

Potomac LAW GROUP

Potomac Law Group PLLC

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W., Suite 700 | Washington, D.C. 20004
T 202.204.3005 | F 202.318.7707 | www.potomaclaw.com

August 16, 2024

Ms. Lisa Felice
Executive Secretary
Michigan Public Service Commission
7109 W. Saginaw Highway
P.O. Box 30221
Lansing, MI 48909

Re: **MPSC Case No. U-21534**

Dear Ms. Felice:

Attached for electronic filing in the above-referenced matter, please find the Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibit of Dr. Laura S. Sherman on behalf of The Michigan Energy Innovation Business Council, Institute for Energy Innovation, and Advanced Energy United, together with the Proof of Service. Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Very truly yours,

Justin K. Ooms

JKO/srd

Enclosure

c. All parties of record.

STATE OF MICHIGAN

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.)
_____)

Case No. U-21534

REBUTTAL TESTIMONY AND EXHIBIT

OF DR. LAURA S. SHERMAN

ON BEHALF OF

THE MICHIGAN ENERGY INNOVATION BUSINESS COUNCIL,

INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY INNOVATION,

AND

ADVANCED ENERGY UNITED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS..... 1

II. REBUTTAL OF WITNESS FREEMAN..... 2

III. REBUTTAL OF WITNESS REVERE 12

IV. REBUTTAL OF WITNESS COPPOLA 13

1 **I. INTRODUCTION AND QUALIFICATIONS**

2

3 **Q. State your name, business name and address.**

4 A. My name is Dr. Laura S. Sherman, and I am the President of the Michigan Energy
5 Innovation Business Council (“Michigan EIBC”) and the Institute for Energy Innovation
6 (“IEI”), located at 115 West Allegan, Suite 710, Lansing, Michigan 48933.

7

8 **Q. On whose behalf are you appearing in this case?**

9 A. I am appearing here as an expert witness on behalf of Michigan EIBC, IEI, and Advanced
10 Energy United (“United”), collectively referred to as “MEIU.”

11

12 **Q. Are you the same Dr. Laura S. Sherman who provided direct testimony in this**
13 **proceeding?**

14 A. Yes, I am.

15

16 **Q. Q. Are you sponsoring any exhibits with your rebuttal testimony?**

17 A. Yes, I am sponsoring the following exhibit:

- 18 • Exhibit MEIU-32 (LSS-22): Discovery Response EVgo-AG-1

19

20 **Q. What is the purpose of your rebuttal testimony?**

21 A. The purpose of my rebuttal testimony is to respond to certain aspects related to electric
22 vehicles (“EVs”) in the direct testimony of Staff witness Allan D. Freeman, in the direct

1 testimony of Staff witness Nicholas M. Revere and in the direct testimony of Attorney
2 General witness Sebastian Coppola.

3
4 **II. REBUTTAL OF WITNESS FREEMAN**

5
6 **Q. According to Staff witness Freeman, how should the Commission address the**
7 **Company’s Transportation Electrification Plan (TEP)?**

8 A. In direct testimony, witness Freeman identifies that

9 Unlike rate cases which typically involve a single year, a TEP examines an
10 intermediate time frame in the future. The TEP docket is intended to create
11 dialogue among all interested parties. The TEPs are informational only and
12 are not intended for cost recovery. A regulated electric utility can only
13 recover its costs in a traditional rate case.¹

14 However, witness Freeman goes on to state that

15 The Company’s current rate case is not the appropriate venue for discussion
16 and criticism of its TEP. Rates cases are increasingly becoming more
17 complex and have a strict time frame. Instead, Staff proposes to adopt a
18 similar strategy as the Commission is employing in Case No. U-20147 for
19 its examination of distribution plans. Staff will work with the Company to
20 set up a process for all interested parties to review and comment on their
21 TEP. Additionally, there would be a period for any reply comments. This
22 proposed schedule would be filed in Case No. U-21538. Such a process
23 would allow for a more robust and holistic TEP conversation outside of the
24 restrictions found in a rate case.²

25

¹ Direct Testimony of Allan D. Freeman on behalf of Michigan Public Service Commission Staff (“Freeman Direct”), Case No. U-21534, p. 6.

² *Id.*, p. 7.

1 **Q. How do you respond to this proposal?**

2 A. I am concerned that the process that witness Freeman envisions will not allow adequate
3 feedback on and evaluation of utility TEPs. As noted by witness Freeman, the Commission
4 currently employs a similar process in Case No. U-20147 for the examination of
5 distribution system plans. In that docket, the Commission set a schedule for comments and
6 reply comments on the most recent utility distribution system plans.³ Comments were due,
7 for example, in the open docket (Case No. U-21047) on DTE Electric’s Distribution Grid
8 Plan on March 15, 2024 and reply comments were due on May 24, 2024. In the midst of
9 that process, the Company filed direct testimony in this case, its current general rate case
10 (Case No. U-21534), on March 28, 2024.

11
12 Although not the focus of my direct testimony, I am aware that the Company included a
13 number of proposed expenditures in this general rate case that are distribution grid
14 investments and are described in its Distribution Grid Plan. However, given the timing of
15 comments and reply comments in the open docket (Case No. U-20147), it is clear that the
16 Company was unlikely to have considered any of those comments or reply comments prior
17 to filing testimony in the general rate case. In addition, given the nature of the open docket,
18 there is no requirement or need for the Company (or the Commission) to consider
19 stakeholder comments – at least not to the same degree as is necessary in a contested case
20 process.

³ Michigan Public Service Commission, Case No. U-20147, “In the matter, on the Commission’s own motion, to open a docket for certain regulated electric utilities to file their distribution investment and maintenance plans and for other related, uncontested matters,” October 24, 2023, available at <https://mi-psc.my.site.com/sfc/servlet.shepherd/version/download/0688y00000AMZSnAAP>.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

As such, despite the Commission’s stated goal of reviewing complex issues such as those related to distribution system planning and transportation electrification planning outside of general rate cases, because the proposed spending and programs can only be approved in general rate cases and because full evaluation and review can only take place in this venue, it is currently impossible to provide the same level of review, feedback, and evaluation in an open docket.

I am concerned that witness Freeman envisions a similar process for utility TEPs that may require significant stakeholder time but, ultimately, will not result in full review and evaluation until the spending is proposed in a general rate case. Although I support and have participated in the Company’s TEP workshops – and appreciate changes made by the Company as a result of stakeholder feedback – fundamentally, there is no way to separate the TEPs from the general rate case process given that the spending must be approved in a rate case.

Q. Is there any way to improve the evaluation of utility TEPs short of re-integrating them with rate cases?

A. Without a statutory change, although spending associated with a TEP must be approved in a general rate case, the Commission could improve the TEP review process by requiring them to be evaluated within a contested case process rather than a comment docket. The Commission’s review of utility voluntary green pricing programs under Section 61 of

1 Public Act 342 of 2016 has similarly evolved into a contested case process with respect to
2 DTE and Consumers Energy Company.

3

4 **Q. How does witness Freeman react to the Company’s proposed EV budget?**

5 A. According to witness Freeman,

6 Staff appreciates the Company’s ambition and its commitment to an EV
7 future. However, Staff advocates for a more cautious approach with rate
8 payers’ dollars at this juncture. As Company witness Bennett noted in her
9 testimony, EVs are still relatively new and evolving. While EV adoption
10 continues to increase, the pace has slowed. The Company can still achieve
11 many of its EV goals, while adopting a more cautious approach to program
12 spending.⁴

13

14 **Q. Do you concur with this reaction?**

15 A. No. Witness Freeman offers no evidence or citations to prove his claim that the pace of EV
16 adoption has slowed. It is unclear if this assertion is based on specific data or simply
17 witness Freeman’s feeling based on recent news reports. However, according to Bloomberg
18 Green, six of the ten biggest EV makers in the U.S. saw much higher sales in the first
19 quarter of 2024 than in the first quarter of 2023.⁵ In fact, sales were up by 56% for Hyundai-
20 Kia and 86% for Ford Motor Company.⁶ In the second quarter of 2024, Ford sales were up

⁴ Freeman Direct, pp. 7-8.

⁵ Randall, T., *Bloomberg Green*, “The Slowdown in US Electric Vehicle Sales Looks More Like a Blip,” May 28, 2024, available at <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2024-05-28/the-slowdown-in-us-electric-vehicle-sales-looks-more-like-a-blip>.

⁶ *Ibid.*

1 61% over second quarter sales for 2023.⁷ It is true that early in 2024, a lack of new models
2 and delays in new vehicles have slowed the pace of increasing sales for some companies,
3 including Tesla and General Motors (“GM”). However, GM appears to be poised to lead
4 and drive EV growth in the U.S. for the rest of the year given improvements in its new line
5 of batteries.⁸ In fact, in the second quarter of 2024, GM sales were up 40% over the second
6 quarter of 2023 and 34% over the first quarter of 2024.⁹

7
8 According to a July 26, 2024 report from J.D. Power, although “premium segment retail
9 sales are down 13% -- driven by Tesla’s 22% decline – the mass market segment is up
10 63%.”¹⁰ Despite more stringent guidance on domestic content and new model eligibility
11 requirements, across the U.S., new EV registrations increased by more than 40% in 2023
12 compared to 2022.¹¹ Furthermore, given that leased vehicles are now eligible for federal
13 tax credits, the rate of adoption is expected to continue increasing.¹² In Michigan, according
14 to a report by the Alliance for Automotive Innovation, EV market penetration has reached

⁷ Johnson, P., *Electrek*, “Ford’s EV sales surge in Q2, topping GM for second in the US EV market behind Tesla,” July 3, 2024, available at <https://electrek.co/2024/07/03/fords-ev-sales-surge-q2-close-gap-with-tesla/>.

⁸ Randall, T., *Bloomberg Green*, “The Slowdown in US Electric Vehicle Sales Looks More Like a Blip,” May 28, 2024, available at <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2024-05-28/the-slowdown-in-us-electric-vehicle-sales-looks-more-like-a-blip>.

⁹ Hogan, M., *Inside EVs*, “General Motors Sold a Record Number of EVs in Q2 2024,” July 2, 2024, available at <https://insideevs-com.cdn.ampproject.org/c/s/insideevs.com/news/725293/gm-ev-sales-q2-2024/amp/>.

¹⁰ J.D. Power, “July SAAR reaches 16.7 Million – Highest in More Than Three Years,” July 26, 2024, available at <https://www.jdpower.com/business/press-releases/jd-power-globaldata-automotive-forecast-july-2024>.

¹¹ International Energy Agency, “Global EV Outlook 2024,” April 2024, available at <https://www.iea.org/reports/global-ev-outlook-2024>.

¹² *Ibid.*

1 4%, which is up from 3.4% in 2023 and 2.13% in 2021, indicating a marked and consistent
2 increase in EV adoption.¹³

3
4 Long-term forecasts of EV sales also indicate strong expected future growth. With more
5 education around EVs and EV charging, infrastructure development, and technological
6 innovations, a recent study found that 80% of today’s EV skeptics will consider the
7 purchase of an EV in the next decade.¹⁴ The International Energy Agency estimated in its
8 “Global EV Outlook 2024,” published in April 2024, that with stated policies in place, U.S.
9 sales of battery electric vehicles (BEVs) are projected to increase to 2.5 million sold in
10 2025 (up from 1.1 million sold in 2024).^{15, 16} In fact, a 2024 Environmental Defense Fund
11 study showed that actual EV sales in 2023 outperformed 85% of expert forecasts from 2019
12 to 2022.¹⁷

¹³ Alliance for Automotive Innovation, “Get Connected: Electric Vehicle Quarterly Report,” 2023, available at <https://www.autosinnovate.org/posts/papers-reports/Get%20Connected%20EV%20Quarterly%20Report%202023%20Q4.pdf>.

¹⁴ Cox Automotive, “Cox Automotive 2024 Path to EV Adoption Study Suggests Electric Vehicle Consideration Will Surge in Second Half of Decade,” May 14, 2024, available at <https://www.coxautoinc.com/news/cox-automotive-2024-path-to-ev-adoption-study-suggests-electric-vehicle-consideration-will-surge-in-second-half-of-decade/>.

¹⁵ International Energy Agency, “Global EV Outlook 2024,” April 2024, available at <https://www.iea.org/reports/global-ev-outlook-2024>.

¹⁶ Recurrent, “2024 Data: EV Adoption is Still on Pace in the US,” July 10, 2024, available at <https://www.recurrentauto.com/research/ev-adoption-us>.

¹⁷ Environmental Defense Fund, “Electric vehicle sales are going further, faster than experts predicted,” March 2024, available at <https://www.edf.org/sites/default/files/2024-03/Actual%202023%20EV%20sales%20compared%20to%20forecasts.pdf>.

1 **Q. What does witness Freeman recommend related to the Business and eFleet Charger**
2 **Rebates?**

3 A. Witness Freeman arbitrarily recommends an \$8 million disallowance from the proposed
4 \$16 million request for the Business and eFleet Charger Rebates program. According to
5 witness Freeman,

6 Staff is uncomfortable with this large, requested amount. It represents a
7 significant increase from past rebate programs. Instead, Staff would like to
8 see the Company implement a scaled down rebate effort. By moving at a
9 more deliberate speed, DTE Electric would still be able to discover if its
10 revised rebates plans accomplish their intended goals.¹⁸

11

12 **Q. How do you respond to this proposal?**

13 A. I disagree with Staff’s proposed disallowance for a number of reasons. First, according to
14 Company witness Pina Bennett, due to cost savings, funding previously approved by the
15 Commission for the Business Charger Rebates program will allow the Company to
16 continue to deploy funds for public direct current fast chargers (DCFC) in 2024 without
17 seeking additional funding.¹⁹ This shows that the Company has been conservative and
18 prudent with funding already approved for this rebate program. As such, the Company’s
19 estimate of the need in this segment, which is based on its projections and modeling, should
20 be accepted.

21

¹⁸ Freeman Direct, pp. 8-9.

¹⁹ Direct Testimony of Pina Bennett on behalf of DTE Electric Company (“Bennett Direct”), Case No. U-21534, pp. 8-9.

1 Second, it is absolutely critical that utility investments in public charging infrastructure
2 continue and are expanded. Specifically, as outlined in my direct testimony,

3 According to a Synapse Energy Economics study examining the revenues
4 and costs associated with EVs between 2011 and 2021, EV drivers have
5 contributed about \$1 million more than their associated costs in each of
6 Illinois and Virginia, \$26.7 million more in Colorado, and \$85.3 million
7 more in New Jersey. In Colorado and New Jersey, when utility expenditures
8 on EV programs are included in costs, the net revenue still exceeds costs by
9 approximately \$15.7 and \$62.7 million, respectively.²⁰
10

11 It is well established, as detailed in my direct testimony, that the existence of public EV
12 charging stations encourages customers to purchase EVs,^{21, 22, 23, 24} leading to at-home EV

²⁰ Direct Testimony of Dr. Laura S. Sherman on behalf of MEIU (“Sherman Direct”), Case No. U-21534, p. 21.

²¹ Osaka, S., *The Washington Post*, “For each public charger, here’s how many EVs are looking to plug in,” May 2024, available at <https://www.washingtonpost.com/climate-solutions/2024/05/20/charging-stations-lag-ev-sales/>.

²² Center for Sustainable Energy, “The State of Electric Vehicle Adoption in the U.S. and the Role of Incentives in Market Transformation,” September 2023, available at <https://energycenter.org/thought-leadership/blog/state-electric-vehicle-adoption-us-and-role-incentives-market#:~:text=Publicly%20available%20EV%20charging%20inspires,apartments%2C%20to%20charge%20an%20EV.>

²³ U.S. Department of Energy, Alternative Fuels Data Center, “Charging Electric Vehicles in Public,” accessed June 2024, available at <https://afdc.energy.gov/fuels/electricity-charging-public>.

²⁴ International Energy Agency, “Global EV Outlook 2024: Moving towards increased affordability,” 2024, available at <https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/a9e3544b-0b12-4e15-b407-65f5c8ce1b5f/GlobalEVO Outlook2024.pdf>.

1 charging and revenue to utilities from increased electricity sales.^{25, 26, 27, 28, 29} As such,
2 investments in EV charging should be expected to *lead* EV adoption. Cutting back on
3 investments in EV charging because of an allegedly falling pace of adoption may simply
4 be a self-fulfilling prophecy, itself contributing to a slower pace of EV adoption.

5
6 Third, the proposed expansions for the Business and eFleet Charger Programs, which Staff
7 proposes to partially disallow, serve specifically to promote equity and access to EV
8 charging for all Michiganders. The Company proposes to continue to offer rebates for
9 school and transit buses through the eFleet Charger Program,³⁰ thereby serving school
10 children and residents without access to or with limited access to a passenger vehicle. The
11 Company also proposes to offer rebates through the Business Charger Program to on-route
12 DCFC in disadvantaged communities (“DACs”) and rural areas, as well as rebates for

²⁵ Nadel, S., American Council for an Energy-Efficient Economy (ACEEE). “Charging Ahead: How EVs Could Drive Down Electricity Rates,” January 2024.

²⁶ Metz, L. et al., Synapse Energy Economics, Inc., “Distribution System Investments to Enable Medium- and Heavy-Duty Vehicle Electrification: A Case Study of New York,” April 2023, available at <https://acrobat.adobe.com/id/urn:aaid:sc:US:3ef62d18-a652-4848-a2a5-15eb2771d8cc>.

²⁷ Synapse Energy Economics, Inc., “EVs Are Driving Rates Down for All Customers: State-by-State Cumulative EV Net Rate Impact Summary,” June 2024, available at https://www.synapse-energy.com/sites/default/files/EV%20All%20State%20List%20PDF_0.pdf.

²⁸ Satchwell, A. et al., Prepared for the U.S. Department of Energy, “Quantifying the Financial Impacts of Electric Vehicles on Utility Ratepayers and Shareholders,” February 2023, available at https://eta-publications.lbl.gov/sites/default/files/ev_financial_impacts_final_report_final_draft_02092023.pdf.

²⁹ California Public Utilities Commission, “Utility Cost and Affordability of the Grid of the Future: An Evaluation of Electric Costs, Rates, and Equity Issues Pursuant to P.U. Code Section 913.1. 2021,” available at: https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/-/media/cpuc-website/divisions/office-of-governmental-affairs-division/reports/2021/senate-bill-695-report-2021-and-en-bancwhitepaper_final_04302021.pdf.

³⁰ Bennett Direct, p. 48.

1 multi-unit dwellings, with higher rebates for properties serving low-income residents.³¹ It
2 seems wholly counter to the stated goals of the Company as well as the state to disallow
3 funding to programs specifically designed to expand access to EVs in low-income and
4 DACs.

5
6 Fourth, witness Freeman does not give adequate evidence or justification for the proposed
7 \$8 million disallowance beyond a statement that the pace of EV sales has slowed. As
8 described above, there is significant evidence to refute this statement, at least over the
9 longer-term time period of these proposed investments.

10
11 Finally, in the context of other approved utility programs to support business/fleet
12 charging, the Company’s proposed program is very small. For example, New York State
13 has an \$885 million make-ready program approved for transportation electrification,³² the
14 Massachusetts Department of Public Utilities recently approved nearly \$400 million in
15 statewide transportation electrification investments,³³ and Commonwealth Edison
16 (“ComEd”) anticipates spending \$231 million from 2023 to 2025 on EV programs and
17 other Illinois Commerce Commission-approved beneficial electrification measures.³⁴

18

³¹ *Id.*, p. 46.

³² Joint Utilities of New York, “EV Make-Ready Program,” available at <https://jointutilitiesofny.org/ev/make-ready>.

³³ Commonwealth of Massachusetts, “DPU’s electric vehicle charging resources,” available at <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/dpus-electric-vehicle-charging-resources>.

³⁴ ComEd, “ComEd Beneficial Electrification Plan,” Compliance Filing May 2023, available at <https://icc.illinois.gov/downloads/public/edocket/589765.PDF>.

1 **III. REBUTTAL OF WITNESS REVERE**

2

3 **Q. What does Staff witness Nicholas M. Revere propose with respect to benefit-cost**
4 **analyses (“BCA”) for fleet projects?**

5 A. Specifically for non-public fleet charging rebates, witness Revere recommends that the
6 Company conduct BCAs on an individual customer basis.³⁵

7

8 **Q. Do you agree with witness Revere?**

9 A. I do agree with witness Revere that for programs such as the residential rebate programs,
10 “it makes sense to view the benefits and costs as a whole rather than at an individual
11 customer basis . . .”³⁶ However, I do not believe that the Company could conduct an
12 individual customer-level BCA for any given fleet customer and gain an accurate
13 representation of the full costs and benefits from electrification of that fleet. As detailed in
14 my direct testimony, there are societal benefits of transportation electrification that cannot
15 be considered on a project-by-project basis. In addition, there may be benefits such as
16 distribution upgrade costs incurred by one fleet electrification project that will then lower
17 costs for future projects. As such, I am concerned that it would be unreasonable to conduct
18 a project-by-project BCA for fleet electrification projects.

19

³⁵ Direct Testimony of Nicholas M. Revere on behalf of Michigan Public Service Commission Staff (“Revere Direct”), Case No. U-21534.

³⁶ *Id.*, p. 8.

1 **IV. REBUTTAL OF WITNESS COPPOLA**

2

3 **Q. What does Attorney General witness Sebastian Coppola suggest regarding EVs?**

4 A. In a discussion of the Company’s forecasted utility make-ready capital expenditures,
5 witness Coppola indicates that

6 During the first six months of 2024, EV manufacturers have realized that
7 electric vehicles are not selling at the pace anticipated as late as 2023 and
8 EVs are stockpiling at dealers’ lots. EV buyers often have been dissatisfied
9 with the actual driving range, particularly during the winter and hot days
10 that quickly drain the car batteries. Reliability of certain vehicles with
11 recalls for software and equipment failures has also created customer
12 dissatisfaction and increased concerns and fear with prospective EV buyers.
13 EV manufactures have cut back production of EVs, delayed new models,
14 deferred building new batteries plants, and redirected resources to hybrid
15 vehicles with batteries that self-charge during gasoline-fueled operation.³⁷
16

17 Witness Coppola goes on to suggest that this “environment,” does not support the
18 Company’s forecasted spending increase in utility make-ready capital expenditures and
19 recommends that the forecasted capital expenditures for utility make-ready investments be
20 reduced by 45% for 2024 and 2025.³⁸

21

22 **Q. What evidence does witness Coppola cite to support these claims?**

23 A. In his direct testimony, in footnote 16, witness Coppola states that the above information
24 was “gathered from recent articles in the Wall Street Journal, the Detroit News, and other
25 publications.”³⁹ According to a discovery response in this case (Exhibit MEIU-32 (LSS-

³⁷ Direct Testimony of Sebastian Coppola on behalf of Attorney General Dana Nessel (“Coppola Direct”), Case No. U-21534, p. 25.

³⁸ *Id.*, p. 55.

³⁹ *Id.*, p. 25.

1 22), witness Coppola was referring to three articles from the Wall Street Journal, three
2 articles from The Detroit News, and a story from National Public Radio from February
3 2024.

4
5 **Q. Is this evidence sufficient to support witness Coppola’s recommendations to reduce**
6 **capital expenditures on utility EV charging programs?**

7 A. In a word, no. It is expected for a new technology that adoption will occur in fits and starts,
8 and even traditional automotive sales experience dips. The evidence cited by witness
9 Coppola represents a limited sample set collected during an extremely brief period of
10 time—less than six months. This is far from sufficient to establish any kind of trend. As
11 detailed above, EV sales continue to be strong and long-term forecasts continue to project
12 increasing EV sales and adoption. In addition, it is well established that access to public
13 charging is critical to ensuring both EV adoption and long-term benefits to ratepayers.
14 Responding to a momentary blip by skimping on investment in public charging will likely
15 threaten to reduce the rate of EV adoption and potential future charging revenues, costing
16 ratepayers more money in the long term.

17
18 **Q. What do you recommend to the Commission?**

19 A. I recommend that the Commission ignore the vague and insufficient evidence provided by
20 Staff witness Freeman and Attorney General witness Coppola used to suggest that
21 investments in EV public charging are not prudent. Instead, I recommend that the
22 Company’s proposed funding for its EV programs be approved and expanded as detailed
23 in my direct testimony.

1

2 **Q. Does that complete your rebuttal testimony?**

3 A. Yes.

4

5 4888-8029-1544, v. 6

STATE OF MICHIGAN

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.)

Case No. U-21534

EXHIBIT

OF DR. LAURA S. SHERMAN

ON BEHALF OF

THE MICHIGAN ENERGY INNOVATION BUSINESS COUNCIL,

INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY INNOVATION,

AND

ADVANCED ENERGY UNITED

MPSC Case No. U-21534
Responding Party: Attorney General
Respondent: Sebastian Coppola
Requestor: EVgo
Question No.: EVgo-AG-1

EVgo-AG 1.01.

Refer to footnote 16 in Mr. Coppola’s testimony, which refers to “recent articles in the Wall Street Journal, the Detroit News, and other publications.” Please provide copies of each of the articles referenced in footnote 16, and/or provide accessible links to each of those articles.

Response:

Below are links to a set of articles and attached are copies of those articles.

https://www.wsj.com/business/earnings/general-motors-gm-q2-earnings-report-2024-f8dcdd49?mod=Searchresults_pos3&page=1

https://www.wsj.com/business/earnings/tesla-tsla-q2-earnings-report-2024-3e849b36?mod=Searchresults_pos6&page=1

https://www.wsj.com/business/autos/ev-electric-vehicle-slowdown-ford-gm-tesla-b20a748e?mod=article_inline

<https://www.detroitnews.com/story/business/autos/2024/04/23/teslas-first-quarter-net-income-tumbles-on-lower-sales-price-cuts/73430223007/>

<https://www.detroitnews.com/story/business/autos/2024/04/18/europe-car-sales-drop-in-march-as-ev-weakness-persists/73371516007/>

<https://www.detroitnews.com/story/business/autos/2024/04/19/the-ev-bust-in-europe-is-a-red-flag-for-regions-climate-goals/73384477007/>

<https://www.npr.org/2024/02/07/1227707306/ev-electric-vehicles-sales-2024>

Date: 8/12/24

STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

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

Case No. U-21534

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF BERKELEY)

Summer R. Duker, the undersigned, being first duly sworn, deposes and says that she is a Paralegal at Potomac Law Group PLLC and that on the 16th day of August, 2024 she served the Rebuttal Testimony and Exhibit of Dr. Laura S. Sherman on behalf of The Michigan Energy Innovation Business Council, Institute for Energy Innovation, and Advanced Energy United, via email, upon those individuals listed on the attached Service List.

Summer R. Duker

<p><u>Administrative Law Judge</u> Honorable Sally L. Wallace Wallaces2@michigan.gov</p> <p><u>The City of Ann Arbor</u> Valerie Jackson Valerie J.M. Brader vjackson@a2gov.org valerie@rivenoaklaw.com</p> <p><u>Attorney General Dana Nessel</u> Joel B. King Kingj38@michigan.gov ag-enra-spec-lit@michigan.gov</p> <p><u>DTE Electric Company</u> Jon P. Christinidis Andrea E. Hayden Paula Johnson-Bacon John A. Janiszewski Breanne K. Reitzel Jon.christinidis@dteenergy.com Andrea.hayden@dteenergy.com Paula.bacon@dteenergy.com John.janiszewski@dteenergy.com Breanne.reitzel@dteenergy.com mpscfilings@dteenergy.com</p> <p><u>Michigan Environmental Council (MEC)</u> <u>Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC)</u> Christopher M. Bzdok Tracy Jane Andrews chris@tropospherelegal.com tjandrews@tropospherelegal.com</p> <p><u>Great Lakes Renewable Energy Association</u> Don L. Keskey Brian W. Coyer donkeskey@publiclawresourcecenter.com bwcoyer@publiclawresourcecenter.com</p>	<p><u>MPSC Staff</u> Amit T. Singh Heather M.S. Durian Michael J. Orris Monica M. Stephens Lori Mayabb Singha9@michigan.gov durianh@michigan.gov orrism@michigan.gov stephensm11@michigan.gov mayabbl@michigan.gov</p> <p><u>Michigan Energy Innovation Business Council</u> <u>Institute for Energy Innovation</u> <u>Advanced Energy United</u> <u>The Foundry Association of Michigan</u> <u>Energy Michigan, Inc.</u> Laura A. Chappelle Timothy J. Lundgren Justin K. Ooms lochappelle@potomaclaw.com tlundgren@potomaclaw.com jooms@potomaclaw.com</p> <p><u>PROTEC</u> Michael J. Watza Mike.watza@kitch.com</p> <p><u>Walmart, Inc.</u> Melissa M. Horne mhorne@hcc-law.com</p> <p><u>UWUA Local 223</u> Benjamin King bking@michworkerlaw.com</p> <p><u>The Kroger Co.</u> Kurt J. Boehm Jody Kyler Cohn Justin Bieber kboehm@bkllawfirm.com jkylercohn@bkllawfirm.com jbieber@energystrat.com</p>
--	--

EVgo Services, LLC

Nikhil Vijaykar
David Nacht
Alicia Zaloga
Lindsey Stegall
Michael G. Oliva
nvijaykar@keyesfox.com
dnacht@nachtlaw.com
azaloga@keyesfox.com
lindsey.stegall@evgo.com
moliva@fosterswift.com

Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff

Equity (ABATE)

Stephen A. Campbell
Michael J. Pattwell
scampbell@clarkhill.com
mpattwell@clarkhill.com

Environmental Law & Policy Center (ELPC)

Union of Concerned Scientists, Inc.

Vote Solar

The Ecology Center

Nicholas N. Wallace
Daniel Abrams
Alonda Estrada
nwallace@elpc.org
dabrams@elpc.org
aestrada@elpc.org

Soulardarity

We Want Green, Too

Amanda Urban
Mark N. Templeton
Jacob R. Schuhardt
D. Samuel Heppell
Madison S. Wilson
t-9aurba@lawclinic.uchicago.edu
templeton@uchicago.edu
jschuhardt@uchicago.edu
heppel@uchicago.edu
madisonwilson@uchicago.edu

Electrify America, LLC

Jennifer Morante
Stephen Bright
Krystal D. Hermiz
jmorante@grsm.com
steve.bright@electrifyamerica.com
khermiz@grsm.com

Michigan Cable Telecommunications

Association

Sean P. Gallagher
sgallagher@fraserlawfirm.com

International Transmission Company

Richard J. Aaron
Olivia R.C.A. Flower
Hannah E. Buzolits
Courtney F. Kissel
raaron@dykema.com
oflower@dykema.com
hbuzolits@dykema.com
ckissel@dykema.com

Intervenor EVgo Services LLC

Michael G. Oliva
moliva@fosterswift.com