annual survey to track their attitudes on EVs. The EV Team also conducts post-rebate surveys with residential and business customers who participate in Charging Forward programs, to improve its processes.

On a national level, DTEE is an active member of several organizations including American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy, Automotive Communities Partnership, Alliance for Transportation Electrification, CALSTART, the DOE US DRIVE<sup>9</sup> program, the Edison Electric Institute, and the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI). Additionally, the EV team engages with Atlas Public Policy, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), EVNoire, Forth Mobility, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Sierra Club, and Smart Electric Power Alliance. DTEE is also a member of the [National Electric Highway Coalition](#) (NEHC), which is committed to ensuring fast charging stations will allow the public to drive EVs with confidence along major travel corridors by the end of 2023. NEHC consists of more than 60 utilities across the country.

On a regional level, DTEE works closely with regulators and policymakers, including the MPSC, Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE), MDOT, and the Office of Future Mobility and Electrification (OFME) to ensure that its EV programs align with state goals and policies. Other regional organizations with which DTE engages include 5 Lakes Energy, Clean Fuels Michigan, Ecology Center, Electrification Coalition, Michigan Economic Development Corporation, Michigan Energy Innovation Business Council, and Midwest Transportation Electrification Collaborative.


From an industry perspective, DTEE maintains frequent contact with OEMs and charging companies through its Charging Forward programs. Those that are invited to its stakeholder discussions include Blink, Chargepoint, Daimler, Delta Products, eCamion, Electrify America, Enel X, EV Connect, EVGo, FLO, Ford, General Motors (GM), Rivian, Tesla, Red E Charging, and Volta.

To discuss progress and solicit feedback, DTEE hosted its sixth key stakeholder discussion on March 29, 2023. The team also distributes high-level [quarterly reports](#) to the same stakeholders mentioned above to provide updates on EV sales in DTEE territory, Charging Forward application statuses, and other key achievements.

## Long-Term Strategy

DTEE is developing a comprehensive Transportation Electrification Plan (TEP) that will detail the company's market assessment, investment plans, and benefit-cost analysis and tie closely to its Distribution Grid Plan. The Company is in the process of evaluating its five-year investment strategy by charging segment while maintaining an overall focus on customer affordability at the portfolio level. DTEE will engage stakeholders before filing the TEP by year end.

A guiding principle of Charging Forward described above is testing new technologies to prepare for widespread adoption in the future. To that end, DTEE recently launched the Emerging Technology Fund (ETF), which was approved as part of the Expansion. The ETF is a \$900,000 grant program established to enable timely funding of prudent pilots in a rapidly evolving market. Types of projects considered include EV-grid integration solutions, novel engagement of underserved communities, and second-life applications for used EV batteries. Organizations seeking funding are vetted via three stages of review: initial screening by the EV team, cross-functional review by other business units within DTE, and the final review by the ETF Advisory Committee (AC). The AC was assembled in March 2023 and includes members from the Ecology Center, EPRI, Ford, GM, the MPSC, and Next Energy. The AC has already met for a kick-off and first round of funding reviews (agreed but not yet finalized / announced) and will meet up to two more times this year until funding is exhausted.



DTE will file a comprehensive  
Transportation Electrification Plan  
by the end of 2023.

<sup>9</sup> US DRIVE stands for Driving Research and Innovation for Vehicle efficiency and Energy sustainability



# Customer Outreach

## Education and Outreach


Charging Forward's EV Education and Outreach (E&O) has defined goals for three key customer segments, including residential customers, charging station owner-operators (site hosts), and fleet owners as outlined in Table 2 below.

**Table 2:** Key Customer Education and Outreach Goals by Segment

	Residential Customers	Site Hosts	Fleet Owners
Inform on available incentives	x	x	x
Make benefits of EVs clear	x	x	x
Educate on available EV models	x		x
Advise on best times to charge	x		
Recruit potential site hosts		x	x
Increase in-person EV experiences	x		
Help enable equitable access to EVs	x		



To achieve these goals, the EV team continues to utilize effective marketing channels to reach all three customer segments described above, resulting in over 140 million customer impressions to date as shown in Figure 2 below.

**Figure 2:** Customer Education & Outreach Impressions Overview



Charging Forward conducts an annual tracking survey to measure customer awareness of EVs by sending the same question set to randomly selected residential customers who manage their utility bill and receives approximately 500 responses. Results from 2022 marked the fifth wave of the study. One question that is a strong indicator of E&O success is awareness of DTEE's EV E&O efforts, or DTE EV advertising recall, which continues to trend upwards. EV owners have 83% ad recall and non-EV owners have 34% ad recall, increases of 177% and 143%, respectively, since 2018 as shown in Figure 3 below.


**Figure 3:** DTE EV Advertising Recall



The majority of E&O efforts aim to drive customers to DTEE's robust EV webpages. Since program launch, over 345,000 customers have visited the [residential EV website](#). Before the Expansion approval, this website included information on the [Home Charger Rebate](#), as well as other resources for residential customers, such as education on [Time of Day electric pricing](#), [EV benefits](#), and a [virtual EV Showroom](#). DTEE has since added webpages for the new residential programs approved with the Expansion, including [Home Charger Installation](#), [EV Data Sharing](#), and the [EV Rebate](#). Similarly, the [business EV website](#) includes information on available incentives (e.g., the [Business Charger Rebate](#) and [eFleet Charger Rebate](#)) in addition to valuable resources, such as [eFleet Advisory Services](#), an overview of the [charger installation process](#), and a directory of [electricians](#). Since launch, the business website has been visited by more than 66,000 site hosts and fleet owners.

Charging Forward launched [EV Connections](#) in April 2020 to build a sense of community centered around EVs. All customers are welcome to join, and interest continues to grow, with more than 1,700 customers now enrolled – an increase of 55% since the 2022 Annual Status Report. The EV team engages this group primarily through its biannual eNewsletter, which highlights Charging Forward progress, introduces readers to an EV driver, and spotlights a new site host to increase awareness of public charging locations. The most recent eNewsletter Road Map is shown in Figure 4 below.


Figure 4: Recent EV Connections eNewsletter Road Map



*“I want to thank DTE for providing the opportunity to test drive [an] EV. I wouldn't have been able to experience driving them without going to a dealership and hoping one was available. The ability to drive different price range EVs was great... Thank you DTE!”*

*DTE Ride and Drive Participant*

Since the 2022 Annual Status Report, Charging Forward used the DTE EV Garage at the following eight in-person events: Detroit Grand Prix, Detroit Jazz Festival, a University of Michigan football game, GM Factory Zero Employee Appreciation Day, the North American International Auto Show at Beacon Park, and three Ride and Drives, with two in Detroit and one in Ann Arbor. In addition to an EV and charger, the EV Garage showcases educational messaging and an interactive game to test the knowledge visitors gain, with over 80% of those surveyed stating they learned “something” or “a lot” about the benefits of EVs. Customers overwhelmingly enjoy the Ride and Drives, with one surveyed participant responding, *“I want to thank DTE for providing the opportunity to test drive [an] EV. I wouldn't have been able to experience driving them without going to a dealership and hoping one was available. The ability to drive different price range EVs was great... Thank you DTE!”* Ride and Drives facilitate in-person exposure and hands-on learning, a critical enabler of EV adoption. A sampling of images from these events is shown in Figure 5 below.



**Figure 5:** Sample Images from 2022 EV Ride and Drives



One modification the Charging Forward team made to 2023 in-person EV events is the addition of the EV Underpass as shown in Figure 6 below. The EV Garage proved popular last year, but the team was unable to fulfill all requests for its use due to budget constraints. As a result, the Company created the EV Underpass, which encompasses the same educational messages the EV Garage houses but is approximately 30% cheaper to transport and setup, allowing Charging Forward to increase outreach by attending more events.

**Figure 6:** EV Underpass



In 2022, Charging Forward piloted two ride-hailing pilots that were funded by its E&O budget as discussed in its annual stakeholder meetings. The first was a pilot with Lyft to provide their drivers up to \$5,000 in incentives for purchasing or leasing a BEV. Six applicants were ultimately approved, as the availability of low-cost, high-range EVs and public chargers proved to be a significant barrier. Because of low enrollment in the Lyft pilot, the Company pivoted to partnering with ride-hailing fleet owner Hertz instead of individual drivers. The pilot increased the Hertz EV rental fleet in Metro Detroit that is available exclusively to Uber drivers through their national partnership. To date, Hertz has added 325 EVs to their fleet, resulting in over 850,000 EV experiences from July 2022 through April 2023 (assuming 1.7 passengers per ride as reported by Lyft and approximately 500,000 rides during this time period as reported by Uber). Additionally, 66% of these rides either picked up or dropped off passengers in a disadvantaged community in DTEE service territory. The MPSC did not approve DTEE's proposal to continue ride-hailing pilots as part of the Expansion, so the Company is not expanding its pilot with Hertz beyond what was already agreed to in 2022, and expects the pilot to end at the end of 2023 (though the EVs will remain in the Hertz rental fleet).

## eFleet Advisory Services


DTEE developed eFleet Advisory Services (eFAS) to empower fleet owners to make informed decisions about how to best electrify their fleets. Additional objectives include supporting customers seeking BIL or IRA funding and applying lessons learned from initial deployments to future distribution operation planning efforts. The eFleets team utilizes a seven-step eFAS process to support fleet owners' electrification journeys as follows:

1. Gather fleet data to analyze operational needs,
2. Provide customized list of available EVs using the [eFleets virtual showroom](#),
3. Model electric fueling requirements that can vary based on eFleet adoption rates,
4. Recommend necessary [charging options](#) for fleet owner consideration,
5. Guide fleet owners through the service connection process,
6. Analyze potential fuel savings and carbon reduction, and
7. Facilitate eFleet Charger Rebate application and implementation.

Since its launch in October 2021, DTEE has reached out to over 5,300 leads, conducted 600 consultations, and completed about 170 total cost of ownership (TCO) analyses for its business customers. After fleet owners receive a TCO analysis, they are asked to complete a survey on their electrification plans as a result of the eFAS received. Analysis of 39 returned surveys yields an electrification plan of over 2,100 vehicles through 2026, demonstrating the effectiveness of eFAS facilitating fleet electrification for DTEE business customers.

With regard to supporting customers seeking available BIL funding, the eFAS team successfully promoted the 2022 CSB program by reaching out to all of the school districts in DTEE service territory – over 160 – and following up with multiple touch points with the 53 districts that were identified as prioritized by the EPA. As a result, school districts in DTEE applied for over 200 electric school buses, with 66 ultimately awarded to eight school districts as shown in Figure 7 below. All awarded buses are on track to be deployed this year and receive eFleet Charger Rebates for the necessary charging infrastructure.

**Figure 7: EPA's 2022 CSB Rebate Awards in DTEE Service Territory**



Through its consultations and TCO analyses, the team has been gathering valuable feedback and lessons learned to further improve eFAS. Key updated lessons learned and associated modifications as applicable include:

- Over 80% of eFleet Charger Rebates have gone to customers in just three fleet segments as discussed in more detail in that section below,
- Organizations with sustainability programs are now considering the incorporation of EVs as part of their carbon reduction plans, and they find the carbon reduction analysis provided as part of eFAS particularly compelling,
- Vehicle use cases vary, ranging from 5,000 to 30,000 miles per year, but the team is able to prioritize use cases that have sufficient utilization levels to justify rebate awards from a ratepayer perspective. For example, for DCFC rebates to be rate neutral over time, the assigned fleet vehicle should have a minimum of 20,000 miles driven per year,
- Some companies utilize eFAS and proceed to electrify their fleet accordingly but opt not to leverage eFleet Charger Rebates. This decision is often driven by internal security policies regarding data sharing or preferred charging equipment not on Charging Forward's qualified charger list,
- Conversations with OEMs continue to provide valuable guidance, enabling the team to prioritize the electrification of use cases with EVs available in the market,
- The team is developing and/or maintaining strong relationships with installers, OEMs, energy service companies, and dealers as they can provide additional resources and support to amplify eFAS efforts, and
- Proof of purchase orders was initially the only eFleet Charger Rebate requirement, but supply chain disruptions made them difficult to acquire before charger deployment. As a result, and as an alternative to the purchase order, Charging Forward started to accept good faith commitment letters, which has proven successful: organizations are willing to proceed with charger installation in anticipation of electrifying their fleets when model availability allows.





# Residential Customer Programs

## Home Charger Rebates

Like Customer E&O, Home Charger Rebates were part of the initial Charging Forward pilot launched in June 2019. Through this program, DTEE provides a rebate of \$500 to its residential customers that purchase or lease an EV, install a qualified Level 2 charger, and enroll in a qualified Time of Day rate. The full eligibility requirements and terms and conditions to receive the rebate are detailed in the [terms and conditions agreement](#). All Home Charger Rebate applications and documentation are managed through the PowerClerk® [website](#).

Approved Home Charger Rebates have increased by 1,938 since the 2022 Annual Status Report (from 1,207 to 3,145), representing over 60% of approved applications in just the last year of a four-year program. Since the beginning of 2023, there has been a significant increase in interest for Home Charger Rebates with over 200 applications submitted each month, nearly doubling the 2022 average of about 120 submissions per month. This is a result of removing the stricter qualified charger requirement in March 2022 as reported in the last status report. Since that modification, the most popular charging provider among participants is Tesla,


which did not previously qualify, as shown in Table 3 below. The most popular participating EV models in descending order are the Chevrolet Bolt, Ford Mustang Mach-e, Tesla Model 3, Tesla Model Y, and the Jeep Wrangler 4xe.

**Table 3: Top Three Home Charger Rebate Network Providers**

Overall Rank	Network Provider	12 Months Ending April 30, 2023	Program to Date
1	Enel-X	359	965
2	Chargepoint	297	894
3	Tesla	570	580

The distribution of approved Home Charger Rebates in DTEE service territory remains primarily in Ann Arbor and Detroit suburbs, with the top five suburbs in descending order being Canton, Northville, Novi, Troy, and Bloomfield Hills. However, the team notices interest growing in other areas, with sixteen new cities and towns in DTEE service territory receiving approved applications since the last status report. The heat map of approved Home Charger Rebates, which can be used to infer highest areas of EV adoption in DTEE service territory, is shown in Figure 8 to the right.

**Figure 8: Heat Map of Approved Home Charger Rebates**



Starting March 1, 2023, DTEE converted its residential customers on rate schedule D1 (residential service rate) to rate schedule D1.11 (standard Time of Day), which has weekday on-peak hours of 3pm – 7pm. However, to help ensure the benefits of transportation electrification accrue to all customers, DTEE still requires enrollment in one of the company's more variable Time of Day rate schedules: D1.2 (Enhanced Time of Day), D1.8 (Dynamic Peak Pricing), or D1.9 (EV Rate). All of these have stricter requirements than D1.11 and can provide additional fuel savings to enrolled EV drivers.

DTEE monitors Time of Day rate selection for the program to better understand EV driver preferences. D1.2 continues to be the most popular choice with 44% of approved customers, followed by D1.9 at 31% and D1.8 at 25%. Application submission results showed that 84% of applicants said the Charging Forward rebate "Somewhat" or "Very Much" influenced their decision to sign up for one of the required Time of Day rates, demonstrating that Home Charger Rebates is successfully shifting EV load – and, for whole-homes rates, some non-EV load - off-peak.

The team continues to process Home Charger Rebate applications quickly; the average runtime for DTEE to review and approve applications is only 16 days, including time for application corrections. Overall, customers have been very satisfied with the Home Charger Rebate program, with 91% of surveyed customers considering themselves "promoters" of the program.<sup>10</sup> This satisfaction can be further observed in the following customer verbatims gathered from the post-rebate survey:

- *"It was easy to manage, you had great people available to answer questions both by phone and online"*
- *"Ease of process, fast rebate time, fair in the amount given back"*
- *"Off peak charging together with the cash rebate represents considerable savings & acts as a further incentive to adopt an electric car"*
- *"It's a good program that is well-explained and helps new EV owners get started"*

## Home Charger Installation

Recently approved with the Expansion, Home Charger Installation is a turnkey installation and financing solution for DTEE residential customers designed to reduce the complexity and upfront cost barriers for home chargers. In Q4 2022, the Company issued a Request for Proposal (RFP) to electricians to select an installation partner. After issuing the RFP to approximately 15 companies, the Company selected [Vehya](#) based on price, anticipated customer experience, and the ability to manage the expected installation volume. Vehya is a Detroit-based software platform delivering EV charging solutions to businesses and homeowners. They offer a certified network of electricians and an easy-to-use [online portal](#) for interested customers to complete a short questionnaire, receive an instant quote, and select appointment times that work best for their schedule. Home Charger Installation jobs are dispatched to Vehya's network of local electricians based on location, availability, and customer ratings. Participating customers choose a financing term of

one, three, five, or 10 years, which will automatically be added to their next DTEE monthly bill following installation.

The full eligibility requirements and terms and conditions to participate in the program are detailed in the [Home EV Charger Installation Agreement](#).

Since launch on February 27th, 2023, DTEE has seen high interest in the offering, indicating there was a market need for a turnkey installation and financing solution. Over 700 customers have registered as users through the portal, and 160 of them have paid a \$100 deposit for an electrical contractor assessment of their property to confirm the final quote. In only two months since launch, 55 installations have been completed, ranging from \$650 to \$5,250 in total costs with an average installation cost of \$2,155. Customers have selected all of the term options, with the most popular being three years, followed by 10, five, and one year, respectively. To date, the program is seeing an average of 20 days from account creation to installation day. However, because some customers prefer to schedule installations closer to vehicle delivery dates (as far out as November 2023), the runtime is likely not a good metric to indicate performance. The team will instead evaluate customer satisfaction through post participation surveys and scheduling adherence with Vehya.

## EV Rebates

Another recently approved offering is the EV Rebate, a \$1,500 incentive for low- and moderate-income (LMI) residential DTEE customers who purchase or lease a new or used BEV designed to help offset the upfront price premium of EVs and enable equitable access to EVs for qualifying customers. The full eligibility requirements and terms and conditions to receive the rebate are detailed in the [EV Rebate Agreement](#). All EV Rebate applications and documentation are managed through the PowerClerk® [website](#).

<sup>10</sup> Customers who have completed the rebate process were sent a customer satisfaction survey with one question asking how likely it is that they would recommend the rebate program to a friend or colleague on a scale 1-10. They were categorized as "Promoter", "Passive", or "Detractor"


A core eligibility requirement is that an applicant's total household income must be under 400% of the [2023 Health and Human Services Poverty Guidelines](#) (often referred to as the federal poverty level, or FPL). This guideline changes depending on the size of the household but is equivalent to \$58,320 for an individual and \$120,000 for a four-person household. DTEE estimates that half of its residential electric customer households would meet this criterion.

Since launch on March 17, 2023, DTEE has received 30 applications, of which eight have been approved. The primary reason for rejection was EVs surpassing the \$50,000 total taxable price restriction (19 applications). The remaining three rejected applications were for PHEVs, which also do not qualify. For the eight approved so far, the team has found that the average household income is about 220% of the FPL.

### EV Data Sharing and Demand Response

DTEE decided to end its Bring Your Own Charger (BYOC) pilot with Sagewell at the end of 2022, primarily due to the fact that Tesla chargers – the primary target for BYOC - are now eligible for the Home Charger Rebate program. The Company prefers to require one of its stricter Time of Day rates in exchange for any off-peak incentives. Additionally, DTEE sought to better understand data collection and charging behavior through vehicle telematics for different rate schedules. As a result, Charging Forward is now collaborating with [WeaveGrid](#) on two new offerings: EV Data Sharing and an expansion of the existing DTE Smart Charge program. Both make use of WeaveGrid's evPulse tool, which pairs vehicle telematic data with DTEE rate information to help drivers save money and access valuable charging insights. Participants of EV Data Sharing will give DTEE access to their vehicle telematics data in exchange for free access to weekly insight emails and a charging dashboard such as the example shown in Figure 9 above.

Figure 9: EV Data Sharing Example of Customer Dashboard



Interested drivers of Tesla, Kia, Hyundai, and Toyota EVs can [enroll](#) and find the full [terms of service](#) online. Since launch on March 23, 2023, 136 drivers have enrolled, primarily via targeted marketing to those known by DTEE to drive a qualified EV.

As mentioned above, [DTE Smart Charge](#), a demand response program for BMW, Ford, and GM EVs, is being expanded through WeaveGrid to include Tesla vehicles beginning in June 2023. With this expansion, DTEE can schedule enrolled EVs to charge during their respective rates' off-peak times and pause charging during critical peak periods of high electric demand.<sup>11</sup> Participating customers will receive a \$50 incentive upon enrollment and an additional \$50 incentive at the end of the summer season if they are still enrolled.



<sup>11</sup> Participants will have the ability to opt-out if needed



## Business Customer Programs

### Network Provider Qualification

DTEE seeks to promote a competitive marketplace environment for EV supply equipment (EVSE) network providers in Southeast Michigan. To date, the Charging Forward team has completed five Requests for Information (RFIs), sending them to a total of 54 different network and manufacturing vendors during the most recent round in August 2022. The team evaluates submissions based on network capabilities, data sharing processes, hardware attributes, and the respondent's value proposition to both site hosts and DTEE. Based on that, 35 business Level 2 chargers ranging from 7.2 to 19.2 kilowatts (kW) and 55 DCFCs ranging from 50-350kW currently [qualify](#) for Business Charger Rebates from eight different network providers (including Blink, ChargePoint, eCamion, Enel X, EV Connect, FLO, Red E Charging, and Volta) and 13 different manufacturers (including ABB, ADS Tec, Autel, BTC Power, ChargePoint, eCamion, FLO, Freewire, Mid-Cour, Phihong/Zerova, Rhombus, Tellus, and Tritium). For eFleet Charger Rebates, 30 Level 2 chargers of the

same power output range and 61 DCFCs ranging from 24-360kW qualify from six of those same network providers plus Ford Pro. To continue adding value for Charging Forward participants, DTE is preparing to launch a sixth RFI this summer to evaluate EVSE network providers in its portfolio.

With the approval of the Expansion, the MPSC also added an uptime requirement for Charging Forward. [Order U-20836](#) states, "the Commission adopts a 97% charger uptime for participants in this pilot as is currently proposed by the Federal Highway Administration's (FHA's) NEVI program guidelines. Should the FHA ultimately revise or update its guidance on uptime requirements upon issuance of the final NEVI rule, the Commission would then be open to revisiting these guidelines and reserves the right to modify this charger uptime requirement to maintain consistency with federal guidelines." Based on the FHA proposed rules at the time of the Order, DTE notified qualified network providers and participating site hosts to maintain an uptime of 97% for each charging port, as calculated by the following formula:

$$\mu = \frac{8760 - (T_{outage} - T_{excluded})}{8760} \times 100$$

where:

- $\mu$  = port uptime percentage,
- $T_{outage}$  = total hours of outage in the previous year, and
- $T_{excluded}$  = total hours of outage in the previous year caused by allowable exceptions such as electric utility service interruptions, internet or cellular service provider interruptions, and outages caused by EVs, provided that the site host can demonstrate that the charging port would otherwise be operational.

DTEE is requiring qualified network providers to submit biannual reports beginning June 2023 stating the uptime percentage for all participating Charging Forward ports commissioned after December 2022. Failure to provide biannual reports or maintain 97% uptime in any calendar year will disqualify network providers and site hosts from future Business Charger Rebates.

## Business Charger Rebates

Along with Customer E&O and Home Charger Rebates, Business Charger Rebates were part of the initial Charging Forward pilot and launched in June 2019. Through this program, qualified site hosts receive rebates of \$2,000 per Level 2 port and up to \$55,000 per DCFC with the goal of incentivizing EVSE deployment to reduce “range anxiety”, a lack of confidence in refueling infrastructure and a key barrier to EV adoption. Full eligibility requirements and terms and conditions to receive the rebate are detailed in the Business Charger Rebate [Agreement](#). All applications and documentation are managed through the Business Charger Rebate PowerClerk® [website](#).

Business Charger Rebates have continued to increase in both approvals and installations over the last year, with only about 110 Level 2 and 18 DCFC rebates remaining available. As a result, the team expects to fully subscribe both incentives by the end of Q3 2023. The complete status of applications is outlined in Table 4 below.

**Table 4: Business Charger Rebate Application Statuses**

Type	Approved	Installed	Under Review	Rejected/Withdrawn
Level 2 sites (ports)	460 (1,297)	199 (872)	17 (79)	129 (666)
DCFC sites (chargers)	55 (135)	22 (51)	6 (9)	102 (259)

The pace of Business Charger Rebates has continued to increase over the last year. Since the 2022 Annual Status Report, Charging Forward has seen a 93% increase in the number of Level 2 ports installed and a 29% increase in the number of Level 2 ports approved. For DCFCs, there is a 70% and 73% increase in the number of installed and approved chargers, respectively. The primary factor driving more projects to installation is members of the Charging Forward team proactively facilitating communication among site hosts, electrical contractors, network providers, and DTEE’s Distribution Operations teams. Doing so enabled the team to better understand project bottlenecks and challenges and step in earlier to identify timely solutions as needed. Additionally, the team has implemented deadlines for sites hosts, as described in the last status report, which prevents stalled applications from remaining in the queue too long.


Overall, customers have been satisfied with Business Charger Rebates, as evidenced by the following verbatims gathered during the post-rebate survey:

- *“The process was simple and easy to follow, and the support and follow-up with the DTE team was outstanding along the way”*
- *“It is a great program that helps bring the new EV technology to Michigan”*
- *“Installing this infrastructure in historic properties is an exercise in creativity and is expensive. Subsidies like this one are needed to deliver the infrastructure needed, and particularly for affordable housing like this nonprofit provides. It’s great that this program is available”*

As part of the Expansion approval, DTEE published [site requirements and preferred site conditions](#) for DCFC sites. The goal of publishing this on the Business Charger Rebate website was to make transparent the types of sites DTEE is seeking for its limited remaining rebates available. The refined and published criteria have led to a more objective process for approving and vetting Business Charger Rebate applications and have slightly increased the number of applications that were rejected. Those rejections are mainly due to lack of surrounding amenities or distance from highway exits.

As previously reported and according to the tiered design of Business Charger Rebates, DTEE saw a year over year (YOY) increase of almost 60% in the average power output of approved DCFCs from 2019 to 2021. However, that trend is beginning to level off to less than 10% in the last year as shown in Figure 10 below. The team expects the average power output of 153kW in 2022 to remain relatively flat over the next few years since the minimum power requirement for NEVI is 150kW.

**Figure 10: Average Power Output of Approved DCFCs by Year (kW)**




The number of installed Business Charger Rebate sites has increased significantly over the last year as discussed above. The impact of the larger sample size is shown in Table 5 below. EV Supply Infrastructure, or the cost of electrical infrastructure between the meter and the charger, increased for Level 2 sites but decreased slightly for DCFC sites. These costs can vary significantly between sites depending on scope of work (e.g., asphalt, electrical upgrades required, transformer pads, etc.), so the team will continue to track this in the future with a larger sample size. Level 2 applications range from two to twenty ports with an average of four ports per site for approved applications, a decrease of one port compared to last year’s report. The team is observing a trend of Level 2 applications ranging from only two to four ports with larger applications becoming rarer. There are no changes for DCFC application sizes; they range from two to four chargers with an average of two chargers per site. The team expects that could increase in the future, since NEVI awards must have a minimum of four DCFCs per site.

**Table 5: Average Business Charger Rebate Installation Costs**

Type	Sites Installed	Average (Avg) Ports per Site	YOY Change (Ports)	Avg EV Supply Infrastructure Cost per Site	YOY Change (%)
Level 2	199	4	(1)	\$13,000	+30%
DCFC	22	2	0	\$91,000	(3%)

The EV team is also tracking the geographic spread of approved applications as shown in Figure 11 to the right. All eleven counties in DTEE service territory have at least one approved site, but only four of the counties have 90% of approved sites: Oakland (37%), Wayne (34%), Washtenaw (12%), and Macomb (7%). Drilling down to the city level, Detroit (16%), Ann Arbor (11%), Troy (5%), and Waterford Township (5%) have the most approved applications. The remaining 63% are in various cities with one to five projects.

**Figure 11: Map of Business Charger Rebate Sites by Charger Type**



## eFleet Charger Rebates

The eFleet Charger Rebate program was approved as part of eFleets in March 2021 and is designed to complement eFAS by facilitating the deployment of necessary fleet charging infrastructure. Full eligibility requirements and terms and conditions to receive the rebate are detailed in the [eFleet Charger Rebate Agreement](#). All eFleets applications and documentation are managed through the eFleet Charger Rebate PowerClerk® [website](#).

eFleet Charger Rebates are building momentum: since the 2022 Annual Status Report, the team has increased approved Level 2 ports from 24 to 178 and approved DCFCs from six to 46. DTEE has found that eFleet Charger Rebate applicants have been deploying EVSE at a faster pace compared to Business Charger Rebate applicants. This trend is likely due to three key reasons. First, fleet owners often have larger budgets with longer-term financial planning, allowing them to invest in charging infrastructure more readily. Second, fleet owner applications typically have more chargers per site than other site host applications. Lastly, expected delivery dates of ordered EVs is a catalyst for fleets to coordinate their charging infrastructure deployment accordingly. A complete overview of the status of eFleet Charger Rebates is shown in Table 6 below.

**Table 6: eFleet Charger Rebate Application Statuses**

Type	Approved	Installed	Under Review	Rejected/Withdrawn
Level 2 sites (ports)	32 (178)	16 (102)	0 (0)	5 (12)
DCFC sites (chargers)	14 (46)	3 (8)	1 (1)	5 (7)

More than 80% of eFleet Charger Rebates have been awarded to business customers in only three segments: government (43%), school (37%), and delivery (6%). In the government segment, only two cities make up 88% of approved ports in this segment, signifying more advanced transportation electrification plans to achieve their decarbonization goals. The high demand in the school segment is mostly driven by school districts that were awarded EPA CSB funds, although there are also participating universities and colleges that generally cite their sustainability plans as the primary reason behind electrifying their fleets. Over 80% of the delivery segment is in partnership with one restaurant and its delivery service as part of their nationwide electrification plans. The remaining 14% of eFleet Charger Rebates are spread across smaller fleet customers ranging in their electrification journeys from one to six chargers with their applications.

As described above, eFleet Charger Rebate projects generally have more ports per site than Business Charger Rebate projects: on average they have seven Level 2s (compared to four) and three DCFCs (compared to two) per site as shown in Table 7 below. The higher average EV Supply Infrastructure costs compared to Business Charger Rebates, even after considering the additional ports per site, is driven by higher-powered, specialized charging to serve the specific use cases of the fleets.



DTEE seeks to promote a competitive marketplace environment for EV supply equipment (EVSE) network providers in Southeast Michigan

**Table 7:** Average eFleet Charger Rebate Installation Costs

Type	Sites Installed	Avg Ports per Site	Avg EV Supply Infrastructure Cost per Site
Level 2	16	7	\$26,600
DCFC	3	3	\$159,000

Similar to other Charging Forward programs, eFleet Charger Rebate participants receive a post-rebate survey. The verbatims received demonstrate the value of the eFleets program overall:

- *“DTE team members were very helpful during and after the rebate submission process”*
- *“The eFleet Charger Rebate program helps facilitate the installation of EV chargers”*

### New Expansion Elements

DTEE received approval in November 2022 for three new programs focused on business customers as part of the Expansion: Business Charger Installation, Charging Hubs, and eFleet Battery Support. All three are in different stages of maturity with details on the programs and status to date provided below.

First, Business Charger Installation is designed to increase access to charging in four specific customer segments that were not seeing significant traction in the Business Charger Rebate program: municipalities, disadvantaged communities, LMI multi-unit dwellings, and rural areas. For this program, DTEE will fund and own the EV Supply Infrastructure, reducing upfront complexity and cost of installation in these targeted segments. Due to the limited pilot size and specific eligibility requirements, DTEE is establishing strategic partnerships with stakeholders as needed to fully subscribe the program by year end. Since its launch in March 2023, multiple sites have been approved to move forward (pending acceptance of terms and conditions by participants). Sites have been approved in the targeted segments of municipalities, disadvantaged communities, and rural areas, with the first installations expected by Q3 2023.

Second, Charging Hubs is designed to support fleet electrification by providing multiple fast chargers at one location and pull-through spaces for larger vehicles. DTEE received approval to build, own, and operate up to two Charging Hubs. After exploring several sites, the team has supported two grant applications for hubs in Southeast Michigan. In February, DTEE partnered with Detroit Diesel (Daimler Truck North America) and the State of Michigan to submit a grant for a Charging Hub located in Redford with a decision expected by July. As part of the application, the team submitted over ten Letters of Support from surrounding businesses and other stakeholders.

In April, the DTEE Distribution Operations team submitted an application for a large resilience project in Southwest Detroit and included a Charging Hub as part of that larger submission with a decision expected in Q3 2023. While the exact location is still to be determined (pending grant award), the intersection of I-75, I-96, and the Ambassador Bridge makes it an ideal location with ample truck traffic to potentially utilize the site.

Lastly, eFleet Battery Support is designed to facilitate transit bus electrification by alleviating the upfront price premium of electric buses. With this program, DTEE will purchase bus batteries on behalf of transit agencies, and those participating agencies will pay a monthly service charge that will both keep rates neutral over time for other DTEE customers and allow them to still capture fuel savings benefits. The terms and conditions for eFleet Battery Support are nearing completion, and the pilot is expected to officially launch in Q3 2023.





## Additional Key Learnings

### Charging Profiles & Utilization


As a condition of qualifying as an approved vendor for Charging Forward, Network Providers must share the charging data with the team on an anonymized basis. DTEE has set up an internal dashboard using Power BI to analyze the data, with ChargePoint, Enel X, EV Connect, and Shell Recharge Solutions as the only Network Providers with installed chargers integrated in the dashboard tool so far. The remaining vendors will continue to be integrated as chargers are installed.

Based on the installation of 3,145 residential Level 2 chargers, 872 business Level 2 ports, and 51 DCFCs in Charging Forward, 9.2 Gigawatt-hours (GWh) have been consumed to date. This is the equivalent of 30 million electric miles powered by DTEE, translating to 7,300 metric tons of carbon emissions eliminated and almost 860 thousand gallons of gasoline avoided. Across both residential and business chargers, 90% of consumption fell outside the coincident peak hours of 3pm-7pm. Overall, usage has been primarily overnight, driven by residential charging.

Residential charging makes up 73% (or 6.7 GWh) of total participating charger consumption. As expected with the Time of Day requirement, Home Charger Rebate

participants primarily charge off-peak as shown in Figure 12 below. For all the residential chargers, 92% of consumption fell outside the coincident peak hours of 3pm-7pm. The graph shows spikes at 7 pm (when off-peak pricing starts for Enhanced Time of Day rate) and 11 pm (when off-peak pricing starts for both the EV and Dynamic Peak Pricing rates).

**Figure 12: Average Daily Home Charger Usage (Jun 2019 - Apr 2023)**



As can be expected, total energy consumption measured from participating Charging Forward chargers has continued to grow as more chargers are deployed. The increase in annual consumption from business Level 2 and DCFCs has increased at a compound annual growth rate of 292%, from approximately 20 MWh in the first year to nearly 1.5 GWh in the fourth year. Over 80% of DCFC charging session durations are under one hour, while Level 2 session times vary greatly (50% are four hours or more). However, since EVs are parked at Level 2 chargers longer, the idle time when they are parked and not charging is much greater at 47% of the session on average, compared to only 8% of the session for higher-priced DCFCs. High level charging station characteristics for business Level 2 and DCFCs are outlined in Table 8 below.

**Table 8: Business Charging Session Characteristics (Jun 2019 – Apr 2023)**

Type	Average Charging Time (minutes)	Average Usage per Session (kWh)	Average Fee to Driver (\$)	Average Fee to Driver (\$/kWh)
Level 2	146	13.87	\$3.09	\$0.22
DCFC	41	27.28	\$9.64	\$0.35

For Level 2 chargers that require a fee for usage, the average cost is \$3.09/session (with an average usage per session of 13.87 kWh). As expected, drivers are paying a premium to charge their vehicles faster. On the DCFC side, the average energy dispensed is greater at approximately 27 kWh/session at a cost of \$9.64. That equates to an eGallon price of approximately \$3.47.<sup>12</sup> The average price of gasoline in Michigan is \$3.64 at the time of this report but has been as high as \$5.21 in the last year, so even with premium DCFC pricing, EV drivers can still save on “fuel” compared to paying at the pump.<sup>13</sup>

### Benefit-Cost Analysis

In its initial proposal, the Charging Forward team estimated net present value (NPV) of \$2,100-\$2,800 in gross margin that each EV sale provides toward DTE system fixed costs over its lifetime as described by Company Witness Serna in filing [U-20162](#) (pages 43-44). DTEE has continued to provide updates on its NPV gross margin analyses in subsequent status reports. Based on the latest market dynamics and charging behavior lessons learned, the team refined the average NPV of lifetime gross margin to approximately \$1,800-\$2,100 as described by Company Witness Peterson in filing [U-21297](#) (pages 62-63) and as outlined in Table 9 below.

**Table 9: Overview of NPV Gross Margin Calculation**

Assumption Description	2018 Value	2023 Value	Key Assumptions for Updated Analysis
Annual EV electricity usage (kWh)	3,900	3,670	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0.27 kWh/mile for cars</li> <li>0.49 kWh/mile for pickups</li> <li>11,463 miles/year</li> </ul>
Life of each incremental EV (years)	10	10	
Weighted average revenue rate (\$/kWh)	\$0.14	\$0.12-\$0.13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>73% from residential</li> <li>27% from business</li> </ul>
Base Fuel and Purchased Power (\$/kWh)	\$0.033	\$0.034	
Coincident Peak charging (%)	30%	15%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12% from residential</li> <li>25% from business<sup>14</sup></li> </ul>
NPV Gross Margin Incremental EV Sales (\$)	\$2,100-\$2,800	\$1,800-\$2,100	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Discount rate of 6.79%</li> </ul>

<sup>12</sup>Based on DOE methodology and assuming 33 mpg internal combustion engine equivalent and 0.3 kWh/mile

<sup>13</sup>AAA

<sup>14</sup>Note the measured value program to date is 13% on-peak, but the team is using a more conservative estimate of 25% on-peak for the purposes of benefits estimation

Four adjustments to the 2023 NPV analysis from the last status report are the annual EV usage, the split between residential versus business charging, the average revenue rate that DTEE will receive, and the base fuel and purchased power cost. The latter two are results of tariff updates following Order U-20836. For annual EV usage, the team reduced all of the input assumptions slightly based on updated guidance from the Alternative Fuels Data Center and internal analysis regarding increased vehicle efficiencies. Lastly, the residential versus business split was modified to reduce residential charging from 80% to 73% based on actual data and to tie to DTEE’s load forecasting assumptions.

With the actual sales from the past three years (~21,000) and strong sales so far in 2023, the team is confident gross margin benefits from EV sales will more than cover the total anticipated costs of Charging Forward. Playing an active role in these early adoption years to ensure DTE is learning about EV charging behavior, piloting new technologies, and efficiently integrating charging infrastructure with the distribution system now is important to optimize investments to serve EV load in the future.

Case No. U-21534  
Exhibit: A-30

This page intentionally left blank



## **March 1, 2024 Tree Trim Annual Report**

In Case U-20162, on May 2, 2019, the Commission directed DTE Electric (DTEE) to file an annual report to detail the progress of the Surge program and Enhanced Tree Trim Program (ETTP) performance. From the U-20162 Order:

Thus, the annual report shall also break out all activity, costs, and miles trimmed under any and all tree trimming programs (including hardening) in the city of Detroit, to provide information on the progress made in the city of Detroit with each program. The reporting shall include measurable data for the efforts, including miles completed by service center, performance of ETTP circuits compared to non-ETTP circuits, the costs of the efforts, number of employees directly involved in the efforts, tree-related outage reductions, SAIDI reductions, and whether the funding for the efforts is a capital expense or O&M cost. Further, the report shall track ETTP circuit performance, comparing average outages for the three years prior to the enhanced trimming with outages in the years after the trimming has been performed. The first report is due in this docket March 1, 2020, and an annual report is due on March 1 of each year thereafter.

Per Case U-20162 order and Case U-20561 order, this report covers the requested information. The report is split into six sections:

- 1) Miles Completed to ETTP Standard – Annual ETTP maintenance miles are reported by Service Center over the 2015-2023 time period. City of Detroit miles are broken out separately.
- 2) O&M and Capital Spend on Tree Trimming Activities – Annual tree trim spend are reported by Service Center over the 2016-2023 time period. City of Detroit spend is broken out separately. Costs from 2015 are not included because the ETTP specification makes up a relatively small portion of the overall tree trim spend in that year.
- 3) ETTP Circuit Performance – ETTP circuit performance comparing average outage events, customer interruptions, outage minutes, and wire downs before and after ETTP work. The performance will cover ETTP circuits trimmed in 2015 through 2022 with reliability data that ranges from 2012 to 2023. Performance of ETTP circuits trimmed in 2023 will be measured starting in 2024.
- 4) Spot Tree Trimming – Description of spot-trimming work done on the 10 worst performing circuits.
- 5) Tree Trim Workforce – A 2023 summary of the tree trim workforce is broken down by DTEE employees and contractors.

- 6) Incremental Funding for Tree Trim Program – Description of the additional work completed in 2023 from the increased funding from Case No. U-21128, in which the Company committed an incremental \$90M to the tree trim program.

### **Section 1 – Miles Completed to ETP Standard**

Since the inception of the ETP standard, the Company has trimmed 38,550 miles. 5,299 ETP miles were trimmed in 2023 as part of the Surge program. Below, **Table 1** breaks out ETP miles trimmed by distribution and subtransmission, **Table 2** details miles trimmed by service center and year. **Table 3** shows total miles trimmed to ETP, which may include second and third cycle ETP trimming. It has a breakdown of only unique miles trimmed to ETP, which does not count the second or third cycle of ETP trimming. It also shows miles in backlog (off-cycle), average density and work location by service center. Previous filings from the Company also included manual/climbing trimming data by service center, which was from a onetime study performed by a third-party consultant. The Company does not collect climbing data for each circuit trimmed, however, backlog work is strongly correlated with manual/climbing trimming. **Table 4** shows ETP miles trimmed in the City of Detroit, and **Table 5** covers miles trimmed as part of the 4.8kV Hardening Program.

**Table 1 – ETP Miles Trimmed by Circuit Type**

<b>Circuit Type</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>% of System</b>
Distribution <sup>1</sup>	257	2,270	2,733	3,128	3,181	4,583	5,021	5,991	4,566	31,730	81%
Subtransmission <sup>2</sup>	188	1,030	868	540	1,006	1,006	726	723	733	6,820	100%
<b>Total Miles</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>3,300</b>	<b>3,601</b>	<b>3,668</b>	<b>4,187</b>	<b>5,589</b>	<b>5,747</b>	<b>6,714</b>	<b>5,299</b>	<b>38,550</b>	<b>83%<sup>3</sup></b>

<sup>1</sup> Some of these distribution miles are on their second cycle of ETP trimming and show up in the numbers more than once.

<sup>2</sup> Some of these subtransmission miles are on their second or third cycle of ETP trimming and show up in the numbers more than once.

<sup>3</sup> Numerator only includes unique miles – it only counts the miles once even if the miles are on their second or third cycle of ETP trimming.

**Table 2 – ETTP Miles Trimmed by Service Center**

Service Center	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
ANN	5	143	566	309	246	537	285	585	423	3,099
CAN	40	60	62	271	307	335	360	375	244	2,054
HWL	192	272	445	262	264	603	659	719	320	3,736
LAP	13	341	390	423	378	653	584	555	616	3,953
MAR	70	351	419	432	303	334	395	776	781	3,861
MTC	23	250	259	115	321	430	274	335	79	2,086
NAE	42	693	470	533	557	463	826	793	605	4,982
NPT	5	159	263	342	254	536	561	196	437	2,753
PON	6	426	230	237	424	567	618	551	443	3,502
RFD	24	219	112	381	670	444	300	922	466	3,538
SBY	8	111	102	207	129	114	181	377	453	1,682
WWS	17	275	283	156	334	573	704	531	433	3,306
<b>Total Miles</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>3,300</b>	<b>3,601</b>	<b>3,668</b>	<b>4,187</b>	<b>5,589</b>	<b>5,747</b>	<b>6,714</b>	<b>5,299</b>	<b>38,550</b>

**Table 3 – ETTP Miles Trimmed, Miles of Backlog, Average Tree Density and Mix of Work by Service Center**

Service Center	Cumulative Miles Trimmed ETTP <sup>4</sup>	Total System Miles		For the 2023 Plan Only			
		Unique Miles Trimmed to ETTP <sup>5</sup>	Remaining Miles of Backlog to ETTP <sup>6</sup>	2023 Unique Miles Trimmed to ETTP <sup>5</sup>	Total 2023 Miles Trimmed	Avg. Tree Density <sup>7</sup> (trees/mile)	Work Location <sup>7</sup> (% Backlot)
ANN	3,099	2,090	146	184	423	575	73%
CAN	2,054	1,387	40	1	244	408	93%
HWL	3,736	2,404	25	38	320	301	74%
LAP	3,953	2,645	24	115	616	276	65%
MAR	3,861	2,449	534	370	781	201	61%
MTC	2,086	1,365	1,206	0	79	108	80%
NAE	4,982	2,887	895	140	605	157	84%
NPT	2,753	1,943	10	46	437	125	75%
PON	3,502	2,614	238	294	443	476	68%
RFD	3,538	2,994	423	226	466	315	84%
SBY	1,682	1,239	71	260	453	286	60%
WWS	3,306	2,343	1,006	95	433	290	82%
<b>Total Miles</b>	<b>38,551</b>	<b>26,359</b>	<b>4,615</b>	<b>1,768</b>	<b>5,299</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>73%</b>

<sup>4</sup> Includes second or third cycle ETTP trim.

<sup>5</sup> Does not include second or third cycle ETTP trim.

<sup>6</sup> Remaining miles in backlog after 2023 trimming.

<sup>7</sup> Density and work location are calculated based on task points identified by the planners during planning – includes brush.

**Table 4 – ETTP Miles Trimmed in the City of Detroit by Service Center**

Service Center	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total	% of City
CAN	40	42	60	234	293	291	326	246	240	1,772	-
MTC	-	-	6	-	-	6	-	-	5	17	-
RFD	5	87	27	251	464	90	129	259	192	1,504	-
<b>Total Detroit Miles<sup>8</sup></b>	<b>45</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>485</b>	<b>757</b>	<b>387</b>	<b>455</b>	<b>505</b>	<b>438</b>	<b>3,293</b>	<b>97%<sup>9</sup></b>

**Table 5 – ETTP Miles Trimmed as Part of the 4.8kV Hardening Program<sup>10</sup>**

Service Center	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
CAN	-	-	-	20	0	106	198	199	143	666
RFD	-	-	-	127	158	161	129	325	100	1,000
<b>Total 4.8kV Miles</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>524</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>1,666</b>

## **Section 2 – O&M and Capital Spend on Tree Trimming Activities**

The Company spent \$169,669,666 in O&M for its tree trim program in 2023 as detailed in **Table 6**; years 2016 through 2022 are also included for reference. **Table 6** groups costs into five categories:

- 1) Line Clearance Maintenance – Comprises costs needed for maintenance activities such as contractor labor and equipment, general foreman cost, per diems, and overtime premiums.
- 2) Trouble – Spend on non-storm unplanned reactive tree trim work related to outage or non-outage problems on the electric system.
- 3) Tree Trim Program/Other – Includes customer request work, auditing, software maintenance, the herbicide program, training, safety, and other cost miscellaneous costs associated with Tree Trim.
- 4) DTE Staff Cost – DTE staff costs related to the tree trim program.
- 5) COVID Expenses – Includes costs associated with the additional safety measures that were taken due to the COVID-19 Pandemic.

<sup>8</sup> Some of these miles are on their second cycle of ETTP trimming and show up in the number more than once.

<sup>9</sup> Numerator only includes unique miles trimmed to ETTP, therefore does not double count miles on second- cycle or beyond.

<sup>10</sup> Program began in 2018 and miles in Table 5 are a subset of miles in Tables 1-3.

**Table 6 – Annual O&M Tree Trim Spend by Category<sup>11</sup>**

O&M Spend	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Line Clearance Maintenance	\$59,155,543	\$69,344,451	\$71,757,936	\$116,748,952	\$151,021,453	\$140,202,546	\$209,270,442	\$149,227,403
Trouble	\$10,738,172	\$11,395,011	\$12,966,909	\$16,556,969	\$12,237,821	\$10,667,520	\$12,682,979	\$9,535,799
Tree Trim Program/Other	\$2,771,660	\$1,812,622	\$2,500,756	\$10,229,182	\$6,839,979	\$15,670,339	\$13,013,567	\$6,483,393
DTE Staff Cost	\$1,496,789	\$1,704,325	\$1,883,630	\$2,667,190	\$3,722,732	\$4,372,897	\$4,603,174	\$4,423,070
COVID-19 <sup>12</sup>					\$1,340,624	\$746,118		
<b>O&amp;M Total</b>	<b>\$74,162,165</b>	<b>\$84,256,409</b>	<b>\$89,109,232</b>	<b>\$146,202,293</b>	<b>\$175,162,609</b>	<b>\$171,659,420</b>	<b>\$239,570,162</b>	<b>\$169,669,666</b>

Table 7 further breaks down the “Line Clearance Maintenance” costs in Table 6 by service center.

**Table 7 – Annual Maintenance Tree Trim Spend by Service Center (O&M Only)**

Service Center	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
ANN	\$4,081,462	\$12,103,989	\$9,489,387	\$6,699,698	\$18,811,275	\$11,077,345	\$19,663,782	\$17,458,180
CAN	\$3,312,191	\$1,200,014	\$8,851,085	\$18,827,931	\$11,253,759	\$6,701,520	\$14,189,914	\$4,913,541
HWL	\$4,838,162	\$12,561,698	\$6,269,100	\$6,523,040	\$19,744,784	\$23,573,175	\$20,366,427	\$10,942,721
LAP	\$5,145,835	\$5,820,146	\$4,385,310	\$5,306,986	\$12,866,142	\$8,215,356	\$6,297,393	\$9,272,157
MAR	\$3,679,637	\$4,450,068	\$5,021,951	\$2,757,355	\$5,087,650	\$3,444,947	\$8,968,144	\$11,316,545
MTC	\$3,868,638	\$4,093,991	\$1,961,451	\$3,770,923	\$9,913,687	\$3,727,800	\$4,874,212	\$2,258,725
NAE	\$3,100,279	\$2,242,086	\$2,615,529	\$3,137,335	\$5,336,176	\$3,858,290	\$5,567,071	\$4,196,993
NPT	\$1,990,418	\$4,844,204	\$5,288,021	\$3,400,257	\$9,634,726	\$12,826,082	\$6,520,390	\$11,730,643
PON	\$12,293,540	\$8,619,875	\$8,167,988	\$24,883,843	\$27,768,967	\$29,346,468	\$31,445,874	\$19,290,761
RFD	\$5,929,162	\$3,762,082	\$11,025,927	\$28,999,125	\$12,309,855	\$6,816,756	\$42,187,521	\$27,138,327
SBY	\$3,351,803	\$3,078,400	\$4,338,480	\$2,656,440	\$3,982,452	\$2,863,698	\$15,143,984	\$13,380,970
WWS	\$7,564,417	\$6,567,898	\$4,343,707	\$9,786,018	\$14,311,980	\$27,751,110	\$34,045,729	\$17,327,840
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$59,155,544</b>	<b>\$69,344,451</b>	<b>\$71,757,936</b>	<b>\$116,748,951</b>	<b>\$151,021,453</b>	<b>\$140,202,546</b>	<b>\$209,270,442</b>	<b>\$149,227,403</b>

<sup>11</sup> Table does not include any spot trimming expenses from other programs because they are not part of the tree trim maintenance costs. This table does not include tree trimming cost related to storm, those costs are charged outside the tree trim budget.

<sup>12</sup> These expenses were mainly for the one-person per vehicle policy, and PPE for DTEE employees and contractors.

Table 8 details the 4.8kV Hardening capital spend in 2018-2023.

**Table 8 – Annual 4.8kV Hardening Tree Trim Capital Spend by Service Center**

Service Center	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
CAN	\$ 2,136,156	-	\$5,878,864	\$11,757,474	\$10,675,606	\$7,819,132
RFD	\$ 7,858,107	\$ 10,081,771	\$12,025,855	\$10,274,963	\$25,313,553	\$10,955,464
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 9,994,263</b>	<b>\$ 10,081,771</b>	<b>\$17,904,719</b>	<b>\$22,032,437</b>	<b>\$35,989,159</b>	<b>\$18,774,596</b>

Table 9 highlights the \$25,903,156 tree trim spend in the City of Detroit for the year 2023, which includes \$16,148,871 of Capital spend. City spend in 2016 through 2023 is included for reference.

**Table 9 – Annual Detroit O&M and 4.8kV Hardening Capital Tree Trim Spend**

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023
Detroit - O&M	\$14,071,122	\$40,513,330	\$7,333,594	\$3,875,167	\$8,468,206	\$9,754,285
Detroit – 4.8kV Hardening Capital	\$9,326,363	\$10,081,771	\$11,888,408	\$21,408,206	\$28,865,840	\$16,148,871
<b>Detroit Total</b>	<b>\$23,397,485</b>	<b>\$50,595,101</b>	<b>\$19,222,002</b>	<b>\$25,283,373</b>	<b>\$37,334,046</b>	<b>\$25,903,156</b>

### **Section 3 – ETPP Circuit Performance**

#### **Methodology Used to Calculate ETPP Performance**

The methodology used to calculate ETPP Performance for all distribution circuits uses the average of three years of pre-trim ETPP tree-related outage events and compares it to each year post-trimming. All post-trim year results of the same year were then summed to increase the sample size (as an example, all post-trim year 1 results are included collectively as a sum). The difference between the before trimming performance and the post trimming performance was used to create the “% Change in Outage Event Reduction for ETPP circuits”. To create a control group for comparison, the same methodology was used for the remainder of circuits not trimmed ETPP<sup>13</sup> (Non-ETPP circuits), which are identified as “% Change in Outage Event Reduction for Non-ETPP circuits”. To account for natural weather variation, the performance of the control group is subtracted from the ETPP circuit performance to provide an accurate representation of the true impact of the ETPP. This is the same methodology outlined in Case U-20561, U-20836, and U-21297.

<sup>13</sup> This group consists of circuits that have not been trimmed to the ETPP specification and are considered off-cycle.

**Table 10 – Methodology for ETPP Performance Analysis**

2012	2103	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	# of ETPP Circuits
			Three Year Average Pre-ETTP Performance			Year of Trim	Post Trim Year 1	321
		Three Year Average Pre-ETTP Performance			Year of Trim	Post Trim Year 1	Post Trim Year 2	128
	Three Year Average Pre-ETTP Performance			Year of Trim	Post Trim Year 1	Post Trim Year 2	Post Trim Year 3	171
Three Year Average Pre-ETTP Performance			Year of Trim	Post Trim Year 1	Post Trim Year 2	Post Trim Year 3	Post Trim Year 4	20

**Table 11 – Methodology for Control Group Non-ETTP Performance Analysis**

2012	2103	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	# of ETPP Circuits
			Three Year Average Pre-Non-ETTP Performance			Year of Trim	Post Trim Year 1	N/A
		Three Year Average Pre-Non-ETTP Performance			Year of Trim	Post Trim Year 1	Post Trim Year 2	N/A
	Three Year Average Pre-Non-ETTP Performance			Year of Trim	Post Trim Year 1	Post Trim Year 2	Post Trim Year 3	N/A
Three Year Average Pre-Non-ETTP Performance			Year of Trim	Post Trim Year 1	Post Trim Year 2	Post Trim Year 3	Post Trim Year 4	N/A

The control group of non-ETTP circuits and the ETPP circuits are compared against each other to account for non-tree trim related variations. This methodology normalizes reliability performance from variations that occur year-to-year, such as weather and storms. This approach provides a more accurate measure of the ETPP effectiveness since we are comparing circuits over the course of years.

**ETTP Outage Event Performance**

The actual difference of outage events on ETPP circuits compared to the balance of the system not trimmed ETPP is 54.0% in post-trim year 1, 36.8% in the second year, 43.8% in the third year,

and 11.1% in the fourth year. The actual reduction for Years 1-4 post ETTP trim is depicted in **Table 12**.

**Table 12 – ETTP Tree-Related Outage Event Difference Compared to Non ETTP Circuits**

	Number of Dist. Circuits ETTP Trimmed	% Change in Outage Event Reduction for ETTP circuits	% Change in Outage Event Reduction for Non-ETTP circuits	Difference in % Change in Event Reduction ETTP vs Non-ETTP circuits	U-20162 Surge Model Projected Reduction
1 Year Post Trim	2,063	-22.0%	32.0%	<b>-54.0%</b>	-57.0%
2 Years Post Trim	1,442	-12.8%	49.6%	<b>-36.8%</b>	-57.0%
3 Years Post Trim	974	9.94%	53.7%	<b>-43.8%</b>	-50.0%
4 Years Post Trim	491	58.1%	69.2%	<b>-11.1%</b>	-37.0%

**ETTP Customer Interruptions Performance**

Using the same methodology discussed above, the Company has determined that actual customer interruptions on ETTP circuits vs. Non-ETTP circuits show a 57.9% difference in Year 1, 59.3% difference in Year 2, 48.6% difference in Year 3, and 40.7% difference in Year 4. These results are shown in Table 13.

**Table 13 – ETTP Tree-Related Customer Interruption Difference Compared to Non ETTP Circuits**

	Number of Dist. Circuits ETTP Trimmed	% Change in Outage Interruption Reduction for ETTP circuits	% Change in Outage Interruption Reduction for Non-ETTP circuits	Difference in % Change in Event Reduction ETTP vs Non-ETTP circuits	U-20162 Surge Model Projected Reduction
1 Year Post Trim	2,063	-38.8%	19.1%	<b>-57.9%</b>	-57.0%
2 Years Post Trim	1,442	-28.0%	31.2%	<b>-59.3%</b>	-57.0%
3 Years Post Trim	974	-24.1%	24.6%	<b>-48.6%</b>	-50.0%
4 Years Post Trim	491	-14.3%	26.4%	<b>-40.7%</b>	-37.0%

**ETTP Customer Outage Minute Performance**

Customer minutes of interruption, shown in **Table 14**, also shows significant improvements from the ETPP program. Actual minutes of customer interruption on ETPP circuits vs. Non-ETPP circuits show a 32.4% difference in Year 1, 8.1% difference in Year 2, -22.4% difference in Year 3, and -6.4% difference in Year

**Table 14 – ETPP Tree-Related Customer Outage Minutes of Interruption Difference Compared to Non ETPP Circuits**

	Number of Dist. Circuits ETPP Trimmed	% Change in Outage Minutes Reduction for ETPP circuits	% Change in Outage Minutes Reduction for Non-ETPP circuits	<b>Difference in % Change in Event Reduction ETPP vs Non-ETPP circuits</b>	U-20162 Surge Model Projected Reduction
1 Year Post Trim	2,063	-27.0%	5.3%	<b>-32.4%</b>	-57.0%
2 Years Post Trim	1,442	16.4%	24.5%	<b>-8.1%</b>	-57.0%
3 Years Post Trim	974	10.5%	-11.9%	<b>22.4%</b>	-50.0%
4 Years Post Trim	491	1.3%	-5.2%	<b>6.4%</b>	-37.0%

Table 15 shows the 2023 outage minutes avoided due to ETPP trimming and the impact to overall system SAIDI, which reflects a net reduction of 226 SAIDI minutes. If only ETPP circuits are considered, the SAIDI reduction is 313 minutes.

**Table 15 – 2023 ETPP Outage Minute Reduction and SAIDI Impact**

	ETPP Outage Minutes
3 Years Before Trim Avg. Outage Minutes	603,540,803
2023 Outage Minutes	900,537,209
Minutes Saved	-296,996,406
Minutes Avoided – Non ETPP System Deterioration	947,747,698
Total Minute Reduction	650,751,293
<b>ETPP Overall System SAIDI Minute Reduction</b>	<b>300</b>

<b>SAIDI Minute Reduction for ETTP Circuits ONLY</b>	<b>390</b>
--	------------

### **ETTP Wire-Down Performance**

Using the same methodology discussed above, the Company has determined that actual wire-down events for ETTP circuits vs. Non-ETTP circuits show a 55.4% difference in Year 1, 56.8% difference in Year 2, 39.8% difference in Year 3, and 15.3% difference in Year 4. These results are shown in **Table 16**.

**Table 16 – Post-ETTP Wire-Down Difference Compared to Non-ETTP Circuits**

	Number of Dist. Circuits ETTP Trimmed	% Change Wire-Down Events for ETTP circuits	% Change for Wire-Down Events for Non-ETTP circuits	<b>Difference in % Change in Wire-Down Events ETTP vs. Non-ETTP circuits</b>
1 Year Post Trim	2,063	-65.5%	-10.1%	<b>-55.4%</b>
2 Years Post Trim	1,442	-64.8%	-8.0%	<b>-56.8%</b>
3 Years Post Trim	974	-58.3%	-18.5%	<b>-39.8%</b>
4 Years Post Trim	491	-52.7%	-37.4%	<b>-15.3%</b>

### **Section 4 – Spot Trimming on Worst Performing Circuits**

DTE Electric provides an annual power quality investigation report which contains data on all primary customer power quality investigations conducted in the past year for end-use customers, derived from their power quality meters, and the outcome of each investigation. This report contains the DTE Electric January 1, 2023 through December 31, 2023 results and identifies a list of 10 worst performing circuits based on SAIFI outages compared to the rest of the system (based on all cause codes, not just tree related events). Table 17 lists these circuits and the spot trimming that took place in 2023, or planned maintenance trimming.

**Table 17 – Tree Trimming on 2023 Ten Worst Performing Circuits**

Circuit	sysSAIFI <sup>14</sup>	sysSAIFI ex MED <sup>15</sup>	Spot Trimming		Last Maintenance Trimming Year
			Performed in 2023?	Number of Poles Trimmed	
MOTT9789	0.01031	0.00451	No		2020
NIXON8932	0.00905	0.00339	No		2023
CROWN9832	0.00853	0.00581	Yes	4	2022
GODSN8134	0.00792	0.00390	Yes	110	2018
PERU9432	0.00765	0.00508	No		2022
KENSL9858	0.00719	0.00436	No		2022
STATE8137	0.00657	0.00308	No		2014
DUBLN8195	0.00617	0.00093	Yes	12	2020
CODY9537	0.00606	0.00187	Yes	125	2015
DUBLN8205	0.00595	0.00126	Yes	21	2020

**Section 5 – Tree Trim Workforce**

The internal employees directly involved in Tree Trimming are detailed in **Table 18**. In 2023, the average number for contractors on property were 1,282. Contractor headcount fluctuation over the course of 2023 is seen in **Chart 1**.


**Table 18 – 2023 DTE and Contractor Tree Trim Headcount**

Facilitator – Arborists	13
Supervision	8
Regional Foresters	5
Strategy and Planning	9
<b>Internal Employees involved with ETP</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>2023 Average # of Contractors</b>	<b>1,282</b>

<sup>14</sup> sysSAFI is the number of customer interruptions on a specific circuit divided by the number of system customer interruptions.

<sup>15</sup> MED stands for Major Event Days.

**Chart 1 – 2023 Contract Tree Trim Headcount by Week**



The 2023 average local journeymen trimmers were 641, and the number of local apprentices were 229. Outsourced journeymen trimmers averaged 412 for 2023. It is typical for the workforce numbers to fluctuate over the year, especially in the late fall when many outsource trimmers return to their home states for the holidays. The outsource trimmers then slowly return through the first quarter of the year based on the Company's capacity needs.

The Company is participating in three programs in an effort to increase the number of local trimmers. The three programs are the Parnall Correctional Facility Vocational Village Training Program, the City of Detroit Tree Trim Academy, and the IBEW Local 17 Traditional Boot Camp. Below is an update on each of the programs:

1. Parnall Correctional Facility The Parnall Tree Trimming program is designed to provide returning citizens the skills needed to start as an apprentice tree trimmer. DTE has partnered with the Michigan Department of Corrections to provide qualified instructors and the required training support within the prison facility before participants are released. The company has paired 30 graduates with jobs.
2. Tree Trim Academy – The Company has partnered with the City of Detroit, IBEW Local 17, and its tree-trimming contractors to develop and implement a pre-woodsman training pilot program to satisfy the demand for qualified tree trimmers. The pilot tree trimming academy is located within the City of Detroit and facilitates training that is aimed at preparing local resident candidates to work as woodsmen. Once candidates complete the pre-woodsman program, graduates enter the nine-day boot camp that was previously designed in partnership with the Company, IBEW Local 17, and the Company's tree-trimming contractors.

To date the tree trimming academy has trained and graduated 202 individuals. Graduates leave the program with sought after climbing experience, a Class B CDL, and a federally required pesticide Applicator certification.

3. Traditional Boot Camp – IBEW continues to hold regular scheduled boot camp training for apprentices. Current camps are conducted at their training facility in Wales, MI.

## **Section 6 – Incremental Funding for Tree Trim Program**

On August 31, 2021, the Company proposed additional funding for the Tree Trim program in Case No. U-21128. Per the application, the Company would invest incremental funding into the Tree Trim Surge during the remainder of 2021 through 2023, beyond the authorized regulatory asset amounts, and would not seek recovery of the additional expenditures. This has the effect of advancing the Company's tree trimming efforts while avoiding future customer expense for those investments, thus providing an affordability benefit to customers. The Company's application was approved on November 4th, 2021, and the Company committed to \$90 million of incremental funding for the Tree Trimming program.

In 2022, the Company spent \$85.8 million of the incremental \$90 million investment. The annual maintenance plan was developed based on the total budget, including the incremental \$85.8 million. The Company did not distinguish specific circuits trimmed as part of the base budget compared to the incremental funding. However, the Company can calculate the incremental work the additional funding enabled us to complete. The additional \$85.8 million allowed the Company to complete an extra 1,700 off-cycle miles in 2022 and lead the system to be 79% on-cycle at year end. These miles were focused in poor reliability areas and trimming was completed prior to the 2022 storm season.

In 2023, the remaining \$4.2 million of the incremental funding was spent to support the Company's spot trimming program to address high-risk areas that were not on the 2023 maintenance plan. The spot trimming program and circuit impact are reviewed in Section 4.

**Michigan Public Service Commission  
DTE Electric Company  
Assistance Disconnect Rates  
Customer Service**

Case No: U-21534  
Exhibit: A-32  
Schedule W1  
Witness: J. E. Sparks  
Page: 1 of 1

*\*Note: 2022 Data is refreshed as of 10/31/2023 and hence shut offs are counted only until that point*

Line	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(m)	(n)	(o)
	LSP Program Year	2018			2019			2020			2021			2022		
	MEAP combinations and Shut off rate within 12 mos (Non-LSP)	Combo	Elec only	Gas only	Combo	Elec only	Gas only	Combo	Elec only	Gas only	Combo	Elec only	Gas only	Combo	Elec only	Gas only
1	a. MEAP	32%	29%	6%	19%	18%	6%	30%	27%	15%	23%	23%	9%	25%	26%	2%
2	b. MEAP and LIA	31%	21%	9%	18%	18%	3%	23%	22%	15%	18%	14%	9%	20%	18%	3%
3	c. MEAP and RIA	33%	27%	6%	22%	21%	7%	32%	30%	19%	24%	24%	10%	26%	27%	2%
4	d. MEAP and HHC	35%	36%	5%	21%	27%	6%	29%	13%	11%	22%	20%	5%	25%	21%	1%
5	e. MEAP + HHC + LIA	32%		0%	21%		8%	22%		0%	18%		14%	18%		0%
6	f. MEAP + HHC + RIA	35%	100%	5%	21%	27%	6%	30%	14%	11%	23%	20%	5%	26%	23%	1%
7	g. MEAP + LIA + RIA	31%		0%	19%	19%	5%	26%	18%	12%	22%	10%	28%	22%	17%	0%
8	h. MEAP + LIA + RIA + HHC	33%		0%	21%		0%	25%			22%		40%	22%		0%

Line	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)	(m)	(n)	(o)
	LSP Program Year	2018			2019			2020			2021			2022		
	Shut-off rate	Combo	Elec only	Gas only	Combo	Elec only	Gas only	Combo	Elec only	Gas only	Combo	Elec only	Gas only	Combo	Elec only	Gas only
9	a. LSP & shutoff															
10	0-75	10%	11%	6%	11%	10%	5%	9%	10%	6%	12%	10%	7%	13%	11%	6%
11	76-110	8%	9%	4%	9%	6%	5%	7%	7%	9%	10%	8%	3%	10%	8%	2%
12	111-150	8%	7%	3%	9%	7%	2%	8%	9%	11%	10%	8%	8%	10%	10%	5%
13	b. LSP and LIA & shutoff															
14	0-75	10%	11%	5%	11%	10%	4%	9%	10%	6%	11%	9%	7%	13%	11%	6%
15	76-110	8%	9%	0%	9%	7%	5%	7%	7%	9%	10%	8%	2%	10%	8%	2%
16	111-150	8%	7%	2%	9%	7%	3%	8%	9%	12%	9%	7%	7%	10%	9%	4%
17	c. LSP and RIA & shutoff															
18	0-75	14%	0%	6%	12%	18%	4%	20%	21%	8%	22%	22%	14%	23%	21%	8%
19	76-110	13%	0%	6%	9%	13%	6%	17%	14%	14%	20%	16%	7%	17%	15%	4%
20	111-150	14%	0%	5%	10%	17%	2%	19%	17%	15%	20%	19%	11%	17%	20%	7%
21	d. LSP and HHC & shutoff															
22	0-75	10%	0%	4%	11%	0%	2%	8%	0%	4%	10%	0%	3%	12%	0%	3%
23	76-110	8%	0%	3%	10%	0%	0%	5%	0%	16%	7%	0%	0%	8%	25%	0%
24	111-150	7%		5%	9%		0%	6%	0%	15%	8%		6%	11%	0%	3%
25	e. LSP + HHC + LIA & shutoff															
26	0-75	10%	0%	9%	11%		1%	7%		4%	9%	0%	1%	11%		3%
36	111-150	14%	0%	0%	9%	17%	2%	18%	15%	16%	19%	20%	10%	16%	21%	6%
37	h. LSP + LIA + RIA + HHC & shutoff															
38	0-75	11%		13%	12%		2%	15%		5%	18%		2%	19%		4%
39	76-110	9%		0%	10%		0%	12%		17%	15%		0%	13%		0%
40	111-150	8%		0%	8%		0%	11%		25%	15%		17%	16%		4%

Michigan Public Service Commission  
DTE Electric Company  
Projected Capital Expenditures  
Distribution - Infrastructure Recovery Mechanism (IRM)  
Proposed Investment and In-Service Levels  
(\$000)

Case No.: U-21534  
Exhibit: A-33  
Schedule: X1  
Witness: N. Foley  
Page: 1 of 1

Line No.	(a) Description	(b) U-21297 Approved 2024 13 mos. ending 12/31/2024	(c) U-21297 Approved 2025 12 mos. ending 12/31/2025	(d) U-21534 Proposed 2026 12 mos. ending 12/31/2026	(e) U-21534 Proposed 2027 12 mos. ending 12/31/2027
1	<b><u>CAPITAL INVESTMENTS</u></b>				
2	Conversions	1,608	185,812	190,000	240,000
3	Subtransmission Redesign & Rebuild	5,546	53,819	55,000	65,000
4	Breaker Replacement Program	13,680	12,628	15,000	15,000
5	URD Replacement Program	14,625	13,500	15,000	20,000
6	Distribution Automation	26,406	24,375	105,000	180,000
7	Pole and Pole Top Maintenance & Modernization	-	-	150,000	200,000
8	<b>Total IRM Investments</b>	<b><u>61,865</u></b>	<b><u>290,134</u></b>	<b><u>530,000</u></b>	<b><u>720,000</u></b>
9	<b><u>Additions to PLANT IN SERVICE</u></b>				
10	Conversions	1,206	139,761	188,953	227,500
11	Subtransmission Redesign & Rebuild	4,159	41,750	54,705	62,500
12	Breaker Replacement Program	13,680	12,628	15,000	15,000
13	URD Replacement Program	14,625	13,500	15,000	20,000
14	Distribution Automation	26,406	24,375	105,000	180,000
15	Pole and Pole Top Maintenance & Modernization	-	-	150,000	200,000
16	<b>Total IRM Investments</b>	<b><u>60,077</u></b>	<b><u>232,015</u></b>	<b><u>528,658</u></b>	<b><u>705,000</u></b>

Case No. U-21534  
Exhibit: A-33  
Schedule: X2

This page intentionally left blank

Case No. U-21534  
Exhibit: A-33  
Schedule: X3

This page intentionally left blank

Michigan Public Service Commission  
DTE Electric Company  
Infrastructure Recovery Mechanism  
Incremental Revenue Requirement - Distribution Operations  
(\$000)

Case No.: U-21534  
Exhibit: A-33  
Schedule: X4  
Witness: K. M. Vangilder  
Page: 1 of 2

Line No.	(a) Description	(b) Source	(c) 13 mos. ending 12/31/2024 (1) <i>(prev. approved)</i>	(d) 12 mos. ending 12/31/2025 (1) <i>(prev. approved)</i>	(e) 12 mos. ending 12/31/2026 <i>(proposed)</i>	(f) 12 mos. ending 12/31/2027 <i>(proposed)</i>	(g) Total
1	<b>PLANT IN SERVICE</b>						
2							
3	Conversions	Exh A-33, Sch X1, Line 10	\$ 1,206	\$ 139,761	\$ 188,953	\$ 227,500	\$ 557,420
4	Subtransmission Redesign & Rebuild	Exh A-33, Sch X1, Line 11	4,159	41,750	54,705	62,500	163,114
5	Breaker Replacement Program	Exh A-33, Sch X1, Line 12	13,680	12,628	15,000	15,000	56,309
6	URD Replacement Program	Exh A-33, Sch X1, Line 13	14,625	13,500	15,000	20,000	63,125
7	Distribution Automation (2)	Exh A-33, Sch X1, Line 14	26,406	24,375	105,000	180,000	335,781
8	Pole and Pole Top Maintenance & Modernization	Exh A-33, Sch X1, Line 15	-	-	150,000	200,000	350,000
9	<b>Total Plant In Service</b>		<b>\$ 60,077</b>	<b>\$ 232,015</b>	<b>\$ 528,658</b>	<b>\$ 705,000</b>	<b>\$ 1,525,749</b>
10							
11	<b>Net Rate Base</b>						
12	Cumulative Plant In Service	Prior Yr plus L9	\$ 60,077	\$ 292,092	\$ 820,749	\$ 1,525,749	
13	Accumulated Depreciation	Prior Yr less L20	(1,227)	(8,417)	(31,140)	(79,052)	
14	Accum. Deferred Taxes	P2, L7	(266)	(1,781)	(6,409)	(15,708)	
15	Ending Net Rate Base	Sum of L12 thru L14	\$ 58,584	\$ 281,893	\$ 783,201	\$ 1,430,989	
16	Average Net Rate Base	L15 (PY+CY)/2	29,292	170,239	532,547	1,107,095	
17							
18	<b>Total Cost of Service</b>						
19	Return on Net Rate Base	L16 * Pre-tax rate of return (3)	2,551	14,825	49,016	101,898	168,290
20	Depreciation (1/2 yr conv.)	(4)	1,227	7,191	22,723	47,912	79,052
21	Property Taxes	P2, L30 + P2, L47	-	1,684	8,871	22,623	33,178
22	<b>Total Cost of Service (COS) Requirement</b>	L19 thru L21	<b>\$ 3,778</b>	<b>\$ 23,700</b>	<b>\$ 80,610</b>	<b>\$ 172,433</b>	<b>\$ 280,520</b>

(1) 2024 and 2025 revenue requirement calculations utilize the same plant in service amounts, rate of return, depreciation rates, and property tax millage rates as those approved in the IRM for DTE Electric Rate Case No. U-21297

(2) Previously known as 4.8 kV Circuit Automation

(3) Pre-tax rate of return for 2026

Exhibit A-14, Schedule D1

	Weighted Cost	Pre-tax Multiplier	Pre-tax Rate of Return
Long-Term Debt	2.12%	1.000	2.12%
Common Equity	5.25%	1.350	7.09%
Total	7.37%		9.20%

(4) 2026 depreciation rate for Distribution Plant is 4.11% per Witness Uzenski Exhibit A-13, Schedule C6. Page 2, Line 9

Michigan Public Service Commission  
DTE Electric Company  
Infrastructure Recovery Mechanism  
Incremental Revenue Requirement - Distribution Operations  
(\$000)

Case No.: U-21534  
Exhibit: A-33  
Schedule: X4  
Witness: K. M. Vangilder  
Page: 2 of 2

Line No.	Description	Source	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
			13 mos. ending 12/31/2024	12 mos. ending 12/31/2025	12 mos. ending 12/31/2026	12 mos. ending 12/31/2027		
			(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
			(prev. approved)	(prev. approved)	(extension)	(extension)	(extension)	(extension)
1	<b>Deferred Tax Expense</b>							
2	Tax Depreciation	Line 17	2,253	13,037	40,585	83,804		
3	Book Depreciation	P1, L20	1,227	7,191	22,723	47,912		
4	Timing Difference	Line 2 - Line 3	1,026	5,846	17,862	35,892		
5	Deferred Tax Expense	Line 4 X 25.91%	\$ 266	\$ 1,515	\$ 4,628	\$ 9,300		
6								
7	Accum. Deferred Tax Expense	Prior Yr plus L5	\$ 266	\$ 1,781	\$ 6,409	\$ 15,708		
8								
9	<b>Tax Depreciation</b>							
10	MACRS Tax Depr Rate (20 Year)		Year 1 3.750%	Year 2 7.219%	Year 3 6.677%	Year 4 6.177%		
11								
12	Year 1 Additions	P1, L9 x P2, L10	2,253	4,337	4,011	3,711		
13	Year 2 Additions	P1, L9 x P2, L10		8,701	16,749	15,492		
14	Year 3 Additions	P1, L9 x P2, L10			19,825	38,164		
15	Year 4 Additions	P1, L9 x P2, L10				26,438		
16	Year 5 Additions	P1, L9 x P2, L10	-	-	-	-		
17	Total Tax Depreciation	Sum of L12 thru L16	\$ 2,253	\$ 13,037	\$ 40,585	\$ 83,804		
18								
19	<b>Property Tax - Plant In Service</b>							
20	Factor	WP-SLW-1	Year 1 0.96	Year 2 0.93	Year 3 0.90	Year 4 0.86		
21								
22	Year 1 Taxable Value	P1, L9 x P2, L20 x 50%	28,837	27,936	27,034	25,833		
23	Year 2 Taxable Value	P1, L9 x P2, L20 x 50%		111,367	107,887	104,407		
24	Year 3 Taxable Value	P1, L9 x P2, L20 x 50%			253,756	245,826		
25	Year 4 Taxable Value	P1, L9 x P2, L20 x 50%				338,400		
26	Year 5 Taxable Value	P1, L9 x P2, L20 x 50%	-	-	-	-		
27	Total Taxable Value	Sum of L22 thru L26	\$ 28,837	\$ 139,303	\$ 388,677	\$ 714,466		
28	Millage	Exh. A-13, Sch C7.1 (5)	57.500	57.500	56.000	56.000		
29	Property Tax Assessed	L27 x L28	\$ 1,658	\$ 8,010	\$ 21,766	\$ 40,010		
30	Property Tax Expense (Year lag)			\$ 1,658	\$ 8,010	\$ 21,766		
31								
32	<b>Property Tax - CWIP</b>							
33	Cumulative Capital Investment	Prior Yr plus Exh A-33, Sch X1, L8	\$ 61,865	\$ 351,999	\$ 881,999	\$ 1,601,999		
34	Cumulative Plant in Service	P1, L12	60,077	292,092	820,749	1,525,749		
35	Cumulative CWIP	Line 33 - Line 34	1,788	59,908	61,250	76,250		
36								
37	Factor	Exh. A-13, Sch C7.1	0.50	0.50	0.50	0.50		
38								
39	Year 1 Taxable Value	P2, L35 x P2, L37 x 50%	447					
40	Year 2 Taxable Value	P2, L35 x P2, L37 x 50%		14,977				
41	Year 3 Taxable Value	P2, L35 x P2, L37 x 50%			15,313			
42	Year 4 Taxable Value	P2, L35 x P2, L37 x 50%				19,063		
43	Year 5 Taxable Value	P2, L35 x P2, L37 x 50%	-	-	-	-		
44	Total Taxable Value	Sum of L39 thru L43	\$ 447	\$ 14,977	\$ 15,313	\$ 19,063		
45	Millage	Exh. A-13, Sch C7.1 (1)	57.500	57.500	56.000	56.000		
46	Property Tax Assessed	L44 x L45	\$ 26	\$ 861	\$ 858	\$ 1,068		
47	Property Tax Expense (Year lag)			\$ 26	\$ 861	\$ 858		

(1) 2024 and 2025 revenue requirement calculations utilize the same plant in service amounts, rate of return, depreciation rates, and property tax millage rates as those approved in the IRM for DTE Electric Rate Case No. U-21297

**Michigan Public Service Commission**  
**DTE Electric Company**  
**Infrastructure Recovery Mechanism**  
**Incremental Revenue Requirement - Distribution Operations**  
**Example of \$1.0 MM Under Investment**  
**(\$000)**

Case No.: U-21534  
 Exhibit: A-33  
 Schedule: X5  
 Witness: K. M. Vangilder  
 Page: 1 of 2

Line No.	(a) Description	(b) Source	(c) Year 1
1	<b><u>PLANT IN SERVICE</u></b>		
2	Capital Under Investment		\$ (1,000)
3	<b>Total Plant In Service</b>		<b>\$ (1,000)</b>
4			
5	<b><u>Net Rate Base</u></b>		
6	Cumulative Plant In Service	Prior Yr plus L3	\$ (1,000)
7	Accumulated Depreciation	Prior Yr less L14	21
8	Accum. Deferred Taxes	P2, L7	5
9	Ending Net Rate Base	Sum of L6 thru L8	\$ (975)
10	Average Net Rate Base	L9 (PY+CY)/2	(487)
11			
12	<b><u>Total Cost of Service</u></b>		
13	Return on Net Rate Base	(1)	(45)
14	Depreciation (1/2 yr conv.)	(2)	(21)
15	Property Taxes	(3)	-
16	<b>Total Cost of Service (COS) Requirement</b>	<b>L13 thru L15</b>	<b>\$ (65)</b>

- (1) The return on net rate base is determined using a permanent capital per-tax rate of return as calculated on Exhibit A-33, Schedule X4  
 (2) Depreciation rate for Distribution Plant is 4.11% per Witness Uzenski Exhibit A-13, Schedule C6. Page 2, Line 9  
 (3) Property tax expense is assessed based on asset balances at end of year. As such, there is no associated property tax in a one year view.

**Michigan Public Service Commission**  
**DTE Electric Company**  
**Infrastructure Recovery Mechanism**  
**Incremental Revenue Requirement - Distribution Operations**  
**Example of \$1.0 MM Under Investment**  
**(\$000)**

Case No.: U-21534  
 Exhibit: A-33  
 Schedule: X5  
 Witness: K. M. Vangilder  
 Page: 2 of 2

Line No.	(a) Description	(b) Source	(c) Year 1
1	<b>Deferred Tax Expense</b>		
2	Tax Depreciation	Line 19	(38)
3	Book Depreciation	P1, L14	(21)
4	Timing Difference	Line 2 - Line 3	(17)
5	Deferred Tax Expense	Line 4 X 25.91%	\$ (5)
6			
7	Accum. Deferred Tax Expense	Prior Yr plus L5	\$ (5)
8			
9			
10			
11	<b>Tax Depreciation</b>		
12	MACRS Tax Depr Rate (20 Year)		3.750%
13			
14	Year 1 Additions	P1, L3 x P2, L12	(38)
15	Year 2 Additions	P1, L3 x P2, L12	
16	Year 3 Additions	P1, L3 x P2, L12	
17	Year 4 Additions	P1, L3 x P2, L12	
18	Year 5 Additions	P1, L3 x P2, L12	-
19	Total Tax Depreciation	Sum of L14 thru L18	\$ (38)

IRM REVENUE REQUIREMENT

Cost of Service Study

DISTRIBUTION COSTS

	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)
	Total Electric	Residential Secondary	Commercial Secondary	Primary	Subtransmission	Transmission	D-9 OPL Residential	D-9 OPL Commercial	E-1 St Lght	E-2 Signals
<u>2024 - 13 mos. Ending 12/31/2024 /1</u>	<u>3,778</u>									
1 IRM Revenue Requirement (Previously Approved)	3,778	2,311	1,008	301	29	-	6	13	107	3
<u>2025 - 12 mos. Ending 12/31/2025 /1</u>	<u>23,700</u>									
2 IRM Revenue Requirement (Previously Approved)	23,700	14,502	6,323	1,886	184	-	35	79	673	16
<u>Allocation Factors</u>										
3 PIS - Dist Direct 521T (521 excl Transmission)	100.000%	61.117%	27.471%	7.592%	0.622%	0.000%	0.142%	0.329%	2.656%	0.071%
<u>2026 - 12 mos. Ending 12/31/2026 /2</u>	<u>80,610</u>									
4 IRM Revenue Requirement (Proposed)	80,610	49,267	22,145	6,120	502	-	114	265	2,141	57
<u>2027 - 12 mos. Ending 12/31/2027 /3</u>	<u>172,433</u>									
5 IRM Revenue Requirement (Proposed)	172,433	105,387	47,370	13,091	1,073	-	244	567	4,580	122

1/- Amounts match the IRM Revenue Requirement by Class approved in the December 1, 2023 Order in Case No. U-21297

2/- Per Exhibit A-33, Schedule X4 page 1, line 22, col. (e)

3/- Per Exhibit A-33, Schedule X4 page 1, line 22, col. (f)

Michigan Public Service Commission  
DTE Electric Company  
IRM Surcharge Design

Case No. : U-21534  
Exhibit: A-33  
Schedule: X7  
Witness: A. Willis  
Page: 1 of 1

Line No.	(a) Distribution COS Class	(b) Residential Secondary	(c) Commercial Secondary (excl D4)	(d) D4	(e) Primary	(f) Sub transmission	(g) Transmission	(h) D9 OPL Residential	(i) D9 OPL Commerical	(j) E1 St Light	E2 Signals	Source
1	<b>2026</b>											
2	Revenue Requirement	\$ 49,266,544	\$ 17,821,482	\$ 4,323,150	\$ 6,119,628	\$ 501,562	\$ -	\$ 114,215	\$ 264,859	\$ 2,141,277	\$ 57,000	Maroun Exhibit A-33, Schedule X6
3												
4	Determinant (MWh)	15,268,251	8,660,829					6,023	27,202	123,056	59,731	Willis and Bellini Exhibit A-16, Schedule F3
5												
6	Determinant (kW)			4,867,687	25,771,207	5,642,510	14,837,522					Willis A-16, Schedule F3 (Rate Schedule D4), AW WP-6
7												
8	<b>2027</b>											
9	Revenue Requirement	\$ 105,386,746	\$ 38,122,178	\$ 9,247,709	\$ 13,090,581	\$ 1,072,899	\$ -	\$ 244,318	\$ 566,564	\$ 4,580,436	\$ 121,930	Maroun Exhibit A-33, Schedule X6
10												
11	Determinant (MWh)	15,268,251	8,660,829					6,023	27,202	123,056	59,731	Willis and Bellini Exhibit A-16, Schedule F3
12												
13	Determinant (kW)			4,867,687	25,771,207	5,642,510	14,837,522					Willis A-16, Schedule F3 (Rate Schedule D4), AW WP-6

		Proposed surcharge			
Residential Secondary		2026	2027 Unit		
	All rates	0.003227	0.006902 \$/kWh	@500 kWh	\$ 1.61 \$ 3.45
<b>Commercial Secondary</b>					
	All rates (ex D4)	0.002058	0.004402 \$/kWh		
	Rate Schedule D4	0.8881	1.8998 \$ / kW		
<b>Primary</b>					
	Primary	0.2375	0.5080 \$/kW		
	Subtransmission	0.0889	0.1901 \$/kW		
	Transmisson	0.0000	0.0000 \$/kW		
	Rate Schedule D10	0.000703	0.001504 \$/kWh		
	Rider 1.1 / 1.2 DV	0.002058	0.004402 \$/kWh		
	Rider 1.1 / 1.2 PV	0.000707	0.001512 \$/kWh		
	Rider 1.1 / 1.2 SV	0.000249	0.000532 \$/kWh		
	Rider 1.1 / 1.2 TV	0.000000	0.000000 \$/kWh		
	D13 PV	0.000434	0.000928 \$/kWh		
	D13 SV	0.000162	0.000347 \$/kWh		
	D13 TV	0.000000	0.000000 \$/kWh		
<b>Other</b>					
	D9 OPL (Res)	0.018962	0.040561 \$/kWh		
	D9 OPL (Comm)	0.009737	0.020828 \$/kWh		
	E1 St Light	0.017401	0.037222 \$/kWh		
	E2 Signals	0.000954	0.002041 \$/kWh		