



State of Michigan
Jennifer M. Granholm, Governor

Michigan Public Service Commission
Orjiakor N. Isiogu, Chairman
Monica Martinez, Commissioner
Steven A. Transeth, Commissioner

MEMORANDUM

Date: 3/23/2009
To: Michigan Planning Consortium Participants
From: Cathy Cole & Tom Stanton, MPSC Electric Reliability Division Staff
Subject: Developing Proposals for Inclusion in MPC Report to the Commission

The purpose of this memo is to solicit from Consortium participants proposals for the report due to the Michigan PSC by July 31, 2009. All MPC participants will be invited to discuss this memorandum at our March 27 meeting.

Staff proposes that answers to these questions, including any supplementary questions added during the March 27 meeting, should be provided back to Staff in two weeks; by April 10. Staff will review and summarize all the answers and provide that summary to participants in one week; by April 16. Then, all participants can discuss that information at the next MPC meeting on April 20.

[The Commission's July 1, 2008 Order in Case No. U-15590](#), gives guidance about the functions of the MPC and possible content of this report.¹ That Order says, in part:

[A] more organized state-level component needs to be developed to consider other infrastructure alternatives that solve an identified problem, examine costs when evaluating potential solutions, and best serve the interests of Michigan energy consumers. ...

The public is better served, and the regional planning process is stronger, when there is adequate coordination among different Michigan entities contributing to energy infrastructure planning. ...

[T]o avoid duplication of effort, the Consortium will recommend how its work complements ongoing state and regional processes as they develop.

The Consortium shall be policy and implementation oriented. Policy issues will be addressed by creating and maintaining a Michigan forum for the Consortium to identify and make recommendations to the Commission for improvements to the planning process for electricity infrastructure. Implementation issues will be addressed through consideration of energy infrastructure solutions to an identified need, including details of specific proposed transmission projects.

[T]he initial goals of the Consortium should include the following:

¹ <http://efile.mpsc.cis.state.mi.us/efile/viewcase.php?casenum=15590>

1. Ensure adequate sharing of information throughout the planning process on a local and detailed level.
2. Evaluate energy infrastructure alternatives, including proposed transmission projects.
3. Examine cost effects of various alternatives on Michigan customers.
4. Recommend the most effective ways for Michigan stakeholders to participate regional planning processes and related state and FERC proceedings, including 1995 Public Act 30 (Act 30) certification proceedings.

At the end of the year, the Consortium may recommend to the Commission that it continue, that it fold into the evolving regional transmission planning processes, or another alternative. ... The Michigan Planning Consortium shall report to the Commission by July 31, 2009 on its accomplishments, the efficacy of the Consortium in impacting electricity infrastructure improvements, and whether or how the Consortium should continue.

Here is a list of questions that might be addressed in the July 31 report from the Consortium to the Commission:

1. In your opinion, what accomplishments have been made by or through the Michigan Planning Consortium since the time it was established?
2. The Consortium is to “recommend how its work complements ongoing state and regional processes... .” What specifically are the state and regional processes that should be considered in the light of this task? What recommendation(s) about this issue should be included in the report?
3. Are there particular problems already identified that the Consortium should address, but has not yet? If yes, please list them.
4. Are there improvements to be made in identifying problems that the Consortium should address? Do Consortium participants recommend any regular process(es) for the identification of problems to be brought to the attention of the Consortium? If so, what process(es)?
5. How should the Consortium act as “the forum to collect needed information and ... work towards consensus recommendations”?
6. Can the general types of information that should be collected be identified? If yes, what are those types of information?
7. What recommendations should be made regarding means to “[e]nsure adequate sharing of information throughout the planning process on a local and detailed level”?

8. Implementation issues are to be addressed “through consideration of energy infrastructure solutions to an identified need, including details of specific proposed transmission projects.” Are there recommendations about implementation issues that should be included in the report? If yes, please explain. Are there any identified needs that should be discussed in the report? If yes, please explain.
9. What “energy infrastructure recommendations” should be included in the July report, if any?
10. What recommendations should be made regarding means to “[e]valuate energy infrastructure alternatives, including proposed transmission projects”?
11. What recommendations should be made regarding means to “[e]xamine cost effects of various alternatives on Michigan customers”?
12. The Consortium is to “identify and make recommendations to the Commission for improvements to the planning process for electricity infrastructure.” What recommendations for improvements should be included in the report?
13. The Commission identified a need for a “more organized state-level” planning process, with “adequate coordination among different Michigan entities contributing to energy infrastructure planning” and “balance to ensure that decisions ... are fully supportable and ... serve Michigan’s energy needs at the most reasonable cost to ratepayers.” Please describe any process(es) for this purpose that you propose the Consortium should recommend to the Commission.
14. What recommendations should be made regarding “the most effective ways for Michigan stakeholders to participate in regional planning processes and related state and FERC proceedings, including 1995 PA 30 (Act 30) certification proceedings”?
15. What recommendations should be made regarding the future of the Consortium? Should it “continue, ...fold into the evolving regional transmission processes, or another alternative”? If recommending “another alternative,” please provide as much specificity as you can. If the Consortium should continue, in what capacity should it continue, and what specifically should the Consortium address?
16. Is there anything else, not included in these questions, that you would like to see addressed in the Consortium’s report to the Commission? If so, please provide details and recommendations.