

RIVENOAK LAW GROUP PC

Valerie J. M. Brader
Admitted in Michigan
valerie@rivenoaklaw.com

July 26, 2024

VIA ELECTRONIC CASE FILING

Ms. Lisa Felice, Executive Secretary
Michigan Public Service Commission
7109 W. Saginaw Highway
Lansing, MI 48917

Re: **MPSC Case No. U-21534**: In the matter of the Application of **DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY** for authority to increase its rates, amend its rate schedules and rules governing the distribution and supply of electric energy, and for miscellaneous accounting authority.

Dear Ms. Felice:

Enclosed for filing please find the public version of the ***Direct Testimony of Richard Bunch on behalf of the Michigan Municipal Association for Utility Issues and Proof of Service*** for the above referenced case.

Should you have any questions or comments regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact my office.

Sincerely,



Valerie J.M. Brader
Counsel to MI-MAUI

cc: w/enclosure: Parties of Record

STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter of the application of **DTE
Electric Company** for authority to increase its
rates for the generation and distribution of
electricity and for other relief.

U-21534

ALJ Sally Wallace

TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH
ON BEHALF OF
THE MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION FOR UTILITY ISSUES

July 26, 2024

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

2 **I. INTRODUCTION & QUALIFICATIONS 2**

3 **II. DTE CASH PAYMENT REQUIREMENTS 7**

4 Commission Rules Regarding Cash Payments 10

5 Increased Ratepayer Costs from Requiring Cash-Only Payments for a Year..... 14

6 Recommendations Regarding Cash Payment Requirements 17

7 **III. STREETLIGHTING 19**

8 Community Lighting Assets 21

9 Community Lighting Sales Forecast 32

10 Company Preventive Maintenance Programs 34

11 Community Lighting Outage Restoration Activities 40

12 Community Lighting Operations & Maintenance and Capital Expenditures 46

13 LED Luminaire Selection Methodology Specific to HID to LED Conversions..... 49

14 Community Lighting Rate Design 70

15 Summary of Municipal Street Lighting Recommendations..... 72

16 **IV. MUNICIPAL COORDINATION PRACTICES 75**

17 Recommendations Regarding Coordination 84

18

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 **I. INTRODUCTION & QUALIFICATIONS**

2 **Q. Please state for the record your name, position, and business address.**

3 A. My name is Richard Bunch. I am Executive Director of the Michigan Municipal
4 Association for Utility Issues (MI-MAUI). I am also a senior consultant at 5 Lakes Energy,
5 LLC. My business address is 220 MAC Ave, Suite 220, Lansing, MI.

6 **Q. On whose behalf is this testimony being offered?**

7 A. I am testifying on behalf of Michigan Municipal Association for Utility Issues (MI-MAUI).

8 **Q. What is MI-MAUI?**

9 A. MI-MAUI is a non-profit membership association formed by Michigan municipal
10 governments to provide them with a collective voice and technical support in their
11 relationships with regulated utilities and in Michigan Public Service Commission
12 proceedings.

13 **Q. Please summarize your experience in the field of utility regulation.**

14 A. I have worked since 2015 in positions related to clean energy, primarily on behalf of local
15 governments. A significant portion of that work has included analysis of MPSC rate and
16 other cases and supporting local government participation in rate cases and other MPSC
17 proceedings. From 2015 to 2017 I organized and led the Municipal Street Lighting
18 Coalition, a group of 24 municipalities served by DTE Energy, which intervened in Cases
19 U-17767, U-18014, U-20836 and U-21297 and participated in the subsequent MPSC-
20 ordered street lighting collaborative. I organized and supported the intervention of several
21 municipalities receiving street lighting services from Consumers Energy in cases U-20134,
22 U-20697, U-20963, U-21224 and U-21389. I have submitted comments in several other
23 case dockets on behalf of MI-MAUI and have participated in various MI Power Grid

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 working groups and the Electric Distribution Planning working group. I directed MI-
2 MAUI's intervention in DTE Energy's Voluntary Green Power case U-20713.

3 In the field of consumer protection, I am president and board chair of the Washington
4 Public Interest Group (WashPIRG), an independent, non-partisan, non-profit organization
5 based in Seattle that works to protect consumers and promote good government. I am also
6 an officer of the WashPIRG Foundation, an affiliated research and public education
7 organization. I was Executive Director of WashPIRG from 1989 to 1992 and worked on a
8 number of consumer protection issues during that time and in more junior positions prior
9 to that. I also served until 2020 as an officer of the PIRG in Michigan (PIRGIM) Education
10 Foundation, a non-partisan consumer protection and good government public education
11 and research organization based in Ann Arbor.

12 I am currently a stakeholder co-chair of the Commission's Data Analysis and Regulatory
13 Review working group, and I am a member of the Commission's Low Income Energy
14 Policy Board.

15 My energy-related work experience, educational and professional development
16 background are summarized in my resumé.¹

17 **Q: Please list your training and education relevant to the field of utility regulation.**

- 18 • EUCI Outdoor Street Lighting Conference, June 2019
- 19 • EUCI Electric Cost-of-Service - Essential Concepts for a Changing Industry, July 2019
- 20 • MSU-IPU Accounting and Ratemaking course, September 2020
- 21 • EUCI Utility Green Tariffs: A to Z course, November 2020
- 22 • MSU-IPU Advanced Regulatory Accounting and Auditing course, October 2021

¹ See Exhibit MAU-1, Resume of Richard Bunch.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 • NRRI Regulatory Training Institute, Regulating Public Utility Performance course,
2 2022.

3 **Q. Have you testified before this Commission or as an expert in any other proceedings?**

4 A. I have previously testified before the Michigan Public Service Commission (Commission)
5 in the following cases:

- 6 • Case U-20530 (I&M PSCR Reconciliation case)
- 7 • Case U-20561 (DTE Electric Company Electric General Rate Case)
- 8 • Case U-20697 (Consumers Energy Company Electric General Rate Case)
- 9 • Case U-20836 (DTE Electric general rate case)
- 10 • Case U-20963 (Consumers Energy Company Electric General Rate Case)
- 11 • Case U-21087 (DTE Electric PrePay case)
- 12 • Case U-20836 (DTE Electric Company Electric General Rate Case)
- 13 • Case U-21224 (Consumers Energy Company Electric General Rate Case)
- 14 • Case U-21297 (DTE Electric Company Electric General Rate Case)
- 15 • Case U-21389 (Consumers Energy Company Electric General Rate Case)

16 I have testified before the Kentucky Public Utilities Commission in rate cases 2020-349
17 and 2020-350, the combined Kentucky Utilities and Louisville Gas & Electric electric and
18 gas rate cases.

19 **Q. What is the purpose of your testimony?**

20 A. I am testifying on behalf of MI-MAUI regarding DTE Electric’s (the Company) customer
21 billing practices, coordination of infrastructure projects with local governments and street
22 lighting service, rates, and tariffs.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 **Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits?**

2 A. I am sponsoring the exhibits listed below. Exhibits MAU-1 through MAU-9, MAU-12
3 through MAU-16, MAU-18 through MAU-31, MAU-33, and MAU-35 through MAU-38
4 were prepared by me. Exhibits MAU-10, MAU-11, MAU-17, MAU-32, and MAU-37
5 were prepared under my direction.

| | | |
|----|-----------------|--|
| 6 | Exhibit MAU-1: | Resume of Richard Bunch |
| 7 | Exhibit MAU-2: | DTE ‘Ways to Pay’ Kiosks Webpage |
| 8 | Exhibit MAU-3: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-3.17a (S1) |
| 9 | Exhibit MAU-4: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-3.14 (S1) |
| 10 | Exhibit MAU-5: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-3.13 |
| 11 | Exhibit MAU-6: | DTE ‘Ways to Pay’ Authorized Agents Webpage |
| 12 | Exhibit MAU-7: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-3.15 |
| 13 | Exhibit MAU-8: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-3.17a Attachment |
| 14 | Exhibit MAU-9: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-3.16 |
| 15 | Exhibit MAU-10: | DTE Kiosk Census Data |
| 16 | Exhibit MAU-11: | National Utility Cash Payment Requirements |
| 17 | Exhibit MAU-12: | Identity Theft Statistics |
| 18 | Exhibit MAU-13: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-4.19a |
| 19 | Exhibit MAU-14: | Bellini Rebuttal Testimony U-21297 p. 9-10 |
| 20 | Exhibit MAU-15: | City of Ferndale LED Conversion Cost Proposal |
| 21 | Exhibit MAU-16: | Consumers Energy LED Bill Credit |
| 22 | Exhibit MAU-17: | U-21585 Consumers Witness Schmoekel Testimony, p. 18 |
| 23 | Exhibit MAU-18: | Electric Sales Forecast Reduction |

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

| | | |
|----|-----------------|--|
| 1 | Exhibit MAU-19: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-4.28b |
| 2 | Exhibit MAU-20: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-6.52 |
| 3 | Exhibit MAU-21: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-6.53 |
| 4 | Exhibit MAU-22: | U-20147 DTE 2023 EDIIP Comments MI-MAUI |
| 5 | Exhibit MAU-23: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-4.26 |
| 6 | Exhibit MAU-24: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-4.24 |
| 7 | Exhibit MAU-25: | U-21297 Witness Bellini Testimony, p. 18 |
| 8 | Exhibit MAU-26: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-6.55 |
| 9 | Exhibit MAU-27 | U-20836 Bellini Rebuttal excerpt |
| 10 | Exhibit MAU-28: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-6.56 REDACTED |
| 11 | Exhibit MAU-29: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-4.20 |
| 12 | Exhibit MAU-30: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-5.47 - GCJ_J Specs |
| 13 | Exhibit MAU-31: | Ann Arbor City LED Conversion Webpage |
| 14 | Exhibit MAU-32: | Consumers Energy LED Streetlight Crossovers |
| 15 | Exhibit MAU-33: | Grand Rapids LED Conversions |
| 16 | Exhibit MAU-34: | LED Luminaire Plant Balance Disallowance |
| 17 | Exhibit MAU-35: | COS Cost Comparisons from WP U-21534 RAB Lighting |
| 18 | | Rate Model |
| 19 | Exhibit MAU-36: | Google Search Results of Capital Improvement Plans |
| 20 | Exhibit MAU-37: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-2.5 |
| 21 | Exhibit MAU-38: | DTE Response to AADE-1.7 |
| 22 | Exhibit MAU-39: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-2.8 |
| 23 | Exhibit MAU-40: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-2.7 |
| 24 | Exhibit MAU-41: | DTE Response to MAUIDE-1.2 |

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 **II. DTE CASH PAYMENT REQUIREMENTS**

2 **Q. How can most customers pay their DTE bills?**

3 A. Most customers have a range of options, including automatic bill payment (using both
4 withdrawals from bank accounts or credit cards), by check, money order, credit or debit
5 card and in cash. If customers want to pay by mail, then they must use either checks or
6 money orders.²

7 **Q. Are there DTE customers who have been required to pay their bills only in cash for
8 a year?**

9 A. Yes. In 2023, 48,410 customers were required to pay in cash; this was a little more than
10 two-thirds of customers subject to payment restrictions.³

11 **Q. Under what conditions does DTE say it imposes the cash-only payment requirement?**

12 A. The Company states, “Customers with a returned payment and arrears greater than \$100
13 are subject to the payment restriction.” If arrears are \$100 or less, then “two returned
14 payments with or without arrears will trigger the same restriction.”⁴

15 **Q. Does the cash payment requirement apply only to customers facing shutoff?**

16 A. No. Customers who have made payments on time for months are still required to pay in
17 cash for one year following a returned payment, according to the Company’s
18 communications.

19 **Q. If a customer had a monthly electric bill of \$101, was a victim of identity theft,
20 cancelled a credit card as a result, and forgot to update their DTE payment method**

² See Exhibit MAU-2 (DTE “Ways to Pay”).

³ Exhibit MAU-3, response to MAUIDE-3.17a (S1).

⁴ Exhibit MAU-4, response to MAUIDE-3.14 (S1).

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 **to change the card on file, under current practice the Company may require them to**
2 **pay in cash for a year?**

3 A. Yes, that scenario is consistent with the Company’s statements regarding when it could
4 impose this restriction.

5 **Q. How does DTE inform customers that it will require them to provide payment in**
6 **cash?**

7 A. DTE’s rate book does not include any specific requirement for the form of notice (e.g.,
8 phone call, email, letter), advance notice or content of notice.⁵ In practice, DTE states
9 that it sends the customer an e-mail including the following text “For the next 12 months
10 you are required to make your payment using cash at a kiosk or at an authorized payment
11 location.”⁶

12 **Q. If required to pay bills in cash, how can customers do that without incurring**
13 **additional fees?**

14 A. The only way to pay bills in cash without incurring additional fees is to pay at a kiosk.
15 Otherwise, customers will have to use an authorized agent and pay that agent a fee. See R.
16 460.123(5)(b). The amount of the fee varies from agent to agent and is not disclosed on
17 DTE’s website.⁷

18 **Q. Does DTE use geographic criteria when imposing the cash-payment-for-a-year**
19 **restriction, such that it ensures customers who must pay in cash have access to**
20 **kiosks?**

⁵ Exhibit MAU-4, MAUIDE-3.14 (S1).

⁶ Exhibit MAU-5, response to MAUIDE-3.13, attachment 2.

⁷ Exhibit MAU-6, DTE Ways to Pay – authorized pay agents webpage.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 A. No.⁸

2 **Q. DTE’s website says kiosks “are located all across the service territory.”⁹ Do you**
3 **believe this is an accurate statement?**

4 A. No. There are only five communities with kiosks currently: Detroit, Ecorse (which borders
5 Detroit), Harper Woods (which borders Detroit), Highland Park (which is surrounded by
6 Detroit), and Redford Charter Township (which borders Detroit).¹⁰

7 **Q. Do you believe that most DTE customers that are required to pay in cash are**
8 **functionally required to pay a processing fee to an authorized agent every time they**
9 **are billed for a year?**

10 A. Yes. Even if all the people in Wayne County who were required to pay in cash in 2023
11 (23,178) lived in and around the five Detroit-area communities with kiosks (which is
12 unlikely), then more than half of the people required to pay in cash would not have access
13 to fee-less payments. For instance, in 2023, there were 10,040 cash-only customers in
14 Oakland County, 8,488 in Macomb County, 2,365 in Washtenaw County and 1,211 in Saint
15 Clair County.¹¹ DTE currently operates no kiosks in these counties.

16 **Q. Does every customer ordered to pay in cash at least have access to an authorized agent**
17 **or kiosk within a 5-mile radius of their billing address?**

18 A. Probably not. For example, Sanilac County has only one authorized agent (in Sandusky)

⁸ Exhibit MAU-4.

⁹ Exhibit MAU-2.

¹⁰ Exhibit MAU-7, response to MAUIDE-3.15.

¹¹ Exhibit MAU-8, attachment to response to MAUIDE-3.17a (S1).

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 but in 2023 had 262 customers who were required to pay in cash.¹² Parts of Sanilac County
2 are 30 miles away from Sandusky.

Commission Rules Regarding Cash Payments

3
4 **Q. Do the Commission rules permit utilities to require customers to pay only in cash or**
5 **by money order, and to bar access to other payment options?**

6 A. As I read them, such restrictions are permitted only when the customer is facing shutoff.
7 In a Rule labelled as regulating the “manner of shutoff,” a utility must permit the customer
8 to “pay in any reasonable manner, including by personal check, credit card, or debit card”
9 but the rule clarifies that if a customer has tried any of those three methods and in the last
10 year has had payment denied for a reason other than financial institution error, then
11 “payment by personal check, credit or debit card” is not reasonable. R. 460.142(4). While
12 Rule 460.123 discusses automatic bill payment plans, it does not address whether and when
13 customers may use them.

14 **Q. Is the practice of requiring customers to pay in cash for a year included in the**
15 **Company’s tariff?**

16 A. The cash-payment provision language included in DTE’s rate book at section C4.6B
17 mirrors the language of found in Rule 460.142(4), without reference to a shutoff scenario.

18 Payment by personal check, credit or debit card is not reasonable if
19 the customer has paid with a personal check, credit or debit card
20 within the last 12 months and at least 1 check has been returned for
21 insufficient funds or no account, or at least 1 credit or debit card
22 payment has been denied excluding financial institution error.

¹² Location of authorized agents determined from DTE’s “Ways to Pay” webpage. Number of cash-payment customers in Sanilac County taken from U-21534 Exhibit MAU-8, attachment to response to MAUIDE-3.17a.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 **Q. Are forms of payment other than “personal check, credit or debit card” discussed**
2 **elsewhere in the rules?**

3 A. Yes. The rule listing forms of payment that “are not reasonable” to accept to avert shutoff
4 does not include automatic bill payment plans, which are referenced elsewhere in the rules.

5 **Q. What do you conclude from your review of the Billing Rules and DTE’s rate book?**

6 A. I conclude that DTE’s cash-payment requirement is inconsistent with, if not explicitly
7 prohibited by, the Billing Rules.

8 **Q. What do the billing rules contemplate as the method by which to balance utility**
9 **interests with customer interests, in situations when a check has bounced or a credit**
10 **card has been declined?**

11 A. The rules specify that in such situations, the utility may require the customer to provide a
12 deposit. R. 460.109(1)(f). Those deposits are returned to the customer with annual interest
13 of 5% after a year of making on-time payments. R. 460.111(8).

14 **Q. Does DTE’s rate book state that a customer who has bounced a check or had a**
15 **declined credit card payment may provide a deposit consistent with Rule**
16 **460.109(1)(f)?**

17 A. No, it does not.

18 **Q. In what way is a deposit potentially better for a utility than requiring customers to**
19 **pay in cash for a year?**

20 A. Because the deposit is paid up front, the utility has greater certainty that overdue bill
21 amounts may be recouped if the customer falls into arrears.

22 **Q. In what way is a deposit potentially better for a customer than being required to pay**
23 **in cash for a year?**

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 A. There are at least three reasons a customer might prefer to pay a deposit rather than pay in
2 cash for a year: safety, cost, and the reduced burden of finding a payment location.

3 **Q. Why would a deposit be safer for customers than paying in cash?**

4 A. Having to carry a large amount of cash on a regular schedule to a known location can create
5 a risk of robbery. The fact that such a risk is real and not merely perceived is shown by the
6 fact that in recent years, DTE experienced “kiosk theft activity” and requests from store
7 owners to remove kiosks “to protect their business from possible theft activity.”¹³

8 **Q. How many kiosks have been taken out of service for theft activity?**

9 A. Although DTE did not provide specific data on this, the Company did report it has cut the
10 number of kiosks by two-thirds in the last five years, and identified only one instance when
11 a kiosk was removed for reasons not related to theft.¹⁴ Specifically, DTE had a total of 38
12 kiosks in operation after 2019 and only operates 13 kiosks now.¹⁵

13 **Q. Does DTE warn customers ordered to pay in cash about the kiosk theft activity it has
14 experienced or that its store owners have warned the Company about?**

15 A. No. Despite the Company’s experience, DTE’s website states that the kiosks “...offer a
16 safe, secure place to access account information and make payments.”¹⁶

17 **Q. Why could paying a deposit be cheaper for customers than paying in cash?**

18 A. While provision of a deposit is often burdensome to a customer (requiring up-front cash),
19 at the end of a year of making payments on time, deposits are returned in full with 5%
20 interest to the customer. If a customer pays in cash at any location but one of the thirteen

¹³ Exhibit MAU-9, response to MAUIDE-3.16.

¹⁴ Exhibit MAU-9, response to MAUIDE-3.16.

¹⁵ Exhibit MAU-7, Response to MAUIDE-3.15.

¹⁶ Exhibit MAU-2.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 remaining kiosks, then the customer must pay a processing fee each time, and will never
2 recoup any of that money, much less any interest they would have earned.

3 **Q. Why could paying DTE a deposit be more convenient for a customer than paying in**
4 **cash?**

5 A. As I discussed above, most customers have poor access to kiosks, and some customers do
6 not have any option that accepts cash payments within a 5-mile radius. Therefore, the
7 ability to make a single payment and then use normal payment methods could prevent
8 having to make a monthly trek to a particular location.

9 **Q. Are there customers for whom having to pay in person would be even more**
10 **problematic?**

11 A. Yes. For example, customers who have medical conditions that compromise their immune
12 systems or render them homebound may find the requirement to pay in cash imposes
13 unreasonable logistical or personal safety risks when trying to deliver cash payments.

14 **Q. Does the geographic distribution of the remaining kiosks create concerns in other**
15 **dimensions?**

16 A. Yes. In general, Commission rules prohibit requiring a deposit for reasons including race
17 and residence location. R.460.108. When examining where kiosks are located, all of them
18 are in higher-poverty areas that have high African-American and other non-white
19 populations. There are other communities within DTE's service territory with comparable
20 size and poverty rates but a racial makeup that is more heavily white. For instance, Lapeer
21 and Port Huron Charter Township are similar in size and poverty rate to Ecorse. Hazel
22 Park, Port Huron, and Mt. Clemens are similar in size and poverty rates to Harper Woods.¹⁷

¹⁷ Exhibit MAU-10, DTE Kiosk Census Data.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 Yet only Detroit and a few inner-ring suburbs have kiosks.

2 **Q. Do customers who do not live near payment kiosks have any reasonable way to avoid**
3 **paying the authorized agent processing fees?**

4 A. In my opinion, they do not. In effect, to pay their bill they are compelled to pay an
5 unavoidable fee, additional to the tariff, that the Commission has not reviewed or approved.

6 In addition, they face security risks and inconveniences related to securing significant sums
7 of cash and traveling to a payment location at least once per month.

8 While the Billing Rules authorize utilities to use payment agents who may assess fees, most
9 customers are not compelled to pay those fees because they have other ways to pay their
10 bills; in other words, if they pay the processing fee it is by choice. Customers required to
11 pay in cash have no option, and if they do not live reasonably close to a DTE kiosk they
12 will have little choice but to pay through an agent and incur the processing fee.

13 *Increased Ratepayer Costs from Requiring Cash-Only Payments for a Year*

14 **Q. Do other large Michigan utilities require their customers to pay in cash for a year?**

15 A. It does not appear they do. The MPSC-approved tariffs, rate books and websites of
16 Consumers Energy and Indiana-Michigan Power do not state any circumstances in which
17 the utility may require a customer to pay their bill in cash.¹⁸

18 **Q. Do any municipal electric utilities in Michigan impose similar cash-payment**
19 **requirements on their customers?**

20 A. It does not appear they do. MI-MAUI reviewed the websites of thirty-nine municipal
21 utilities in Michigan, of which all but two had websites explaining how bills could be paid.
22 None of these sites stated requirements for customers to pay in cash under any

¹⁸ Exhibit MAU-11, MI-MAUI Cash Payment Requirements research.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 circumstances.¹⁹

2 **Q. Was MI-MAUI able to identify large utilities outside of the state of Michigan that**
3 **require their customers to pay in cash?**

4 A. No. MI-MAUI reviewed the websites of seven of the biggest electric investor-owned
5 electric utilities operating outside of Michigan. None of these websites stated requirements
6 for customers to pay in cash under any circumstances.²⁰

7 **Q. What do you conclude from this review of other utilities' practices?**

8 A. DTE is the only utility we were able to identify among a large peer sample in Michigan
9 and nationally that has a policy of regularly requiring cash payments from customers.
10 Therefore, DTE is not following common or standard practices among its peers in
11 Michigan and nationwide, who do not appear to require customers to pay in cash for a year,
12 if ever.

13 **Q. Do you believe the practice of requiring cash-only payments for a year harms all**
14 **ratepayers by increasing uncollectibles?**

15 A. Yes. It is common sense that making it harder for people to pay you is generally going to
16 decrease your collections and drive up your collection costs. Moreover, given that the
17 Department of Justice reported that 1 in 10 Americans were victims of identity theft in
18 2021,²¹ situations in which customers may be needing to freeze a bank account or cancel a
19 credit card and may not remember to change the DTE form of payment are likely to be
20 common and easily rectifiable by providing another credit card or setting up payment from
21 an alternative bank account. Customers given the opportunity to rectify these situations

¹⁹ Exhibit MAU-11.

²⁰ Exhibit MAU-11.

²¹ Exhibit MAU-12, US Department of Justice press release, identity theft statistics.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 with little inconvenience means that DTE is more likely to get paid. I believe this is why
2 other utilities do not impose such a requirement.

3 Imposing a cash-payment on some customers – even if they have no reasonable explanation
4 for their returned payment – is likely to drive up uncollectibles. For example, it would
5 simply be imprudent to make customers who are enrolled in shutoff protection programs
6 pay in cash, because they will be much more likely not to bother paying at all. If the
7 Commission finds that the Company may continue imposing a cash-only requirement on
8 some customers, it should at least prevent the Company from recovering uncollectible costs
9 caused by imprudent management decisions of this nature.

10 **Q. How can DTE incentivize customers to present valid forms of payment, and avoid**
11 **increased collections costs caused by returned payments, if it cannot require**
12 **customers to pay in cash?**

13 A. DTE has other means to minimize the impact on the cost of service of returned forms of
14 payment and to encourage valid forms of payment.

15 First, DTE assesses customers a \$15 charge for payments returned by banks or other
16 financial institutions under section C4.6c of the rate book.

17 Second, returned payments frequently result in late fees, limited to 2% of the portion of the
18 bill, net of taxes, that is delinquent.²²

19 These provisions limit cost-of-service impacts on other ratepayers of returned payments
20 and establish appropriate incentives for customers to present valid forms of payment. In
21 addition, per my preceding point, there is no reason to think that making it harder for
22 customers to pay their bills will reduce uncollectible expense.

²² R460.125, late payment charges.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 **Q. Is the Company's late fee policy appropriately documented in its rate book?**

2 A. No, it is not. The Company's rate book section C4.8A, Late Payment Charge Residential,
3 refers to Rule 460.122. This reference is incorrect. Rule 460.122 is titled Cycle Billing.
4 The correct reference is to Rule 460.125. The Commission should order the Company to
5 correct this error in its rate book. Because the Billing Rules were recently revised, it may
6 be prudent for the Company to conduct a general reconciliation of its rate book to the
7 revised rules.

8 *Recommendations Regarding Cash Payment Requirements*

9 **Q. If the Commission agrees that DTE's practice of requiring customers not facing
10 imminent shutoff to pay in cash is a violation of the billing rules, what do you
11 recommend it do?**

12 A. The Commission should order an amendment to DTE's tariff to restrict the Company's
13 ability to require customers to pay in cash to the specific and narrow circumstance covered
14 by Rule 42, because doing otherwise is a violation of the billing rules and results in an
15 unauthorized rate for many customers.

16 **Q. If the Commission does not agree the billing rules prohibit DTE from imposing cash-
17 only requirements when payments are returned, what notice requirements should it
18 order the Company to observe?**

19 A. The Commission should create requirements pertaining to both the form and content of
20 such notices.

21 First, the Commission should order the Company to mail notice to the customer, in addition
22 to the email notice it already provides.

23 Second, the notice should state that the cash-payment requirement pertains only to the

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 person whose payment was returned. The Company should continue to accept standard
2 forms of payment from others. Imagine a restaurant that, following presentation of a
3 declined credit card, refused to accept anything but cash from everybody else in the party:
4 such a policy would be petty and self-defeating.

5 Third, the notice should describe how a customer may appeal imposition of the requirement
6 by providing a reasonable explanation for the returned payment or by demonstrating undue
7 hardship from paying in cash.

8 **Q. If the Commission does not agree the billing rules prohibit DTE from imposing cash-**
9 **only requirements, but does agree the Company's practice of requiring it for**
10 **customers in vulnerable or protected groups is unreasonably burdensome, what do**
11 **you recommend the Commission do?**

12 A. The Commission should order the Company to ensure that no customer will be
13 unreasonably burdened by a requirement to pay cash. The Commission should specify that
14 no customer enrolled in critical care protection or medical emergency protection may be
15 required to pay in cash. Per my preceding point, customers should be afforded an appeal
16 process allowing them to present evidence of undue hardship or unreasonable burden.

17 **Q. If the Commission does not agree the billing rules prohibit DTE from imposing cash-**
18 **only requirements, but does agree the Company's practice of requiring it for**
19 **customers who cannot access a kiosk imposes on them a higher rate than is authorized**
20 **due to the effective requirement to pay processing fees with every bill, what do you**
21 **recommend the Commission do?**

22 A. The Commission should find that before imposing a requirement that a customer pay in
23 cash, the Company must ensure there is an opportunity for the customer to pay their bill at

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 a location without an additional fee within five miles of the billing location.

2 **Q. If the Commission does not agree DTE’s cash-only-for-a-year requirement for some**
3 **customers violates the billing rules, but does believe that the practice unreasonably**
4 **increases uncollectibles, what do you recommend?**

5 A. The Commission should disallow 1% of the expense amount uncollectibles contribute to
6 the revenue requirement, and disallow the costs associated with the high rate of theft, etc.
7 of kiosks that has also been borne by ratepayers.

8 **Q. What is the basis for the recommendation regarding 1% of uncollectibles?**

9 A. DTE does not keep data that would allow us to determine the degree to which customers
10 required to pay in cash for a year default compared to customers not required to do so.
11 Therefore, the 1% number is a reasonable assumption that this practice has driven up
12 uncollectibles, but also recognizes that the default rate from approximately 70,000
13 customers is likely to make up a small percentage of overall revenue.

14 **Q. Do you have any other recommendations for the Commission on this topic?**

15 A. On a related topic, I recommend the Commission order the Company to correct the
16 erroneous reference regarding late payment fees to Rule 460.122 in section C4.8A of the
17 rate book. The correct reference is to Rule 460.125.

18 **III. STREETLIGHTING**

19 **Q. Please summarize why local governments are concerned about street lighting services**
20 **provided by DTE.**

21 A. Local governments are concerned about the street lighting services they receive from DTE
22 for fiscal, service delivery and social and environmental policy reasons.

23 For many local governments, street lighting is their biggest utility cost. They need to

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 deliver good street lighting service, but they also need it to be cost-effective, to be
2 appropriately responsive to their taxpayers. My testimony here is mostly concerned with
3 costs.

4 Streetlighting is an important municipal service. Badly designed or unreliable street
5 lighting reflects poorly on the capabilities of the local government, even if the service is
6 provided by DTE. Part of my testimony here is concerned with outage reporting, a key
7 accountability component that can help improve reliability. Another part of my testimony
8 addresses O&M priorities and costs.

9 Street lighting also impacts attainment of social and environmental policy goals. As the
10 biggest electricity use for many local governments, streetlights that use more electricity
11 than is necessary to achieve lighting standards make it harder to achieve local climate goals.

12 A growing number of cities are also adopting lighting ordinances intended to reduce
13 obtrusive light, including glare, light trespass, and light pollution. These phenomena can
14 have public health, environmental and scientific impacts to which communities are
15 increasingly attuned. Alignment of utility rates and practices with public policy goals,
16 including state and local climate goals, is especially important for the streetlighting class
17 of customers, which is made up entirely of governments.

18 **Q. What street lighting topics will you address in testimony?**

19 A. I will follow the outline used by DTE witness Bellini, and address the following topics in
20 turn:

- 21 • Community Lighting Assets
- 22 • Community Lighting Sales Forecast
- 23 • Company Preventive Maintenance Programs

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

- 1 • Outage Restoration Activities
- 2 • Community Lighting Operation & Maintenance and Capital Expenditures
- 3 • LED Luminaire Selection Methodology Specific to HID to LED Conversions
- 4 • Community Lighting Rate Design

Community Lighting Assets

5
6 **Q. Do you support phasing out HPS streetlights and replacing them with LED**
7 **luminaires upon failure?**

8 A. I agree that HPS fixtures should be phased out, because LEDs were the standard offering
9 before DTE recognized that. I testified to this effect in case no. U-21297, DTE’s previous
10 electric rate case. I agree that any HPS fixture that fails should be replaced with an LED
11 luminaire.

12 **Q. Would you recommend even speedier phasing out of HPS streetlights than witness**
13 **Bellini recommends to lower overall costs?**

14 A. Yes, I would. To reduce the number of truck rolls necessary for the conversion, I would
15 go slightly further: any maintenance event requiring a visit to an HPS fixture, including its
16 mast arm, pole, and wiring, should result in replacement of the fixture. Making another
17 repair now, only to return in a few years when the lamp burns out, is an expensive waste
18 of crew time and leaves an inefficient fixture in service all that time.

19 **Q. Do you support DTE’s proposal to allow for immediate replacement of failed HPS**
20 **with LED luminaires upon customer request, without assessment of a contribution in**
21 **aid of construction (“CIAC”)?**

22 A. Yes: I support witness Bellini’s commitment to allow any customer to request that the
23 Company replace failed HPS lights with LED luminaires starting immediately, rather than

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 after stocks of replacement HPS lamps are depleted, without assessing a CIAC.²³

2 **Q. Do you support DTE’s proposal to continue to require CIACs for group conversions**
3 **of HPS fixtures to LED technology?**

4 A. No. No CIAC should be assessed, because a planned conversion of a set of lights *en masse*
5 (“group conversion”) would lower overall costs compared to a conversion done as lights
6 in the same area or on the same street burn out at different times (“reactive conversion”).
7 There is no justification to charge CIAC for a customer-requested project that will be
8 cheaper for the Company to implement than if the customer did nothing and thus reactive
9 conversions were the way every light in a City were addressed.

10 In addition, as witness Bellini noted in his testimony in case no. U-21297, charging a CIAC
11 when LEDs are the standard offering creates a situation where municipalities that act
12 proactively and choose to pay for the entirety of their conversion will effectively subsidize
13 future LED municipal conversions; this problem should not be deliberately exacerbated by
14 continuing the practice when LEDs have become the default.²⁴

15 Finally, if reactive conversions were actually cheaper and a CIAC was appropriate, then
16 credits would need to reduce the CIAC for group conversions, as witness Bellini notes
17 (though I believe the proper credit would be calculated differently than the labor credit
18 witness Bellini describes).

19 **Q. Why do you find the proposal to continue charging a CIAC for conversions to be**
20 **inappropriate?**

21 A. That is concerning to me for a few reasons. First, we have argued for some time that LEDs

²³ Exhibit MAUI-13, discovery response 4.19a.

²⁴ Exhibit MAU-14, Bellini rebuttal, case U-21297, p. 10 lines 6-8.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 are becoming the standard light and people should not have to pay up front as if they were
2 a specialty item. The Company argued this was not true right up until the time their
3 suppliers told them they would not even carry HPS lights anymore. The Company's
4 communication to its customers about the change in policy seems like an effort by DTE to
5 entice customers to rush into a process that will result in those customers covering the
6 project costs for converting from HID's to LED's when they would not have to pay hundreds
7 of thousands – or even millions – of dollars up front for that conversion if they just waited
8 for their existing lights to fail.²⁵ It also raises concerns regarding whether those customers
9 will essentially pay for their conversion and the conversion of other customers, without
10 getting any credit for that.

11 **Q. Do you agree that it is cost-effective for DTE to continue to re-lamp HPS light fixtures**
12 **until its inventory of HPS lamps is depleted?**

13 A. No, I do not. DTE has testified in the last rate case, when it was arguing that a CIAC should
14 continue to be charged for LED conversions because LED's should not be viewed as the
15 default offering, that some customers prefer HPS fixtures.²⁶ Assuming Mr. Bellini is
16 correct, then the remaining stock of HPS fixtures should be reserved for those customers
17 who request them.

18 Moreover, for customers who do not actively prefer HPS fixtures, it is wasteful to keep an
19 HPS fixture in service. It uses much more electricity than an LED luminaire and requires
20 more-frequent service, which is a major cost-driver. Every HPS fixture that DTE relamps
21 can be expected to remain in service for another eight years – the rated life of the HPS

²⁵ Bellini Exhibit A-25, Sch O3.

²⁶ Exhibit MAU-14, Bellini rebuttal, case U-21297, p. 9-10.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 lamps that DTE uses. Converting luminaires to LED at the first service opportunity reduces
2 the customer's tariff significantly, rather than pushing realization of that savings out
3 another eight years.

4 **Q. What is your recommendation to ensure that streetlighting rates are based on the**
5 **most efficient practices?**

6 A. The Commission should deny the proposal to continue a CIAC for group LED conversions.
7 Absent that, the Commission should put DTE on notice that costs of any truck roll to a
8 streetlight in the eight years following replacement with an HPS instead of an LED light
9 will be presumed to be unrecoverable, a presumption that could be rebutted and recovery
10 assumed if the Company can show the roll would have been reasonable and necessary if
11 an LED had replaced the HPS light (e.g. for a pole knockdown event).

12 **Q. Would your recommendation be a departure from past practice, since DTE**
13 **historically collected CIAC for customer-requested conversions of HPS fixtures to**
14 **LED?**

15 A. Yes: until now, any conversion of an HPS fixture to LED has been done only at customer
16 request and has required a CIAC.

17 **Q. If as you recommend, customers should get LED group conversions without paying**
18 **CIAC up front, won't they be getting something for free that they formerly had to**
19 **pay for?**

20 A. No, they will not get LEDs for free. DTE will recover the cost of new LEDs through its
21 tariff, as it already does. In fact, the current system of collecting CIAC creates the actual
22 equity problem, because customers who pay for conversions pay the same tariff, including
23 LED cost recovery, as customers who did not pay up front (e.g., customers whose Mercury

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 Vapor (MV) fixtures were replaced upon failure without a CIAC payment). Moreover, the
2 continuation of a CIAC charge as Bellini recommends is poor policy as well as being unfair
3 to customers: it will likely slow societal take-up of the environmental and cost-savings
4 associated with LED conversions, since customers who wait could get the same benefit for
5 free.

6 **Q. Many customers already paid up front to get LEDs. Are you arguing that customers**
7 **who have not invested in LEDs should get the same benefit without having the same**
8 **costs?**

9 A. I agree it is not fair for one customer who paid for their LED luminaires to pay the same
10 tariff as another customer who got them at no out-of-pocket cost. It is also not fair that
11 customers be charged for installation of the standard offering (LEDs). I believe there are
12 ways to effectively address the potential disadvantage to those who did pay without
13 knowing that LEDs would become the standard offering, as other utilities have done
14 successfully.

15 **Q. Can you give a specific example that will illustrate the cost implications of DTE's**
16 **proposal for communities that chose to pay a CIAC for LED group conversions in**
17 **prior years?**

18 A. Yes, I can. Several years ago, the City of Ferndale, a MI-MAUI member, paid DTE
19 \$418,240 to convert all its streetlights to LED.²⁷
20 Under DTE's reactive-conversion proposal, going forward other customers will get their
21 LEDs without having to pay CIAC, via reactive conversions. LED rates will rise as LED
22 luminaire plant-in-service balances rise. Ferndale cannot benefit because all its lights are

²⁷ Exhibit MAU-14, City of Ferndale LED conversion quote from DTE.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 already LEDs, so its rates will rise to pay for other customers' LEDs. That would not be
2 fair to Ferndale.

3 **Q. What rate structure would be more reflective of the cost-of-service principle in**
4 **ratemaking for LED "early adopters" like Ferndale?**

5 A. Ferndale should not have to pay the portion of the LED rates, going forward, that recover
6 costs of installing other customers' LEDs. Fortunately, we already have a Commission-
7 approved model for handling this exact situation. Several years ago, Consumers Energy
8 decided to discontinue charging customers CIAC for LED conversions, and instead to
9 convert any HID fixture to LED when any kind of maintenance visit was required.
10 Recognizing that rate-basing no-cost conversions would be unfair to customers who had
11 previously paid for them, Consumers worked out a system of time-limited bill credits that
12 protect early-mover LED customers against the rate impacts of those later no-CIAC
13 conversions.

14 **Q. How does Consumers Energy determine its bill credits for early adopters?**

15 A. The Consumers bill-credit has three notable features: first, the credits are time-limited,
16 meaning the credit scheme will end as of a specified date. Second, every customer receives
17 the same credit amount per LED per year (only for LEDs they paid for through CIAC),
18 regardless of the amount of original CIAC they paid or current tariff. Third, the credit
19 amount is adjusted each time new rates incorporate changes in LED plant in service
20 balances. I recommend that DTE bill credits have the same three features.

21 **Q. When should bill credits sunset?**

22 A. I recommend that the bill credits sunset after DTE has replaced half of the LEDs that were
23 paid for by CIAC fees. At that point, it becomes reasonable for those early-mover LED

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 customers to end the credit because the CIAC contribution will have been effectively
2 exhausted and replacement cost for those LEDs is recovered through rates.

3 DTE depreciates LEDs on a 15-year schedule. Although a few LEDs were installed earlier,
4 I would recommend starting the 15-year clock at 2018, meaning that the bill credits would
5 continue through 2033.

6 **Q. Can you illustrate how this 2033 end to the credit would be applied in the Ferndale**
7 **example?**

8 A. Ferndale's LED conversion was finished in 2020. Ferndale's LEDs, according to DTE's
9 depreciation policy, should last, on average, through 2035. To end bill credits much before
10 2035 would be to charge Ferndale for LED conversions they do not benefit from – i.e., a
11 cost they do not cause; to credit after 2035 would not be appropriate.

12 The choice of 2033 also roughly coincides with the end of the period over which DTE will
13 be replacing HPS fixtures with LEDs. DTE uses HPS lamps rated to last for eight years,
14 meaning the great majority will burn out by 2033. Consequently, reactive conversion of
15 HPS fixtures to LED will stop adding appreciably to the rate base after 2033.

16 **Q. Why use a single year when customers' installation timelines varied?**

17 A. Using a fleet approach would be much more workable, less confusing to customers and be
18 much easier to administer. A perfectly equitable credit would account for when each
19 customer's CIAC-paid LEDs entered service. DTE does not track service records of
20 individual streetlights with the granularity necessary to establish a credit schedule for each
21 light or even each conversion project.

22 **Q. What data should be used to determine the credit amount?**

23 A. The test-year revenue requirement associated with rate-based LED conversion costs should

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 be tracked. Customers who were assessed CIAC fees for LED conversions should not
2 contribute to that cost recovery. This calculation should be performed separately for UG
3 and OH lights because they have different luminaire costs. The resulting figure gives the
4 annual amount that should be credited back to customers for each LED paid for by CIAC.
5 I attach the exhibit provided by Consumers Energy in rate case no. U-21389 showing the
6 inputs and calculation method they use.²⁸

7 Consumer's methodology is instructive, but DTE may reasonably use a simpler approach.
8 Consumers accounts for costs of all rate-based conversions going back several years. Until
9 now, DTE has rate-based conversion costs only for failed MV fixtures, and it is reasonable
10 to assume those conversions benefitted all customers with reasonable equity. Thus, DTE
11 should be able to track only past CIAC-paid LED conversions to figure the credit amount.

12 I recommend that the credit should be the same for all CIAC-paid LEDs and should be
13 recalculated with each successive rate case because the number of rate-based LED
14 conversions and the associated revenue requirements will rise over time. Just like the bill
15 credit sunset timeline, the bill credit amount would be prohibitively difficult and confusing
16 to implement with perfect equity. Ideally, the bill credit amount would be figured
17 separately for each LED model and wiring type, and the rate impact would be divided by
18 the number of LEDs of that model that were paid for through CIAC. In my opinion, this
19 level of accuracy would be more trouble than it is worth and would be confusing to
20 customers; it is also likely that DTE does not have the installation and cost records for
21 every conversion project that this approach would rely upon as inputs.

22 **Q. How do you recommend such a credit be implemented?**

²⁸ Exhibit MAU-16, Consumers LED bill credit worksheet.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 A. I recommend that the Commission instruct DTE to file a bill credit method and initial
2 amount with its next rate case, including the features I have described here. I also
3 recommend that the Commission instruct DTE to consult with staff and intervenors in the
4 development of its proposed credit scheme in advance of its next filing.

5 **Q. Why does your calculation of a credit differ from witness Bellini's proposal for a**
6 **credit for labor against a CIAC?**

7 A. I believe witness Bellini and I differ on how to think about what costs are being caused and
8 avoided by early adopters (in addition to disagreeing about whether a CIAC is appropriate)
9 in a world where all conversions will eventually occur. Witness Bellini approaches the
10 question of conversion CIACs from the perspective of total cost of the group conversion,
11 rather than the marginal cost – that is, the difference in cost between a group conversion
12 and the alternative, which would be many reactive conversions that would happen over a
13 period of time, each requiring a visit by a restoration crew. His proposal to provide a labor
14 credit recognizes that the Company will, eventually, incur labor costs to convert any given
15 HPS fixture to LED, so it might as well cover the labor cost now for any customer prepared
16 to sign up for a group conversion.

17 This reasoning is sound as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. In fact, if the
18 customer does not request conversion now, then the Company, sooner or later, is going to
19 have to cover the entire cost of an HID-LED conversion, including the cost of the
20 luminaire, the cost of a truck roll and crew time, various other staff costs (planning,
21 supervision, bill updates, etc.) and administrative and general costs, to name a few. That
22 time will come when the HID fixture fails, in most cases owing to a lamp burnout. Witness
23 Bellini has articulated no underlying rationale for crediting group-conversion customers

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 for labor costs -- but not all the other conversion costs saved by group conversions -- when
2 assessing what credit should be applied.

3 I believe the better method is to calculate marginal costs, comparing the cost per fixture of
4 a group conversion project today to the cost per fixture of reactive (post-failure)
5 conversions over an extended period of time. We already have good building blocks to
6 determine these figures, because we know how much DTE charges per light for group
7 conversions and we know how much DTE spends per light to respond to individual
8 outages. Cost of service is lower with group conversions than with reactive conversions –
9 not to mention that group conversions improve reliability by preventing outages that trigger
10 reactive conversions.

11 **Q. Can you illustrate some of the savings that group conversions can deliver compared**
12 **to the current CIAC that is charged for such projects?**

13 A. In the case of the City of Ferndale’s LED conversion project, the net unit CIAC fee DTE
14 assessed was \$279.81, calculated as follows:

$$15 \quad \$418,240 \text{ gross project cost} + \$69,750 \text{ DTE contribution} = \$487,990$$

$$16 \quad \$487,990 / 1,744 \text{ fixtures} = \$279.81 \text{ total unit cost recovered through CIAC}$$

17 We also know how much it costs DTE to respond to a streetlight outage. In Exhibit A-25,
18 Sch O2, we see that the “Outage cost per event” in 2023 was \$568. This amount is several
19 hundred dollars higher than the cost of replacing the fixture with an LED as part of a group
20 conversion project.

21 Cost data from Consumers Energy tends to confirm this finding. Consumers performs
22 vicinity conversions: when a HPS light is reported out, the crew not only converts the non-
23 functioning light to LED but also converts other nearby fixtures to LED even though there

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 is nothing wrong with them. Consumers witness Dan Schmoekel testifies, “Approximately
2 \$253,000 in customer savings has been realized since 2022 through vicinity conversions
3 by reducing non-premise time of field personnel.”²⁹ If it is more cost-effective to convert
4 two fixtures in one trip, as Consumers does, then it is even more cost effective to convert
5 20 or 30 fixtures in one trip – about the number of conversions that a crew can typically
6 complete in a workday.

7 **Q. If DTE does not assess a CIAC for group conversion projects, won’t there be greater**
8 **demand for group conversions than the Company can keep up with?**

9 A. If so, this would be a solvable problem. A project queue could be established that DTE
10 could work through in an orderly manner. While I might in other circumstances be more
11 concerned with establishing an equitable process for rationing group conversion projects
12 among customers, in this case no such concern is warranted. First, when other customers
13 had to pay to be “first,” those who were not volunteering to pay up front for a project will
14 have little basis to object about now having to wait. Second, the customers who still have
15 HPS lights have not responded to various financial incentives and outreach promoting LED
16 conversions for the last ten years; meaning they are less likely to complain about delays in
17 receiving a benefit that now comes without up-front cost to them.

18 The reason that escalated demand for conversions is properly understood as an opportunity,
19 not a problem, is that it presents the opportunity to get fleet LED conversion done faster
20 and cheaper, while preventing future HPS outages, and transitioning customers to the
21 cheaper LED tariff sooner. Having not paid a CIAC, of course, these customers would not

²⁹ U-21534 Exhibit MAU-16, U-21585 Consumers witness Schmoekel direct testimony, p. 18, lines 9-10.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 receive the LED bill credits I describe above; but their new LED tariffs should still be less
2 than the HPS tariffs they are paying today.

3 **Q. Please summarize your recommendation to the Commission regarding CIAC fees for**
4 **customer-requested HID-LED group conversion projects.**

5 A. No CIAC should be assessed for HPS-LED conversion projects going forward. The cost
6 of service will be less by converting lights to LED in group projects than by converting
7 them one-by-one upon failure.

8 *Community Lighting Sales Forecast*

9 **Q. What adjustment do you recommend making to the community lighting sales forecast**
10 **as described by witness Bellini?**

11 A. I mostly agree with the forecast but recommend that the Commission update the inputs
12 used to determine reduction to the E1 Option I annual usage to account for lights that are
13 non-operational throughout the course of the year.

14 **Q. Please explain why DTE reduces its sales forecast to account for outages.**

15 A. In case no. U-21297, the Commission adopted MI-MAUI's recommendation to reduce the
16 streetlighting E1-Option I Sales Forecast for Company-owned lights. Until then, street
17 lighting rates assumed that all streetlights were fully operational and using electricity 4,200
18 hours per year. MI-MAUI objected that streetlight electricity use is drastically reduced
19 when a streetlight is out of service and recommended using the Company's Night Patrol
20 outage rate as a reliable measure of overall outage rate. We also recommended that the
21 Night Patrol outage rate of 3.57% be reduced slightly to account for the small amount of
22 electricity used by HID fixture ballasts when their lamps have burned out. The Commission
23 accepted MAUI's recommendations and ordered a net reduction of 3.25% in the E1-Option

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 I sales forecast.

2 **Q. Please describe what changes to the forecast you would recommend.**

3 A. I do not recommend any changes in the methodology. However, three key calculation
4 inputs have changed measurably compared to the figures used in case no. U-21297. The
5 updated inputs should be used to recalculate the sales forecast reduction.

6 **Q. Please describe and quantify the three input values that have changed.**

7 A. The first input value that has changed is the Night Patrol outage rate. In 2023, that rate was
8 4.37%, which is an increase in outages from the 2022 rate used in in case no. U-21297 of
9 3.57%.³⁰

10 The second input value that has changed is the number of HID fixtures remaining under
11 the E1, Option I rate. DTE has since converted many of those fixtures to LED. It is
12 important to track this change in figuring the sales forecast reduction because the ballasts
13 in HID fixtures use about 15% of normal electricity even when their lamps are burned out,
14 whereas non-functioning LED luminaires use essentially no electricity. Fewer HIDs means
15 fewer ballasts using energy during outages.

16 The third input value that has changed is the total (unadjusted) electric sales forecast, which
17 declines as LED luminaires replace HID fixtures. I note that I do not recommend any
18 changes based on this input because unlike the two factors above, DTE accounts for this
19 change in its sales forecast adjustment.

20 **Q. Based on these changed inputs, what reduction in the sales forecast for E1, Option I
21 lighting do you recommend?**

22 A. I recommend a reduction of 3,308,045 kwh, equivalent to 4.06% of DTE's unadjusted

³⁰ DTE Exhibit A-25, Schedule O1.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 forecast for E1, Option I streetlights.³¹

2 *Company Preventive Maintenance Programs*

3 **Q. What preventive maintenance topics will you address?**

4 A. I will address streetlight post inspection and painting, Night Patrol and underground cable
5 replacement.

6 **Q. What concerns do you have about the Company's proposals for streetlight post
7 inspection and painting?**

8 A. I have concerns that the Company has a history of vastly over-collecting for this area. MI-
9 MAUI members are concerned about the condition of their decorative posts, which are
10 typically located in neighborhoods where aesthetics matter, such as commercial areas with
11 heavy pedestrian traffic. Inspection and painting of posts is necessary to maintain the
12 appearance and condition of posts and guard against the need for more rapid capital
13 investment.

14 The Company proposes to spend significantly less on inspections and painting (\$260,000
15 total) than the Commission approved in previous cases. Further investigation reveals that
16 in recent years the Company has collected substantially more than half a million dollars for
17 this work that was not spent, as shown in the following table. Calendar years and test years
18 do not align perfectly but suffice for comparison purposes, especially given the large
19 differences.

³¹ Exhibit MAU -18, sales forecast outage adjustment worksheet.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

| | CY2022/U-20561 | 2023/U-20836 | CY2024/U-21297 |
|--|----------------|--------------|----------------|
| Approved spend (inspection + painting) | \$489,000 | \$486,580 | \$718,810 |
| Actual spend | \$218,005 | \$102,886 | n/a |
| Difference | \$270,995 | \$383,694 | |

1 *Actual spend per U-21534 Exhibit MAU-18, response to MAUIDE-4.28b.*

2 Actual 2024 spending has not been provided, but witness Bellini’s explanations of his
3 proposed amounts for the test year in the instant case gives us some clues. He explains that
4 Community Lighting spent less in 2023 than in prior years because wood-pole inspections
5 are now conducted by the Pole Top Maintenance program.³² Thus, there should be no need
6 for higher post inspection budget going forward.

7 Regarding post painting, witness Bellini explains that the Company anticipates reduced
8 painting capacity going forward because it now uses one painting contractor instead of the
9 two it used prior to 2024.³³ Therefore, the 2024 amount should be less than the 2023
10 amount, as should the test-year amount. Based on witness Bellini’s testimony and
11 discovery responses, then, it seems reasonable to assume that 2024 inspection and painting
12 costs will be no greater, and possibly less than, 2023 expenditures.

13 Based on actual historical spending and witness Bellini’s explanations, I would normally
14 recommend that the Commission approve spending at 2023 levels plus inflation.

15 The table above, however, makes it obvious that the Company has already recovered its
16 projected test-year inspection and painting costs several times over by vastly
17 underspending approved amounts over the past several years. Between 2022 and 2023, the
18 Company recovered about \$650,000 more than it spent, and reasonable extrapolation

³² Exhibit MAU-20, response to MAUIDE-6.52.

³³ Exhibit MAU-21, response to MAUIDE-6.53.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 supports an estimate that will recover at least \$500,000 more than it will spend in 2024. In
2 total, then, through 2024 the Company will have recovered at least \$1,150,000 more than
3 it will have spent on inspections and painting – and that is looking back only three years.
4 Another way to look at it is to observe that the Company has spent only about 25%
5 (~\$425,000/\$1,694,390) of what it has recovered from customers to pay for inspections
6 and painting from 2022-2024.

7 Therefore, my recommendation to the Commission is that it disallow any recovery of
8 inspection and painting costs in the test year, based on evidence in the record that the
9 Company has already been paid to do that work. However, the Commission should also
10 make clear that DTE must continue to inspect and paint posts at the historical pace, if not
11 more to avoid further disallowances.

12 **Q. Do you have any other recommendations for the Commission pertaining to post**
13 **inspection and maintenance?**

14 A. Yes, I do. First, the Commission should clearly state that the Company must implement
15 robust inspection and maintenance programs. It is not acceptable for the Company to
16 maintain assets poorly and then incur premature capital replacement costs. Specifically, the
17 Commission should instruct DTE to state annual targets for inspections and painting and
18 to report on its performance to those targets in rate filings.

19 Second, the Commission should make clear that it will not pay twice to perform important
20 O&M once. Given the Company's dramatic failure to spend recovered money on
21 maintenance of decorative lamp posts that customers paid an additional amount for, and
22 which are highly visible in the community, I recommend that the Commission order the
23 Company to file as part of their next rate case a report on actual costs with amounts

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 recovered in rates, looking back five years.

2 **Q. DTE proposes to spend significantly more on Night Patrol in the projected test year**
3 **than in 2023. Do you support this change?**

4 A. Yes, I support increasing the scope of Night Patrol. Night Patrol is an innovative program
5 that has identified many outages before they are reported by community members, allowed
6 for quick restoration of service, and given the Company valuable data to understand causes
7 of outages. Outage occurrences and durations have been a long-standing challenge for the
8 Company, and I believe that Night Patrol is a key element in helping the Company turn the
9 corner and improve overall reliability.

10 **Q. What concerns do you have about the Company's underground cable replacement**
11 **program?**

12 A. The Company has not provided reliability or cost data to justify this program. The
13 Commission should disallow the proposed spending and make clear what information the
14 Company should provide if it chooses to propose this program in future rate cases.

15 The first waypoint in this analysis should be the Company's plan for improving streetlight
16 reliability as articulated in its Distribution Grid Plan. As I noted in my comments dated
17 March 15, 2024 and submitted to docket U-20147, DTE makes absolutely no mention of
18 streetlights or streetlight cable replacement in its DGP.³⁴ As a general proposition, the
19 Commission should not authorize distribution system investments that have not been
20 incorporated as part of DTE's DGP.

21 That said, I commend the Company for exploring preventive maintenance approaches that
22 may prevent future outages. Preventive replacement of underground cable holds the

³⁴ Exhibit MAU-22, MI-MAUI comments in U-20147 docket in re DTE DGP.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 promise of preventing outages that impact multiple lights and last longer than other
2 outages.

3 Replacing underground cable is expensive, however, and prioritization should be data-
4 driven. This is an analysis that the Company should have conducted in its DGP but did not;
5 nor has it done so here. Witness Bellini states, “The cable replacement program uses the
6 following criteria to determine selection and prioritization of projects: 1) age of cable, 2)
7 pedestrian conflict (level of pedestrian traffic), 3) recurring outages, 4) number of lights
8 on the circuit, and 5) type of road.”³⁵ The Company provides no data to support this
9 prioritization, and evidence that is in the record suggests that it does not even have the
10 relevant data necessary to perform this prioritization. For instance, the Company has
11 previously maintained it does not have data on how many lights are impacted by outages,
12 so it will not have the historical information necessary to perform this prioritization.

13 Presumably, the best predictor of future outages is past outages, especially those that occur
14 spontaneously (e.g., not from third-party strikes). The Company’s OMS might be queried
15 to find areas that are experiencing the most spontaneous cable breaks, but the Company
16 has previously indicated that it is unable to classify outages by cause, including the ability
17 to distinguish between spontaneous breaks and third-party damage.

18 It is also plausible to suppose that old cable is more likely to break and therefore ought to
19 be prioritized for preventive replacement, but this depends on knowing where the old cable
20 is located and showing a correlation between age and failure rates. Again, this hypothesis
21 is testable, but there is neither data nor analysis in the record.

22 Witness Bellini states other criteria for replacing underground cable preventively include

³⁵ Exhibit MAU-23, response to MAUIDE-4.26.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 road type, pedestrian traffic, and number of lights on the circuit but makes no logical
2 connection between them and light failures, nor does he provide any data or analysis.

3 Witness Bellini also argues that preventive maintenance is more cost-effective than
4 reactive repairs, an appealing proposition that may well be correct, but one without any
5 underlying quantified analysis.

6 **Q. What would make the case for preventive cable replacement more persuasive?**

7 A. A data-driven approach would demonstrate that:

- 8 • Underground cable with certain characteristics, ages, installation types or locations
9 is prone to repeated and reasonably predictable failures.
- 10 • The Company can identify where the failure-prone cable is installed.
- 11 • Failures of this type account for a disproportionate number of outage days,
12 considering the number of lights impacted and the time it takes to restore service.
- 13 • Replacing the cable altogether costs less than repeatedly repairing it and prevents
14 outages.
- 15 • To whatever extent preventive cable replacement is not strictly cost-effective, the
16 Company can quantify the reliability benefits customers will realize from the
17 investment.

18 Based on witness Bellini's descriptions of the new outage management system and the
19 Night Patrol database, the data needed to make this case may be available for the next rate
20 case, in a way the data is unavailable today.

21 **Q. What do you recommend the Commission order regarding replacement of
22 underground street lighting cable?**

23 A. The Commission should not include spending on this program in the revenue requirement.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 Consonant with my comments on DTE’s DGP, filed in case no. U-20147, the Commission
2 should require the Company to support its plans for this part of the distribution grid in its
3 DGP.

4 If the Commission does not wish to instruct the Company to amend its DGP, it should leave
5 the door open for the Company to support its cable replacement plans in a future rate filing.

6 I have testified repeatedly about the Company’s inferior performance with streetlight
7 reliability. I welcome investments that can be shown to improve that performance.

8 Spending based on hunches, when those hunches can be tested using straightforward
9 analyses, is not prudent.

Community Lighting Outage Restoration Activities

11 **Q. What is your assessment of DTE’s streetlight outage restoration performance?**

12 A. Both outage frequency and outage duration are declining. However, it is likely that
13 reductions in outage counts are not attributable to the Company’s outage response efforts.
14 Because the Company’s spending on outage restoration activities has been growing
15 rapidly, the Commission should require the Company to provide additional data to
16 demonstrate cost effectiveness.

17 **Q. Is DTE achieving its target for outage durations?**

18 A. No, it is not. In 2023, average outage duration was 4.17 days, continuing a downward trend
19 from 2021’s peak of 5.22 days.³⁶ The Company is still about 39% over its previously stated
20 target of 3.0 days for outage durations and well above its average for 2017-2020 of 3.57
21 days – despite greatly increased spending. The improvement we see has come since 2021,

³⁶Bellini, Exhibit A-25, Sch O1. I note that witness Bellini’s testimony (RAB-17, line 21) states that 2022 performance was 4.2 days, but the exhibit shows 4.7 days. I assume that witness Bellini’s testimony refers to 2023 performance.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 which is not a useful baseline year for measuring performance. When we compare to a
2 more useful pre-pandemic performance baseline, we are not seeing remotely the kind of
3 performance improvement we should expect from the Company's greatly increased
4 spending in this area. In fact, from a pre-pandemic baseline, performance has worsened.
5 Furthermore, outage durations data for 2023 are derived from less than three months of
6 data, from some point in October through December.³⁷ Months with the longest average
7 streetlight outages tend to be those when distribution system outages are most widespread
8 and crews de-prioritize streetlight repairs in favor of restoring power to buildings. Outages
9 occur at all times of the year, of course, but generally the worst periods are late summer
10 and winter, not the fall months from which the 2023 outage durations data were
11 extrapolated. Thus, there are grounds to suspect that the reported durations understate the
12 true full-year average.

13 **Q. What is the company's target for outage durations?**

14 A. I note that witness Bellini's testimony no longer includes a stated target for outage
15 restoration time, as it has in the past. Witness Bellini's testimony in case no. U-21297 stated
16 an outage duration target of 3.0 business days.³⁸

17 **Q. Please summarize the Company's spending trend on outage restoration activities.**

18 A. The average outage cost per event has risen, almost without interruption, from \$221 per
19 event in 2017 to \$568 per event in 2023.³⁹ Total outage restoration costs have increased
20 over that period from \$4.5 million to \$9.4 million. Spread over approximately 200,000
21 lights, that increase equates to about \$25 in increased annual cost per light for outage

³⁷ Exhibit MAU-24, response to MAUIDE-4.24.

³⁸ Exhibit MAU-25, U-21297, Bellini direct testimony RAB-18, line 24.

³⁹ Bellini, Exhibit A-25, Sch O2.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 restoration, the majority of which is capitalized. This increase in costs is significantly
2 impacting the cost of service and has not been adequately explained.

3 **Q. Why do you state that reductions in outage counts are not attributable to the**
4 **Company's outage restoration efforts?**

5 A. All the reductions in outage counts can be attributed to increased deployment of LED
6 luminaires, because they do not require bulb replacements every eight years or so. The
7 Company had about 71,000 fewer HID streetlights (and 71,000 more LEDs) in 2023 than
8 it had in 2017.⁴⁰ On average, one-eighth of those decommissioned HIDs would have had
9 reportable outages each year caused by lamp failures – accounting for roughly 9,000 of the
10 reported outages in 2017. Yet Mr. Bellini reports that total outage events went from 20,670
11 in 2017 to 16,544 in 2023 – a reduction of only 4,026 events.⁴¹ Increased deployment of
12 LEDs alone should have led to 5,000 fewer outages than were reported in 2023. The
13 Company's increased spending on outage restoration should have contributed an additional
14 reduction in outage events on top of the reduction attributable to LEDs, but we see no
15 evidence of any such contribution – in fact, we see the opposite.

16 Except when the Company replaces failed Mercury Vapor fixtures with LEDs, customers
17 pay for HID-LED conversions. A reasonable interpretation of the data available is that the
18 Company's greatly increased spending on outage restoration has contributed nothing to the
19 observed reduction in outage events. The *entire* reduction in outage frequency – and then
20 some – is likely attributable to out-of-pocket spending via CIACs by customers on LED
21 conversions.

⁴⁰ Bellini testimony, Table 2, RAB-8.

⁴¹ Bellini, Exhibit A-25, Sch O2.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 **Q. Why do you estimate the contributions of LEDs to the observed reduction in outage**
2 **counts rather than using actual outage data?**

3 A. The Company has not provided data on root causes of outages, so we cannot isolate outages
4 caused by lamp and fixture failures from other causes. My understanding is that the new
5 OMS described in witness Bellini's testimony will greatly increase the Company's ability
6 to track and report on root causes and their costs.

7 **Q. What do you recommend the Commission order with respect to DTE's outage**
8 **restoration costs?**

9 A. I recommend that the Commission approve the Company's proposed costs. Reliability is
10 the biggest concern of most streetlight customers and nobody wants to see a decline in
11 performance. The decision to deploy the new OMS is particularly welcome, however,
12 because of the impact it could have on better targeting spending.

13 Simply put, current data does not demonstrate that the Company's spending or efforts are
14 effective – much less cost-effective. That is, the Company provides annual outage
15 occurrence and duration data but cannot demonstrate any association between its programs
16 and changes in those metrics. Therefore, I recommend that the Commission order the
17 Company to provide detailed outage event data with its next rate case filing, covering both
18 customer-reported outages and Night Patrol outages. Reporting should be organized by
19 root cause and should include average restoration cost and average duration per root cause.
20 Reporting should also include detailed data on long-duration events, organized by cause of
21 the delay in restoration. Rather than being more prescriptive than this in its order, I
22 recommend the Commission order the Company to provide a proposed reporting scheme
23 within three months of its final order in this case, for review and discussion with Staff and

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 intervenors. The proposal should provide a proposed taxonomy of root outage causes,
2 causes of delays in restoration, cost breakdowns and other data to be provided.

3 **Q. Witness Bellini proposes a plan for periodically reporting outage data to streetlight**
4 **customers. Do you support his proposal?**

5 A. Yes, I do. MI-MAUI met with DTE and Commission staff and reviewed the Company's
6 proposal. We asked questions and made several recommendations, and we received
7 reasonable responses from the Company. We consider this a valuable and important step
8 forward on what we hope will be a more strategic and informed approach to tackling
9 streetlight reliability issues.

10 **Q. Witness Bellini proposes to narrow the scope of the Commission's order in case no.**
11 **U-21297 by providing outage reports only to E1, Option I customers rather than all**
12 **E1 customers. Do you support this change?**

13 A. Yes, I do. I agree with witness Bellini's reasoning on this point.

14 **Q. Do you support the timeline witness Bellini proposes for sending outage reports to**
15 **customers?**

16 A. Witness Bellini's testimony does not commit to a date by which the Company will begin
17 to send outage reports, evidently because of uncertainty about the timeline for achieving
18 full operation of the new OMS system he describes. However, Mr. Bellini's testimony also
19 estimates that the OMS will be fully functional by Q2 or Q3 of 2024, which time is already
20 upon us. Therefore, I believe it would be reasonable for the Commission to include in its
21 order a date certain by which the Company should provide initial reports.

22 Specifically, I recommend that the Commission order the Company to provide the required
23 quarterly reports to its largest customers for Q3 and Q4 of 2024 no later than January 31,

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 2025, and thereafter to comply with the reporting schedule specified in its U-21297 order.

2 **Q. Would you recommend that the Commission put any stipulations on its approval of**
3 **the Company’s proposal?**

4 A. Yes. Currently, the Company asserts that it has the ability only to report outage events.
5 Each event may impact more than one streetlight. For example, an underground conductor
6 strike may interrupt electric service to multiple lights. The Company explains that its
7 outage management system currently does not have the ability to track how many lights
8 each event impacts. Thus, while the Company reports 12,264 “standard events adjusted”
9 in 2023,⁴² the number of streetlights out of service during those events may have been, and
10 likely was, significantly higher.

11 While I understand why there may be a technical issue with reporting the number of lights
12 that have experienced outages in any given period, it is important to recognize that
13 customers see the number of lights that are out, not some common root cause. They are
14 unlikely to feel confident in the integrity of a report that represents that (for example) six
15 lights out is “1” outage.

16 Mr. Bellini has described the Company’s efforts to improve its outage management system
17 and it is my understanding that the Company anticipates being able to report outages on a
18 “per light” rather than “per event” basis soon. This capability is one of the key factors in
19 MAUI’s support for the OMS. Therefore, I recommend that the Commission order DTE to
20 propose a specific timeline for reporting on outages per light rather than per event as part
21 of its next rate filing, or to justify why it cannot do so.

⁴² Bellini Exhibit A-25, Sch O1.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

Community Lighting Operations & Maintenance and Capital Expenditures

1
2 **Q. Do you support witness Bellini’s proposed O&M expenditures?**

3 A. No, I do not. The Company is proposing an unjustified increase in spending on staff. Per
4 my testimony about preventive maintenance activities above, the Company is also
5 proposing unjustified costs for post inspection and painting.

6 **Q. What change in staff O&M spending does the Company propose?**

7 A. In its order in case no. U-21297, the Commission approved staff O&M spending of
8 \$1,279,807, and in this case proposes spending of \$1,800,000, an increase of about
9 \$520,000 or 41%.

10 Witness Bellini explains that the increase is meant to cover new hires for unfilled positions,
11 inflation and increase in administrative costs inclusive of using contractors.⁴³ When invited
12 to explain the changes in number of FTEs broken down by title and or classification,
13 witness Bellini provided only historic and projected total head counts showing that 2025
14 staffing will be about [REDACTED] lower than 2024 and [REDACTED] lower than 2021.⁴⁴ The Company
15 does not explain why it needs a 41% increase in the staff budget when it will have fewer
16 staff in the test year than in the past. A significantly higher staffing budget is being
17 proposed for a team that is projected to do fewer inspections and respond to fewer outages
18 than in the past.

19 The following table compiles the Company’s proposed O&M spending in the instant case
20 to the levels approved in the Commission’s order in case no. U-21297 and to my
21 recommendations for test-year spending.

⁴³ Exhibit MAU-26, Bellini response to MAUIDE-6.55.

⁴⁴ Exhibit MAU-28, Bellini NDA response to MAUIDE-6.56.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

| | O&M 2024 Rate Case Test Period | U-21297 approved spending | MI-MAUI test-year recommendation |
|---|---|--|---|
| Streetlight Inspection | \$130,000 | \$334,383 | \$0 |
| Streetlight Painting | \$130,000 | \$384,427 | \$0 |
| Night Patrols | \$400,000 | \$384,427 | \$400,000 |
| Cancelled Projects/Other | \$60,000 | \$80,252 | \$60,000 |
| Outage Restoration | \$5,653,000 | \$7,490,173 | \$5,653,000 |
| OPL Outage Restoration | <u>\$665,000</u> | <u>\$802,519</u> | <u>\$665,000</u> |
| Gross direct cost of O&M projects | \$7,038,000 | \$9,476,181 | \$6,778,000 |
| Supervisory & Administration | \$1,800,000 | \$1,279,807 | \$941,950 |
| Supv & Admin as % of direct project costs | 25.6% | 13.5% | 13.9% |
| Capitalization Credit | (\$4,750,000) | (\$6,921,723) | No recommendation |
| Damage Claims | \$0 | \$0 | |
| Net Total | \$4,088,000 | \$3,834,265 | No recommendation |

1 I recommend that the Commission approve \$6,778,000 on direct O&M project spending
2 in the test year, with the only difference from the Company's proposal being my proposed
3 disallowance of any further cost recovery for inspections and painting.

4 I recommend that the Commission approve Supervisory & Administration spending of
5 \$941,950. As the table shows, this is the same ratio of staff budget to direct project cost as
6 the Commission approved in case no. U-21297, plus a 2.9% adjustment for inflation.

7 I make no recommendation concerning capitalization credits, and consequently no
8 recommendation about total net spending on O&M.

9 **Q. Do you have any other comments on the Company's proposed Community Lighting**
10 **O&M?**

11 A. Yes, I do. I support robust O&M with emphasis on outage prevention. I see outage
12 prevention as even more important with streetlights than with other rate classes, for two
13 reasons. First, streetlight outages get reported slowly, which is why Night Patrol finds so
14 many outages that have not yet been reported by customers. Second, streetlight outages are

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 at the bottom of the restoration priority list – rightly so: it is more important to restore
2 power to buildings. If we de-prioritize restoration, allowing known streetlight outages to
3 wait until crews become available after serving higher priorities, then at least we should
4 take strong steps to prevent those outages happening to begin with.

5 Regrettably, the Company has greatly underspent its inspection and painting budgets over
6 the past several years. It would be imprudent to support recovery of O&M costs that history
7 shows the Company will not incur. I would support an O&M plan that provided specific
8 targets for inspections and painting, and I would support an O&M budget grounded in
9 evidence that the spending was likely to improve reliability. For now, though, in my view
10 the Company has already been paid in advance for the next several years’ worth of
11 inspections and painting at historic levels, has experienced decreasing reliability, and
12 should not be allowed to recover additional money until it can reconcile how it has used
13 funds it already received.

14 **Q. Do you support the Company’s proposed Community Lighting capital expenditures?**

15 A. First, I renew my objection to the Company’s failure to address street lighting in any way
16 in its Distribution Grid Plan. I recommend that the Commission order DTE to address its
17 plans for all Community Lighting services in its next DGP, where it may be analyzed with
18 the same level of rigor as other distribution system investments.

19 My objection notwithstanding, I support the costs itemized in Exhibit A-12, Sch, B5.5
20 except for the underground cable replacement program. Per my testimony above, the
21 Company has failed to show that this program is cost-effective. The Commission should
22 disallow this expenditure while also inviting the Company to propose this program in a
23 future filing with appropriate cost-effectiveness data and analysis. Total test-year capital

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 expenditure for Community Lighting should therefore be \$15.575 million.

2 *LED Luminaire Selection Methodology Specific to HID to LED Conversions*

3 **Q. Please summarize your concerns about DTE's practices and costs for conversions of**
4 **HID streetlights to LED.**

5 A. I am concerned that the Company continues to install LED luminaires that are
6 unnecessarily bright and drive up the cost of service.

7 In case no, U-21297, the Commission found that the Company's costs for choosing LED
8 luminaires to replace HID fixtures were unreasonable. The Commission noted that the
9 Company significantly exceeded its manufacturer's guidance for choosing LED
10 replacements for each kind of HID fixture, without providing any other evidence that its
11 conversion standards are reasonable.

12 **Q. What is DTE's proposal in this case pertaining to conversion costs?**

13 A. The Company is providing new evidence and arguments that purport to justify its
14 conversion practices and costs and asks the Commission to allow the Company to recover
15 the costs that were disallowed in case no. U-21297.

16 **Q. Do you support the Company's proposal?**

17 A. No, I do not. The Company has failed to meet the clear standard that the Commission set
18 in case no. U-21297, which is to demonstrate that its costs are consistent with reasonable
19 efforts to comply with roadway lighting standards.

20 Instead, the Company disavows that its objective is to comply with roadway lighting
21 standards when it converts HID streetlights to LED and asserts that it is therefore
22 reasonable for it only to match performance of the incumbent HID's when choosing LED's.

23 It then provides expert opinions that its methodology for matching LED's to HID's is

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 technically sound. Here, the Company is making the perfect the enemy of the good,
2 claiming that since complete compliance with a standard of roadway lighting would be
3 burdensome due to the need to develop new lighting designs, it should be permitted to
4 disregard the standards entirely when more closely approximating the standards would
5 lower customer costs. The Commission should sustain its prior disallowances.

6 **Q. Has DTE consistently taken the position that new lighting designs for LED streetlights**
7 **would be an added expense?**

8 A. No. When MI-MAUI first raised the issue that DTE’s standard LED light replacements
9 were too expensive and too bright, witness Bellini opposed those proposed revenue
10 reductions in part because he testified that the Company’s light selection would provide
11 the opportunity for cost reductions through redesigns: “[u]sing higher wattage fixtures
12 means fewer poles and luminaires are used which is economical and reduces the need for
13 additional infrastructure.”⁴⁵ However, when pressed, the Company admitted that its
14 practice was to replace all poles with HPS fixtures with LEDs rather than undertake the
15 necessary redesign to determine if fewer poles could be used. DTE’s purchase of higher
16 wattage fixtures, therefore, does not reduce the need for additional infrastructure, or the
17 costs to customers, in practice.

18 **Q. Does the ability of customers to depart from DTE recommended wattage lights**
19 **address your concerns about higher costs of the DTE recommended lights?**

20 A. No; this argument is a red herring. The Company makes it inconvenient and expensive for
21 customers to choose materials other than the Company’s default choices and asks
22 customers to agree that other choices will not comply with lighting standards, without

⁴⁵ Exhibit MAU-27, U-20836 Bellini Rebuttal excerpt.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 providing analysis regarding whether their choices are compliant or not.

2 **Q. DTE witness Bellini makes four recommendations regarding HID-LED streetlight**
3 **conversion costs in his testimony. Do you support his recommendations?**

4 A. No, I disagree with witness Bellini’s recommendations.⁴⁶ I will summarize my concerns
5 first, then develop each more fully further on.

6 **Q. What is witness Bellini’s first recommendation and why do you disagree with it?**

7 A. Witness Bellini argues it would be prudent for the Company to continue utilizing its current
8 default LED replacements for certain HID streetlight fixtures, rather than the LEDs
9 recommended in a crossover chart provided by its supplier, Leotek, which is not currently
10 available. Witness Bellini argues that expert analyses provided in his exhibits and
11 workpapers support the Company’s choices of standard LED replacements for its
12 incumbent HID fixtures. The Company’s testimony does not do so, for the reasons
13 summarized below and explained in more detail in my testimony.

14 In U-21297, the Commission sought evidence that the Company’s preferred luminaires
15 were necessary to comply with streetlighting standards, and without such evidence, denied
16 cost recovery for the needlessly expensive lights. The expert assessments that witness
17 Bellini provides vouch for the comparability of the Company’s standard LED luminaire
18 replacements for common HID fixtures, but do not find that this replacement is necessary
19 to meet standards. Moreover, the modeling data his experts provide belies the Company’s
20 contention that such lights are necessary. The Company’s workpapers provide modeling
21 results that show its default LEDs usually and often significantly deliver more light than
22 standards indicate is needed. The modeling results also show that using other, less

⁴⁶ Bellini testimony, p. 35, line 5 – p. 36, line 24.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 expensive LED models would yield better cost and lighting results.

2 **Q. What is witness Bellini’s second recommendation regarding HID-LED conversions**
3 **and why do you disagree with it?**

4 A. Witness Bellini describes the Company’s current and proposed practices for informing
5 customers about its compliance with roadway lighting standards. The Company proposes
6 “explicitly informing the customer in the contract and during discussions that the customer
7 has the choice to select another LED at their discretion and confirmed in the municipal
8 conversion agreement.”⁴⁷

9 I support this proposal as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough. Witness Bellini’s
10 proposal is insufficient to meaningfully empower customers and lead to greater
11 accountability for quality of conversion practices. Empowered customers need reliable,
12 sufficient, and comprehensible information and the ability to act on that understanding.
13 That is not the case here. Checkbox-style disclosure that standards will not be met is
14 insufficient because customers are unlikely to understand the implications of that
15 disclosure. Customers cannot rely on DTE’s information, either: I will show that DTE does
16 not consider reasonable alternatives, much less present these more cost-effective options
17 to customers. It makes little sense to make customers responsible for a decision they expect
18 DTE to have the technical capacity to make, and most customers will depend on the
19 Commission to confirm the reasonableness and cost effectiveness of standard offerings.
20 Finally, customers’ freedom of choice is significantly constrained: DTE makes alternative
21 light choices more expensive and inconvenient for the customer.

22 This is a textbook example of the need for regulation. When customers have a difficult

⁴⁷ Bellini testimony, RAB- 36 starting at line 6.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 time gathering and understanding technical information, and have no ability to choose
2 different providers, then the solution is to ensure the choices provided are reasonable and
3 prudent, without needless built-in costs.

4 **Q. What is witness Bellini's third recommendation regarding HID-LED conversion**
5 **practices and costs and why do you disagree with it?**

6 A. Witness Bellini states that DTE would be amenable to a staff-facilitated technical
7 workshop with various stakeholders to examine the Company's conversion standards and
8 costs.⁴⁸

9 I would not support convening of a technical workshop at this time. If the Commission
10 were presented here with relevant technical evidence about which experts could reasonably
11 disagree, then convening a technical collaborative might make sense. While we can glean
12 some evidence about compliance of the Company's LED installations with the ANSI/IES
13 RP-8 standards, witness Bellini's testimony and the consultants' reports focus on the
14 equivalency of DTE's HID-LED conversions, not to compliance with standards. Once DTE
15 presents comprehensive and credible information in a rate case filing about its efforts to
16 comply with roadway lighting standards, supported by comparative cost data, which
17 intervenors can scrutinize and reply to, then the Commission can choose whether to decide
18 the issue then and there or refer it for technical study. Moreover, since DTE's lighting
19 choices are very different than those of other Michigan utilities, there is little evidence that
20 the issue here is truly technical as opposed to a continuing effort to attempt to increase
21 capital spending beyond reasonable and prudent levels.

22 **Q. What is witness Bellini's fourth recommendation and why do you disagree with it?**

⁴⁸ Bellini testimony, RAB-36 starting at line 6.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 A. Witness Bellini asks the Commission to revisit its decision in case no. U-21297 to disallow
2 \$5.8 million in LED gross plant.

3 I disagree because witness Bellini has not met the clear standard that the Commission
4 articulated in case no. U-21297. The Commission wrote, "...the company is simply guided
5 by the original lumen output, which does not equate to compliance with the relevant
6 standards and is based on an outdated technology that is undergoing replacement."⁴⁹

7 Rather than attempting to show that the Company makes reasonable attempts to comply
8 with relevant standards, witness Bellini declares, without offering any evidence, that the
9 standards are impractical for HID-LED conversions. Instead, he attempts to demonstrate
10 how well the Company performs a function that the Commission has stated is not relevant
11 to the task at hand: matching the *original* lumen output. Not only does this ignore
12 testimony offered about output, it sidesteps the question of whether that original output
13 was appropriate in the first place.

14 My argument for disallowance does not rest solely on DTE's failure to respond to the
15 Commission's prior order. It is based on evidence that shows DTE does have cost-effective
16 options for improving compliance of its HID-LED conversions with roadway lighting
17 standards, and that these options are used by comparable utilities here in Michigan.

18 **Q. Please outline your argument against witness Bellini's first recommendation,**
19 **regarding prudence of DTE's practices for choosing LEDs to replace each type of**
20 **HID streetlight.**

21 A. My argument has two key elements.

⁴⁹ U-21297 order, p139.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 First, witness Bellini has not addressed the Commission's concerns stated in its U-21297
2 order. Rather, he tries to move the metaphorical goalposts by focusing his testimony on
3 comparability of LEDs to HIDs. He also inappropriately delegates responsibility for
4 satisfying roadway lighting standard to customers, obfuscating the technical role the
5 Company necessarily plays in lighting conversion projects and the barriers customers
6 encounter when they want to diverge from DTE recommendations.

7 Second, his attempt to move the goalposts is ill-founded. He simply asserts that meeting
8 roadway lighting standards is unreasonable for HID-LED conversion projects, without
9 providing any supporting data. The modeling data he does provide proves the opposite
10 case: the Company could come into closer compliance with roadway lighting standards
11 and save customers money while doing it.

12 **Q. In its U-21297 order, the Commission discussed the Leotek conversion chart, which**
13 **was congruent with your interpretation of a key lighting standard (ANSI/IES RP8)**
14 **in contrast to DTE's interpretation. Is that chart discussed in DTE's current**
15 **testimony?**

16 A. No, because Leotek has removed that chart and now offers no conversion advice.

17 **Q. Should the removal of the conversion chart by Leotek excuse DTE from discussing**
18 **why its preferred but more expensive lights are necessary to meet lighting standards?**

19 A. No. In its U-21297 order, the Commission did not say that DTE must follow the
20 manufacturer's guidance; it merely noted that DTE failed to justify why it was departing
21 from that guidance, without providing any evidence that its preferred approach yields better
22 results. If DTE cannot rely on the manufacturer's guidance to show its brighter lights are
23 needed to comply with roadway lighting standards, then it must find another way to do so,

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 for example through the modeling exercises it offers as evidence in this case.

2 **Q. Does DTE put forward evidence in this case that its brighter lights are needed to**
3 **comply with ANSI/IES RP8 standards when converting existing HPS streetlights?**

4 A. No. DTE’s position in this case is that it would be “impractical and costly to conform to
5 current ANSI/IES RP8 lighting standards for pre-existing lighting systems” because older
6 systems would need extensive reconfiguration inclusive of work such as pole relocations
7 and rewiring of the overhead and underground system cable.⁵⁰ Therefore, it continues to
8 install an LED that is as bright as the HPS was projected to be at the start of its life, without
9 first analyzing whether lower wattages would suffice.⁵¹

10 **Q. Would lower-wattage lights better approximate lighting standards without extensive**
11 **redesign of older systems, and save customers money?**

12 A. Yes, in most cases I believe they would, for several reasons. The expert analyses provided
13 by witness Bellini, support this contention – DTE could more closely approximate roadway
14 lighting standards without redesign by installing LED luminaires from the same product
15 line but with lower wattages.

16 **Q. Can we assume incumbent HID lights at their brightest were compliant with roadway**
17 **lighting standards?**

18 A. No. Even if original designs did meet lighting standards at the time (which is itself an
19 assumption that we have no data to support), lighting standards, designs and technologies
20 have all changed over decades.

21 Second, data available suggest that DTE’s HID fixtures vary greatly with respect to their

⁵⁰ Bellini testimony RAB-25, lines 12-18.

⁵¹ Bellini testimony RAB-25, lines 12-18.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 performance against standards. The modeling done by Mr. McLean, described in Exhibit
2 A25, Schedule O5 and documented in his workpapers submitted by Mr. Bellini, shows
3 wide variance in lighting provided by 100w HPS fixtures compared to standards, and
4 consistent overlighting of areas served by 250w HPS fixtures.⁵²

5 Although Mr. McLean's narrative report primarily addresses whether DTE's choices of
6 LED luminaires reasonably match the HID fixtures they replace (which I note was never
7 in dispute in U-21297), his workpapers also model performance of the incumbent HID
8 fixtures and show the ANSI/IES RP-8 standards for the roadways he modeled. Data in the
9 tables below is copied from Mr. McLean's workpapers, with the only addition being a
10 simple calculation to show how each original HPS light modeled stacks up against the
11 lighting standards Mr. McLean identified for each location. Note that this table, and others
12 to follow, provide both luminance and illuminance values. For straight roadways, the
13 ANSI/IES RP-8 handbook prefers use of luminance. I focus my discussion on luminance
14 but provide illuminance values for reference.

15 For the roadways labeled 100A through G (originally served by 100w HPS fixtures),
16 modeling shows that average luminance varied considerably with respect to the standards.
17 Notably, Roadway 100A provided 240% of the standard, Roadway 100D provided only
18 85% of standard and Roadway 100E provided 160% of the standard. Choosing LED
19 replacements based on HIDs that performed very inconsistently with respect to standards,
20 but overlit the roadway in the majority of modelled intersections, is not prudent practice.

⁵² Bellini Exhibit A-25, Sch O5.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

| DTE ID | Surface | Road Type | 100W HPS | |
|-----------|--------------|-------------|----------|---------|
| | | | Avg Lum | Avg Ill |
| A,B,C,F,G | IES Standard | | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| D,E | IES Standard | | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| 100 A | R3 | Unspecified | 0.72 | 0.87 |
| | | | 240% | 218% |
| 100 B | R1 | Local | 0.43 | 0.42 |
| | | | 143% | 105% |
| 100 C | R1 | Local | 0.51 | 0.49 |
| | | | 170% | 123% |
| 100 D | R3 | Collector | 0.34 | 0.45 |
| | | | 85% | 75% |
| 100 E | R3 | Collector | 0.66 | 0.84 |
| | | | 165% | 140% |
| 100 F | R3 | Local | 0.33 | 0.39 |
| | | | 110% | 98% |
| 100 G | R3 | Local | 0.35 | 0.46 |
| | | | 117% | 115% |

Data source: Witness Bellini's Work Paper H - Application Performance Results 100 HPS All LED to HPS 11 11 22

Turning to the roadways formerly lit by 250w HPS fixtures, we see that Mr. McLean's modeling found all modelled roadways to be drastically overlit by the HPS fixtures per standards, providing 216% to 314% of the average luminance standard.

| DTE ID | Surface | Road Type | 250 HPS | |
|--------|--------------|-------------|---------|---------|
| | | | Avg Lum | Avg Ill |
| A,F | IES Standard | | 0.8 | 1.2 |
| B,C | IES Standard | | 0.5 | 0.7 |
| 250 A | R3 | Unspecified | 2.22 | 2.98 |
| | | | 278% | 248% |
| 250 B | R1 | Local | 1.36 | 1.29 |
| | | | 272% | 184% |
| 250 C | R1 | Local | 1.57 | 1.51 |
| | | | 314% | 216% |
| 250 F | R2 | Collector | 2.13 | 2.94 |
| | | | 266% | 245% |

Data source: Witness Bellini's Work Paper J - Application Performance Results 250 HPS All LED to HPS 11 11 22

Thus, DTE's own expert results indicate it is not sound to assume that the original lights complied with relevant standards, so matching their initial output will not be a good predictor of the necessary wattage, just as I argued in U-21297. At least one expert the Company engaged stated explicitly that the analysis the Company asked it to perform

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 contained the assumption that past HPS lighting levels were appropriate: “It is noteworthy
2 that this method of comparing to incumbent technology assumes that the existing
3 technology does not over- or under-light the roadway.”⁵³ That is an assumption which the
4 DTE experts’ modeling shows is unsound.

5 **Q. If local governments have important fiscal, social, and environmental goals impacted
6 by street lighting, why do they not simply exercise their power as customers to have
7 DTE install different lights?**

8 A. Customers with the resources to devote staff engineering time to selecting streetlights, the
9 ability to warehouse streetlighting stock, and the upfront cash necessary to meet the CIAC
10 can depart from standard offerings. There are very few municipalities that have the staffing
11 and financial resources to make departing from standard offerings an accessible option.

12 **Q. How does DTE describe lighting standards to customers considering alternative
13 models?**

14 A. DTE’s HID-LED group conversion proposals to customers regularly include a checkbox
15 asking the customer to agree it has been told the design does not meet roadway lighting
16 standards. Customers are not informed by the Company or ever asked to certify that it
17 understands that current lights may *also* not meet roadway lighting standards, and that
18 overlighting is a more common non-compliance result than underlighting in DTE’s own
19 modelling. When DTE moves to a system of automatically replacing failed HPS lights with
20 LEDs, as witness Bellini proposes in this case, this problem will become more acute
21 because there will be no dialogue or sign-off with the customer for the Company’s

⁵³ Bellini Exhibit A-25, Sch O9, “Review of the DTE Energy Luminaire Selection Process,” by Prof. Ronald Gibbons, p3.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 conversion standards.

2 Second, DTE makes it expensive for customers interested in departing from the Company's
3 streetlight models. The Company applies additional fees for "special order materials,"
4 including LEDs with different wattages or color temperatures than DTE usually uses. The
5 Company requires the customer either to pay a stocking fee or keep special order materials
6 on hand themselves when they select a non-standard offering.⁵⁴ To the instant point, this
7 practice demonstrates that the Company's policies make it impractical or infeasible for
8 customers to choose luminaire specifications that comply better with ANSI/IES RP-8
9 standards than the Company's default choices, and thus it is all the more important that the
10 Commission continue to deny recovery when the standard lights provided are more
11 expensive to purchase and operate than is necessary. A quick review of spec sheets show
12 that it is not difficult to find or procure luminaires of different wattages, optics, and color
13 temperature from DTE's standard offerings, and thus it would not be difficult for the
14 Company to adopt a new, more cost-effective model that responds to customer feedback.
15 I will discuss how this standard should apply to luminaire wattage choices, optics, and
16 color temperature.⁵⁵

17 **Q. Does DTE have a standard offering LED with a color-correlated temperature**
18 **recommended in the ANSI/IES RP-8 standard?**

19 A. No. DTE stocks luminaires with CCT of 4,000k. The ANSI/IES RP-8 standard
20 recommends luminaires around 3,000k on highways to improve driver visibility and reduce
21 glare. The standard also states that streets may have a wider range depending on the specific

⁵⁴ Exhibit MAU-29, response to MAUIDE-4.20.

⁵⁵ Exhibit MAU-30, response to MAUIDE-5.47, Leotek GCJ_J Specs.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 application. Furthermore, lower-temperature lights are generally preferred by customers
2 and can reduce obtrusive light. The City of Ann Arbor recently polled residents on LED
3 CCT options and found a strong preference for 3,000 or 2,700k lights rather than 4,000k.⁵⁶
4 Lower-temperature lights, finally, emit less energetic photons, which are less likely to
5 reflect off incident surfaces and create obtrusive light problems such as glare and sky glow.
6 In short, DTE's standard offering LED not only is of a wattage that is likely to over-light
7 compared to the standard, the Company also fails to offer a standard-order light that
8 conforms to the color temperature preferred by ANSI/IES RP-8 and customers.

9 **Q. Has DTE provided any evidence directly responsive to the Commission's stated focus**
10 **on compliance with roadway lighting standards?**

11 A. Yes, it has, and that evidence undermines the Company's testimony. As I have already
12 shown, the Company's own workpapers reveal that incumbent HPS fixtures do not
13 consistently comply with roadway lighting standards, and most often exceed those
14 standards. The modeling also shows that the Company's criteria and method for matching
15 replacement LED luminaires to incumbent HID fixtures usually results in illumination
16 above, and often well above, the standards.

17 None of these data, however, come forth in the exhibits or testimony offered by the
18 Company, but rather become evident only upon close examination of witness Bellini's
19 workpapers. Witness Bellini's testimony is concerned only with demonstrating that the
20 Company has a robust method for matching LED luminaires to the HPS fixtures they
21 replace. This was never disputed by MI-MAUI; the dispute was whether this method
22 resulted in over-spending, which it does and continues to do, a conclusion the work done

⁵⁶ Exhibit MAU-31, City of Ann Arbor webpage for LED conversion project.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 by the Company’s own lighting experts supports.

2 **Q. What do the modeling results show happens when 58w LED luminaires are**
 3 **substituted for 100W or 250W HPS lights – would similar overlighting occur when**
 4 **compared to the HPS lights that they replace?**

5 A. The most common result is significant exceedance of the standards. I reach this
 6 conclusion by comparing Mr. McLean’s modeling of LEDs over the various roadways to
 7 the lighting standards he found apply to each of them. Mr. McLean modeled five local
 8 roadways for 58w LED luminaires and found they would average 188% of the luminance
 9 standard, varying from 150% to 313%. Mr. McLean modeled another two collector
 10 roadways for 58w LED luminaires and found they would provide 113% and 218%,
 11 respectively, of the luminance standard.

| DTE ID | Surface | Road Type | 58.4W LED | | 37W LED | |
|------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | Avg Lum | Avg Ill | Avg Lum | Avg Ill |
| A,B,C,F,G | IES Standard | | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 |
| D,E | IES Standard | | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| 100 A | R3 | Unspecified | 0.94 | 0.93 | 0.7 | 0.75 |
| | | | 313% | 233% | 233% | 188% |
| 100 B | R1 | Local | 0.52 | 0.44 | 0.43 | 0.39 |
| | | | 173% | 110% | 143% | 98% |
| 100 C | R1 | Local | 0.59 | 0.52 | 0.46 | 0.42 |
| | | | 197% | 130% | 153% | 105% |
| 100 D | R3 | Collector | 0.45 | 0.48 | 0.32 | 0.37 |
| | | | 113% | 80% | 80% | 62% |
| 100 E | R3 | Collector | 0.87 | 0.9 | 0.64 | 0.71 |
| | | | 218% | 150% | 160% | 118% |
| 100 F | R3 | Local | 0.45 | 0.4 | 0.36 | 0.36 |
| | | | 150% | 100% | 120% | 90% |
| 100 G | R3 | Local | 0.46 | 0.5 | 0.33 | 0.38 |
| | | | 153% | 125% | 110% | 95% |
| Total | Average | | 188% | 133% | 143% | 108% |
| A,B,C,F,G | Average | | 197% | 140% | 152% | 115% |
| D,E | Average | | 165% | 115% | 120% | 90% |

12
 13 *Data source: Witness Bellini’s Work Paper H - Application Performance Results 100 HPS All LED to HPS*
 14 *11 11 22.*

15 Mr. McLean’s modeling also shows that DTE’s preferred 136w LED replacement for the

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 250w HPS fixtures delivers, on average, 317% of the average luminance standard (see
2 table). In other words, the modelling predicts the Company’s preferred LED results in the
3 average street will be more than three times as bright as design standards recommend.

| DTE ID | Surface | Road Type | 136W LED | | 111W LED | | 89W LED | | 72W LED | |
|--------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | Avg Lum | Avg Ill | Avg Lum | Avg Ill | Avg Lum | Avg Ill | Avg Lum | Avg Ill |
| A,F | IES Standard | | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 1.2 |
| B,C | IES Standard | | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.7 |
| 250 A | R3 | Unspecified | 2.62 | 3.03 | 2.19 | 2.64 | 1.81 | 2.18 | 1.46 | 1.76 |
| | | | 328% | 253% | 274% | 220% | 226% | 182% | 183% | 147% |
| 250 B | R1 | Local | 1.43 | 1.21 | 1.39 | 1.04 | 1.15 | 1.04 | 0.93 | 0.84 |
| | | | 286% | 173% | 278% | 149% | 230% | 149% | 186% | 120% |
| 250 C | R1 | Local | 1.66 | 1.44 | 1.52 | 1.39 | 1.26 | 1.15 | 1.02 | 0.93 |
| | | | 332% | 206% | 304% | 199% | 252% | 164% | 204% | 133% |
| 250 F | R2 | Collector | 2.59 | 3.12 | 2.13 | 2.6 | 2.13 | 2.15 | 1.42 | 1.74 |
| | | | 324% | 260% | 266% | 217% | 266% | 179% | 178% | 145% |
| Total | Average | | 317% | 223% | 281% | 196% | 244% | 168% | 188% | 136% |
| A,F | Average | | 326% | 256% | 270% | 218% | 246% | 180% | 180% | 146% |
| B,C | Average | | 309% | 189% | 291% | 174% | 241% | 156% | 195% | 126% |

4 *Data source: Witness Bellini’s Work Paper J - Application Performance Results 250 HPS All LED to HPS*
5 *11 11 22.*

7 **Q. Could DTE satisfy lighting standards by using lower-wattage LEDs on the modeled**
8 **roadways, instead of the 58w and 136w models used now?**

9 A. Yes, the data provided by Mr. McLean strongly suggest it could in almost all cases.
10 The “100A-100G” roadways he modeled would provide, on average, 143% of the
11 luminance standard with 37w LEDs, with only one of the seven roadways coming in below
12 the standard.

13 The modeling results make an even more compelling case for using a lower-wattage LED
14 over the “250A-250D” roadways. If the Company were to step down to a 72w LED instead
15 of 136w LED in place of 250w HPS fixtures, average roadway luminance would still be
16 188% of the standard level.

17 **Q. If the models show that lower-wattage LEDs would comply with roadway lighting**
18 **standards, then why did the Company’s experts rule out their use?**

19 A. The Company’s experts ruled out the use of lower-wattage LEDs because they were not

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 asked to find which LEDs would best satisfy roadway lighting standards. Rather, they were
2 asked to determine which LEDs would best match incumbent HPS lights.

3 **Q. What would be the benefit of using lower-wattage LEDs?**

4 A. The 37w luminaire uses about 36% less electricity than the 58w model. The cost of service
5 of a 37-watt LED is about \$34 less per year than that of a 58w LED (\$203 vs \$237).⁵⁷

6 The 72w LED luminaire uses just over half the electricity of the Company’s preferred 136w
7 LED. Witness Bellini’s Lighting Rate Model shows that the 72w LED has a COS total rate
8 of \$271.50 per year, whereas the Company’s preferred 136w model has a COS total rate
9 of \$374 – more than \$100 extra per year.

10 **Q. Modeling aside, do any other streetlight service providers in Michigan use HID-LED
11 conversion practices similar to what you recommend?**

12 A. Consumers Energy and the City of Grand Rapids both use significantly lower LED
13 wattages to replace common HID wattages than DTE does.

14 Consumers Energy, for example, uses a 40-watt LED cobrahead luminaire as the standard
15 replacement for 100-watt high pressure sodium (HPS) luminaires.⁵⁸ For this same
16 conversion, DTE uses a 58-watt LED luminaire, which uses 45% more electricity than
17 Consumers’ choice. It costs DTE about \$15 more to buy a 58-watt LED than a 40-watt
18 LED.⁵⁹ The cost of service for a 58-watt LED cobrahead luminaire is about \$17 more per
19 year than for a 40-watt LED. Across the board, Consumers is replacing HID luminaires
20 with LED luminaires that are cheaper and use less electricity than DTE’s choices. The

⁵⁷ WP RAB U-21534 Lighting Rate Model, Output worksheet, Column AP.

⁵⁸ Exhibit MAU-32, Consumers Energy LED Streetlight Crossovers, excerpt from testimony of Consumers Energy witness Schmoekel in case no. U-21585.

⁵⁹ WP RAB U-21534 Lighting Rate Model, E1 Option I OH, worksheet.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 choice is consequential for customer cost, lighting quality and customer climate and energy
2 goals.

3 Differences between Consumers’ more-rural service territory compared to DTE’s may
4 justify differences in standard lighting levels. However, DTE also serves rural areas and
5 has not shown that it uses different lights there than in cities. Furthermore, this point simply
6 underscores why it is important to choose lights based on standards that take such factors
7 into account, rather than using a cookie-cutter approach.

8 Given this observation, it may nevertheless be useful for the Commission also to consider
9 how another large street lighting provider has converted to LEDs in an urban environment.

10 The City of Grand Rapids recently completed conversion of its streetlights to LED. Grand
11 Rapids uses 55-watt LEDs to replace 100-watt HPS luminaires – closer to DTE’s choice
12 of 58-watt LEDs. However, Grand Rapids also installs dimmers on its LEDs, and drives
13 those 55-watt LEDs initially at 70% of maximum, equivalent to only about 40 watts.⁶⁰ As
14 the luminaire’s light output slowly decreases over time, Grand Rapids can adjust to yield
15 constant illumination by giving the luminaire more electricity. This practice also
16 significantly extends the service life of the luminaire, which saves the City money, because
17 replacing failed lights is more expensive.

18 **Q. What conclusion do you draw from the fact that other streetlight conversions in**
19 **Michigan use lower wattage lights or operate similar lights at lower wattage output?**

20 A. The Commission was right to deny recovery to DTE for the unreasonable costs its unusual
21 LED conversion choices cause customers in U-21297, and it should do so again in this

⁶⁰ Exhibit MAU-33, Grand Rapids LED Conversion, “City of Grand Rapids FOIA Response Letter to Request PR-2024-368 to Michigan Municipal Association for Utility Issues,” answers 1 and 6.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 case. DTE has failed to offer evidence that the Commission should reconsider the
2 unreasonable nature of the costs that DTE's choices are creating.

3 DTE's LED conversion practices, according to its own modeling, result in overlighting of
4 public streets. Other large streetlight fleet owners in Michigan use different practices,
5 suggesting that DTE has viable options for improving its compliance.

6 **Q. Witness Bellini recommends that the Commission should reverse itself by allowing**
7 **the Company to recover on the \$5.8 million in excess LED costs disallowed in case no,**
8 **U-21297. Do you agree?**

9 A. No. The evidence in this case clearly shows the Company has cost-effective ways to
10 improve compliance with ANSI/IES RP-8 that it has not properly evaluated, and it is not
11 making lighting that is more likely to comply with lighting standards available without
12 charging an up-front CIAC and imposing other cost and staffing burdens on customers who
13 wish lights that better meet their lighting, environmental, and economic goals.

14 **Q. Witness Bellini recommends that the Commission order a technical collaborative on**
15 **lighting conversion standards if it is not prepared to approve the Company's LED**
16 **costs with its order in this case. Do you agree?**

17 A. No, I do not agree. DTE's own technical experts have given it all the information it needs
18 to understand that its conversion practices usually overlight roadways. Until recently, its
19 own preferred supplier had a conversion chart that suggested DTE's selections were more
20 expensive than were recommended. Other utilities in Michigan choose lights of lower
21 wattages or deliberately operate them to consume less energy and last longer. If DTE will
22 not accept that it is wrong when it is out of step with its peers, its supplier, and even the
23 analysis of its own experts, a technical conference is unlikely to do more than absorb a lot

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 of time without achieving any consensus.

2 If DTE can present comprehensive and credible technical and cost information in a rate
3 case filing about why its preferred light is more likely to comply with roadway lighting
4 standards than the more usual alternatives, which intervenors can then scrutinize and reply
5 to, then a technical collaborative may be a reasonable path forward. Ordering one in this
6 case, in which the Company's experts provide some of the best evidence that the
7 Company's lights are too expensive, would not be appropriate.

8 **Q. Has DTE continued to install the same LEDs that the Commission found were**
9 **unreasonably expensive in its order in case no. U-21297?**

10 A. Yes, it has. The Commission should not allow the Company to recover on unreasonable
11 LED costs it has incurred subsequent to the order in case no. U-21297. The Commission
12 found that the Company's LED costs were unreasonable, yet the Company persists in the
13 very overspending the Commission disallowed. Below, I explain how the Commission
14 should update this disallowance, and provide a supporting exhibit.

15 **Q. Why should the Commission update the LED luminaire plant in service values that it**
16 **disallowed in case no. U-21297?**

17 A. The disallowance in plant-in-service values should be updated to include unreasonable
18 costs incurred after the plant balances used to calculate the disallowance were established.
19 The Company has continued to install the unreasonably costly LEDs, thus increasing the
20 unreasonable costs. It should no more be allowed to recover those new excessive costs
21 than it was the historic excessive costs.

22 **Q. How do you propose calculating the updated disallowance amount?**

23 A. There are two reasonable approaches; one is to follow the same procedure as last time,

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 including substitutions of the same LEDs. This is a reasonable approach because Leotek
2 has not disavowed the chart that the Commission used in U-21297, so there is no indication
3 that continuing the same method previously used is currently unreasonable.

4 The second approach is to benchmark against another regulated provider in Michigan. The
5 obvious choice in this regard is Consumers Energy, and use the lights Consumers Energy
6 installs as the comparison set.

7 I recommend that the disallowance should be baselined against the recommendations
8 available from Leotek in the last rate case, because Leotek is DTE's supplier and this will
9 allow consistent YOY calculation methods. That said, using the Consumers Energy data
10 as an alternative guide for a more reasonable conversion model for each type of light would
11 also be reasonable.

12 **Q. What disallowance amount do you recommend?**

13 A. I recommend that the Commission disallow \$7,705,567 in unreasonable LED conversion
14 costs to date, based on the most recently available equivalency recommendations made by
15 DTE's supplier, Leotek. If the Commission prefers to use Consumers Energy's LED
16 equivalencies as a benchmark, then the disallowed amount should be \$5,833,539.⁶¹

17 **Q. Is your recommended disallowance cumulative or incremental to the amount**
18 **disallowed by the Commission in case no. U-21297?**

19 A. My recommended disallowance is cumulative; that is, it covers costs of LEDs installed
20 both before and after the Commission's order in case no. U-21297.

21 The reason I am providing a cumulative figure is that I have improved my calculation of
22 the disallowance. In case no. U-21297, I used the difference in tariffs for DTE's LED

⁶¹ Exhibit MAU-34, LED luminaire plant balance disallowance.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 choices versus those recommended by the manufacturer. In my instant recommendation, I
2 am using the difference in cost of service. Using differences in rates between different LED
3 models, as I did before, is imprecise because those very rates change depending on the case
4 outcome. In addition, because the Company is still adjusting streetlight rates slowly to align
5 with cost of service, many rates still differ significantly from cost of service.

6 **Q. Is your proposed disallowance a conservative estimate of unreasonable costs resulting**
7 **from DTE's imprudent conversion practices?**

8 A. Yes. My proposed disallowance is conservative, in two ways.

9 First, my proposed disallowance excludes costs of a significant number of LEDs that the
10 Company has installed. I excluded LEDs of wattages that are deployed in small numbers
11 because I do not have reliable data on what wattage of HID lamps they replaced;
12 consequently, I do not know what replacement LED Leotek would have recommended.

13 Second, my proposed disallowance assumes that all the LEDs included in my analysis were
14 installed in place of HPS fixtures. But we know that many were installed in place of MV
15 fixtures, and we know that Leotek recommends substantially larger reductions in wattage
16 for MV-LED conversions. The data on MVs that have been replaced by LEDs is older and
17 less reliable than that for HPS conversions, and rather than estimating I made the
18 simplifying assumption that all decommissioned HID fixtures to date have been HPS.

19 Given these two conservative elements of my approach to the analysis, my proposed
20 disallowance should be understood to represent a significantly smaller amount than DTE's
21 actual level of overspend on LED conversions.

22 **Q. Do you have any other concerns about DTE's continued use of LED luminaires that**
23 **the Commission has found to be too expensive?**

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 A. Yes, I do. Excessively bright street lighting is not only a utility-cost concern: it creates
2 several external costs. Excessive outdoor lighting has social, human health, environmental
3 and scientific impacts. Attainment of state and local climate change goals are impeded by
4 lights that use too much energy. Lights of the preferred color temperature improve
5 visibility in ways that promote traffic and pedestrian safety. Light trespass risk also
6 increases when lights are brighter than needed, and fewer city-dwellers can see the stars.
7 These impacts, which go beyond the financial, point to why regulatory oversight of this
8 matter is so important.

Community Lighting Rate Design

9
10 **Q. What rate design topics will you address here?**

11 A. I will address the Company’s continuing gradual adjustment to streetlight rates to bring
12 them into alignment with the cost of service.

13 **Q. Do you support continued gradual adjustment of E1 streetlight rates to bring them
14 into alignment with cost of service?**

15 A. No, I do not. I recommend the Commission order adoption of full cost of service rates in
16 this case. The gradual adjustment has not worked as intended nor within a reasonable
17 timeline, and its perpetuation causes a subsidy of less-efficient lights by more-efficient
18 LEDs.

19 **Q. Why did the Commission order the gradual adjustment?**

20 A. As of 2016, streetlights served by underground wires (“UG”) were paying more than the
21 cost of service, and streetlights served by overhead wires (“OH”) were paying less than the
22 cost of service. A one-time adjustment would have caused a rate shock for customers with
23 a preponderance of OH lights, many of whom are older communities with limited financial

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 ability to absorb rate increases.

2 The less disruptive way out of this problem was to adjust the rates slowly, which would
3 also give those customers time to transition their existing OH lights to LEDs. Because LED
4 rates are lower than HID rates, the change in technology could fully (or more than) offset
5 the concurrent change in relative OH and UG rates.

6 **Q. Why do you believe the period of gradual rate adjustment should end?**

7 A. Customers have had plenty of time, by now, to convert to LED to offset increases in OH
8 rates. The Commission commenced this process with its order in Case no. U-18014 on
9 January 31, 2017. Since then, more than seven years have elapsed, and the Company has
10 filed six subsequent rate cases. The Company and the state have offered consistent and
11 significant technical and financial support to customers to convert their OH lights to LED.
12 Seven years is a long time to pay less than the costs you are causing, and customers who
13 have spent time and effort to lower their bills through LED adoption should not continue
14 to subsidize communities that have put their resources elsewhere. Subsidized OH rates are
15 causing rates for customers with UG lights, customers with LED lights and customers
16 served under rates E1, Options II and III to pay higher than their cost of service, which is
17 not fair.

18 Furthermore, continuing the subsidy of OH lights results in all LED lights paying more
19 than their cost of service, a perverse disincentive to reduce energy waste which the
20 Commission should seek to avoid. The Company's proposed rates would have LED lights
21 (OH and UG combined) paying about \$1 million more than cost of service.⁶²

⁶² Exhibit MAU-34, WP RAB U-21534 Lighting Rate Model, Output sheet, MAUI-modified (LED totals for columns 195 +196).

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 **Q. Aside from the perverse or unfair subsidies created by the slow adjustment to cost of**
2 **service, is the gradual adjustment serving its stated objectives?**

3 A. No, it is not. Witness Bellini’s Lighting Rate Model shows that, collectively, UG lights
4 are currently annually paying \$156,935 more than cost of service.⁶³ Witness Bellini’s
5 proposed revenue for UG lights under the E1 rate would be \$745,523 higher than Cost of
6 Service.⁶⁴ Rather than being a gradual move towards cost-causation, the proposed rates
7 would move drastically in the opposite direction. Stated another way, the Company’s
8 proposed rates for UG lights would widen the gap between the cost of service compared to
9 current rates. Thus, the mechanism is failing not only to accomplish its intended objectives
10 of moving gradually to cost of service, but while doing so, is also failing to signal to
11 customers the true cost advantages of moving to LEDs.

12 **Q. What is your recommendation to the Commission regarding E1 rate design?**

13 A. Tariffs for all E1, Option I lights should reflect full cost of service and the adjustments
14 should be concluded.

15 *Summary of Municipal Street Lighting Recommendations*

16 **Q. Please summarize your street lighting recommendations to the Commission.**

17 A. In the same order as above:

- 18 • The Commission should eliminate the CIAC for HID-LED conversions from the
19 tariff, whether individual or group conversions. The only exception should allow
20 CIAC for special order materials that are not more likely to comply with

⁶³ Exhibit MAU-34, WP RAB U-21534 Lighting Rate Model, Output sheet, MAUI-modified (total of column 79).

⁶⁴ Exhibit MAU-34, WP RAB U-21534 Lighting Rate Model, Output sheet, MAUI-modified (total of column 196).

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 streetlighting standards. Relatedly, the Company should stop servicing HPS
2 fixtures right away, with the only exception being for customers who want to keep
3 HPS fixtures in service as long as possible.

- 4 • I recommend that the Commission instruct DTE to file a bill credit method and
5 initial amount with its next rate case, including the features I have described above,
6 to assure equitable rate treatment of customers who have paid for past LED
7 conversions versus those who will receive them with no CIAC in the future. I also
8 recommend that the Commission instruct DTE to consult with staff and intervenors
9 in the development of its proposed credit scheme in advance of its next filing.
- 10 • For the street lighting sales forecast, I recommend a reduction of 3,308,045 kwh,
11 equivalent to 4.06% of DTE's unadjusted forecast for E1, Option 1 streetlights, to
12 adjust for known outage rates when streetlights are using no, or almost no, energy.
- 13 • I recommend that the Commission approve the Company's proposal for streetlight
14 outage reporting to customers, including witness Bellini's proposal to narrow the
15 scope of reporting to E1, Option I lights only. However, I recommend the
16 Commission include two additional stipulations in its order. First, the Commission
17 should set a deadline by which the Company will provide customers with the outage
18 reports. I recommend that Commission order the Company to provide initial
19 quarterly outage reports to large customers for Q3 and Q4 of 2024 by January 31,
20 2025; and thereafter comply with the reporting schedule detailed by the
21 Commission in its order in case no. U-21297. Second, in the next rate case filing,
22 the Company should be required to make a specific proposal and timeline for

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 including accurate outage counts by light, rather than bundling multiple lights into
2 reported outage events.

- 3 • I recommend that the Company be instructed to include in its next rate-case filing
4 information regarding its inspection and painting annual targets as well as a report
5 on inspection and painting completed in the prior years and the costs incurred for
6 such activities;
- 7 • I recommend that the Commission order DTE to include street lighting capital and
8 distribution O&M plans in its Distribution Grid Plan, including reliability, energy
9 efficiency and cost-benefit analyses.
- 10 • Regarding O&M costs, I recommend the Commission approve \$941,950 for
11 Community Lighting Supervisory and Administrative staff (instead of the proposed
12 \$1,800,000) and allow no cost recovery for streetlight inspections and painting in
13 the projected test year.
- 14 • I recommend the Commission approve other proposed O&M line items specified
15 in this testimony (e.g. the costs of the new outage management system).
- 16 • I recommend the Commission require the Company to provide outage event root-
17 cause data in the next rate case filing, covering both customer-reported outages and
18 Night Patrol outages, to facilitate informed analysis of the Company's outage
19 response and prevention expenditure proposals. Rather than being more
20 prescriptive than this in its order, I would recommend the Commission order the
21 Company to propose a sample report within three months of its final order in this
22 case, for review and discussion with MPSC Staff and intervenors.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

- 1 • Regarding streetlight capital costs, I recommend the Commission disallow
2 spending on the underground cable replacement program. This program was not
3 discussed in the Company’s DGP and no meaningful cost-benefit analysis is
4 included with the Company’s filings in the instant case.
- 5 • I recommend no changes to other capital expense line items. Therefore I
6 recommend that total test-year capital expenditure for Community Lighting should
7 be \$15.575 million.
- 8 • I recommend that the Commission maintain its disallowance of unreasonable
9 spending on excessively bright LED streetlights as ordered in case no. U-21297,
10 and to disallow excessive spending on LEDs installed since then. The total
11 cumulative disallowed amount should be \$7,705,567.
- 12 • I recommend that the Commission order the Company to implement full cost-of-
13 service rates for all E1 rate schedules.

14 **IV. MUNICIPAL COORDINATION PRACTICES**

15 **Q. Why do local governments want better coordination of electric infrastructure**
16 **projects with DTE?**

17 A. Local governments can be impacted by uncoordinated infrastructure project coordination
18 in several ways. Poor coordination of projects can lead to:

- 19 • avoidable damage to municipal infrastructure or easements.
- 20 • avoidable levels of disruptions to residential neighborhoods, business districts and
21 vehicle traffic.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

- 1 • avoidable costs that impact the electric rates paid by the residents and businesses
2 served by local governments.

3 **Q. Can you illustrate how a utility project might cause avoidable problems and costs?**

4 A. Utilities often need to excavate, or otherwise operate, in the public right-of-way or
5 easements. Such projects may be coordinated with municipal (or other) infrastructure
6 projects that could be implemented concurrently or consecutively. While coordination of
7 project implementation may cause costs of its own, as might adjustment of utility-project
8 timelines, financial economies may also be realized related to permitting processes,
9 excavation, and infrastructure repair costs. Municipal governments, for example, plan road,
10 sidewalk, water and sewer projects typically years in advance; excavations conducted
11 during these projects may create the opportunity for a utility to service or install its own
12 underground infrastructure. If the utility were to implement its own project before or after
13 the municipal project, avoidable damage and disruption might be incurred.

14 The need, and opportunity, for this kind of coordination is growing as project volumes
15 grow. Increased federal infrastructure spending, along with emphasis in Michigan on
16 improving road conditions, is causing local governments to increase the scope and scale of
17 their infrastructure projects. At the same time, DTE is significantly increasing investments
18 in its electric infrastructure to improve reliability and resilience, support distributed
19 resources and electrification of buildings and vehicles. Many local governments are keenly
20 interested in the undergrounding of electric infrastructure as a reliability measure, the high
21 costs of which might be reduced were projects scheduled to coincide with local road, water,
22 sewer and other projects. The opportunity to coordinate project planning and scheduling
23 has never been greater, nor has the need to seek financial economies to moderate the impact

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 of all these projects on electric rates, taxes, and quality of life in communities served by
2 these projects.

3 This recent and future coincidence of escalating investment in utility and municipal
4 infrastructure heightens the need for coordination to reduce disruptions to the community.

5 It is said that Michigan experiences five seasons: winter, spring, summer, fall and
6 construction – highlighting the inconveniences forced on residents and businesses by the
7 short seasonal window of opportunity afforded to infrastructure projects in Michigan.
8 Exacerbating this unavoidable consequence of our climate by missing opportunities to
9 coordinate projects adds insult to injury.

10 City of Ann Arbor witness Stewart provides examples of actual infrastructure project
11 coordination opportunities that DTE’s normal processes failed to identify.

12 **Q. Has the Commission addressed infrastructure project coordination in prior DTE case**
13 **orders?**

14 A. Yes. In its final order in case no. U-21297, the Commission wrote:

15 “...in its next rate case, DTE Electric shall include a demonstration of its
16 efforts to improve communication and coordination with local
17 governments regarding construction activities.”⁶⁵

18 **Q. Did the Company respond fully to this order in its filing in the current case?**

19 A. No, it did not. Witness Kryscynski testified:

20 “When DTE is ready to move forward with a capital project the Company
21 coordinates with the appropriate municipal personnel to set up a briefing
22 meeting to discuss the details of the project, benefits, and collaboration
23 opportunities of the work. We request that the municipality provide any
24 potential conflicts to the project before permits are sought. This provides
25 both the municipality and DTE some assurance that the planned project

⁶⁵ U-21297 final order, p361.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 does not conflict with a municipal project, whether it's in the conceptual
2 or planned stage.

3 Once the project is in progress, periodic updates are provided to the
4 municipality and meetings may be held work through any questions that
5 arise. ...

6 The company is working to improve the frequency of updates to
7 municipalities and garnering feedback to determine their preferred
8 methods to receiving these updates. In addition, we are working with
9 county road commission to support their projects, and to coordinate
10 where possible to avoid conflicts.”⁶⁶

11 **Q. How does witness Kryscynski’s testimony fall short of fully responding to the**
12 **Commission’s prior order?**

13 A. Witness Kryscynski’s testimony falls short in multiple ways.

14 First, where the Commission ordered the Company to provide a “demonstration of its
15 efforts,” witness Kryscynski provides only a cursory, high-level description of how the
16 Company approaches a complex and complicated process. A demonstration would involve
17 data, a more detailed description of policies and practices, and examples.

18 Second, the Commission said it wanted a description of the Company’s efforts to *improve*
19 coordination. Witness Kryscynski’s testimony does not do that. The Company describes
20 communications that occur after the Company has decided when and where it will be
21 working – communications that are very similar to what the Company did in previous
22 years. If this is in any way an improvement, it is still a description of communication, not
23 coordination. This belated communication robs both DTE and the local government of
24 opportunities to compare planned projects over the next 5-6 years and choose to schedule
25 co-located projects concurrently or consecutively. Thoroughgoing coordination would

⁶⁶ Kryscynski direct testimony, AJK-102, lines 6-22.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 involve consultation from the beginning of the prioritization and planning processes, not a
2 separate process that culminates in belated notification.

3 Third, witness Kryscynski twice refers to conflict avoidance, as if that is the only value
4 DTE sees in coordination and communication. While that is valuable, concurrent or
5 consecutive scheduling may yield the best results for minimizing costs and disruptions for
6 both parties. Ann Arbor witness Stewart lists several costs – totaling a notable percentage
7 of overall costs for a project, which DTE can avoid by coordinating a single project. For
8 instance, without coordination, DTE may have to bear the costs of sidewalk restoration;
9 with coordination those costs could be avoided. Municipal governments, in contrast to
10 DTE, see coordinated project planning and implementation as an opportunity as well as a
11 risk-management exercise, and as part of their responsibility to the ratepayers and
12 taxpayers they serve.

13 **Q. Did you ask the Company to elaborate on witness Kryscynski’s testimony in**
14 **discovery?**

15 A. Yes. In discovery request MAUIDE-2.8, MAUI asked DTE to “list all projects in the
16 historical test year, or which are planned from now through the end of the test year, that
17 were or are planned to be coordinated with another utility or local unit of government.”
18 DTE’s response included the following statements: “The Company does not currently have
19 a database system that includes coordination efforts between the Company and other
20 utilities or local units of government,” and, “there is no formal analysis on this work.”
21 DTE’s response went on to provide “some examples that are illustrative of the coordination
22 between DTE, local units of government and other utilities. Included in these examples are
23 DTE-owned or municipal-owned projects on which DTE *collaborates to resolve conflicts*

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 *and eliminate delays where possible.”⁶⁷ (emphasis added)*

2 In addition, Ann Arbor asked specifically “how the Company has complied with the
3 Commission’s directive in Case No. U-21297 to ‘include a demonstration of its efforts to
4 improve communication and coordination with local governments regarding construction
5 activities.’” In response DTE referred solely to MAUIDE-2.8.⁶⁸

6 **Q. How did DTE’s discovery response demonstrate lack of understanding of the purpose
7 of the Commission’s directive in case no. U-21297?**

8 A. The Commission’s prior order sought to encourage the Company to proactively plan
9 projects with local governments. The list of projects witness Kryscynski provides in his
10 discovery response fall into two categories: municipal projects for which the local
11 government has requested relocations of DTE infrastructure, and DTE projects that depend
12 on local government permitting or other enabling actions. These are mostly examples of
13 tactical and final-stage coordination: DTE responds when asked, and in turn asks for local
14 help to facilitate its own projects. DTE provides no evidence that it is aware of or
15 incorporating local infrastructure project plans so it can plan and schedule its own projects
16 in ways that might realize cost efficiencies or reduce disruptions.

17 **Q. Are there any other indications that DTE has not tried to improve its communication
18 and coordination with local governments?**

19 A. Yes, there are such indications. An examination of DTE’s FERC accounts for Regional
20 Relations (which it describes as work with local governments to “facilitate dialogue on
21 operational matters such as storm recovery, infrastructure improvements and other capital

⁶⁷ Exhibit MAU-39, response to MAUIDE-2.8.

⁶⁸ Exhibit MAU-38, response to AADE-1.7.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 projects”) suggests the Company is not committed to improving its communication or
2 coordination with local governments. The total of these FERC accounts in the historical
3 test year (2022) was \$0.733 million, and the total requested for the projected test year
4 (2025) is \$0.801 million, which is the “adjusted historical cost of \$733,000 plus
5 inflation.”⁶⁹. Thus, DTE is demonstrating its intent to maintain the status quo regarding its
6 relations with local governments and not to devote any additional staff time to coordination
7 efforts.

8 **Q. Do local governments employ processes for planning and coordinating infrastructure**
9 **projects and communicating plans and priorities to stakeholders?**

10 A. Yes. Local governments are required to produce Capital Improvement Plans (CIPs).
11 In implementation of their CIPs, local government agencies also conduct careful
12 coordination of municipal infrastructure projects with each other and with private
13 infrastructure projects. These processes are neither easy nor fast, but they represent the
14 responsibility of local governments to manage costs and disruptions caused by projects.
15 Participation in such processes would not cause delays or interfere with any franchise
16 rights, but rather allow DTE to coordinate with municipalities and other utilities in a way
17 that would minimize conflicts but also identify cost-saving opportunities.

18 **Q. Please describe CIP objectives and content.**

19 A. CIPs are roadmaps for local governments’ long-term investments in their physical assets.
20 These plans aim to achieve several key objectives including strategic alignment, efficient
21 resource allocation, financial planning, project prioritization, and proactive infrastructure
22 management. A typical CIP centers upon a multi-year list of capital-intensive projects, such

⁶⁹ Exhibit MAU-41, response to MAUIDE-1.2.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 as new construction, renovations, and equipment purchases for physical assets like
2 roadways, sewer lines, public buildings, and more. Accompanying the project list are
3 annual forecasted expenditures, funding sources, location, and timeline for each project.

4 **Q. How are CIPS developed?**

5 A. Every municipality has their own distinct process for developing a CIP. In general, though,
6 the development process is highly collaborative and includes the following pieces:

- 7 • Initiation and Leadership: the CIP project is kicked off and a lead department is
8 designated.
- 9 • Needs Assessment: municipal infrastructure needs are identified through department
10 project proposals.
- 11 • Project Evaluation and Prioritization: submitted projects are evaluated on a variety of
12 factors, potentially including urgency, alignment with strategic goals, environmental
13 impact, and potential community benefits.
- 14 • Financial Analysis: project costs are estimated, and potential funding sources are
15 explored.
- 16 • Drafting and Public Input: a draft CIP is prepared and presented to relevant
17 stakeholders for feedback and adjustments.
- 18 • Review and Approval: relevant governing bodies review and approve the CIP.
- 19 • Updating and Monitoring: the approved CIP is updated periodically to reflect changes
20 in priorities, funding, and project progress.

21 **Q. How are CIPS communicated?**

22 A. Similar to the previous answer, each local government communicates their approved CIP
23 in different ways. CIPs are typically documented as either a spreadsheet or pdf document

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 and uploaded to municipal websites.

2 **Q. Would a CIP normally contain information that could constructively inform utility**
3 **infrastructure project prioritization and planning?**

4 A. Yes, it would. CIPs contain information on planned and in-progress municipal
5 infrastructure investments. Relevant project information includes the timeline, location,
6 and type of project (i.e., surface penetration). Knowing such information would answer the
7 “when”, “where”, and “what” of project planning, and could help inform a utility about
8 potential project coordination opportunities.

9 **Q. Are CIPs readily available for utilities to review?**

10 A. Yes. They are public records. In most cases, local governments make them readily
11 available through their websites. If a CIP were not available on a website, a utility could
12 easily get a copy by contacting the local government – no FOIA request is needed.

13 **Q. Are the CIPs of MI-MAUI member governments readily available to anybody?**

14 A. Yes, they are. MI-MAUI was able easily to locate and download member governments’
15 CIPs online using simple web search methods.⁷⁰

16 **Q. Does DTE review local government CIPs when planning and prioritizing its own**
17 **electric infrastructure projects?**

18 A. No, it does not.⁷¹ Witness Kryscynski offers, in elaboration, that “Once a DTE project is
19 selected to move forward, our local governmental affairs team reaches out to the affected
20 municipalities to notify them of the work and identify potential coordination
21 opportunities.” Ann Arbor witness Stewart’s testimony provides a concrete example (no

⁷⁰ Exhibit MAU-36, Capital Improvement Plans Google search results

⁷¹ U-21534 Exhibit MAU-37, response to MAUIDE-2.5.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 pun intended) of opportunities this approach can easily miss, and the increased costs that
2 result from failing to take advantage of those opportunities.

3 **Q. Does DTE coordinate project planning with local governments in other ways?**

4 A. Yes, it does, but DTE normally initiates this coordination late in the planning process,
5 potentially avoiding outright conflicts but missing opportunities to save money and reduce
6 disruption through joint project implementation. For example, DTE provides an extensive
7 list of projects in Detroit that require relocations or coordination.⁷² These efforts are
8 appreciated and important, but reflect the Company being responsive to customer requests
9 rather than proactive about coordinating and communicating its own plans and work and
10 finding opportunities to identify cost savings.

11 **Q. Does DTE Electric coordinate with other right-of-way users?**

12 A. DTE Electric does not routinely coordinate, even with DTE Gas on infrastructure projects.
13 Witness Deol states, “The Buffalo-Charles pilot project was the first construction
14 collaboration between DTE Electric and DTE Gas. Based on the efficiencies realized the
15 company will determine next steps.”⁷³ It is notable that collaboration even between “sister”
16 companies of DTE has never been attempted before, and witness Deol’s response suggests
17 this first-of-its-kind project will be used to definitively determine whether future
18 collaborations occur.

Recommendations Regarding Coordination

19
20 **Q. Please summarize your recommendations to the Commission regarding coordination
21 of DTE electric infrastructure projects with local governments.**

22 A. The Commission should make clear that it will presume that 10% of the costs of electric

⁷² U-21534 Exhibit MAU-39, response to MAUIDE-2.8

⁷³ U-21534 Exhibit MAUI-40, response to MAUIDE-2.7.

**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 infrastructure projects that involve excavation in the public right of way or easements are
2 not recoverable unless the Company can show neither DTE Gas nor the government plans
3 potential work in the same area, or that the Company made reasonable attempts to
4 coordinate work with such projects. In most cases, the requirement regarding local
5 governments could be met by reference to publicly-available CIPs with very little effort.
6 For example, the Commission should require DTE to demonstrate that it prioritizes
7 locations of infrastructure undergrounding and underground maintenance projects, in part,
8 by identifying local-government infrastructure projects that require excavation with which
9 the DTE projects could be co-located and -scheduled. This discipline should apply to
10 preventive maintenance projects, as well: the Company should prioritize maintenance of
11 its underground infrastructure at times and places where local governments plan to
12 implement their own infrastructure projects.

13 Given DTE's lackluster response to the Commission's order in the last rate case, it is
14 important that the Commission set a higher and clearer bar for this requirement than it did
15 with its order in case no. U-21297. The Company's filings and responses in the instant case
16 on this issue gave cursory attention to the Commission's prior order. The Commission
17 should be more prescriptive in its order in this case.

18
19 *The rest of this page is intentionally left blank*
20


**DIRECT TESTIMONY OF RICHARD BUNCH FOR MI-MAUI
CASE NO. U-21534**

1 **Q. Does this complete your direct testimony?**

2 A. Yes, it does.

3 **Q. Do you swear under penalty of perjury that the statements above are true to the best**
4 **of your knowledge, information and belief?**

5 A. Yes.

6 

7 _____
8 Richard Bunch

STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter of the Application of **DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY** for authority to increase its rates, amend its rate schedules and rules governing the distribution and supply of electric energy, and for miscellaneous accounting authority.

U-21534

ALJ Sally L. Wallace

PROOF OF SERVICE

On the date below, an electronic copy of the public version of the **Direct Testimony of Richard Bunch for the Michigan Municipal Association for Utility Issues (MI-MAUI)** was served on the following:

| Name/Party | E-mail Address |
|---|--|
| ABATE Michael J. Pattwell Stephen A. Campbell Jessica York | mpattwell@clarkhill.com scampbell@clarkhill.com jyork@consultbai.com |
| Advanced Energy United: Energy Michigan, Inc.; Foundry Assoc. of Michigan; Institute for Energy Innovation; Michigan Energy Innovation Business Council Timothy J. Lundgren Justin K. Ooms | tlundgren@potomaclaw.com jooms@potomaclaw.com |
| Citizens Utility Board of Michigan; Michigan Environmental Council; Natural Resources Defense Council; Sierra Club Christopher M. Bzdok Tracy Jane Andrews Breanna Thomas | chris@tropospherelegal.com tjandrews@tropospherelegal.com breanna@tropospherelegal.com |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>City of Ann Arbor Valerie J.M. Brader Valerie R. Jackson</p> | <p>ecf@rivenoaklaw.com valerie@rivenoaklaw.com vjackson@a2gov.org</p> |
| <p>DTE Electric Company Jon P. Christinidis Paula Johnson-Bacon Andrea E. Hayden</p> | <p>mpscfilings@dteenergy.com jon.christinidis@dteenergy.com paula.bacon@dteenergy.com andrea.hayden@dteenergy.com</p> |
| <p>Electric America, LLC Jennifer Morante Stephen Bright</p> | <p>jmorante@grsm.com Steve.Bright@electrifyamerica.com</p> |
| <p>Environmental Law and Policy Center; Ecology Center; Union of Concerned Scientists; Vote Solar Daniel Abrams Nicholas Wallace James Gignac Will Kenworthy Brad Klein Lee Shaver Boratha Tan Curt Volkman Carolyn Boyce Alondra Estrada</p> | <p>dabrams@elpc.org nwallace@elpc.org jgignac@ucsusa.org will@votesolar.org bklein@elpc.org lshaver@ucsusa.org btan@votesolar.org curt@newenergy-advisors.com cboyce@elpc.org aestrada@elpc.org</p> |
| <p>EVGO Services, LLC Michael G. Oliva</p> | <p>moliva@fosterswift.com</p> |
| <p>Great Lakes Renewable Energy Assoc. Inc. Don L. Keskey Brian W. Coyer</p> | <p>donkeskey@publiclawresourcecenter.com bwcoyer@publiclawresourcecenter.com</p> |
| <p>International Transmission Company Richard J. Aaron Courtney F. Kissel Olivia R.C.A. Flower Hannah E. Buzolits</p> | <p>raaron@dykema.com ckissel@dykema.com oflower@dykema.com hbuzolits@dykema.com</p> |
| <p>The Kroger Company Michael L. Kurtz Kurt J. Boehm Jody Kyler Cohn</p> | <p>mkurtz@bkllawfirm.com kboehm@bkllawfirm.com jkylercohn@bkllawfirm.com</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| Justin Bieber | jbieber@energystrat.com |
| Michigan Attorney General Joel King Seb Coppola | ag-enra-spec-lit@michigan.gov KingJ38@mich.gov sebcoppola@corp.lytics.com |
| MPSC Staff Lori Mayabb | mayabbl@michigan.gov |
| Michigan Cable Telecommunications Assoc.; Zeco Systems, Inc. d/b/a Greenlots Sean P. Gallagher Justin Mann | sgallagher@fraserlawfirm.com jmann@fraserlawfirm.com |
| Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings and Rules Sally L. Wallace, ALJ | wallaces2@michigan.gov |
| Michigan Municipal Association for Utility Issues Valerie J.M. Brader Linda Hofrichter Rick Bunch | valerie@rivenoaklaw.com linda@rivenoaklaw.com rick@mi-maui.org |
| MPSC Staff Heather M.S. Durian Michael J. Orris Amit T. Singh Monica M. Stephens Lori Mayabb | durianh@michigan.gov orrism@michigan.gov singha9@michigan.gov stephensm11@michigan.gov mayabbl@michigan.gov |
| Soulardarity; We Want Green, Too Mark Templeton Amanda Urban Jacob Schuhardt Sam Heppell Joseph Amdur Claire Black Michelle David Jason Frey Andrew Kieffer Ellie Maltby Andrew Obeso | templeton@uchicago.edu t-9aurba@lawclinics.uchicago.edu jschuhardt@uchicago.edu heppell@uchicago.edu jamdur@lawclinic.uchicago.edu claireblack@lawclinic.uchicago.edu madavid@lawclinic.uchicago.edu jmfrey@lawclinic.uchicago.edu akieffer@lawclinic.uchicago.edu emaltby@uchicago.edu obeso@uchicago.edu |

| | |
|--|--|
| Ivy Truong Madison W. Wilson | itruong@lawclinic.uchicago.edu madisonswilson@uchicago.edu |
| Utility Workers Local 223 Ben King | bking@michworkerlaw.com |
| Wal-Mart Melissa M. Horne | mhorne@hcc-law.com |

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

Dated: July 26, 2024

RIVENOAK LAW GROUP P.C.

By:



Valerie J.M. Brader
Attorney for the Michigan Municipal
Association for Utility Issues
3331 W. Big Beaver Rd.
Suite 109
Troy, MI 48084
Telephone: (248) 677-1045
Email: valerie@rivenoaklaw.com
ecf@rivenoaklaw.com