



John A. Janiszewski
(313) 235-7309
john.janiszewski@dteenergy.com

September 24, 2026

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

RE: In the matter of the Application of **DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY** for approval of its Integrated Resource Plan pursuant to MCL 460.6t, Clean Energy Plan pursuant to MCL 460.1051, Certificates of Necessity pursuant to MCL 460.6s, related accounting authorizations, and for other relief.
MPSC Case No. U-22168

Dear Ms. Felice:

Attached for electronic filing in the above captioned matter is the redacted version of DTE Electric Company's Application, Proposed Protective Order, Nondisclosure Certificates, with the supporting Testimony and Exhibits of Witnesses, Christina J. Hajj, Shayla D. Manning, Jason T. Busse, Ryan C. Pratt, Shawn D. Burgdorf, Justin J. W. Brooks, Frank J. Sirwaitis, Markus B. Leuker, Margaret E. Guillaumin, David Swiech, Kevin L. Bilyeu, Jason R. Kupser, Husaninder Singh, Jablan Djordjevic, Barry J. Marietta, Harry O. Stansell Jr., Michael E. Banks, Matthew Lind, Priya Machi, Terri Schroeder, and Theresa M. Uzenski. Also attached is the Proof of Service.

In addition, in the above captioned matter is DTE Electric Company's confidential Application, Mr. Banks's confidential Testimony and confidential Exhibits A-17.2 and A-17.6, Ms. Hajj's confidential Testimony and confidential Exhibit A-1.7, Mr. Pratt's confidential Testimony and confidential Exhibits A-4, A-4.13, A-4.14, A-4.15, A-4.16, A-4.17, and A-4.20, Mr. Stansell's confidential testimony and confidential Exhibits A-16, A-16.1, A-16.2, and A-16.3, Mr. Burgdorf's confidential Exhibit A-5 (a)-(d) will be filed under seal with the Commission.

Very truly yours,

John A.

Janiszewski

John A. Janiszewski

Digitally signed by John A.
Janiszewski
Date: 2026.09.24 17:07:40
-04'00'

JAJ/erb
Attachments
cc: Service List

STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter of the Application of)	
DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY for approval)	
of its Integrated Resource Plan pursuant)	
to MCL 460.6t, Clean Energy Plan pursuant)	Case No. U-22168
to MCL 460.1051, Certificates of Necessity)	
pursuant to MCL 460.6s, related accounting)	
<u>authorizations, and for other relief.</u>)	

APPLICATION

DTE Electric Company (“DTE Electric” or the “Company”) respectfully requests that the Michigan Public Service Commission (“MPSC” or the “Commission”) approve the Company’s 2026 Integrated Resource Plan (“IRP”) and its Proposed Course of Action (“PCA”) pursuant to MCL 460.6t; approve its Clean Energy Plan (“CEP”) pursuant to MCL 460.1051; issue Certificates of Necessity (“CONs”) pursuant to MCL 460.6s for the construction of two Company-owned generation facilities included in the PCA; specify and approve for future recovery the costs of certain investments and resources pursuant to MCL 460.6t(11); grant accounting authorizations and other relief described below and in supporting testimony and exhibits; and find that the PCA is the most reasonable and prudent means for meeting customers’ energy and capacity needs. In support of this Application, DTE Electric states as follows:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. DTE Electric is a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Michigan, with its principal office at One Energy Plaza, Detroit, Michigan 48226. DTE Electric is owned by DTE Electric Holdings, LLC, which is a wholly-owned subsidiary of DTE Energy, providing retail electric service to customers located in Michigan.

2. DTE Electric’s retail electric business is subject to the Commission’s jurisdiction pursuant to Michigan law, including certain provisions of 1939 PA 3, as amended, MCL 460.1 *et seq.*; 1909 PA 106, as amended, MCL 460.551 *et seq.*; 1909 PA 300, as amended, MCL 462.2 *et seq.*; 2016 PA 341, as amended by 2023 PA 231, MCL 460.6t; and 2008 PA 295, as amended by 2023 PA 235, MCL 460.1001 *et seq.* Under these statutory provisions, the Commission has the power and jurisdiction to regulate the Company’s retail electric rates and to review the relief requested in this Application.

3. On July 26, 2023, the Commission approved a Settlement Agreement establishing DTE Electric’s currently applicable IRP in Case No. U-21193 (“2022 IRP”). The PCA approved through the 2022 IRP Settlement Agreement included 15,400 MW of renewable resources and 1,830 MW of battery energy storage; conversion of the Belle River Power Plant from coal-fired baseload generation to a natural gas peaking resource; retirement of Monroe Power Plant Units 3 and 4 in 2028 and Units 1 and 2 in 2032; retirement of the River Rouge peaking units 11-1 through 11-4 and St. Clair diesel peaking units 12-1 and 12-2 in 2024; and average energy waste reduction (“EWR”) savings of 2.0% from 2023 through 2027. The 2022 IRP Settlement Agreement also accelerated the Company’s interim carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions reduction targets and required additional modeling, peaker analysis, emerging technology evaluation, and enhanced public outreach in preparation for the Company’s next IRP.

4. Since approval of the 2022 IRP, DTE Electric has implemented or advanced several aspects of that plan. The Company retired the River Rouge 11-1 through 11-4 and St. Clair 12-1 and 12-2 peaking units in 2024; converted Belle River Unit 1 from coal to natural gas in 2025 and expects to complete conversion of the Belle River Power Plant to a natural gas peaking resource by the end of 2026; achieved EWR savings exceeding 2.0% in each of 2023, 2024, and 2025; and

remains on schedule for the planned Monroe Power Plant retirements. By the end of 2027, the Company expects to have brought approximately 3.7 GW of renewable resources and 1.1 GW of energy storage into service. The Company also completed the required peaker evaluation, which supports the proposed retirement of the Superior Peaking Station in 2032, and conducted the additional modeling, resource adequacy analyses, emerging technology evaluations, and public outreach arising from the 2022 IRP Settlement Agreement and other applicable law.

5. Planning conditions have evolved since the 2022 IRP was approved. As further described below, Michigan enacted new energy laws broadening requirements for resource planning, clean energy, and related regulatory matters. In addition, Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. (“MISO”) adopted a seasonal resource adequacy construct and is transitioning to Direct Loss of Load (“DLOL”) resource accreditation; the Company’s load forecast now includes approximately 2.4 GW of contracted large load demand associated with Oracle America Cloud Services LLC (“OACS”) and Google LLC (“Google”); federal tax and environmental policies have continued to evolve; and interconnection, supply chain, permitting, siting, labor, and equipment constraints have increased resource development risk. The 2026 IRP therefore builds on the strategic direction and implementation progress of the 2022 IRP while updating the Company’s resource plan to address these changed conditions.

6. Consistent with applicable law, including MCL 460.6t(12)-(13), MCL 460.6s(1), and MCL 460.1051(2)(a), DTE Electric’s 2026 IRP filing includes its IRP, CEP, and CON requests in a single proceeding, permitting the Company to rely on a common planning record, load forecast, modeling, resource adequacy assessment, resource alternatives, risk analyses, transmission analyses, environmental analyses, and implementation strategy in support of the related approvals.

7. The Company's 2026 IRP filing includes testimony, exhibits, workpapers, an IRP Executive Summary, the CEP template, cross-reference tables addressing the applicable IRP, CEP, and CON filing requirements, and the PCA implementation plan. The supporting materials are incorporated into this Application by reference as if fully set forth herein. The Company has also submitted the Verification and Letter of Transmittal required by the applicable IRP and CEP Filing Requirements, attached hereto as Attachment A and Attachment B, respectively.

8. The PCA presented in this filing is designed to sequence replacement resources ahead of planned resource retirements while balancing reliability, affordability, statutory compliance, resource diversity, and implementation risk. Under current assumptions, the 2026 PCA is projected to lower customer costs by approximately \$3.5 billion on a net-present-value-of-revenue-requirements basis and to lower average residential rates by approximately 4% compared with the resource portfolio approved in the Company's 2022 IRP. The Company's rate analysis also projects lower average rates over the study period for all customer classes compared with the 2022 PCA.

9. The 2026 IRP filing presented in this Application and the relief requested therein constitutes an integrated proposal. The individual components were developed and evaluated together based on common planning assumptions, modeling results, resource adequacy requirements, implementation schedules, statutory compliance objectives, and associated costs and risks. Rejection or material modification of a component may affect the cost, timing, feasibility, reliability, statutory compliance, or continued viability of other components and may require the Company to reevaluate the PCA and related requests. Accordingly, the Company reserves all rights available under applicable law, including the right to update its cost estimates pursuant to

MCL 460.6t(7) and to abandon or amend its PCA or associated relief if the Commission rejects or modifies any of the Company's proposals.

II. STATUTORY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK

10. On November 28, 2023, Public Act 231 of 2023 ("Act 231") was signed into law and became effective on February 13, 2024. Act 231 amended MCL 460.6t to revise the Commission's IRP planning parameters, utility filing requirements, and standards for reviewing and approving IRPs. The amendments require IRPs to analyze the proposed plan's consistency with Michigan's renewable energy requirements, demonstrate compliance with applicable clean energy requirements, and address EWR and energy storage requirements; include projections of long-term greenhouse gas and other pollutant emissions, rates, and affordability impacts; and address applicable environmental justice considerations, including reasonably anticipated impacts associated with proposed new natural gas-fired generation and the retirement or retention of fossil fuel peaking plants located in those identified communities.

11. Also on November 28, 2023, Public Act 235 of 2023 ("Act 235") was signed into law and became effective on February 27, 2024. Act 235 amended the Clean and Renewable Energy and Energy Waste Reduction Act, 2008 PA 295, to establish a Clean Energy Standard ("CES") requiring electric providers to achieve a clean energy portfolio of at least 80% in 2035 through 2039 and 100% in 2040 and each year thereafter. Among other things, Act 235 requires an electric provider whose rates are regulated by the Commission to submit a CEP as part of its IRP and establishes requirements for Commission review and approval of the CEP. MCL 460.1051(2)(a).

12. The required components of an IRP filing are statutorily provided in MCL 460.6t(5). Under MCL 460.6t(8), the Commission shall approve an IRP if it determines that the

plan represents the most reasonable and prudent means of meeting the utility's energy and capacity needs, after considering whether the IRP appropriately balances the statutory factors. MCL 460.6t(11) further authorizes the Commission to specify the costs approved for investments or resources included in an approved IRP and provides for pre-approval of costs for specified investments or resources commenced within three years after the Commission's order.

13. MCL 460.6s authorizes the Commission to issue CONs for the proposed construction of an electric generation facility and to determine, among other things, the need for the proposed power, whether the proposed facility's size, fuel type, and other design characteristics represent the most reasonable and prudent means of meeting that need, the approved cost of the facility, and the financing plan. MCL 460.6s(3)(a)-(b), (d). Exhibit A-1.2 identifies where the Company addresses each applicable statutory criterion and CON filing requirement established in Case No. U-15896 in the supporting testimony, exhibits, and workpapers.

14. MCL 460.6t(13) requires an electric utility, when a capacity resource subject to MCL 460.6t(12) involves the construction of an electric generation facility of 225 megawatts or more, to submit an application seeking a CON under MCL 460.6s. MCL 460.6s(1), in turn, requires the Commission to consolidate its proceedings under MCL 460.6t and MCL 460.6s when a CON application for such a facility is submitted as required under MCL 460.6t(13). Accordingly, the Company submits its CON requests as part of its 2026 IRP for review in a consolidated proceeding.

15. MCL 460.1051 requires an electric provider to include a CEP in its IRP. The Company developed the 2026 IRP and CEP using common assumptions, inputs, load forecasts, modeling analyses, and resource planning results. The CEP identifies how the Company plans to

satisfy the Clean Energy Standard (“CES”) while continuing to serve customers reliably, affordably, and prudently.

16. In its December 18, 2025, order in Case Nos. U-21570 and U-21867, the Commission approved updated IRP Filing Requirements, Michigan Integrated Resource Planning Parameters (“MIRPP”), and CEP Filing Requirements pursuant to Act 231 and Act 235 that are applicable to this filing. The Company has satisfied those requirements through its 2026 IRP testimony, exhibits, workpapers, modeling files, and cross-reference tables submitted with this Application, including Exhibits A-1 and A-1.1 which identify where each applicable IRP, MIRPP, and CEP requirement is addressed.

III. THE 2026 IRP AND PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION

17. The 2026 IRP examines the 2027 through 2046 planning period. The Company used EnCompass for capacity expansion and production cost modeling, including stochastic economic risk analysis, supplemented by long-term fundamental market forecasts, probabilistic resource adequacy analysis using SERVIM, transmission grid studies, financial analysis, environmental justice and health impact analyses, and other supporting studies.

18. In developing the 2026 IRP, the Company evaluated resource portfolios across scenarios, sensitivities, and risk analyses to assess portfolio performance under a range of potential future conditions. The Company developed and evaluated load forecasts reflecting alternative assumptions regarding economic growth, weather, electric vehicle adoption, building electrification, distributed generation, EWR, Customer Choice, and identified and prospective large load growth. The Company also accounted for material developments since approval of the 2022 IRP, including significant load growth; new state renewable energy, clean energy, energy storage, affordability, and environmental justice requirements; changes in the availability and

timing of federal tax credits; MISO's seasonal resource adequacy construct and transition to DLOL resource accreditation; tightening regional capacity conditions; and interconnection, permitting, siting, supply-chain, labor, equipment, and other resource-development constraints. These considerations collectively informed the Company's assessment of the amount, timing, cost, feasibility, and reliability contribution of potential resources.

19. The Company's modeling satisfies the applicable IRP Filing Requirements and MIRPP approved by the Commission in its December 18, 2025, order in Case Nos. U-21570 and U-21867. The Company modeled MIRPP Scenario 1, MIRPP Scenario 2, and its Company-developed Reference scenario, together with the applicable required and Company-developed sensitivities; evaluated a reasonable range of supply-side and demand-side resource alternatives; and performed the required capacity expansion, production cost, risk, resource adequacy, transmission, emissions, rate-impact, affordability, environmental justice, health impact, and other applicable analyses. The supporting testimony, exhibits, workpapers, and modeling files document the relevant assumptions, methods, inputs, and results, and Exhibit A-1 identifies where each applicable modeling and filing requirement is addressed.

20. The Company developed the PCA by synthesizing the capacity expansion and production cost modeling results with the additional analyses and risks evaluated in the IRP process. The Company reviewed the optimized portfolios across the modeled scenarios and sensitivities and conducted a portfolio metric evaluation addressing cost, environmental performance, resource adequacy, modeling, grid reliability modeling, market exposure and risk, flexibility and integration, and resource diversity. Based on that evaluation, the Company developed a preliminary PCA and evaluated it, together with other candidate portfolios, through the supporting analyses described above. Based on those analyses, the Company revised the

preliminary PCA, confirmed the resource adequacy of the revised preliminary PCA, and established the final PCA. The PCA therefore reflects the Company's synthesis of the modeling results, supporting analyses, planning objectives, statutory requirements, stakeholder input, and identified risks.

21. The PCA selected through this robust process is the Company's proposed resource plan and represents the most reasonable and prudent means for meeting customers' forecasted energy and capacity needs over the 20-year planning period. The resource plan builds upon the starting point planning resources and assumptions used in the IRP analysis and transitions the generation portfolio by replacing retiring coal-fired and peaking generation resources with a diverse portfolio of supply-side and demand-side resources that reliably and affordably meet customers' energy and capacity needs. The PCA also maintains the operation of existing resources that continue to support reliability and provide customer value.

22. For purposes of describing the timing and implementation of the PCA, the Company divides the 20-year planning period into three periods: the first five years, 2027 through 2031; the second five years, 2032 through 2036; and the final ten years, 2037 through 2046.

23. During the first five years of the planning period, 2027 through 2031, the PCA focuses on satisfying the 2030 RPS and statewide energy storage requirements while implementing the near-term resources necessary to support the phased retirement of the Monroe Power Plant. The PCA retires Monroe Power Plant Units 3 and 4 in 2028, removing approximately 1.5 GW of coal-fired generation from the Company's portfolio, while preparing for the retirement of Monroe Power Plant Units 1 and 2 in 2032 and the Company's resulting exit from coal. Building on the starting point planning resources and assumptions, during this period, the PCA adds approximately 1.2 GW of incremental renewable energy, consisting of 1,050 MW of solar and 150 MW of wind.

Together with the renewable resources included in the IRP starting point, these additions enable the Company to satisfy the 50% RPS beginning in 2030 and position it to satisfy the 60% RPS beginning in 2035. The IRP starting point also includes substantial existing and planned energy storage resources that are expected to enable the Company to exceed its 1,127 MW proportional share of the statewide energy storage target in 2029. In addition, the PCA includes acquisition of the existing 138 MW Michigan Power Cogeneration facility in 2030 to provide additional firm, dispatchable generation. This period of the PCA also includes development of the proposed approximately 1,400 MW Carbon Capture and Storage (“CCS”)-ready Livingston County Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (“CCGT”) generation facility (“Livingston County project”), with planned commercial operation in 2031, representing the first phase of approximately 2.1 GW of planned new CCS-ready CCGT capacity. In addition, the PCA maintains annual EWR savings of 2.0% at the levels described in Case No. U-21681 through 2028 and 1.5% thereafter; maintains an aggregate demand-response portfolio that remains relatively constant while reflecting changes in individual program contributions, including increased CoolCurrents capacity supported by planned investments from 2028 through 2030; advances residential and commercial virtual power plant (“VPP”) deployment to 23 MW by the end of 2031; and adds 10 MW of conservation voltage reduction and volt/var optimization (“CVR/VVO”) by the end of 2031. Together, these near-term actions establish the resources and programs needed to maintain reliability through the planned retirement of the remaining Monroe Power Plant Units and the Superior Peaking Station in 2032 and position the Company to satisfy the 2035 RPS and CES requirements and the 2040 CES requirement.

24. During the second five years of the planning period, 2032 through 2036, the PCA completes the Company’s transition away from coal and establishes a diverse resource portfolio

consisting of renewable energy, energy storage, demand-side resources, nuclear generation, and natural gas-fired generation. During this period, building on the IRP starting point, the PCA adds approximately 6.4 GW of incremental renewable energy to meet and maintain the 60% RPS requirement beginning in 2035 and support compliance with the CES, including the 80% clean energy requirement beginning in 2035. The PCA retires Monroe Power Plant Units 1 and 2 in 2032, removing the final approximately 1.5 GW of coal-fired generation from the Company's portfolio and completing the Company's exit from coal, and retires the 76 MW Superior Peaking Station in 2032. The PCA also includes the proposed approximately 700 MW CCS-ready Monroe County CCGT generation facility ("Monroe County project"), with planned commercial operation in 2032, completing the addition of approximately 2.1 GW of new CCS-ready CCGT capacity. The PCA reflects planned future implementation of CCS at both CCGT facilities beginning in 2035 to support compliance with the CES requirement. The Company does not request approval in this proceeding of the future CCS systems, implementation scope or plans, or associated costs, which will be subject to future Commission review and approval. In addition, the PCA expands the Fermi 2 Nuclear Power Plant through the proposed 177 MW extended power uprate in 2036, increases VPP capacity by approximately 15 MW, and adds approximately 6 MW of CVR/VVO by the end of 2036. Collectively, these actions during 2032 through 2036 complete the Company's transition away from coal-fired generation, replace retiring capacity with a diverse portfolio of clean and dispatchable energy resources, and position the Company to maintain reliability and resource adequacy while meeting customers' energy and capacity needs and complying with Michigan's RPS, CES, and energy storage requirements through the mid-2030s.

25. During the final ten years of the planning period, 2037 through 2046, the PCA reflects the continued evolution of the Company's generation portfolio while maintaining

reliability and compliance with Michigan’s clean energy requirements. During this period, the PCA maintains compliance with the 60% RPS and the 80% CES and meets the 100% clean-energy requirement beginning in 2040; adds approximately 1.7 GW of the Company’s first long-duration energy storage resources capable of supporting the system for periods longer than ten hours; retires the approximately 1 GW Belle River Power Plant peaking resource in 2039; increases VPP capacity by approximately 36 MW; and integrates hydrogen-fueled combustion turbines as needed to support reliability requirements. The PCA also preserves flexibility to evaluate and incorporate emerging low- and zero-carbon technologies as they become commercially available, executable, and cost-effective. Given the long-term nature of the resource decisions in this period, the Company expects to periodically reassess its resource needs and refine the timing and composition of the later-year portfolio through future IRP filings as technologies, customer demand, state and federal requirements, and market conditions evolve.

26. The timing and sequence of resource retirements and additions is critical to maintaining reliability and resource adequacy. Because generation, energy storage, transmission interconnections, and other major infrastructure investments can require years to develop and place in service, replacement resources must be identified, procured, and available prior to retiring existing resources. The PCA aligns new resource additions with the planned retirements of the Monroe Power Plant Units 1 and 2 and the Superior Peaking Station to maintain resource adequacy, comply with MISO reliability requirements, preserve sufficient energy and capacity resources to meet customer demand, and support an orderly transition to a cleaner and more diverse generation portfolio while continuing to provide safe, reliable, and affordable electric service.

27. The PCA provides substantial reliability, customer, environmental, economic, and technology benefits while supporting compliance with Michigan’s energy requirements. It

maintains resource adequacy through a diverse mix of renewable energy, energy storage, natural gas and nuclear generation, VPPs, and other demand-side resources, with firm, dispatchable resources entering service before significant retirements. The PCA also completes the Company's transition away from coal, reduces CO₂ emissions by approximately 90% from 2005 levels, substantially reduces other fleet air emissions, and provides environmental and public health benefits associated with retiring facilities located near environmental justice communities. In addition, the PCA supports investment, employment, workforce transition, and local tax benefits in Michigan; advances renewable energy, storage, VPPs, the Fermi 2 extended power uprate, and CCS; and preserves flexibility to incorporate long-duration storage, hydrogen-fueled generation, and other emerging low- and zero-carbon technologies as they become commercially available, executable, and cost-effective.

IV. CLEAN ENERGY PLAN

28. The Company requests that the Commission approve the CEP as part of the 2026 IRP filing pursuant to MCL 460.1051 and find that the CEP satisfies the applicable filing requirements. The CEP is based on the same planning assumptions, inputs, load forecasts, modeling analyses, and resource planning results used to develop the PCA and illustrates how the resources and implementation strategy reflected in the 2026 IRP enable the Company to achieve the applicable CES requirements.

29. The Company's CEP presents a reliable, affordable, and diversified pathway for achieving Michigan's CES. The CEP reflects the coordinated expansion of renewable energy, energy storage, and demand-side resources; the continued use and expansion of nuclear generation; the retirement of the Company's remaining coal-fired generation; and the deployment of emerging clean-energy technologies. This integrated portfolio maintains resource adequacy and reliability;

complies with the 80% CES beginning in 2035 and the 100% CES beginning in 2040; reduces annual CO₂ emissions by approximately 90% from 2005 levels over the planning period; substantially reduces other fleet air emissions as the Company transitions away from coal; and preserves flexibility to incorporate additional low- and zero-carbon technologies as they become commercially available, executable, and cost-effective.

30. MCL 460.1003(i) defines a “clean energy system” to include an individual generation facility, a generation system, or a set of generation systems that meets one of several statutory pathways. Consistent with the statute’s express recognition of a set of generation systems and its reference to the Commission approval of a plan achieving functional equivalence, the Company’s CEP applies a portfolio-wide approach. The CEP includes an integrated portfolio of generation resources and other actions reflected in the PCA that meets the applicable CES requirements and produces substantial greenhouse gas reductions through the combined effects of resource retirements, resource additions, demand-side resources, and other available applications. Accordingly, the functional equivalence analysis contemplated in MCL 460.1003(i)(iii) is based on the overall CEP and its portfolio-wide greenhouse gas reductions rather than a standalone analysis of any individual facility.

31. The PCA also reflects planned future implementation of CCS at the proposed Livingston County project and Monroe County project beginning in 2035 to support compliance with the CES, although approval of future CCS systems, CCS costs, or a detailed CCS execution plan are not requested in this proceeding.

32. The Company's CEP is supported by the testimony, exhibits, workpapers, and CEP materials submitted with the 2026 IRP filing, including Exhibit A-2.5 and the supporting testimony identified in Exhibit A-1.1. Those materials collectively demonstrate how the integrated portfolio

reflected in the PCA satisfies the applicable CES requirements and otherwise satisfies the applicable CEP filing requirements.

V. CERTIFICATES OF NECESSITY

33. MCL 460.6s(3) authorizes the Commission to issue separate CONs determining that (a) the power to be supplied by a proposed electric generation facility is needed; (b) the proposed facility's size, fuel type, and other design characteristics represent the most reasonable and prudent means of meeting that need; and (d) the estimated capital costs of the facility and the financing plan will be recoverable in rates, subject to MCL 460.6s(4)(c). MCL 460.6s(3)(a), (b), (d).

34. The Company requests that the Commission issue the three CONs authorized by MCL 460.6s(3)(a), (b), and (d) for each of two proposed CCGT generating facilities designed to support the planned future implementation of CCS: (i) the approximately 1,400 MW Livingston County project, with planned commercial operation in 2031; and (ii) the approximately 700 MW Monroe County project, with planned commercial operation in 2032. As described in the supporting testimony, the projects are intended to provide the firm, dispatchable capacity and energy needed to maintain reliability and resource adequacy while providing a pathway for future compliance with Michigan's CES through the planned implementation of CCS beginning in 2035.

35. The proposed projects address the need for firm, dispatchable capacity and energy as existing generating resources retire and customer demand evolves. The projects also support resource adequacy, operational flexibility, the integration of increasing levels of intermittent renewable resources, and compliance with applicable planning reserve and reliability requirements.

36. The Company evaluated the proposed projects through its IRP modeling and portfolio selection process, its 2025 All-Source Request for Proposals (“RFP”) competitive solicitation that was conducted in accordance with the Commission’s Competitive Procurement Guidelines, project-specific technical and economic analyses, transmission studies, environmental analyses, and consideration of alternative resource portfolios. The supporting record demonstrates that each proposed project is included in the PCA and supports the requested determinations that the power to be supplied by the project is needed; the project’s size, fuel type, and other design characteristics represent the most reasonable and prudent means of meeting that need; and the project’s estimated capital costs and financing plan will be recoverable in rates.

37. The 2026 IRP filing addresses the proposed projects’ locations, technology selection, engineering and construction approaches, fuel supply, permitting, transmission interconnection, environmental impacts, workforce and labor considerations, development schedules, estimated capital and operating costs, operations and maintenance plans, implementation risks, and financing plans. Exhibit A-1.2 identifies where each applicable CON Filing Requirement is addressed in the supporting testimony, exhibits, and workpapers.

38. The Company requests that the Commission approve the estimated capital costs and financing plans for the Livingston County project and Monroe County project. The Company further requests that the Commission issue the CONs authorized by MCL 460.6s(3)(d), determining that the approved capital costs and financing plans will be recoverable in the Company’s rates, subject to MCL 460.6s(4)(c). The requested approvals are supported by the capital cost estimates, financing plans, testimony, exhibits, and workpapers submitted with this Application.

39. Pursuant to MCL 460.6s, including MCL 460.6s(12), the Company requests approval of financing plans for the Livingston County project and Monroe County project that authorize the Company to include the projected construction work in progress (“CWIP”) balances for the projects in rate base through future general rate cases and to recover the associated financing costs during construction. To the extent project CWIP is reflected in approved rate base, the corresponding balances would be included without an allowance for funds used during construction (“AFUDC”) offset, and AFUDC would not accrue on those balances. Construction costs not reflected in approved rate base would continue to accrue AFUDC. This treatment will align recovery of financing costs with the construction period, avoid recovery of both a current return and capitalized AFUDC on the same construction costs, reduce the financing costs ultimately capitalized as part of the projects, and thereby reduce future revenue requirements. The Commission previously approved the same financing approach in its April 27, 2018 order in Case No. U-18419.

40. The Company requests that the Commission authorize the accounting and ratemaking treatment necessary to implement the approved financing plans in future general rate cases. The amount of project CWIP included in rate base and the associated revenue requirement recovery will be determined based on the projected test period and supporting record presented in each applicable general rate case.

VI. PREAPPROVALS UNDER MCL 460.6t(11)

41. MCL 460.6t(11) authorizes the Commission, when approving an IRP, to specify the costs approved for future recovery for investments and resources included in the approved plan, including the purchase of an existing electric generation facility, the purchase of power under a power purchase agreement, and other investments or resources used to meet the Company’s

energy and capacity needs. Costs approved for investments or resources commenced within three years after the Commission's order approving the IRP are considered reasonable and prudent for cost-recovery purposes. Pursuant to MCL 460.6t(11), the Company requests that the Commission specify and approve the costs identified below for three resources included in the PCA and planned to commence during 2028 through 2030.

42. The Company requests approval under MCL 460.6t(11) of \$21.3 million in projected capital costs for planned investments in the existing CoolCurrents demand-response resource during 2028 through 2030. These investments support the CoolCurrents capacity reflected in the PCA and constitute investments or resources used to meet the Company's energy and capacity needs.

43. The Company requests approval under MCL 460.6t(11) of \$130 million in projected capital costs for the proposed acquisition of the existing 138 MW Michigan Power Cogeneration facility from DTE Sustainable Generation under the applicable purchase-and-sale agreement ("PSA"). The Michigan Power Cogeneration facility is included in the PCA as an existing electric generation facility to be acquired in 2030 and will provide firm, dispatchable capacity and energy. The Michigan Power Cogeneration facility is also included among the resources comprising the integrated portfolio evaluated in the Company's CEP.

44. The Company requests approval under MCL 460.6t(11) of the costs of the proposed [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [END CONFIDENTIAL] ("Solar PPA") as supported by the Company's testimony and exhibits. The Solar PPA is included in the PCA, is planned to commence within three years after Commission approval of the IRP and constitutes the purchase of power under a PPA for purposes of MCL 460.6t(11).

45. The Company also requests authorization of the financial incentive for the Solar PPA provided by MCL 460.6t(15). Consistent with that provision, the financial incentive will be calculated annually based on the contract payments made during the applicable year and the Company's pretax weighted average cost of permanent capital established in the Commission's final order in the Company's most recent general rate case, as updated by each succeeding general rate case during the term of the PPA. The Company requests that the Commission approve this financial incentive mechanism in conjunction with its approval of the Solar PPA.

46. Each of the foregoing investments and resources is included in the PCA and is planned to commence within three years after Commission approval of the IRP. The Company therefore requests that the Commission specify and approve the costs identified above and determine that the approved costs associated with the investments and resources commenced within that three-year period are reasonable and prudent for cost recovery purposes pursuant to MCL 460.6t(11).

VII. LARGE LOAD ANALYSES AND REQUIREMENTS ARISING FROM THE DECEMBER 18, 2025, ORDER IN CASE NO. U-21990

47. In its December 18, 2025, order in Case No. U-21990, the Commission approved special contracts between DTE Electric and Green Chile Ventures LLC, now known as Oracle America Cloud Services LLC ("OACS"), and established requirements applicable to the Company's next IRP, initial CEP, and amended Renewable Energy Plan ("Amended REP"). As relevant to this proceeding, the Commission directed the Company to compare the resource requirements necessary to serve its load with and without the OACS load. The required analysis identifies the resources included in the PCA, tests the PCA's performance using the applicable base model, and compares the corresponding plan production costs, rate impacts by customer class, and affordability impacts. To isolate the effects of the OACS load, the Company conducted a

sensitivity comparing the “2026 PCA (No OACS/Google)” modeled case, which excludes both the OACS and Google loads, with the “2026 PCA (No Google)” modeled case, which includes the OACS load but excludes the Google load. Consistent with the Commission’s directive, the “2026 PCA (No OACS/Google)” modeled case also excludes the incremental renewable generation needed for RPS compliance with the OACS load and identified in the Company’s Amended REP, as well as the storage expected to be developed pursuant to the OACS energy storage agreement.

48. The Company has addressed the applicable directives from the December 18, 2025, order in Case No. U-21990 through its testimony, exhibits, and workpapers in its 2026 IRP filing. These materials compare the applicable resource requirements, production costs, rate impacts, and affordability impacts with and without the OACS load, and Exhibit A-1.3 identifies where each applicable requirement is addressed.

49. The Company also evaluated the resource planning and customer rate impacts associated with the Google load that is the subject of pending Case No. U-22058. Based on the information and contractual arrangements reflected in the load forecast when it was finalized, the IRP includes the Google load and associated renewable, energy storage, demand-response, and capacity assumptions in the PCA starting point. To isolate the effects of the Google load, the Company conducted a sensitivity comparing the “2026 PCA (No Google)” modeled case, which includes OACS but excludes the Google load, with the “2026 PCA” modeled case, which includes both OACS and Google. The Company evaluated the resulting changes using an approach generally consistent with the customer-specific analysis required for OACS by the December 18, 2025, order in Case No. U-21990 and the applicable IRP Filing Requirements.

50. The December 18, 2025, order in Case No. U-21990 further directed the Company to file an amended REP with its next IRP and initial CEP. The Company has complied with that directive by filing the Amended REP concurrently with the 2026 IRP filing in Case No. U-22057.

VIII. COMPETITIVE PROCUREMENT AND APPROVAL PROCESSES

51. The renewable resource additions and energy storage resources reflected in the PCA form part of the Company's proposed resource plan for meeting customers' forecasted energy and capacity needs, maintaining reliability and resource adequacy, and satisfying applicable statutory requirements. The Company will competitively procure specific renewable and energy storage projects needed to implement the approved PCA through RFP processes consistent with the Commission's Competitive Procurement Guidelines and other applicable Commission requirements.

52. The Company requests authorization to submit subsequent *ex parte* applications seeking Commission approval of eligible renewable and energy storage projects selected through competitive procurements consistent with the Commission's approved framework. As applicable to each selected project, the subsequent application would request approval of the project, associated contracts, and project costs and would demonstrate that the proposed project is consistent with the resource additions approved in this IRP and satisfies the applicable statutory and Commission-approved requirements for project-specific approval.

53. Under the requested implementation framework, approval of the 2026 IRP would establish the need, amount, targeted timing, and planning basis for the renewable and energy storage resource additions reflected in the PCA. The Company would then competitively procure specific projects to implement the approved resource plan and submit the selected projects, associated contracts, and project costs for Commission review and approval. This framework

avoids duplicating the resource need and portfolio determinations made in the IRP while preserving the Commission's review of whether each proposed project is consistent with the approved IRP, resulted from the applicable competitive procurement process, and satisfies the requirements governing approval of the project, contract, and costs.

IX. CAPACITY NEED AVOIDED COSTS

54. DTE Electric does not have a material long-term capacity need in the next five years of its PCA. DTE Electric does not address PURPA avoided cost rates in this IRP. A five-year outlook remains the most appropriate timeframe for determining a capacity need under PURPA.

X. ACCOUNTING AUTHORIZATIONS

55. The Company also requests any other accounting or regulatory authorizations necessary to implement the 2026 IRP and relief described in this Application and the supporting testimony and exhibits.

XI. TESTIMONY, EXHIBITS, AND CONFIDENTIAL MATERIALS

56. The Company is filing direct testimony and exhibits from its sponsoring witnesses in support of the 2026 IRP, CEP, CON requests, preapprovals, and other relief requested in this proceeding. The testimony and exhibits are incorporated in this Application by reference, and the relief described in those materials should be considered as if specifically requested herein.

XII. OTHER ISSUES

57. Due to the confidential nature of much of the information contained in and included with the Company's 2026 IRP filing, the Company is proposing entry of a protective order. The Company's proposed protective order is included as Attachment C to this Application. The Company requests that the entry of its proposed protective order be considered during the prehearing conference for this matter.

XIII. REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, DTE Electric Company respectfully requests that the Michigan Public Service Commission:

- A. Accept this Application and the supporting testimony and exhibits for filing;
- B. Give such Notice to interested parties as may be required by statute or the Commission's rules;
- C. Establish a date, time, and place for a prehearing conference;
- D. Find that the Company's 2026 IRP satisfies MCL 460.6t, the Commission's applicable IRP Filing Requirements and Michigan Integrated Resource Planning Parameters, and all other applicable law;
- E. Approve the 2026 IRP and determine that the PCA represents the most reasonable and prudent means of meeting the Company's energy and capacity needs;
- F. Approve the Company's CEP and find that the CEP and the resources and implementation strategy reflected in the PCA satisfy the applicable Clean Energy Standard requirements set forth in MCL 460.1051, the Commission's applicable CEP Filing Requirements, and other applicable law;
- G. Find that the approved and planned energy storage resources reflected in the Company's resource plan support compliance with, and are forecasted to exceed, the Company's proportional share of the statewide energy-storage target established under MCL 460.1101, subject to any specific approvals required in subsequent proceedings;
- H. Find that the Company has complied with the Commission's applicable Competitive Procurement Guidelines for the procurement processes addressed in this proceeding;

- I. Find that the Company's CON applications satisfy MCL 460.6s, the Commission's applicable CON Filing Requirements, and all other applicable law;
- J. Issue the three requested Certificates of Necessity pursuant to MCL 460.6s for the approximately 1,400 MW Livingston County project: (1) a certificate under MCL 460.6s(3)(a) determining that the power to be supplied is needed; (2) a certificate under MCL 460.6s(3)(b) determining that the project's size, fuel type, and other design characteristics represent the most reasonable and prudent means of meeting that need; and (3) a certificate under MCL 460.6s(3)(d) determining that the estimated capital costs and financing plan will be recoverable in rates, subject to MCL 460.6s(4)(c);
- K. Issue the three requested Certificates of Necessity pursuant to MCL 460.6s for the approximately 700 MW Monroe County project: (1) a certificate under MCL 460.6s(3)(a) determining that the power to be supplied is needed; (2) a certificate under MCL 460.6s(3)(b) determining that the project's size, fuel type, and other design characteristics represent the most reasonable and prudent means of meeting that need; and (3) a certificate under MCL 460.6s(3)(d) determining that the estimated capital costs and financing plan will be recoverable in rates, subject to MCL 460.6s(4)(c);
- L. Approve under MCL 460.6s the financing plans for the Livingston County project and Monroe County project, including authorization to include the projected CWIP balances for the projects in rate base through future general rate cases without a corresponding AFUDC offset to the extent the associated financing costs are recovered in approved base rates; authorize AFUDC to accrue on project construction costs not reflected in approved rate base; and grant the accounting and ratemaking treatment necessary to implement the approved financing plans;

- M. Pursuant to MCL 460.6t(11), specify and approve for future recovery the following costs for investments and resources included in the PCA and planned to commence within three years after the Commission's order approving the IRP:
- a. \$21.3 million in projected capital costs for planned investments in the CoolCurrents demand-response resource during 2028 through 2030;
 - b. \$130 million in projected capital costs for acquisition of the existing 138 MW Michigan Power Cogeneration facility; and
 - c. The [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [REDACTED] [END CONFIDENTIAL] under the proposed 20-year solar PPA with [BEGIN CONFIDENTIAL] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [END CONFIDENTIAL].
- N. Determine, consistent with MCL 460.6t(11), that the costs approved for the investments and resources identified in paragraph L that are commenced within three years after the Commission's order approving the IRP are reasonable and prudent for cost recovery purposes;
- O. Authorize the financial incentive for the proposed 20-year Solar PPA under MCL 460.6t(15), calculated annually based on the applicable contract payments and the Company's pretax weighted average cost of permanent capital established in the Commission's final order in the Company's most recent general rate case, as updated by succeeding general rate cases during the term of the Solar PPA;
- P. Authorize the Company to submit subsequent *ex parte* applications seeking approval of eligible renewable and energy storage projects, associated contracts, and project costs selected through competitive procurements consistent with the Commission's Competitive Procurement Guidelines;

- Q. Find, for purposes of PURPA, that the Company does not have a material long-term need for generation capacity during the five-year planning period of 2027 through 2031;
- R. Accept the Company's Verification and Letter of Transmittal and find that the Company has satisfied the applicable filing requirements;
- S. Grant any other relief described in this Application as requested by the Company; and
- T. Grant the Company such further additional relief as the Commission may deem suitable and appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY

September 24, 2026

By:



Angela P. Wojtowicz
Vice President, Business Planning & Development
DTE Electric Company

DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY
Legal Department

John A.

Janiszewski

September 24, 2026

By:

John A. Janiszewski (P74400)
Andrea Hayden (P71976)
Jon P. Christinidis (P47352)
Carlton D. Watson (P77857)
Breanne K. Reitzel (P81107)
Morgan L. Esters (P83072)
One Energy Plaza, 1635 WCB
Detroit, MI 48226
Ph: (313) 235-7309

Digitally signed by John A.
Janiszewski
Date: 2026.09.24 17:08:20 -04'00'

ATTACHMENT A

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter of the Application of)
DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY for approval)
of its Integrated Resource Plan pursuant)
to MCL 460.6t, Clean Energy Plan pursuant)
to MCL 460.1051, Certificates of Necessity)
pursuant to MCL 460.6s, related accounting)
authorizations, and for other relief.)

Case No. U-22168

VERIFICATION

Angela P. Wojtowicz, being duly sworn, deposes and states that she is the Vice President of Business Planning & Development for DTE Electric Company; that she has executed the forgoing Application for and on behalf of DTE Electric Company; that she has read the Application and is familiar with its contents; that the facts contained in the Application are true, to the best of her knowledge, information, and belief; and that she is authorized to execute the Application on behalf of DTE Electric Company.

DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: September 24, 2026

By:



Angela P. Wojtowicz
Vice President, Business Planning & Development
DTE Electric Company

ATTACHMENT B

STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter of the Application of)
DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY for approval)
of its Integrated Resource Plan pursuant)
to MCL 460.6t, Clean Energy Plan pursuant)
to MCL 460.1051, Certificates of Necessity)
pursuant to MCL 460.6s, related accounting)
authorizations, and for other relief.)

Case No. U-22168

TRANSMITTAL LETTER

I, Angela P. Wojtowicz, express DTE Electric Company's commitment to the Company's Integrated Resource Plan Proposed Course of Action, which the Company has determined represents the most reasonable and prudent resource plan and resource-acquisition strategy for meeting its customers' energy and capacity needs, and its commitment to the Clean Energy Plan and the two projects for which the Company seeks Certificates of Necessity, as described in this Application. The Company reserves the right to make changes to its resource acquisition strategy and Clean Energy Plan as appropriate due to changing circumstances and as permitted by law.

DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY

Dated: September 24, 2026

By:



Angela P. Wojtowicz
Vice President, Business Planning & Development
DTE Electric Company

ATTACHMENT C

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter of the Application of)
DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY for approval)
of its Integrated Resource Plan pursuant)
to MCL 460.6t, Clean Energy Plan pursuant)
to MCL 460.1051, Certificates of Necessity)
pursuant to MCL 460.6s, related accounting)
authorizations, and for other relief.)

Case No. U-22168

PROTECTIVE ORDER

This Protective Order governs the use and disposition of Protected Material that any Party discloses to another Party during the course of this proceeding. This Protective Order protects non-public, confidential information and materials so designated by the Disclosing Party as Protected Material, as defined herein. Accordingly, it is ordered:

I. “Protected Material” and Other Definitions

A. “Protected Material” consists of trade secrets or confidential, proprietary, or commercially sensitive information provided in Disclosing Party’s application, exhibits, discovery or audit responses, any witness’ related exhibits and testimony, motions, objections, briefing, responses to an order issued by the presiding hearing officer or the Michigan Public Service Commission (“MPSC” or the “Commission), and any arguments of counsel describing or relying upon the Protected Material. Subject to challenge under Paragraph IV.A, Protected Material shall also consist of non-public confidential information and materials including, but not limited to, the following information disclosed during the course of this case if it is marked as required by this Protective Order:

1. To the extent permitted, information obtained under license from a third-party licensor, to which the Disclosing Party or witnesses engaged by the Disclosing Party is a licensee, that is subject to any confidentiality or non-transferability clause. This information includes reports; analyses; models

(including related inputs and outputs); trade secrets; and confidential, proprietary, or commercially sensitive information that the Disclosing Party or one of its witnesses receives as a licensee and is authorized by the third-party licensor to disclose consistent with the terms and conditions of this Protective Order.

2. Information that is protected as confidential in another jurisdiction that the Applicant provides utility service, and the source of the other jurisdiction's protective designation is made known to the Receiving Party.

B. The information subject to this Protective Order does not include:

1. Information that is or has become available to the public through no fault of the Receiving Party or Reviewing Representative and no breach of this Protective Order, or information that is otherwise lawfully known by the Receiving Party without any obligation to hold it in confidence;
2. Information received from a third party free to disclose the information without restriction;
3. Information that is approved for release by written authorization of the Disclosing Party, but only to the extent of the authorization;
4. Information that is required by law or regulation to be disclosed, but only to the extent of the required disclosure; or Information that is disclosed in response to a valid, non-appealable order of a court of competent jurisdiction or governmental body, but only to the extent the order requires.

C. "Applicant" refers to the filing party in this proceeding.

D. "Disclosing Party" means a Party producing Protected Material in this proceeding.

E. "Party" refers to the Applicant, MPSC Staff ("Staff"), Michigan Attorney General, or any other person, company, organization, or association that is granted intervention in this case under the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure, Mich Admin Code, R 792.10401 et al.

F. "Receiving Party" means any Party to this proceeding who requests or receives access to Protected Material. A Receiving Party is responsible for assuring that persons,

representatives, or agents under its control or supervision comply with this Protective Order.

G. “Reviewing Representative” means a representative of the Receiving Party who is:

1. An attorney who has entered an appearance in this proceeding for a Receiving Party;
2. An attorney, paralegal, or other employee associated, for the purpose of this case, with an attorney described in Paragraph I.G.1;
3. An expert or employee of an expert retained by a Receiving Party to advise, prepare for, or testify in this proceeding; or an employee or other representative of a Receiving Party with significant responsibility in this case.

H. If a Reviewing Representative’s scope of employment includes any of the activities listed under this Paragraph I.H, such Reviewing Representative may not use information contained in any Privileged Material and/or CEII obtained in this proceeding for a commercial purpose (e.g., to give a Participant or competitor of any Participant a commercial advantage):

1. Energy marketing and/or energy development;
2. Direct supervision of any employee or employees whose duties include energy marketing and/or energy development; or
3. The provision of consulting services to any person whose duties include energy marketing and/or energy development.

A Reviewing Representative who meets any of the three criteria above is “Competitive Duty Personnel.”

I. “Nondisclosure Certificate” refers to Attachment 1 to this Protective Order. Except as otherwise provided herein, the Reviewing Party and Reviewing Representatives will be required to sign Nondisclosure Certificates. However, Nondisclosure Certificates will not be required from administrative law judges, members of the Commission and its support staff, Staff (excluding consultants, third-party experts, agents or other similar persons), and Staff counsel, for whom by virtue of their employment are presumed to be bound by the terms of this Protective

Order.

II. Access to and Use of Protected Material

A. This Protective Order governs the use of all provided Protected Material. This Protective Order protects: (i) the Protected Material; (ii) any copy or reproduction of the Protected Material made by any person; and (iii) any memorandum, handwritten notes, or any other form of information that copies, contains, or discloses Protected Material. All Protected Material in the possession of a Receiving Party and a Reviewing Representative shall be maintained in a secure place. Access to Protected Material shall be limited to the Receiving Party and the Reviewing Representative, after each has executed the Nondisclosure Agreement and provided a copy of the Nondisclosure Agreement to the Disclosing Party, subject to the limited exception in Paragraph I.G and I.H.

B. Protected Material must be used and disclosed by the Receiving Party solely in accordance with the terms and conditions of this Protective Order. A Receiving Party and Reviewing Representative may analyze the Protected Material; make or respond to discovery; present evidence; prepare testimony, argument, briefs, or other filings; prepare for cross-examination; consider strategy; and evaluate settlement. A Reviewing Representative shall not release or disclose the content of Protected Material to any other person or use the information for any other purpose.

C. The Disclosing Party may request the Receiving Party withhold certain information from a Reviewing Representative and retains the right to object to any designated Reviewing Representative if the Disclosing Party has reason to believe that there is an unacceptable risk of misuse of confidential information. If a Disclosing Party objects to a Reviewing Representative, then the Disclosing Party shall submit the dispute to the presiding hearing officer simultaneously upon objection. If the Disclosing Party notifies a Receiving Party

of an objection to a Reviewing Representative, then the Protected Material shall not be provided to that Reviewing Representative until the objection is resolved by agreement or by the presiding hearing officer.

D. If a Receiving Party seeks access to Critical Energy Infrastructure Information (“CEII”) as defined in 16 U.S.C § 824o-1(a)(3) and FERC rules, specifically 18 CFR § 388.113(c), the Receiving Party and Reviewing Representative shall also sign the CEII Nondisclosure Certificate (Attachment 2 to this Protective Order) and provide a copy of the executed CEII Nondisclosure Certificates to the Disclosing Party.

E. The obligations under this Protective Order do not expire by entry of a final order in this case and are enforceable by the MPSC or a court of competent jurisdiction. To the extent Protected Material is not returned to a Disclosing Party, it remains subject to this Protective Order. Members of the Commission, Commission staff assigned to assist the Commission with its deliberations, and the presiding hearing officer shall have access to all Protected Material that is submitted to the Commission under seal.

F. A Party retains the right to seek further restrictions on the dissemination of Protected Material to persons who have or may subsequently seek to intervene in this MPSC proceeding.

G. Nothing in this Protective Order precludes a Party from asserting a timely evidentiary objection to the proposed admission of Protected Material into the evidentiary record for this case.

III. Procedures

A. The Disclosing Party shall identify what portion(s) of any document designated confidential it considers confidential. This can be done through highlights or other clear identifier. The Disclosing Party must mark any information that it considers confidential as

“CONFIDENTIAL: SUBJECT TO THE PROTECTIVE ORDER ISSUED IN CASE NO. U-22168.” Software executable files containing Protected Material may not be capable of being marked with the foregoing required protective language. The inability to mark software executable files containing Protected Material with such protective language shall not diminish the requirements of this Protective Order. It shall be sufficient if the medium used to deliver software executable files containing Protected Material is marked with the required protective language. However, any output from the software executable files containing Protected Material that is generated only as a reproducible document, whether electronic or non-electronic, that is capable of being marked with the required protective language, shall be marked by the party who generated the output with such protective language and subject to the requirements of this Protective Order. If the Receiving Party or a Reviewing Representative makes copies of any Protected Material, they shall conspicuously mark the copies as Protected Material. Notes of Protected Material shall also be conspicuously marked as Protected Material by the person making the notes.

B. If a Receiving Party wants to quote, refer to, or otherwise use Protected Material in pleadings, pre-filed testimony, exhibits, cross-examination, briefs, oral argument, comments, or in some other form in this proceeding (including administrative or judicial appeals), the Receiving Party shall do so consistent with procedures that will maintain the confidentiality of the Protected Material. For purposes of this Protective Order, the following procedures apply:

1. Written submissions using Protected Material shall be filed in a sealed record to be maintained by the MPSC’s Docket Section, or by a court of competent jurisdiction, in envelopes clearly marked on the outside, “CONFIDENTIAL – SUBJECT TO THE PROTECTIVE ORDER ISSUED IN CASE NO. U-22168.” Simultaneously, identical documents and materials, with the Protected Material redacted, shall be filed and disclosed the same way that evidence or briefs are usually filed;
2. Oral testimony, examination of witnesses, or argument about Protected Material shall be conducted on a separate record to be maintained by the

MPSC's Docket Section or by a court of competent jurisdiction. These separate record proceedings shall be closed to all persons except those furnishing the Protected Material and persons otherwise subject to this Protective Order. The Receiving Party presenting the Protected Material during the course of the proceeding shall give the presiding officer or court sufficient notice to allow the presiding officer or court an opportunity to take measures to protect the confidentiality of the Protected Material; and

3. Copies of the documents filed with the MPSC which contain Protected Material, including the portions of the exhibits, transcripts, or briefs that refer to Protected Material, shall be marked or identified as, "CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO PROTECTIVE ORDER IN CASE NO. U-22168" and shall be maintained in a separate portion of the record under seal, segregated in the files of the Commission, and withheld from inspection by any person not bound by the terms of this Order.

C. The Protected Material subject to this Order shall be shielded from disclosure to the extent permitted by law. If any person files a request under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") with the MPSC or the Michigan Attorney General seeking access to documents subject to this Protective Order, the MPSC's Executive Secretary, Staff, or the Attorney General shall promptly notify the Disclosing Party, and the Disclosing Party may take whatever legal actions it deems appropriate to protect the Protected Material from disclosure. In light of Section 5 of the Freedom of Information Act, MCL 15.235, the notice must be given at least five (5) business days before the MPSC, Staff, and/or the Michigan Attorney General grant the request in full or in part.

IV. Termination of Protected Status

A. A Receiving Party reserves the right to challenge by motion whether a document or information is Protected Material and whether this information can be withheld under this Protective Order. The Receiving Party challenging the protected status of the document must explicitly state its reason for challenging the confidential designation. In response to a motion, the Commission or the presiding hearing officer in this case may revoke a document's protected status after notice and hearing. If the presiding hearing officer revokes a document's protected

status, then the document loses its protected status after 14 days unless a Party files an application for leave to appeal the ruling and a request for a stay to the Commission pursuant to R 792.10433. If the application for leave is timely, the document's protected status will continue during the Commission appeal process. Any Party opposing the application for leave to appeal and the stay shall file an answer with the Commission no more than 14 days after the filing and service of the appeal. Continued protected status post order, will be determined by the Commission in its order addressing the application for leave and the request for stay. Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit the Disclosing Party from seeking a stay on appeal of the Commission's decision regarding the revocation of any document's protected status.

B. The Disclosing Party bears the burden of proving that the document should continue to be protected from disclosure.

V. Retention of Documents

Protected Material remains the property of the Disclosing Party and, except as required by applicable law and State retention schedules, only remains available to the Receiving Party until the time expires for petitions for rehearing of a final MPSC order, until the MPSC has ruled on all petitions for rehearing in this case (if any), or until judicial review is completed and the time to take further appeal has expired. If the Disclosing Party seeks to have the Receiving Party return all Protected Material in the Receiving Party's possession or in the possession of its Reviewing Representatives, or certify in writing that all Protected Material has been destroyed, it is the responsibility of the Disclosing Party to contact the Receiving Party and make its request no earlier than the expiration of time for filing petitions for rehearing of a final MPSC order, until the MPSC has ruled on all petitions for rehearing in this case (if any), or until judicial review is completed and the time to take further appeal has expired. Further, for a Receiving Party that is associated with the State, the request must be consistent with the expiration of the State retention

requirement.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, counsel for the Receiving Party may maintain a single confidential file of Protected Material subject to all other provisions in this Order. Should counsel seek to refer to the Protected Material in another Commission proceeding, the Disclosing Party must be the Applicant in said proceeding and counsel must ensure there is a protective order in said proceeding which protects the Protected Material from public disclosure.

VI. Limitations and Disclosures

This Protective Order does not apply to a particular document, or portion of a document, described in Paragraph II.A if a Receiving Party can demonstrate that it has been previously disclosed by the Disclosing Party on a non-confidential basis or meets the criteria set forth in Paragraphs I.B.1 through I.B.4. A Receiving Party intending to disclose information taken directly from materials identified as Protected Material must-before actually disclosing the information-do one of the following: (i) contact the Disclosing Party's counsel of record and obtain written permission to disclose the information, or (ii) challenge the confidential nature of the Protected Material and obtain a ruling under Paragraph IV that the information is not confidential and may be disclosed in or on the public record.

VII. Remedies

If a Receiving Party violates this Protective Order by improperly disclosing or using Protected Material, the Receiving Party shall take all necessary steps to remedy the improper disclosure or use. This includes promptly notifying all Parties and the presiding hearing officer in writing. The written notice must identify the person known or reasonably suspected to have obtained the Protected Material. A Party or person that violates this Protective Order remains subject to this paragraph regardless of whether the Disclosing Party could have discovered the violation earlier than it was discovered. This paragraph applies to both inadvertent and

intentional violations. Nothing in this Protective Order limits the Disclosing Party's rights and remedies, at law or in equity, against a Party or person using Protected Material in a manner not authorized by this Protective Order, including the right to obtain injunctive relief in a court of competent jurisdiction to prevent violations of this Protective Order.

VIII. Modification

Formal Addendums to this agreement may be established by an ALJ upon motion by any party and after notice and hearing.

MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
For the Michigan Public Service Commission

Administrative Law Judge

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter of the Application of)
DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY for approval)
of its Integrated Resource Plan pursuant)
to MCL 460.6t, Clean Energy Plan pursuant)
to MCL 460.1051, Certificates of Necessity)
pursuant to MCL 460.6s, related accounting)
authorizations, and for other relief.)

Case No. U-22168

Attachment 1

NONDISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE

By signing this Nondisclosure Certificate, I acknowledge that access to Protected Material is provided to me under the terms and restrictions of the Protective Order issue in Case No. U-22168, that I have read the Protective Order, and that I agree to be bound by the terms of the Protective Order. I understand that I shall maintain the substance of the Protected Material (as defined in the Protective Order), any notes from Protected Material, or any other form of information that copies or discloses Protected Material, as confidential and shall not disclose it to anyone other than in accordance with the Protective Order. I understand that I may not use Protected Material for a commercial or competitive purpose.

Reviewing Representative:

Date: _____

Receiving Party:

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter of the Application of)
DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY for approval)
of its Integrated Resource Plan pursuant)
to MCL 460.6t, Clean Energy Plan pursuant)
to MCL 460.1051, Certificates of Necessity)
pursuant to MCL 460.6s, related accounting)
authorizations, and for other relief.)

Case No. U-22168

Attachment 2

NONDISCLOSURE CERTIFICATE

FOR CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION

I hereby agree and certify my understanding that access to Critical Electric Infrastructure Information (“CEII”) as defined at 16 USC Section 824o-1(a)(3) and 18 CFR Section 388.113(c) is provided to me pursuant to the terms and restriction of this CEII Nondisclosure Certificate and the Protective Order issued in Case No. U-22168, that I have been given a copy of and have read the Protective Order, and I agree to be bound by the terms of this CEII Nondisclosure Certificate and the Protective Order. I further agree that:

1. I will use CEII only for the purpose for which it was requested;
2. I will not use CEII for a commercial or competitive purpose;
3. I will only discuss CEII with a Party and/or Reviewing Representative;
4. I will keep CEII in a secure place in a manner that prevents unauthorized access;
5. I will destroy CEII or return it to the disclosing party upon request;
6. I understand that CEII is not subject to release under the Freedom of Information

Act;

7. I understand that I am obligated to protect CEII even after a designation as CEII has lapsed until a determination by the administrative law judge that the information should no longer be designated as CEII; and
8. I will report all unauthorized disclosures of CEII to the Disclosing Party.

Reviewing Representative:

Date:_____

Title:_____

Receiving Party:_____

Printed Name:_____

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the matter of the Application of)
DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY for approval)
of its Integrated Resource Plan pursuant)
to MCL 460.6t, Clean Energy Plan pursuant)
to MCL 460.1051, Certificates of Necessity)
pursuant to MCL 460.6s, related accounting)
authorizations, and for other relief.)

Case No. U-22168

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF MICHIGAN)
) ss.
COUNTY OF WAYNE)

ESTELLA R. BRANSON states that on September 24, 2026, she served a copy of redacted version of DTE Electric Company's Application, Proposed Protective Order Nondisclosure Certificates, Testimony and Exhibits of Witnesses, Christina J. Hajj, Shayla D. Manning, Jason T. Busse, Ryan C. Pratt, Shawn D. Burgdorf, Justin J. W. Brooks, Frank J. Sirwaitis, Markus B. Leuker, Margaret E. Guillaumin, David Swiech, Kevin L. Bilyeu, Jason R. Kupser, Husaninder Singh, Jablan Djordjevic, Barry J. Marietta, Harry O. Stansell Jr., Michael E. Banks, Matthew Lind, Priya Machi, Terri Schroeder, and Theresa M. Uzenski and in the above captioned matter, via electronic mail upon the persons listed on the attached service list. DTE Electric Company's confidential Application, Mr. Banks's confidential Testimony and confidential Exhibits A-17.2 and A-17.6, Ms. Hajj's confidential Testimony and confidential Exhibit A-1.7, Mr. Pratt's confidential Testimony and confidential Exhibits A-4, A-4.13, A-4.14, A-4.15, A-4.16, A-4.17, and A-4.20, Mr. Stansell's confidential testimony and confidential Exhibits A-16, A-16.1, A-16.2, and A-16.3, Mr. Burgdorf's confidential Exhibit A-5 (a)-(d) was filed under seal with the Commission.

**Estella R.
Branson**

ESTELLA R. BRANSON

Digitally signed by Estella R.
Branson
Date: 2026.09.24 17:09:19
-04'00'

MPSC Case No. U-22168
Joint Service List U-21193, U-21860 & U-22046

ABATE

Benjamin J. Holwerda
Michael J. Pattwell
Clark Hill PLC
215 South Washington Square, Suite 200
Lansing, MI 48933
bholwerda@clarkhill.com
mpattwell@clarkhill.com

Stephen A. Campbell
Clark Hill PLC
500 Woodward Avenue, Suite 3500
Detroit, MI 48226
scampbell@clarkhill.com

**ADVANCED ENERGY UNITED; THE CLEAN
GRID ALLIANCE; ENERGY MICHIGAN, INC.;
FOUNDRY ASSOCIATION OF MICHIGAN;
INSTITUTE FOR ENERGY INNOVATION;
MICHIGAN ENERGY INNOVATION BUSINESS
COUNCIL**

Laura A. Chappelle
Timothy J. Lundgren
Justin K. Ooms
Haylee N. Skank
Varnum LLP
333 Bridge Street NW, Suite. 1700
Grand Rapids, MI 49501
lachappelle@varnumlaw.com
tjlundgren@varnumlaw.com
jkooms@varnumlaw.com
hnskank@varnumlaw.com

**CITIZENS UTILITY BOARD OF MICHIGAN;
MICHIGAN ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL;
NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL;
SIERRA CLUB**

Christopher M. Bzdok
Tracy Jane Andrews
Holly L. Hillyer
Sean C. Clark
Troposphere Legal, PLC
420 East Front Street
Traverse City, MI 49686
chris@tropospherelegal.com
tjandrews@tropospherelegal.com
holly@tropospherelegal.com
sean@tropospherelegal.com

CITY OF ANN ARBOR

Valerie Jackson
Assistant City Attorney
City of Ann Arbor
Guy C. Larcom City Hall
301. E. Huron Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
Vjackson@a2gov.org

ELECTRIFY AMERICA, LLC

Krystal D. Hermiz
Gordon Rees Scully Mansukhani
37000 Woodward Avenue, Suite 225
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48304
khermiz@grsm.com

Stephen Bright
Electrify America, LLC
1950 Opportunity Way, Suite 1500 Reston,
Virginia 20190
Steve.Bright@electrifyamerica.com

**ENVIRONMENTAL LAW & POLICY
CENTER; ECOLOGY CENTER; UNION
OF CONCERNED SCIENTISTS; VOTE
SOLAR (CEO)**

Daniel Abrams
Katie Duckworth
Environmental Law & Policy Center
35 E. Wacker Drive, Suite 1600
Chicago, IL 60601
dabrams@elpc.org
kduckworth@elpc.org
mpscdocket@elpc.org

Nicholas J. Schroeck
University of Detroit Mercy
School of Law
Environmental Law Clinic
651 E. Jefferson,
Detroit, MI 48226
schroenj@udmercy.edu

**ENERWISE GLOBAL TECHNOLOGIES,
LLC d/b/a CPOWER; GERDAU
MACSTEEL, INC.**

Jennifer Utter Heston
Potomac Law Group PLLC
1717 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 1025
Washington, DC 20006
jheston@potomaclaw.com

**MPSC Case No. U-22168
Joint Service List U-21193, U-21860 & U-22046**

**GREAT LAKES RENEWABLE ENERGY
ASSOCIATION INC.**

Don L. Keskey
Brian W. Coyer
University Office Place
333 Albert Avenue, Suite 425
East Lansing, MI 48823
donkeskey@publiclawresourcecenter.com
bwcoyer@publiclawresourcecenter.com

**INTERNATIONAL TRANSMISSION
COMPANY d/b/a ITCTRANSMISSION**

Richard J. Aaron
Courtney F. Kissel
Olivia R.C.A. Flower
Hannah E. Buzolits
201 Townsend Street, Suite 900
Lansing, MI 48933
RAaron@dykema.com
CKissel@dykema.com
OFlower@dykema.com
HBuzolits@dykema.com

THE KROGER COMPANY

Michael L. Kurtz
Kurt J. Boehm, Esq.
Jody Kyler Cohn, Esq.
Boehm, Kurtz & Lowry
425 Walnut Street, Suite 2400
Cincinnati, OH 45202
mkurtz@BKLawfirm.com
KBoehm@BKLawfirm.com
JKylerCohn@BKLawfirm.com

MICHIGAN ATTORNEY GENERAL

Joel King
Lucas Wollenzien
Michael Moody
Assistant Attorney General
ENRA Division
525 W. Ottawa Street, 6th Floor
P.O. Box 30755
Lansing, MI 48909
KingJ38@michigan.gov
WollenzienL@michigan.gov
moodym2@michigan.gov
ag-enra-spec-lit@michigan.gov

**MICHIGAN BUILDING &
CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL**

John R. Canzano
Ben King
Mcknight, Canzano, Smith Radtke & Brault, P.C.
423 N. Main Street, Suite 200
Royal Oak, MI 48067
jcanzano@michworkerlaw.com
king@michworkerlaw.com

**MICHIGAN CABLE
TELECOMMUNICATIONS
ASSOCIATION**

Sean P. Gallagher
Fraser Trebilcock Davis Dunlap & Cavanaugh, P.C.
124 West Allegan Street, Suite 1000
Lansing, MI 48933
sgallagher@fraserlawfirm.com

**MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION
FOR UTILITY ISSUES ("MI-MAUI"); THE
MICHIGAN COALITION TO PROTECT
PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY (PROTEC)**

Michael J. Watza
Nathan D. Inks
Bloom Sluggett, PC
400 Renaissance Center, Ste 2600
Detroit, MI 48243
mike@bloomsluggett.com
nathan@bloomsluggett.com

MICHIGAN PUBLIC POWER AGENCY

Nolan J. Moody
Dickinson Wright PLLC
123 Allegan Street, Suite 900
Lansing, MI 48933
nmoody@dickinsonwright.com

MPSC STAFF

Adam Cozort
Amit T. Singh
Daniel E. Sonneveldt
Monica M. Stephens
Anna Stirling
Nicholas Taylor
Assistant Attorney General
Public Service Division
7109 West Saginaw Hwy, 3rd Floor
Lansing, MI 48917
cozortal@michigan.gov
singha9@michigan.gov

MPSC Case No. U-22168
Joint Service List U-21193, U-21860 & U-22046

sonneveltdtd@michigan.gov
stephensm11@michigan.gov
stirlinga1@michigan.gov
taylorn10@michigan.gov

Amelia Arnold, Staff Case Coordinator
ArnoldA11@michigan.gov

OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN

Sean P. Gallagher
Jared A. Roberts
Geofrey C. Bilabaye
Fraser Trebilcock Davis Dunlap & Cavanaugh, P.C.
124 West Allegan Street, Suite 1000
Lansing, MI 48933
sgallagher@fraserlawfirm.com
jroberts@fraserlawfirm.com
gbilabaye@fraserlawfirm.com

SIERRA CLUB

Michael C. Soules
Shannon Fisk
Jacob Elkin
Helen Li
Hema Lochan
1001 G Street NW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20001
msoules@earthjustice.org
sfisk@earthjustice.org
jelkin@earthjustice.org
hli@earthjustice.org
hlochan@earthjustice.org

SMALL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION OF MICHIGAN

Jason T. Hanselman
Dykema Gossett PLLC
201 Townsend St. Suite 900
Lansing, Michigan 48933
jhanselman@dykema.com

SOULARDARITY; WE WANT GREEN, TOO

Mark Templeton
Amanda Urban
Jacob Schuhardt
Alexandria (Alex) Miskho
University of Chicago Law School
Abrams Environmental Law Clinic
6020 South University Avenue
Chicago, IL 60637
templeton@uchicago.edu
aurbanlaw@gmail.com
t-9aurba@lawclinics.uchicago.edu
jschuhardt@uchicago.edu
amiskho@uchicago.edu
aelc_mpsc@lawclinic.uchicago.edu

LOCAL 223, UTILITY WORKERS UNION OF AMERICA (UWUA), AFL-CIO

Richard G. Mack, Jr.
Jacob S. Porcarelli
Miller Cohen, PLC
7700 Second Ave, Suite 335
Detroit, MI 48202
richardmack@millercohen.com
jporcarelli@millercohen.com

WAL-MART

Melissa M. Horne
Higgins, Cavanagh & Cooney, LLP
10 Dorrance Street, Suite 400
Providence, RI 02903
mhorne@hcc-law.com

WOLVERINE POWER SUPPLY COOPERATIVE, INC.

Kyle Asher
201 Townsend Street, Suite 900
Lansing, Mi 48933
kasher@dykema.com