



**VIA ELECTRONIC FILING**

October 3, 2024

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

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

Dear Executive Secretary Felice:

Attached for electronic filing please find the Initial Brief of Electrify America LLC for submission in the above-referenced proceeding. Proof of service is likewise attached to this filing.

Please contact the undersigned if you have any questions or concerns regarding this letter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'SMB', written over a horizontal line.

Stephen Bright, Esq.  
Electrify America, LLC  
1950 Opportunity Way, Suite 1500  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
Phone: (781) 206-7979  
Steve.Bright@electrifyamerica.com

cc: Service List, Case No. U-21534

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**

**BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

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

**INITIAL BRIEF OF**

**ELECTRIFY AMERICA, LLC**

**October 3, 2024**

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>I. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. Test Year, Rate Base, Capital Structure and Rate of Return, Adjusted Operating Income and Cost of Service</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>III. Rate Design and Tariffs</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>IV. DTE’S Proposed Removal of its CIAC Waiver</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>VI. DTE’s Proposed Eligibility Requirements for its DCFC Rebate Program</b>	<b>8</b>

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**

**BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

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

**INITIAL BRIEF OF ELECTRIFY AMERICA, LLC**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

In Case No. U-21297, the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”) directed DTE Electric Company (“DTE”) to develop a permanent transportation electrification (“TE”) program (“TEP”) that built upon its previously-implemented Charging forward program, design and propose a direct current fast charger (“DCFC”) rate class, and further extend the demand charge relief for DCFC sites greater than 1 MW that take service under DTE’s proposed D3 rate.<sup>1</sup> In the instant proceeding, DTE complies with these directives and makes various proposals related to electric vehicle (“EV”) rates and EV infrastructure incentives.

Electrify America, LLC (“Electrify America”) is generally supportive of DTE’s proposed DCFC rebate program, however, to better align the program with DTE’s stated goal of incentivizing DCFC deployment within its service territory, Electrify America requests that the Commission reject certain eligibility requirements applicants must meet to receive incentives. Electrify America likewise recommends that the Commission reject DTE’s proposed EV Fast Charger Rate, as this rate does not have the requisite justification to become a permanent rate class. Instead, Electrify America recommends that the Commission further extend the demand

---

<sup>1</sup> Case No. U-21297, Order at 338, 342, and 374 (December 1, 2023).

charge relief provided for customers taking service under D3's rate. Finally, Electrify America recommends that the Commission reject DTE's proposed deletion of its contribution in aid of its Charging Forward construction ("CIAC") waiver. Electrify America further expands on these recommendations in this brief, demonstrating that they are supported by this proceeding's record and best position DTE's investments to provide support for the rapidly growing number of EVs within its service territory. Electrify America respectfully requests that the Commission adopts its recommendations, which are summarized in greater detail below.

## **II. TEST YEAR, RATE BASE, CAPITAL STRUCTURE AND RATE OF RETURN, ADJUSTED OPERATING INCOME AND COST OF SERVICE**

While the issues related to DTE's proposed Test Year, Rate Base, Capital Structure and Rate of Return, Adjusted Operating Income and Cost of Service are critically important to DTE's customers, Electrify America did not provide evidence on these issues or address them in the record of this proceeding. As such, Electrify America takes no position on these topics.

## **III. RATE DESIGN AND TARIFFS**

### **a. EV Fast Charger Rate<sup>2</sup>**

In this proceeding, DTE Witness Willis discusses DTE's proposed EV Fast Charger Rate class. As part of his testimony, DTE Witness Willis makes clear that the proposed EV Fast Charger Rate class should be used as a starting point for discussion only, and that the rate should not be implemented at the conclusion of this proceeding. DTE Witness Willis confirmed this

---

<sup>2</sup> See Case No. U-21297, Order at 342; 6 Tr. 2603-2605, DTE Willis Direct; Exhibit EA-2 (EA-JJS-1); 6 Tr. 4784-4786, Electrify America Shah Revised Direct; 6 Tr. 3303-3305, EVgo Stegall Direct; 6 Tr. 4097-4099, MEIU Sherman Direct; 6 Tr. 4740-4742, Walmart Perry Direct.

recommendation in response to discovery. Electrify America Witness Jigar J. Shah, as well as EVgo Services, LLC (“EVgo”) Witness Lindsey R. Stegall, Michigan Energy Innovation Business Council, Institute for Energy Innovation, and Advanced Energy United (“MEIU”) Witness Dr. Laura S. Sherman, and Walmart, Inc. (“Walmart”) Witness Lisa V. Perry all submitted testimony concurring, for various reasons, with DTE Witness Willis that the proposed EV Fast Charger Rate class should not be implemented at the conclusion of this proceeding. The proposed EV Fast Charger Rate class was not addressed during cross-examination, nor did any party submit rebuttal testimony addressing the EV Fast Charger Rate class.

Given the concerns stated by DTE, Electrify America, and the other parties to this proceeding, the Commission should decline to implement the EV Fast Charger Rate class as proposed. DTE’s proposal relies on a small sample of DCFC customers, and Witness Willis astutely points out that the small sample size and quality of the data supporting the cost of service study (“COSS”) may lead to a volatile rate class that has outsized impacts on customers. As such, the Commission should decline to implement the EV Fast Charger Rate class and maintain the existing flexibility that DCFC customers have to select their preferred rate.

b. Rate Schedule No. D3 – General Service Rate<sup>3</sup>

DTE does not propose to make any changes or modifications to Rate Schedule No. D3 – General Service Rate. This rate includes an exemption from its 1000 kilowatt (“kW”) discretionary demand restriction for service provided to Electric Vehicle Fast-Charging Stations until June 1, 2026 for existing stations and for two years after beginning service for new stations. In direct testimony, Electrify America Witness Shah recommends that DTE extend the

---

<sup>3</sup> DTE Electric Company, M.P.S.C. No. 1- Electric, Tenth Revised Sheet No. D-18.00; 6 Tr. 4786-4787, Electrify America Shah Revised Direct; 6 Tr. 4098-4099, MEIU Sherman Direct; 6 Tr. 4740-4742, Walmart Perry Direct; 6 Tr. 3322-3324, EVgo Stegall Rebuttal; 6 Tr. 5203-5206, Staff Krause Rebuttal; 6 Tr. 2644-2645, DTE Willis Rebuttal.

exemption beyond the June 1, 2026 deadline until 2028 or later to provide more long term, and more certain, demand charge relief to DCFC customers. MEIU Witness Sherman similarly recommends in direct testimony that existing and new customers be allowed to access the Rate Schedule D3 without the demand restriction for at least four additional years, until January 1, 2030. Walmart Witness Perry testifies in direct testimony that limiting the application of Rate Schedule D3 to only two years could deter companies from investing in public EV chargers due to the economic uncertainty caused by rate instability. Instead, Witness Perry recommends that the Commission either remove the two-year limitation from Rate Schedule D3 or require DTE to collaborate with interested parties to develop a public EV charging-specific rate informed by the COSS included in Witness Willis' testimony as well as future data, and seek approval of the proposed rate in its next general rate case.

Michigan Public Service Commission Staff ("Staff") Witness Krause and DTE Witness Willis responded to the recommendations set forth in the direct testimony of Electrify America, MEIU, and Walmart to extend the demand exemption provided in Rate Schedule D3.<sup>4</sup> Staff Witness Krause opposes these recommendations, stating that the demand charge relief provided under Rate Schedule D3 will not end for another two years and will be available for two rolling years to all new fast charging customers, which is sufficient to get the market started. Staff Witness Krause similarly rejects Witness Perry's assertion that the two-year rate stability provided by the current version of Rate Schedule D3 is inadequate, arguing that customers may have to switch to a less desirable rate based on their demand, but that such a switch does not constitute uncertainty or instability. DTE Witness Willis similarly rejects the recommendations

---

<sup>4</sup> For clarity, DTE Witness Willis responded only to Electrify America Witness Shah and MEIU Witness Sherman, while Staff Witness Krause responded to the direct testimony submitted by all three parties.

of Electrify America Witness Shah and MEIU Witness Sherman, arguing that neither witness provides any evidence of the necessity of their proposed changes. DTE Witness Willis states that no other DTE customer receives a ten-year period of rate certainty and that it would be inappropriate to do so, especially for large customers with very large demands. DTE Witness Willis additionally states that there is no evidence that the tariff is inhibiting the deployment of fast chargers.

In rebuttal testimony, EVgo Witness Stegall supports Witness Perry's recommendation to remove the two-year limit on the exemption from the 1,000 kW demand restriction for EV charging stations in Rate Schedule D3. EVgo Witness Stegall does not support Walmart Witness Perry's recommendation that DTE seek approval of an EV charging-specific rate in its next general rate case, arguing that the sample size and data quality concerns are likely to be present in next year's rate case, as well. Instead, Witness Stegall recommends that DTE collaborate with stakeholders to develop an optional successor rate to Schedule D3 that is made available upon the expiration of Rate Schedule D3's exemption from the demand restriction for EV charging stations.

Electrify America, as stated in Witness Shah's revised direct testimony, does not propose that it be provided with ten years of rate certainty. Electrify America instead proposes that future DCFC sites built before 2028 be provided with additional rate certainty such that forward-looking investment analyses can incorporate concrete and fixed costs. Should Rate Schedule D3 not be revised in this proceeding, it will only provide two years of rate certainty for new stations with loads in excess of 1000 kW, and even less for existing stations with loads in excess of 1000 kW. DCFC site development takes far longer than two years, and it is difficult for Electrify America to make the DCFC investments in DTE's service territory that will help it meet

Michigan's TE goals without some sense of what rates will be for DCFC stations two years after they are installed.

DTE Witness Willis similarly asserts that there is no evidence that the tariff is inhibiting the deployment of fast chargers. As Witness Davis stated in her testimony, the DCFCs installed at Electrify America's sites range from 150 kW to 360 kW of power. To take service under Rate Schedule D3, Electrify America can only install 2 of its most powerful chargers at a site within DTE's service territory, before it needs to determine whether to a) install an additional charger and take service on a far less beneficial rate that includes demand charges, or b) simply have two chargers instead of three at the site, which can lead to queuing and customer frustration. Given both choices are not particularly attractive, it is difficult for Electrify America to justify further investments in 1000 kW DCFC sites in DTE's service territory without the further rate certainty.

Staff Witness Krause's rebuttal testimony underestimates the impact that switching from one rate to another has on the overall financial health of a given DCFC site. What Witness Krause describes in his testimony, specifically "[w]hile the switch to rate D4 may not be desirable it is incorrect to characterize it as uncertainty, or instability," greatly simplifies the impact of such a change. Switching from one rate to another, and therefore completely shifting one of the major costs that a DCFC site has to pay as part of its operations, can quite easily be described as instability. For this reason, and for those state above, Electrify America recommends that the Commission approve its suggested modification to Rate Schedule D3 and extend the demand exemption until 2028 to provide more certainty to its DCFC customers.

#### **IV. DTE's Proposed Removal of its CIAC Waiver<sup>5</sup>**

DTE proposes to delete the Charging Forward CIAC waiver in section C6.1(16) of Section C – Part I, Company Rules and Regulations. DTE Witness Pina Bennett proposes this modification based on a finding that continuing with the waiver would require fifteen (15) percent of its total capital required for customer connections to come from non-EV customers. Witness Bennett also states that such a modification should be approved by the Commission to align the CIAC policy for EV customers and non-EV customers as DTE moves from a TE pilot to a permanent TEP.

Electrify America opposed the proposed modification, arguing that the removal of the CIAC waiver restricts future development of DCFC sites in DTE's service territory. Electrify America also contends that should DTE seek to own and operate EV charging infrastructure in the future, removing the waiver of CIAC costs could have competitive implications in the future. MEIU Witness Sherman similarly opposes DTE's proposal to eliminate the CIAC waiver for Level 2 charging stations and public DCFCs, as both provide benefits to all the aggregate in the form of increased demand and increased utility revenues. Witness Douglas B. Jester, testifying on behalf of Citizens Utility Board of Michigan, Sierra Club, Michigan Environmental Council, and Natural Resources Defense Council (collectively, "MNSC"), similarly opposes DTE's removal of the CIAC waiver, recommending that the Commission waive CIAC for all new residential and commercial installations of EV charging, whether installing customers are participants in DTE's TEP programs or not. MNSC Witness Jester proposes this change to avoid

---

<sup>5</sup> 6 Tr. 4787-4789, Electrify America Shah Direct; Exh. EA-2 (EA-JJS-1); 6 Tr. 1963-1964, 1968, DTE Bennett Direct; 6 Tr. 4094-4097, MEIU Sherman Direct; 6 Tr. 3804-3806, MNSC Jester Direct; 6 Tr. 2012-2013, DTE Bennett Rebuttal; 6 Tr. 4980, Staff Revere Rebuttal.

some customers having to pay significant line extension costs, while others avoid paying them entirely.

DTE Witness Bennett, in rebuttal testimony, opposes these recommendations. According to Witness Bennett, DTE's decision to align the CIAC policy for EV customers with other connections promotes fairness and equity, and will provide positive rate impacts and keep rates affordable for all customers. In a maturing and cost-socialized EV market, Witness Bennett states, the CIAC waiver is no longer appropriate or necessary. Staff Witness Nicholas M. Revere similarly opposes the recommendations of Electrify America and MNSC, arguing that maintaining the current CIAC waiver would amount to non-benefitting ratepayers subsidizing EV charging infrastructure in a manner that does not maximize the net benefits of DTE's investments.

Electrify America respectfully disagrees with the rebuttal testimony of Witness Bennett and Witness Revere. The initial investment required for DCFC stations is significant, as DTE concedes. Removing the CIAC waiver will only serve to inhibit DCFC site development, as there will be less certainty when it comes to line extension costs, which can lead to more upfront capital to be required for each site. Moreover, proposing to remove the waiver is contrary to DTE's stated goal of further incentivizing public charging as a mechanism to reduce range anxiety. Therefore, Electrify America requests that the Commission reject DTE's proposal to delete the Charging Forward CIAC waiver from its tariff.

## **V. DTE's Proposed Eligibility Requirements for its DCFC Rebate Program**

a. Commitment to 97% Charger Uptime<sup>6</sup>

DTE Witness Bennett describes DTE's proposal to require participants in its Business Charger Rebate program to commit to 97% charger uptime, which will be used by DTE to derive utilization rates for that charger, verify that the charger is meeting uptime requirements, discern charging trends, and other purposes. Witness Bennett clarifies that uptime data will not include any personally identifiable information of the EV drivers that use participating chargers.

In response, Electrify America Witness Davis notes Electrify America's opposition to this requirement for two reasons. The first is a competitive concern. Witness Davis testified that uptime data is confidential and competitively sensitive data, and that while DTE stated that while it is not seeking to own and operate EV chargers in its initial TEP, it may seek to do so in the future. As stated by Witness Davis, companies receiving DCFC rebates from DTE will therefore be required to provide confidential and competitively sensitive uptime data to a potential future competitor. The second concern is a practical one. Witness Davis testifies that the metrics used to calculate uptime are not sufficiently described, and this lack of detail will lead to the calculation of uptime data being an onerous and time-consuming task.

In rebuttal, Witness Bennett testifies that DTE included the uptime requirement to ensure that ratepayer funding under the program is utilized most effectively. Additionally, Witness Bennett further testifies that the Commission adopted the uptime requirement in Case No. U-20836, requiring 97% charger uptime as a condition of receiving a rebate. Witness Bennett does acknowledge that charger reliability and uptime information are sensitive data, and that there are variety of factors that can impact an EV charger's uptime. However, even if there are outages

---

<sup>6</sup> 6 Tr. 1964, 1952, DTE Bennett Direct; 6 Tr. 4767-4769, Electrify America Davis Rebuttal; 6 Tr. 2005-2006, DTE Bennett Rebuttal; 6 Tr. 4981-4982.

not caused by the charger itself, physical damage to the charging equipment, or unexpected electric utility service interruptions, Witness Bennett maintains that the operator of the charging station must be able to demonstrate that the charging port would otherwise be operational.

Staff Witness Revere similarly opposes Witness Davis' recommendations. Witness Revere dismisses both Witness Davis' testimony that uptime data is confidential and competitively sensitive, as well as her stated concern that providing such data to DTE could provide DTE with a competitive disadvantage. According to Witness Revere, this concern relies on a number of speculative future events and is not outweighed by the benefit of ensuring that those receiving rebates funded by ratepayers are providing the necessary benefits. Witness Revere recommends that the Commission reject this concern and approve the requirement to provide uptime data as a condition of receiving rebates for DCFCs.

Electrify America acknowledges that the Commission has previously required uptime data to be provided as a condition of receiving charger rebates. However, Electrify America's most significant concern with providing such data is that it will be provided directly to DTE, a potential future competitor. While Staff Witness Revere dismisses this concern as speculative, DTE itself stated that it believes there is merit in owning and operating chargers, and signaled that it may seek Commission approval to do so in the future. If DTE is provided with such data, it will have expansive information about where EVs charge within its service territory, the utilization rates of each DTE-funded charger, and, ultimately, where it should site such charging infrastructure to ensure it is maximizing the benefits of ratepayer investments in EV charging. This is not a speculative concern, it is a concrete and easily foreseeable scenario that could readily occur in the coming years. It is also something that is likely to impact Electrify America's strategic decisions regarding investments in DTE's service territory.

Electrify America likewise disagrees with Witness Revere’s testimony that Witness Davis’ assertion that uptime data is confidential and competitively sensitive is merely a “claim.” As the operator of the largest public fast charging network in the United States, Electrify America can state from experience that uptime data is a crucial metric for how effectively its network is operating. In turn, such information then drives customer trust in that network’s availability, which encourages EV drivers to choose Electrify America’s charging stations over its competitors. Should uptime data be provided to a competitor, that competitor would then understand the strengths and weaknesses of individual charging stations within Electrify America’s network and could make its own investment decisions accordingly. Therefore, the uptime data that will be provided to DTE as a condition of receiving a rebate meets any reasonable definition of confidential and competitively sensitive information. Indeed, DTE Witness Bennett agrees with this in her rebuttal testimony.

Electrify America therefore recommends that should the Commission approve the requirement that uptime data be provided as a condition of receiving charger rebates, it not be provided to DTE or Staff, as providing either with such data presents competitive and/or confidentiality concerns.

b. Exclusion of Destination Charging Sites<sup>7</sup>

DTE Witness Bennett describes DTE’s proposed criteria that a DCFC site must meet to receive rebates. To receive an on-route DCFC rebate, the site must be within one mile a major throughway exit. However, according to Witness Bennett, to receive a rebate, potential sites cannot be “destination charging” sites, which are defined as those that are located at businesses

---

<sup>7</sup> 6 Tr. 1942, 1964, DTE Bennett Direct; Exh. EA-1 (EA-RD-1); 6 Tr. 4769-4770, Electrify America Davis Direct; 6 Tr. 3297-3302, EVgo Stegall Direct; 6 Tr. 4090-4091, MEIU Sherman Direct; 6 Tr. 2006-2007, DTE Bennett Rebuttal; 6 Tr. 4982; Staff Revere Rebuttal.

like hotels, restaurants or grocery stores that may not be located within one mile of a major throughway. According to Witness Bennett, destination charging sites have other incentives and motivations for charger installation, such as increasing foot traffic and attracting customers to their businesses. As such, DTE recommends that such sites be ineligible for DCFC rebates under DTE's proposed participation criteria.

Electrify America Witness Davis, in direct testimony, opposes the exclusion of such sites, noting that DTE excluded them from eligibility without justification for its conclusion that such sites have other incentives and benefits for installing EV charging. Witness Davis further testifies that making such sites ineligible artificially limits the number of sites at which the public charging rebate criteria can be met, as companies such as Electrify America partner with businesses to de-risk the economics of such sites.

In direct testimony, EVgo Witness Stegall similarly opposed DTE's exclusion of rebates for DCFC deployment for destination charging sites, noting that DTE does not explain why it proposes to eliminate such incentives. Further, Witness Stegall asserts in direct testimony that such a decision is contrary to the feedback DTE received from stakeholders in developing its TEP. MEIU Witness Sherman similarly supports expanding rebate eligibility to all public DCFC locations.

In rebuttal testimony, DTE Witness Bennett argues against these proposals, stating that DTE is committed to supporting 35% of forecasted on-route public charger deployment and that its eligibility for such rebates is in alignment with stakeholder priorities. Witness Bennett identifies "both on-route and destination charging" as the most important public charging subsegments for utility action. Staff Witness Revere likewise opposes Electrify America Witness' Davis recommendation, arguing that whether rebates funded by ratepayers for DCFCs

are good for Electrify America is not Staff's primary concern, nor should it be the primary concern of the Commission. Moreover, according to Witness Revere, the limit on potential deployment of DCFCs is not artificial as Witness Davis states, it is removing rebates for sites that are not necessary to achieve the goal of a skeleton network designed to reduce range anxiety.

Electrify America reiterates its recommendation to the Commission that it should not adopt DTE's proposed exclusion of destination charging sites from eligibility for DTE's DCFC rebate program. Electrify America emphasizes what Witness Bennett stated in rebuttal testimony, which is that both on-route and destination charging are the most important public charging subsegments for utility action, not just on-route charging. The practical outcome of DTE's proposed rebate program is that it will incentivize DCFC sites that have no amenities, no public restrooms, and no business or other activity for EV drivers to take part in while their vehicles charge. Few DCFC sites are designed in such a manner, mainly because EV drivers typically choose to charge at locations where they can take advantage of other amenities available on-site while they are charging. In short, the sites funded by DTE's ratepayers are likely to have very low utilization because of the way DTE has defined eligibility for rebates.

In response to Witness Revere, Electrify America's recommendations to DTE and the Commission about the inclusion of destination charging sites in DTE's DCFC rebate program have not been put forth in this proceeding solely to benefit Electrify America. In this proceeding, DTE has estimated that it will need 7,000 incremental public EV chargers in its service territory over the next four years to adequately support forecasted EV adoption. As stated above, Electrify America has a unique perspective into the techniques, practices, financial incentives, and overall needs inherent to the development and operation of DCFC stations. Electrify America's recommendations are made to educate and inform the parties to this

proceeding, including Staff, about how ratepayer funds can be best expended to support DTE's charger deployment goals. As such, when Electrify America makes recommendations regarding the structure of financial incentives that may be provided for DCFC sites, they are made based on its experience and are designed to assist DTE and the Commission in determining appropriate parameters for its EV rates and programs.

Electrify America therefore recommends that the Commission reject DTE's exclusion of destination charging sites from its DCFC rebate program.

## **VI. Conclusion**

For the reasons described in this brief and its testimony submitted in this proceeding, Electrify America requests that the Commission adopt the following recommendations regarding the issues identified above:

- The Commission should decline to implement the EV Fast Charger Rate class and maintain the existing flexibility that DCFC customers have to select their preferred rate.
- Electrify America recommends that the Commission approve its suggested modification to Rate Schedule D3 and extend the demand exemption until 2028 to provide more certainty to its DCFC customers.
- The Commission should reject DTE's proposal to delete the Charging Forward CIAC waiver from its tariff.
- Should the Commission approve the requirement that uptime data be provided as a condition of receiving charger rebates, Electrify America recommends that such data not be provided to DTE or Staff, as providing either with such data presents competitive and/or confidentiality concerns.

- The Commission should reject DTE's exclusion of destination charging sites from its DCFC rebate program.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Stephen Bright, Esq.  
Electrify America, LLC  
1950 Opportunity Way, Suite 1500  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
Phone: (781) 206-7979  
Steve.Bright@electrifyamerica.com

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**

**BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

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

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

On October 3, 2024, an electronic copy of the Initial Brief of Electrify America, LLC was served on the following via email. I hereby verify that the foregoing statements are true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Sincerely,



---

Stephen Bright, Esq.  
Electrify America, LLC  
1950 Opportunity Way, Suite 1500  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
Phone: (781) 206-7979  
Steve.Bright@electrifyamerica.com

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

**EVgo Services, LLC**

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

**Association of Businesses Advocating Tariff**

**Equity (ABATE)**

Stephen A. Campbell  
Michael J. Pattwell  
[scampbell@clarkhill.com](mailto:scampbell@clarkhill.com)  
[mpattwell@clarkhill.com](mailto: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](mailto:nwallace@elpc.org)  
[dabrams@elpc.org](mailto:dabrams@elpc.org)  
[aestrada@elpc.org](mailto: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](mailto:t-9aurba@lawclinic.uchicago.edu)  
[templeton@uchicago.edu](mailto:templeton@uchicago.edu)  
[jschuhardt@uchicago.edu](mailto:jschuhardt@uchicago.edu)  
[heppel@uchicago.edu](mailto:heppel@uchicago.edu)  
[madisonwilson@uchicago.edu](mailto:madisonwilson@uchicago.edu)

**Electrify America, LLC**

Jennifer Morante  
Stephen Bright  
Krystal D. Hermiz  
[jmorante@grsm.com](mailto:jmorante@grsm.com)  
[steve.bright@electrifyamerica.com](mailto:steve.bright@electrifyamerica.com)  
[khermiz@grsm.com](mailto:khermiz@grsm.com)

**Michigan Cable Telecommunications Association**

Sean P. Gallagher  
[sgallagher@fraserlawfirm.com](mailto:sgallagher@fraserlawfirm.com)

**International Transmission Company**

Richard J. Aaron  
Olivia R.C.A. Flower  
Hannah E. Buzolits  
Courtney F. Kissel  
[raaron@dykema.com](mailto:raaron@dykema.com)  
[oflower@dykema.com](mailto:oflower@dykema.com)  
[hbuzolits@dykema.com](mailto:hbuzolits@dykema.com)  
[ckissel@dykema.com](mailto:ckissel@dykema.com)

**Intervenor EVgo Services LLC**

Michael G. Oliva  
[moliva@fosterswift.com](mailto:moliva@fosterswift.com)