

124 West Allegan Street, Suite 1000
Lansing, Michigan 48933
T (517) 482-5800 F (517) 482-0887
www.fraserlawfirm.com

Sean P. Gallagher
sgallagher@fraserlawfirm.com
(517) 377-0820

October 26, 2026

BY EMAIL

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

RE: MPSC Docket No. U-22046

Dear Ms. Felice:

Enclosed for filing please find the *Initial Brief of Oakland County* and a *Proof of Service*.

If you have any questions regarding the attached, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

Fraser Trebilcock Davis Dunlap & Cavanaugh, P.C.

 Digitally signed
by Sean P.
Gallagher
Date: 2026.10.26
16:39:12 -04'00'

Sean P. Gallagher

Enclosures

cc: Parties of Record

STATE OF MICHIGAN

BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

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

Case No. U-22046

INITIAL BRIEF OF OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN

October 26, 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND OF RELEVANT RECORD EVIDENCE.....	3
A. DTE's requested substantial residential rate increase	3
B. The proposed increase closely follows the increase recently approved in U-21860.	4
C. Oakland County presented evidence concerning actual customer bill impacts.....	4
D. DTE's states that residential bill growth was 3.7% on average since 2021.	7
E. Oakland County's historical residential revenue evidence shows annual increases of 4.3% and 30% from 2019 to 2025.	8
F. DTE's opposes Oakland County's transparency proposals	8
III. LEGAL STANDARD.....	10
IV. ARGUMENT	11
A. DTE's proposed 9.7% residential rate increase should be rejected or substantially reduced – to the current level of inflation or below – because the record clearly shows material cumulative bill pressure on customers.	11
B. Customer-level evidence is more probative of affordability than a headline rate-case percentage.....	12
C. DTE's 3.7% residential-bill-growth comparison does not rebut the affordability evidence presented by Oakland County.	12
D. DTE's existing customer resources do not substitute for or eliminate the need for Oakland County's requested transparency measures.....	13
E. The Commission should adopt Oakland County's Net Effective Rate disclosure and annual rate-review recommendations.	14
V. CONCLUSION & REQUESTED RELIEF.....	15

INITIAL BRIEF OF OAKLAND COUNTY, MICHIGAN

Pursuant to the Scheduling Memorandum in this case and Rule 434, Mich Admin Code, R 792.10434, Oakland County, Michigan (“Oakland County” or the “County”), by and through its attorneys, Fraser Trebilcock, P.C., submits its initial brief in this case involving DTE Electric Company (“DTE” or the “Company”) before the Michigan Public Service Commission (“Commission”):

I. INTRODUCTION

DTE asks the Commission to approve approximately \$474.3 million in additional annual base-electric revenue beginning as early as March 1, 2027. The Company proposes a 9.7% increase in residential-class revenue from approximately \$3.267 billion to \$3.582 billion annually, an increase of approximately \$315.7 million. The standard residential Time-of-Use tariff rate, D1.11, which accounts for the overwhelming share of proposed residential revenue, would increase 9.5%. For Oakland County residents, this would mean paying at least an additional approximately \$76 million per year to DTE in electric service rates.¹ These are substantial increases.

Oakland County does not dispute that DTE must maintain safe and reliable service or that reasonable, prudent investments may be recovered. But the proposed residential increase cannot be evaluated in isolation. It arrives immediately after rates approved in Case No. U-21860 took effect on March 5, 2026. The Commission publicly described that earlier change as a \$4.93, or 4.6%, monthly increase for a typical residential customer using 500 kWh. However, Oakland County witness Thomas Ihrig presented testimony that examined what an Oakland County

¹ Oakland County ratepayers on Residential Time-of-Use Rate paid DTE \$803 million in 2025. See Oakland County Exhibit OC-9. Adding 9.5% to the 2025 revenue would yield \$881 million, an additional \$76 million. This rough calculation does not account for the rate increase the Commission approved in early 2026.

residential customer actually paid after the March 2026 changes, including rates and surcharges appearing on the entire bill. He calculated a 13% Net Effective Rate Increase at normalized actual usage and a 15% increase over Commission's announced 500-kWh usage level. The context shows the effective increases to residential customers was significantly more than the nominal 4.6% after that rate case concluded.

DTE's did not rebut this evidence. In direct testimony, DTE witness Marco Bruzzano presented a 3.7% average annual residential bill-growth figure measured from 2021 through 2027 and compared it with 3.5% inflation. As Mr. Ihrig explained, however, DTE's election to use 2021 as the starting point for that analysis omits 2020, when DTE's Oakland County residential revenue increased 16% over 2019. Mr. Ihrig further contrasted DTE's presentation with Oakland County data showing DTE's real residential revenue growth of approximately 4.3% annually, which amounts to 30% revenue growth when measured from 2019 through 2025. DTE's starting point skews the analysis from the perspective of Oakland County ratepaying families struggling with utility bills.

Summary of Issues

In sum, first, Oakland County asks the Commission to evaluate affordability in light of the cumulative effective bill impacts.

Second, Oakland County asks the Commission to reject or substantially reduce the proposed 9.7% residential-class increase to a rate that does not exceed the inflation rate, which was 3.7% (over the last 12 months) as of September 2026.²

² The is the U.S. Bureau of Labor & Statistics' currently published rate before seasonal adjustment. See <https://www.bls.gov/news.release/cpi.nr0.htm>, last visited October 21, 2026.

Third, the Commission should also require DTE to disclose Net Effective Rate Increases by rate schedule after each general rate case and to prepare bill analysis for each customer and provide annual notice when a customer may be served more economically under another available tariff. Those limited transparency measures respond directly to the record evidence concerning cumulative bill impacts and rate complexity.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND OF RELEVANT RECORD EVIDENCE

The record in this case, as with each of DTE's electric general rate cases in recent years, is extensive. As such, Oakland County confines its review of the record to affordability and related issues developed through its testimony and that of DTE.

A. DTE's requested substantial residential rate increase

DTE's April 28, 2026 Application proposes to add \$474.3 million in revenues to its base electric rates as soon as March 1, 2027.³ DTE also proposes Infrastructure Recovery Mechanism ("IRM") revenue requirements of \$154.4 million for 2028, \$227.8 million for 2029, and \$318.1 million for 2030.⁴

DTE proposes to increase retail electric rate revenue from the residential ratepayer class by an average of 9.7% by adding \$315.6 million to its residential electric rate base.⁵ DTE's Application states that a typical residential customer using 500 kilowatt hour (kWh) per month will see its summer bill on residential service rate D1.11 increase by \$11.06 per month, or 9.66%.⁶

³ See Case No. U-22046, Dkt. 0003, Application at 2; see also 4 Tr 1980:19-20 (referencing 4 Tr 3149).

⁴ Application at 4.

⁵ DTE Official Exhibit A-16, Sch F2, Witness P. Machi, page 2 of 4, line 10, columns (d) and (e).

⁶ See Case No. U-22046, Dkt. 0003, Application, Attachment 3, line 5, columns (d) and (e).

For the residential class, DTE proposes present revenue of \$3,266,822,000, proposed revenue of \$3,582,490,000, and an increase of \$315,667,000, or 9.7%.⁷ The proposed increases for individual residential schedules range from 9.5% for D1.11 Time of Use to 18.4% for D1.1 Interruptible Air Conditioning.⁸

B. The proposed increase closely follows the increase recently approved in U-21860.

On February 29, 2026, in case no. U-21860, the Commission approved rates to increase DTE's revenue by \$242.4 million.⁹ The Commission reported that the increase for a residential customer using 500 kWh per month of electricity would be a monthly increase of \$4.93, or 4.6%.¹⁰ The new DTE electricity service rates from that case took effect March 5, 2026.¹¹ The Commission also stated that it had reduced DTE's requested amount by nearly 58% and had disallowed costs for projects it found unsupported, ineffective, or poorly planned.¹²

C. Oakland County presented evidence concerning actual customer bill impacts.

Thomas Ihrig, Vice President of The Legacy Energy Group, offered direct testimony on behalf of Oakland County.¹³ Mr. Ihrig brings nearly four decades of experience in the energy industry to bear in this case, including over two decades analyzing DTE's electric service tariffs on behalf of customers to help them save on electric costs.¹⁴

⁷ Application, Attachment 2, at 1, line 10.

⁸ *Id.* at 1, lines 1-10.

⁹ Oakland County Official Exhibit OC-2 at 1.

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² Ex OC-2 at 1, 3.

¹³ Sept. 29, 2026 Vol 2 Corrected Hr'g Tr 372-396 (Revised Direct Testimony of Thomas Ihrig).

¹⁴ 2 Tr 373:10 to 375:6, 393:4-9.

Mr. Ihrig presented testimony concerning electricity affordability in Michigan generally, and Oakland County specifically, for both residential and industrial scale DTE customers. He recommends certain transparency and other measures to support affordability of electric rates..¹⁵ For crucial context, he notes that in June 2026, Governor Whitmer called upon the Commission to identify opportunities to lower utility bills for Michiganders, including potential legislative reforms to improve affordability and reliability.¹⁶

With respect to affordable residential electric rates in Oakland County, Mr. Ihrig's analysis focuses on "Net Effective Rate Increase." He sets the stage for this analysis by noting at the outset that the present case is DTE's seventh (7th) general electric rate case and base rate increase request in eight (8) years, with the last five (5) cases back-to-back each year.¹⁷ Mr. Ihrig next states that these annual rate increases along with other proceedings from other dockets together make the effective rate increase experienced by customer larger than publicly observed by the Commission in its press release announcing approval of the rate increase in February 2026.¹⁸

As part of his analysis, Mr. Ihrig reviews the various charges on a customer's "whole bill" that increase outside of a general electric rate case or on a schedule set in a rate case which are separate than the electric service tariff rate approved as part of a general rate case.¹⁹ Mr. Ihrig defined "Net Effective Rate Increase" as the amount by which the customer's bill actually changed, rather than only the change in tariff rates for energy supply and distribution.²⁰ He identified additional bill components including the power supply cost recovery ("PSCR"), IRM, nuclear

¹⁵ 2 Tr 377-380, 369.

¹⁶ Oakland County Official Exhibit OC-1 at 1.

¹⁷ 2 Tr 381.

¹⁸ 2 Tr 381:4-11.

¹⁹ 2 Tr 382:2 to 383:12.

²⁰ 2 Tr 382:8-17.

surcharge, base-securitization surcharge, and energy waste reduction surcharge (“EWRs”).²¹ He further explained that not all of those components are determined in a general rate case: PSCR and EWRs are determined and reconciled in separate proceedings, while the IRM is approved in a general rate case and changes over time under a Commission-approved schedule.²²

DTE’s own “Explanation of Current Charges,” a document found on DTE’s website, similarly identifies capacity and non-capacity charges, PSCR, service and distribution charges, Low-Income energy Assistance Fund (“LIEAF”), and other power-supply and delivery surcharges, including securitization, EWRs, nuclear, and IRM charges.²³

To illustrate the point about the changes in a “whole bill,” Mr. Ihrig reviewed redacted bills for an Oakland County residential customer on Rate D1.11 for billing periods ending December 23, 2025, and April 27, 2026.²⁴ The December bill shows 370.705 kWh and \$83.27 in current charges.²⁵ The April bill shows 229.812 kWh and \$62.04 in current charges.²⁶

To isolate the effect of changed rates and surcharges from changed consumption, Mr. Ihrig normalized both periods to 370.705 kWh.²⁷ Exhibit OC-5 shows total normalized charges increasing from \$83.26 to \$94.00, a 13% increase.²⁸ Mr. Ihrig identified the principal surcharge changes reflected in that comparison that led to a monthly increase in the customer’s whole bill of \$11.74 per month: the PSCR increased from \$0.0025 to \$0.01877 per kWh (from .25¢ per kWh to 1.877¢ per kWh); IRM increased from \$0.000941 to \$0.002762 per kWh (from 0.0941¢ per kWh

²¹ 2 Tr 382:19-383:2.

²² 2 Tr 383:3-12.

²³ Ex OC-11.1 at 2.

²⁴ 2 Tr 383:13-384:19; see also Exs OC-3 and OC-4 at 1-2.

²⁵ Ex OC-3 at 2.

²⁶ Ex OC-4 at 2.

²⁷ 2 Tr 385:1-10.

²⁸ Ex OC-5 at 1.

to 0.2762¢); and EWRS increased from \$0.002699 to \$0.004488 per kWh (from .2699¢ per kWh to .4488¢ per kWh).²⁹ Cumulatively, these three surcharges increased from 0.614¢ per kWh (just over half a cent) to 2.602¢ per kWh – an increase of 2¢ per kWh which helped increase the overall bill by \$11.74 per month between December 2025 and April 2026.

Mr. Ihrig also applied the Commission’s 500-kWh assumption to the same customer profile. At 500 kWh, Exhibit OC-7 shows charges increasing from \$94.89 to \$108.83, or 15%.³⁰ Thus, the same usage quantity underlying the Commission’s 4.6% public description of the nominal percentage of rate increase produced a 15% Net Effective Rate Increase under Oakland County’s net effective rate increase analysis on the whole customer bill.³¹

D. DTE's states that residential bill growth was 3.7% on average since 2021.

DTE’s Marco Bruzzano testified that relief consistent with DTE’s request would result in an average yearly residential bill increase since 2021 of 3.7%, which he characterized as in line with inflation and below Great Lakes and national utility averages.³² His Figure 1 used 3.5% as the inflation comparison.³³

Mr. Ihrig directly compared that presentation with Oakland County’s evidence. He testified that DTE’s analysis begins in 2021, omits 2020, and does not define the phrase “Full Ask”³⁴ used in Mr. Bruzzano’s figure.³⁵ Mr. Ihrig testified that including the 2020 Oakland County residential-

²⁹ 2 Tr 386:7-15; Ex. OC-5 at 1.

³⁰ 2 Tr 387:5-12; Ex OC-7 at 1.

³¹ 2 Tr 386:17-20, 387:5-12; see also Ex OC-2 at 1; see also Ex OC-7 at 1.

³² 4 Tr 1985:19-24 to 1986:1.

³³ 4 Tr 1986:1.

³⁴ While this apparent utility industry jargon is not explained, this term might reasonably be taken to mean the full amount DTE requests in its rate case application.

³⁵ 2 Tr 391:7-13.

revenue increase likely would produce an average above 3.7% and closer to Oakland County's 4.3% figure.³⁶

E. Oakland County's historical residential revenue evidence shows annual increases of 4.3% and 30% from 2019 to 2025.

Mr. Ihrig also analyzed DTE's annual Oakland County residential revenue data for 2019 through 2025.³⁷ Exhibit OC-9 shows total residential revenue increasing from \$669,623,275 in 2019 to \$872,388,908 in 2025, an increase of \$202,765,634, or 30%, with a displayed annualized rate of 4.3%.³⁸ The same exhibit shows 2020 residential revenue of \$780,924,334, approximately 16% above 2019.³⁹

Mr. Ihrig further projected that even if DTE did not file another general electric rate case between now and 2030, Oakland County residential customers will face increasing costs for DTE electric service in the range of 8% based on increases to the PSCR factor, IRM, and EWRS surcharges.⁴⁰

F. DTE's opposes Oakland County's transparency proposals

In order to create awareness of the true cost increases that residential customers will see in their electric bill, Mr. Ihrig recommends that DTE publish, after each general rate case, the Net Effective Rate Increase for each rate class as a calendar-year-over-year increase.⁴¹ He also recommends an annual review of residential and commercial accounts, with notice to a customer whose recent usage indicates that a less expensive available rate may apply.⁴²

³⁶ 2 Tr 391:13-17.

³⁷ 2 Tr 390:8-391:6; see also Exs OC-6 at 1-4, and OC-9 at 1.

³⁸ Ex. OC-9 at 1.

³⁹ *Id.*

⁴⁰ 2 Tr 387:14-20.

⁴¹ 2 Tr 387:14 to 388:6; see also 396:7-13.

⁴² 2 Tr 395:20 to 396:18.

On behalf of DTE, Witness Milena Kabashi offered testimony rejecting both proposals. She testified that DTE already provides rate-change information through notices, bill-impact communications, its website, and other channels, and that bills reflect rates, riders, surcharges, and mechanisms that may change outside a general rate case.⁴³ She also identified online information, customer-service support, rate-comparison tools, commercial calculators, rate studies, and educational materials as resources for rate selection.⁴⁴

On cross-examination, however, Ms. Kabashi acknowledged that a DTE actually has no idea whether, or the extent to which, customers ever use, understand, or rely upon DTE's online information, customer service support, rate comparison tools, commercial calculators, rate studies, and educational materials.⁴⁵ She acknowledged a "rate study" is a customer-specific bill analysis performed upon request using historical usage and billing information.⁴⁶ She was not aware how many residential or business rate studies DTE performed in 2025 and did not know whether DTE tracks performance of those studies.⁴⁷ She also was not aware of whether DTE tracks customer use of its online rate information, customer-service support, residential rate simulator, or business comparison tools, or evaluates the effectiveness of those resources.⁴⁸ Nor was she aware whether DTE evaluates the effectiveness of the educational materials identified in Exhibit OC-18.⁴⁹

Ms. Kabashi's cross-examination testimony and DTE's discovery responses nevertheless establish that the Company has the underlying mechanisms needed for customer-specific rate

⁴³ 4 Tr 1914:16 to 1915:14.

⁴⁴ 4 Tr 1915:15-22.

⁴⁵ 4 Tr 1961:18 to 1964:25.

⁴⁶ 4 Tr 1941:15 to 1942:10; see also Ex OC-16 at 1.

⁴⁷ 4 Tr 1963:20 to 1964:9.

⁴⁸ 4 Tr 1961:18-1963:19.

⁴⁹ 4 Tr 1964:10-25.

review.⁵⁰ Customer service may discuss billing and usage information and assist with customer-specific rate-study requests based on historical usage.⁵¹ The residential rate simulator compares estimated bill impacts under available residential options, and business workbooks compare specified schedules using customer usage characteristics.⁵² Rate studies use historical billing and usage information to identify options that may better align with the customer's usage.⁵³

III. LEGAL STANDARD

“The Michigan Public Service Commission . . . has a statutory duty to provide just and reasonable rates.” *Gen Tel Co v PSC*, 78 Mich App 528, 534; 260 NW2d 874 (1977). “When setting rates, the Commission is not bound by any particular formula method in determining what is just and reasonable, but has broad discretion to determine the factors relevant to its analysis and to make adjustments as necessitated by the particular circumstances of a given case.” *Attorney General v PSC*, 189 Mich App 139, 148; 472 NW2d 53 (1991) (citing *Mich Bell Tel Co v PSC*, 332 Mich 7, 36-37; 50 NW2d 286 (1952)).

⁵⁰ 4 Tr 1965:1-14; see also OC-16.

⁵¹ Ex OC-12 at 1.

⁵² Ex OC-14 at 1.

⁵³ Ex OC-16 at 1.

IV. ARGUMENT

A. DTE's proposed 9.7% residential rate increase should be rejected or substantially reduced – to the current level of inflation or below – because the record clearly shows material cumulative bill pressure on customers.

DTE's proposed residential increase is not a marginal adjustment. DTE seeks an additional \$315.667 million from the residential class, raising its residential-class revenue by 9.7%. For residential rate D1.11, the standard Time-of-Day rate and the source of nearly \$3.0 billion in present residential revenue, DTE proposes a 9.5% increase. That request follows on the heels of rates that became effective March 5, 2026.

The Commission should evaluate the request in the context of what customers actually pay. Mr. Ihrig presented evidence that shows that general-rate-case percentages do not capture simultaneous changes in PSCR, IRM, EWRS, and other bill elements. DTE's own explanation document confirms that a residential bill is composed of multiple rates and surcharges, not a single base-rate number. A further 9.7% class increase should not be layered onto this record. If the rate is to increase, then there should be a substantial reduction in DTE's proposed amount, supported by the Commission's review of DTE's underlying revenue requirement and proposed allocation.

The Commission should view the current level of annual inflation, 3.7% for the 12 months ended September 2026, which the Bureau of Labor Statistics just published on October 14, 2026, as the ceiling for any increase to residential rate D1.11 in this proceeding. The Commission has authority under Michigan law to consider just such circumstances, see *Attorney General*, 189 Mich App at 148. The Commission may take judicial notice of such information which was not available when this rate case was at hearing as it can be verified as accurate with independent, public sources. See *Federal Armored Svc, Inc v PSC*, 204 Mich App 24, 29; 514 NW2d 178 (1994) (citing and quoting MCL 24.277 and related authority). The Commission may conclude that under the

circumstances, the residential rate increase should be less than 3.7%, every bit of which will help the residential customers of DTE in Oakland County and elsewhere better afford their utility bills.

B. Customer-level evidence is more probative of affordability than a headline rate-case percentage.

The strength of Oakland County's analysis is its normalization. Mr. Ihrig did not compare two bills with different usage and attribute the difference to rates. He held usage constant at 370.705 kWh and calculated the change in the complete bill. That analysis yielded a 13% rate increase in real terms, not the nominal 4.6% rate increase publicly associated with the prior case. Mr. Ihrig separately used 500 kWh, the Commission's own assumption, which showed a 15% customer bill increase, in real terms, as of the end of the last case.

These are not abstract percentages. Exhibit OC-5 traces each power-supply, delivery, and surcharge component; Exhibit OC-7 repeats the calculation at 500 kWh. The analysis therefore demonstrates why residential affordability cannot be judged by isolating the nominal base-rate change from the charges appearing on the bill customers must pay.

C. DTE's 3.7% residential-bill-growth comparison does not rebut the affordability evidence presented by Oakland County.

Mr. Bruzzano's 3.7% figure over time and Oakland County's evidence address different questions. DTE measured average annual residential bill growth beginning in 2021 and extending through 2027. Oakland County and Mr. Ihrig examined actual County-level residential revenue from 2019 through 2025 and separately analyzed an actual customer's bill before and after the March 2026 changes.

The difference in starting point matters. Exhibit OC-9 shows residential revenue increasing from \$669.6 million in 2019 to \$780.9 million in 2020, a 16% increase. By beginning in 2021,

DTE's 'cherry-picked' comparison excludes that substantial increase. Mr. Bruzzano's figure therefore does not rebut Oakland County's evidence of longer-term revenue growth or the larger effective increases shown by the normalized whole-bill analysis.

D. DTE's existing customer resources do not substitute for or eliminate the need for Oakland County's requested transparency measures.

Ms. Kabashi's rebuttal rests on the proposition that DTE already provides multiple resources for consumers to understand their bills and their rates. While the record confirms that those resources exist, there is no evidence that those resources are used effectively or reach customers who might benefit from them. Ms. Kabashi was unaware whether DTE tracks use or evaluates effectiveness of its online rate information, customer-service support, residential simulator, business comparison tools, or educational materials. She also did not know how many residential or business rate studies were performed in 2025 or whether DTE tracks those studies. Those resources are window dressing, as the record shows.

These DTE claimed resources also place the burden on the customer to find, understand, and use them. Exhibit OC-19.1 describes several base and specialty residential rates and directs customers to online tools, while Exhibit OC-19.2 presents detailed pricing for the available residential options. On cross-examination, Ms. Kabashi agreed that Exhibit OC-19.2 contains extensive detail about residential pricing options, but she was not an expert on the rates themselves.

What is more, DTE was wrong to reject Oakland County's proposed transparency improvements. This is especially so where, as here, DTE *already performs the core analysis* that Oakland County seeks. For example, DTE's discovery response defines a rate study as a customer-specific bill analysis using historical usage and billing information to identify rate options that may better align with usage. DTE's response concerning customer-service support likewise states that

Company personnel may discuss billing and usage, assist with rate-plan changes, and help with customer-specific rate-study requests. There's no evidence that these resources are helpful to or effectively utilized by customers. Thus, Oakland County proposed that DTE should make that existing capability systematic in order to benefit all residential customers and that DTE should notify the customer when the analysis identifies a less expensive available tariff.

E. The Commission should adopt Oakland County's Net Effective Rate disclosure and annual rate-review recommendations.

The Net Effective Rate Increase disclosure is modest and directly tied to the evidentiary problem. DTE already reports proposed class revenue increases in its rate-case materials. Oakland County asks that, after a case concludes, DTE also disclose the calendar-year-over-year effective change by rate schedule so customers can see the combined effect reflected in the bill. Ms. Kabashi's acknowledgment that bills reflect mechanisms changing outside a general rate case reinforces, rather than defeats, the need for a whole-bill disclosure.

The annual rate-review recommendation is similarly supported. DTE already maintains rate simulators, business comparison workbooks, customer-service support, and individualized rate studies based on historical usage and billing data. Ms. Kabashi's rebuttal asserted that annual review would require individual-usage analysis, but on cross examination she admitted that she was not qualified to evaluate whether DTE could perform that task, and the presiding officer stated that the limits of her expertise and knowledge were available for briefing. The record thus establishes the existence of the analytical inputs and services, while DTE's rebuttal witness did not establish that annual review is infeasible.

V. CONCLUSION & REQUESTED RELIEF

For the reasons stated above, Oakland County respectfully requests that the Commission reject or substantially reduce DTE's proposed 9.7% increase in residential-class revenues, and limit any increase to the most recent available figure for inflation, 3.7%. Michigan ratemaking principles allow for the Commission to consider such circumstances when fashioning rates. The record shows that the proposed increase would follow closely after the March 2026 increase and would be imposed on customers whose actual bills reflect multiple rates and surcharges not captured by a headline or nominal general-rate-case percentage.

Oakland County further requests that the Commission require DTE to publish Net Effective Rate Increases by rate schedule on a calendar-year-over-year basis after this and future general electric rate cases, and to conduct an annual residential and commercial rate review with notice when a customer's recent usage indicates that a less expensive available tariff may apply.

Respectfully Submitted,

Fraser Trebilcock Davis Dunlap & Cavanaugh, P.C.

Dated: October 26, 2026

By:  Digitally signed by
Sean P. Gallagher
Date: 2026.10.26
16:38:52 -04'00'

Sean P. Gallagher (P73108)
Jared A. Roberts (P55182)
Geofrey Bilabaye (P83397)
124 West Allegan Street, Suite 1000
Lansing, Michigan 48933
Telephone: (517) 482-5800
Facsimile: (517) 482-0887
sgallagher@fraserlawfirm.com
jroberts@fraserlawfirm.com
gbilabaye@fraserlawfirm.com
Attorneys for Oakland County, Michigan

**STATE OF MICHIGAN
BEFORE THE MICHIGAN PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

In the matter of the Application of	)	
DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY for authority	)	
to increase its rates, amend its rate schedules	)	Case No. U-22046
and rules governing the distribution and supply	)	
of electric energy, and for miscellaneous	)	
<u>accounting authority.</u>	)	

PROOF OF SERVICE

Joann M. Schofield hereby certifies that on October 26, 2026, she caused to be filed in the above-referenced electronic docket the ***Initial Brief of Oakland County*** and this ***Proof of Service*** and to be delivered to the persons identified on the attached service list by electronic mail.

/s/ Joann M. Schofield
Joann M. Schofield

Service List U-22046

Hon. Theresa A.G. Staley	Administrative Law Judge	staleytl@michigan.gov
Lori Mayabb	Case Coordinator	mayabbl@michigan.gov
Jon P. Christinidis	DTE Electric Company	jon.christinidis@dteenergy.com
Andrea E. Hayden	DTE Electric Company	Andrea.hayden@dteenergy.com
DTE Service Email	DTE Electric Company	mpscfilings@dteenergy.com
Daniel E. Sonneveldt	MPSC Staff Counsel	SonneveldtD@michigan.gov
Nicholas Q. Taylor	MPSC Staff Counsel	taylorn10@michigan.gov
Amit T. Singh	MPSC Staff Counsel	singha9@michigan.gov
Anna B. Stirling	MPSC Staff Counsel	stirlingal@michigan.gov
Christopher M. Bzdok	Michigan Environmental Counsel, Citizens Utility Board of Michigan, and Natural Resources Defense Council	chris@tropospherelegal.com
Tracy Jane Andrews	Michigan Environmental Counsel, Citizens Utility Board of Michigan, and Natural Resources Defense Council	tjandrews@tropospherelegal.com
Holly L. Hillyer	Michigan Environmental Counsel, Citizens Utility Board of Michigan, and Natural Resources Defense Council	holly@tropospherelegal.com
Sean C. Clark	Michigan Environmental Counsel, Citizens Utility Board of Michigan, and Natural Resources Defense Council	sean@tropospherelegal.com
Natasha Fowles	Michigan Environmental Counsel, Citizens Utility Board of Michigan, and Natural Resources Defense Council	natasha@tropospherelegal.com
Sue Fruchey	Michigan Environmental Counsel, Citizens Utility Board of Michigan, and Natural Resources Defense Council	sue@tropospherelegal.com
Helen Li	Sierra Club	hli@earthjustice.org
Timothy J. Lundgren	Michigan Energy Innovation Business Council, Institute for Energy Innovation, Advanced Energy United, Energy Michigan, and Foundry Association of Michigan	tjlundgren@varnumlaw.com

Service List U-22046

Service List U-22046

Laura A. Chappelle	Michigan Energy Innovation Business Council, Institute for Energy Innovation, Advanced Energy United, Energy Michigan, and Foundry Association of Michigan	lachappelle@varnumlaw.com
Justin K. Ooms	Michigan Energy Innovation Business Council, Institute for Energy Innovation, Advanced Energy United, Energy Michigan, and Foundry Association of Michigan	jkooms@varnumlaw.com
Haylee N. Skank	Michigan Energy Innovation Business Council, Institute for Energy Innovation, Advanced Energy United, Energy Michigan, and Foundry Association of Michigan	hnskank@varnumlaw.com
Jennifer U. Heston	Gerda MacSteel, Inc.	jheston@potomacclaw.com
Amanda Urban	We Want Green, Too and Soulardarity	aurbanlaw@gmail.com
Alexandria C. Miskho	We Want Green, Too and Soulardarity	amiskho@uchicago.edu
Mark N. Templeton	We Want Green, Too and Soulardarity	templeton@uchicago.edu
Emma Young	We Want Green, Too and Soulardarity	aelc_mpsc@lawclinic.uchicago.edu
Kurt J. Boehm	The Kroger Co.	KBoehm@BKLawfirm.com
Michael L. Kurtz	The Kroger Co.	mkurtz@BKLawfirm.com
Jody Kyler Cohn	The Kroger Co.	JKylerCohn@BKLawfirm.com
Justin Bieber	The Kroger Co.	jbieber@energystrat.com
Valerie Jackson	The City of Ann Arbor	vjackson@a2gov.org
Michael J. Watza	PROTEC (The Michigan Coalition to Protect the Public Rights of Way) and MI-MAUI (Michigan Municipal Association for Utility Issues)	mike@bloomsluggett.com

Service List U-22046

Nathan D. Inks	PROTEC (The Michigan Coalition to Protect the Public Rights of Way) and MI-MAUI (Michigan Municipal Association for Utility Issues)	nathan@bloomsfluggett.com
Melissa M. Horne	Walmart, Inc.	mhorne@hcc-law.com