

**From:** [Kyle Kraft](#)  
**To:** [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)  
**Subject:** Case No. U-2187  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 7:16:27 PM

---

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to [abuse@michigan.gov](mailto:abuse@michigan.gov)**

I am writing this to OPPOSE all BESS and Data Centers in Michigan, with specific reference to the proposed BESS in Oshtemo Township, Kalamazoo County. BESS facilities are dangerous equipment prone to runaway fire events that will emit toxic cyanide smoke and will burn for several days. They cannot be extinguished with water and our firefighters are not trained for, and should not be expected to risk their own lives fighting such a disaster. What about the millions of gallons of water they will spray on the adjacent batteries to keep them from igniting? Who will be responsible for the environmental damage caused by the water migrating through our sandy soil directly into our aquifer? Remember the Union Carbide incident in Bhopal, India back in the late 1900's that killed thousands of Indians? That was the work of cyanide gas. My property is on Van Kal Street, approximately 7/10 of a mile downwind of the proposed installation, and I will be directly impacted by this facility.

BESS is wrong for Michigan and wrong for Oshtemo Township!

Kyle R. Kraft Kalamazoo, MI

**From:** [Katie Liby](#)  
**To:** [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)  
**Subject:** Case No. U-21867  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 10:59:09 PM

---

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to [abuse@michigan.gov](mailto:abuse@michigan.gov)

### Concerns Regarding Renewable Energy Project Siting and Implementation of PA 233

To the Members of the Michigan Public Service Commission,

I am submitting this comment to express serious concern regarding the MPSC's current siting requirements for large-scale renewable energy projects and the broader implications of Public Act 233 of 2023.

The public is increasingly aware that what has been marketed as a "green transition" has, in practice, become a politically driven initiative — pushed primarily by the Democratic Party and implemented through mechanisms that undermine local control. The MPSC's three-person review panel — comprised of two Democrats and one member publicly described as non-partisan but whose professional background demonstrates a clear bias toward green-energy advocacy — was appointed by Governor Whitmer, the same official who signed PA 233 into law. That legislation was passed just in time to prevent Michigan residents from gathering the necessary signatures to challenge it, effectively silencing public opposition.

Rural residents in Michigan have chosen to live in rural areas for many reasons — not least among them a desire to live apart from industrial and commercial development. The siting of massive wind, solar, and battery energy storage system (BESS) facilities directly contradicts that choice. These projects threaten the very qualities that make rural living desirable: peace, safety, clean air, unspoiled views, and natural ecosystems. In many cases, these developments are destroying green space, displacing wildlife, and forcing both people and animals from their homes.

The public is not ignorant to the risks associated with current renewable technologies, particularly BESS installations. It is well-established that lithium-ion storage systems remain an evolving, experimental technology with unresolved safety issues. By removing local control through PA 233, the State of Michigan is effectively compelling communities and individuals to participate in large-scale experiments that could endanger their health and property. Residents do not consent — voluntarily or otherwise — to becoming subjects in such experiments, nor do we consent to the risks of catastrophic battery fires and the resulting toxic contamination of our land and water.

When such fires occur, state and federal agencies have repeatedly downplayed the human and environmental impacts. For example, following the Moss Landing BESS fire in California in January 2025, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency reported that hydrogen fluoride and particulate matter levels posed "no public health risk." Yet many local residents experienced acute symptoms, including sore throat, coughing, wheezing, headaches, eye and skin irritation, nausea, metallic taste, and nosebleeds. Furthermore, independent research by San José State University's Moss Landing Marine Laboratories found that marsh soils near the site contained concentrations of toxic metals — including nickel, cobalt, and manganese — at levels 100 to 1,000 times higher than normal.

Michigan residents are not naïve to these facts. We are fully aware of the dangers associated with BESS technology and of the State's tendency to overlook or minimize the negative impacts of developments in its rush to meet political or ideological goals. This disregard extends not only to the physical environment but also to the well-being of the people expected to live beside these industrial-scale facilities.

Finally, it is clear that insufficient due diligence is being conducted on developers seeking to enter Michigan. Many have limited operational experience, questionable financial standing, or a record of environmental and safety violations in other states. Yet these same companies are being granted entry into Michigan communities with minimal scrutiny or accountability — an unacceptable practice for projects of this scale and potential hazard.

For these reasons, we urge the MPSC to pause and reassess its current approach to renewable project siting. Transparent public involvement, robust safety review, and genuine local consent must be prerequisites for all such developments! Michigan cannot afford to trade one environmental and public-health risk for another in the name of political expedience.

Respectfully,

Katheryn Liby  
Oshtemo Township, MI

**From:** [Rosemary O'Connor](#)  
**To:** [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)  
**Subject:** Case No. U-21867  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 10:31:57 PM

---

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to [abuse@michigan.gov](mailto:abuse@michigan.gov)**

Concerns Regarding Renewable Energy Project Siting and Implementation of PA 233

To the Members of the Michigan Public Service Commission,

I am submitting this comment to express serious concern regarding the MPSC's current siting requirements for large-scale renewable energy projects and the broader implications of Public Act 233 of 2023.

The public is increasingly aware that what has been marketed as a "green transition" has, in practice, become a politically driven initiative — pushed primarily by the Democratic Party and implemented through mechanisms that undermine local control. The MPSC's three-person review panel — comprised of two Democrats and one member publicly described as non-partisan but whose professional background demonstrates a clear bias toward green-energy advocacy — was appointed by Governor Whitmer, the same official who signed PA 233 into law. That legislation was passed just in time to prevent Michigan residents from gathering the necessary signatures to challenge it, effectively silencing public opposition.

Rural residents in Michigan have chosen to live in rural areas for many reasons — not least among them a desire to live apart from industrial and commercial development. The siting of massive wind, solar, and battery energy storage system (BESS) facilities directly contradicts that choice. These projects threaten the very qualities that make rural living desirable: peace, safety, clean air, unspoiled views, and natural ecosystems. In many cases, these developments are destroying green space, displacing wildlife, and forcing both people and animals from their homes.

The public is not ignorant to the risks associated with current renewable technologies, particularly BESS installations. It is well-established that lithium-ion storage systems remain an evolving, experimental technology with unresolved safety issues. By removing local control through PA 233, the State of Michigan is effectively compelling communities and individuals to participate in large-scale experiments that could endanger their health and

property. Residents do not consent — voluntarily or otherwise — to becoming subjects in such experiments, nor do we consent to the risks of catastrophic battery fires and the resulting toxic contamination of our land and water.

When such fires occur, state and federal agencies have repeatedly downplayed the human and environmental impacts. For example, following the Moss Landing BESS fire in California in January 2025, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency reported that hydrogen fluoride and particulate matter levels posed “no public health risk.” Yet many local residents experienced acute symptoms, including sore throat, coughing, wheezing, headaches, eye and skin irritation, nausea, metallic taste, and nosebleeds. Furthermore, independent research by San José State University’s Moss Landing Marine Laboratories found that marsh soils near the site contained concentrations of toxic metals — including nickel, cobalt, and manganese — at levels 100 to 1,000 times higher than normal.

Michigan residents are not naïve to these facts. We are fully aware of the dangers associated with BESS technology and of the State’s tendency to overlook or minimize the negative impacts of developments in its rush to meet political or ideological goals. This disregard extends not only to the physical environment but also to the well-being of the people expected to live beside these industrial-scale facilities.

Finally, it is clear that insufficient due diligence is being conducted on developers seeking to enter Michigan. Many have limited operational experience, questionable financial standing, or a record of environmental and safety violations in other states. Yet these same companies are being granted entry into Michigan communities with minimal scrutiny or accountability — an unacceptable practice for projects of this scale and potential hazard.

For these reasons, we urge the MPSC to pause and reassess its current approach to renewable project siting. Transparent public involvement, robust safety review, and genuine local consent must be prerequisites for all such developments! Michigan cannot afford to trade one environmental and public-health risk for another in the name of political expedience.

Respectfully,

Rosemary O’Connor  
Oshtemo Township, Michigan

**From:** [anne hicks](#)  
**To:** [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)  
**Subject:** Case No. U-21867  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:57:56 PM

---

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to [abuse@michigan.gov](mailto:abuse@michigan.gov)**

Date: 10/28/2025

Concerns Regarding Renewable Energy Project Siting and Implementation of PA 233

To the Members of the Michigan Public Service Commission,

I am submitting this comment to express serious concern regarding the MPSC's current siting requirements for large-scale renewable energy projects and the broader implications of Public Act 233 of 2023.

The public is increasingly aware that what has been marketed as a "green transition" has, in practice, become a politically driven initiative — pushed primarily by the Democratic Party and implemented through mechanisms that undermine local control. The MPSC's three-person review panel — comprised of two Democrats and one member publicly described as non-partisan but whose professional background demonstrates a clear bias toward green-energy advocacy — was appointed by Governor Whitmer, the same official who signed PA 233 into law. That legislation was passed just in time to prevent Michigan residents from gathering the necessary signatures to challenge it, effectively silencing public opposition.

Rural residents in Michigan have chosen to live in rural areas for many reasons — not least among them a desire to live apart from industrial and commercial development. The siting of massive wind, solar, and battery energy storage system (BESS) facilities directly contradicts that choice. These projects threaten the very qualities that make rural living desirable: peace, safety, clean air, unspoiled views, and natural ecosystems. In many cases, these developments are destroying green space, displacing wildlife, and forcing both people and animals from their homes.

The public is not ignorant to the risks associated with current renewable technologies, particularly BESS installations. It is well-established that lithium-ion storage systems remain an evolving, experimental technology with unresolved safety issues. By removing local control through PA 233, the State of Michigan is effectively compelling communities and individuals to participate in large-scale experiments that could endanger their health and property. Residents do not consent — voluntarily or otherwise — to becoming subjects in such experiments, nor do we consent to the risks of catastrophic battery fires and the resulting toxic contamination of our land and water.

When such fires occur, state and federal agencies have repeatedly downplayed the human and environmental impacts. For example, following the Moss Landing BESS fire in California in January 2025, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency reported that hydrogen fluoride and particulate matter levels posed “no public health risk.” Yet many local residents experienced acute symptoms, including sore throat, coughing, wheezing, headaches, eye and skin irritation, nausea, metallic taste, and nosebleeds. Furthermore, independent research by San José State University’s Moss Landing Marine Laboratories found that marsh soils near the site contained concentrations of toxic metals — including nickel, cobalt, and manganese — at levels 100 to 1,000 times higher than normal.

Michigan residents are not naïve to these facts. We are fully aware of the dangers associated with BESS technology and of the State’s tendency to overlook or minimize the negative impacts of developments in its rush to meet political or ideological goals. This disregard extends not only to the physical environment but also to the well-being of the people expected to live beside these industrial-scale facilities.

Finally, it is clear that insufficient due diligence is being conducted on developers seeking to enter Michigan. Many have limited operational experience, questionable financial standing, or a record of environmental and safety violations in other states. Yet these same companies are being granted entry into Michigan communities with minimal scrutiny or accountability — an unacceptable practice for projects of this scale and potential hazard.

For these reasons, we urge the MPSC to pause and reassess its current approach to renewable project siting. Transparent public involvement, robust safety review, and genuine local consent must be prerequisites for all such developments! Michigan cannot afford to trade one environmental and public-health risk for another in the

name of political expedience.

Respectfully,

Anne Hicks

Oshtemo township, MI

**From:** [Rose Crawford](#)  
**To:** [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)  
**Subject:** Case No. U-21867  
**Date:** Thursday, October 30, 2025 6:36:02 AM

---

CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to [abuse@michigan.gov](mailto:abuse@michigan.gov)

Energy Project Siting and Implementation of PA 233

To the Members of the Michigan Public Service Commission,

I am submitting this comment to express serious concern regarding the MPSC's current siting requirements for large-scale renewable energy projects and the broader implications of Public Act 233 of 2023.

The public is increasingly aware that what has been marketed as a "green transition" has, in practice, become a politically driven initiative — pushed primarily by the Democratic Party and implemented through mechanisms that undermine local control. The MPSC's three-person review panel — comprised of two Democrats and one member publicly described as non-partisan but whose professional background demonstrates a clear bias toward green-energy advocacy — was appointed by Governor Whitmer, the same official who signed PA 233 into law. That legislation was passed just in time to prevent Michigan residents from gathering the necessary signatures to challenge it, effectively silencing public opposition.

Rural residents in Michigan have chosen to live in rural areas for many reasons — not least among them a desire to live apart from industrial and commercial development. The siting of massive wind, solar, and battery energy storage system (BESS) facilities directly contradicts that choice. These projects threaten the very qualities that make rural living desirable: peace, safety, clean air, unspoiled views, and natural ecosystems. In many cases, these developments are destroying green space, displacing wildlife, and forcing both people and animals from their homes.

The public is not ignorant to the risks associated with current renewable technologies, particularly BESS installations. It is well-established that lithium-ion storage systems remain an evolving, experimental technology with unresolved safety issues. By removing local control through PA 233, the State of Michigan is effectively compelling communities and individuals to participate in large-scale experiments that could endanger their health and property. Residents do not consent — voluntarily or otherwise — to becoming subjects in such experiments, nor do we consent to the risks of catastrophic battery fires and the resulting toxic contamination of our land and water.

When such fires occur, state and federal agencies have repeatedly downplayed the human and environmental impacts. For example, following the Moss Landing BESS fire in California in January 2025, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency reported that hydrogen fluoride and particulate matter levels posed "no public health risk." Yet many local residents experienced acute symptoms, including sore throat, coughing, wheezing, headaches, eye and skin irritation, nausea, metallic taste, and nosebleeds. Furthermore, independent research by San José State

University's Moss Landing Marine Laboratories found that marsh soils near the site contained concentrations of toxic metals — including nickel, cobalt, and manganese — at levels 100 to 1,000 times higher than normal.

Michigan residents are not naïve to these facts. We are fully aware of the dangers associated with BESS technology and of the State's tendency to overlook or minimize the negative impacts of developments in its rush to meet political or ideological goals. This disregard extends not only to the physical environment but also to the well-being of the people expected to live beside these industrial-scale facilities.

Finally, it is clear that insufficient due diligence is being conducted on developers seeking to enter Michigan. Many have limited operational experience, questionable financial standing, or a record of environmental and safety violations in other states. Yet these same companies are being granted entry into Michigan communities with minimal scrutiny or accountability — an unacceptable practice for projects of this scale and potential hazard.

For these reasons, we urge the MPSC to pause and reassess its current approach to renewable project siting. Transparent public involvement, robust safety review, and genuine local consent must be prerequisites for all such developments! Michigan cannot afford to trade one environmental and public-health risk for another in the name of political expedience.

Respectfully,

Rosemary Crawford

Oshtemo township, MI  
Sent from my iPhone

**From:** Sarah Morisot [REDACTED] [Sent You a Personal Message](#)  
**To:** [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)  
**Subject:** Case No. U-21867: Public Comment on IRP Filing Requirements and Planning Parameters  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 5:41:45 PM

---

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to  
[abuse@michigan.gov](mailto:abuse@michigan.gov)**

Dear Michigan Public Service Commission,

I am the parent of two young adults. they are just starting off in their adult lives and have many challenges to face. one is the state of our environment and how fragile it is. do they even have a future to look forward to, they wonder? please protect our great lakes and keep energy costs affordable for our kids.

Commissioners and Staff of the MPSC:

I write to share my thoughts on IRP filing requirements & planning parameters.

**Speculative Data Center Forecasts & Stranded Asset Risk:**

I urge the commission to consider the unprecedented risks not currently factored into IRPs given the highly speculative and uniquely volatile electricity demand forecasts based on data centers. Data center 'pipelines' depend on rapidly evolving technologies that could sharply reduce electricity use, volatile market conditions that could stall demand altogether, and a high likelihood of regulatory or legislative changes within the 20-year planning period that could cap or reprice large loads. If IRPs don't factor in these risks and uncertainties, Michigan could be left with stranded assets, unnecessary costs, and extremely overleveraged utility companies.

**Recommendations:**

1. Prohibit utilities from using speculative data-center pipelines to justify long-lived capital investments, preventing stranded asset risk.
2. Require modeling scenarios with and without data center load growth to ensure transparency of the costs and resource decisions the addition of data centers would impose on the system.
3. Require modeling scenarios that factor in the unique uncertainties and volatility of speculative data center demand, including market volatility, progressive regulatory and legislative changes, technological shifts, siting challenges, local ordinances, water constraints, and public scrutiny.
4. For more technical analysis, please read Sierra Club's reports – Demanding Better at <https://sc.org/3I4ymku> and Unconstrained Demand at <https://sc.org/466FCnX>.

**Affordability:**

We need to standardize real affordability data collection. The most at-risk Michiganders are being gentrified out of their own energy system as utilities continuously request higher ROE in rate cases, and there's currently no rules that require utilities to track energy burden. This is a recipe for exploitation. Energy burden—the share of household income spent on energy—

must be calculated and factored in. Without this, rising costs can fall disproportionately on low- and moderate-income households.

Recommendations:

1. Mandate energy-burden analyses across specific income segments over 5 years.
2. Adopt affordability language that ties IRPs explicitly to minimizing household energy burden by income segment.
3. Require utilities to propose specific mitigation measures (bill credits, weatherization, EWR expansion), not just a “discussion” of options, whenever burdens rise above 6% threshold.

Data Centers and the Emerging Water Crisis:

I urge the MPSC to require IRPs to track and project local water constraints and choose low-water resource portfolios wherever shortages are a risk—in short, factor water limits into filing requirements. To understand the urgency, please read the Alliance for the Great Lakes Report at <https://sc.org/3JIpSzV>, which finds only ~1% of the Lakes’ volume is replenished each year; up to 40% comes from groundwater used by 40–75% of residents, with failing wells and subsidence already occurring. Hyperscale data centers could withdraw 150+ billion gallons in 5 years, and when powered by coal or gas, that water footprint can increase by up to 15X—this means that the resource mix matters. With evaporation rising under climate change, failing to require these analyses in IRPs risks catastrophic water shortages, and growing public outcry.

Recommendations:

1. Require IRPs to quantify and project expected water use for each PCA that includes data centers.
2. Require IRPs to demonstrate that resource choices minimize total water intensity in water constrained regions.
3. IRPs should include climate-adjusted water scenarios, reflecting that hotter, drier summers reduce aquifer recharge and worsen groundwater stress.
4. Adopt a principle that residential and ecological uses take precedence over speculative industrial loads in times of water stress.

Sincerely,

Sarah Morisot

[REDACTED]  
Rochester Hls, MI 48306  
[REDACTED]

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Member Care at Sierra Club at [member.care@sierraclub.org](mailto:member.care@sierraclub.org) or (415) 977-5673.

**From:** [Bruce Hirsh](#) [REDACTED] [Sent You a Personal Message](#)  
**To:** [LARA-MPSC-EDOCKETS](#)  
**Subject:** Case No. U-21867: Public Comment on IRP Filing Requirements and Planning Parameters  
**Date:** Wednesday, October 29, 2025 7:01:16 PM

---

**CAUTION: This is an External email. Please send suspicious emails to  
[abuse@michigan.gov](mailto:abuse@michigan.gov)**

Dear Michigan Public Service Commission,

Commissioners and Staff of the MPSC:

I write to share my thoughts on IRP filing requirements & planning parameters.

**Speculative Data Center Forecasts & Stranded Asset Risk:**

I urge the commission to consider the unprecedented risks not currently factored into IRPs given the highly speculative and uniquely volatile electricity demand forecasts based on data centers. Data center ‘pipelines’ depend on rapidly evolving technologies that could sharply reduce electricity use, volatile market conditions that could stall demand altogether, and a high likelihood of regulatory or legislative changes within the 20-year planning period that could cap or reprice large loads. If IRPs don’t factor in these risks and uncertainties, Michigan could be left with stranded assets, unnecessary costs, and extremely overleveraged utility companies.

**Recommendations:**

1. Prohibit utilities from using speculative data-center pipelines to justify long-lived capital investments, preventing stranded asset risk.
2. Require modeling scenarios with and without data center load growth to ensure transparency of the costs and resource decisions the addition of data centers would impose on the system.
3. Require modeling scenarios that factor in the unique uncertainties and volatility of speculative data center demand, including market volatility, progressive regulatory and legislative changes, technological shifts, siting challenges, local ordinances, water constraints, and public scrutiny.
4. For more technical analysis, please read Sierra Club’s reports – Demanding Better at <https://sc.org/3I4ymku> and Unconstrained Demand at <https://sc.org/466FCnX>.

**Affordability:**

We need to standardize real affordability data collection. The most at-risk Michiganders are being gentrified out of their own energy system as utilities continuously request higher ROE in rate cases, and there’s currently no rules that require utilities to track energy burden. This is a recipe for exploitation. Energy burden—the share of household income spent on energy—must be calculated and factored in. Without this, rising costs can fall disproportionately on low- and moderate-income households.

**Recommendations:**

1. Mandate energy-burden analyses across specific income segments over 5 years.

2. Adopt affordability language that ties IRPs explicitly to minimizing household energy burden by income segment.
3. Require utilities to propose specific mitigation measures (bill credits, weatherization, EWR expansion), not just a “discussion” of options, whenever burdens rise above 6% threshold.

#### Data Centers and the Emerging Water Crisis:

I urge the MPSC to require IRPs to track and project local water constraints and choose low-water resource portfolios wherever shortages are a risk—in short, factor water limits into filing requirements. To understand the urgency, please read the Alliance for the Great Lakes Report at <https://sc.org/3JIpSzV>, which finds only ~1% of the Lakes’ volume is replenished each year; up to 40% comes from groundwater used by 40–75% of residents, with failing wells and subsidence already occurring. Hyperscale data centers could withdraw 150+ billion gallons in 5 years, and when powered by coal or gas, that water footprint can increase by up to 15X—this means that the resource mix matters. With evaporation rising under climate change, failing to require these analyses in IRPs risks catastrophic water shortages, and growing public outcry.

#### Recommendations:

1. Require IRPs to quantify and project expected water use for each PCA that includes data centers.
2. Require IRPs to demonstrate that resource choices minimize total water intensity in water constrained regions.
3. IRPs should include climate-adjusted water scenarios, reflecting that hotter, drier summers reduce aquifer recharge and worsen groundwater stress.
4. Adopt a principle that residential and ecological uses take precedence over speculative industrial loads in times of water stress.

Sincerely,

Bruce Hirsh

[REDACTED]  
Michiana, MI 49117  
[REDACTED]

This message was sent by KnowWho, as a service provider, on behalf of an individual associated with Sierra Club. If you need more information, please contact Member Care at Sierra Club at [member.care@sierraclub.org](mailto:member.care@sierraclub.org) or (415) 977-5673.