

Michigan Planning Consortium
Response Template for 3/23/09 MPC Memo

Responding Company or Individual: _____ (Anonymous or blank is OK, but if you would like to receive credit in the MPC report for your ideas, please include a response)

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.

Please send your responses via email by April 10th to Cathy Cole of the MPSC Staff at colec1@michigan.gov. If you have any questions, contact Cathy at 517-241-6065.