



**House
Legislative
Analysis
Section**

Washington Square Building, Suite 1025
Lansing, Michigan 48909
Phone: 517/373-6466

THE APPARENT PROBLEM:

Public Act 158 of 1988, House Bill 5415, exempted the Public Service Commission from the Open Meetings Act when deliberating the merits of a case. (The PSC is a three-member, quasi-judicial body that regulates public utilities providing electricity, telephone, gas, and intrastate transportation services.) The exemption was justified on several grounds. Advocates said that requiring the commissioners to deliberate in public on matters such as rate cases, particularly when sensitive issues were being considered, could affect the financial stability of utilities whose cases were under deliberation. But principally, it was considered unwieldy and absurd that two commissioners (a quorum of the commission) could not meet and discuss a case without issuing a notice of a public hearing and inviting the public to attend. Commissioners were limited to communicating with one another through staff liaisons or in writing. (Some people considered that method itself a violation of the Open Meetings Act.) An exemption from the Open Meetings Act would, it was said, make the PSC's decision-making more efficient and effective. However, because there was uncertainty as to the effect of the Open Meetings exemption on consumer interests (and because there was vigorous opposition to the exemption in some quarters), the exemption legislation carried a sunset date of January 1, 1990, to allow the legislature to evaluate the consequences of permitting the commissioners to meet in closed sessions to discuss cases before them. The commissioners claim that the exemption has proved itself in two recent cases, one a Michigan Consolidated Gas rate case, the other the Consumers Power co-generation case. In a letter to the chair of the House Public Utilities Committee in support of a repeal of the sunset (that is, making the exemption permanent), the three commissioners said:

"Open discussions between Commissioners facilitated decisions regarding complex, competing, and sometimes conflicting issues based on lengthy and intricate case records in both of these cases. The exemption allowed for the expeditious weaving of public policy, legal principles, and economic theory with modern technological advancements, without the burden of dealing through an intermediary. Without the exemption, it is doubtful that the many issues relevant to these cases could have been examined as thoroughly and as quickly as was possible with direct interaction. In addition, the exemption speeds up the initial learning phase of a new Commissioner, allowing the new Commissioner to be more effective more quickly."

THE CONTENT OF THE BILL:

The bill would amend the Open Meetings Act to extend the sunset on the exemption for the Public Service Commission from January 1, 1990, to December 31, 1991.

MCL 15.263

PSC OPEN MEETING EXEMPTION SUNSET

House Bill 4321 (Substitute H-2)
First Analysis (3-20-89)

Sponsor: Rep. Alma Stallworth
Committee: Public Utilities

RECEIVED

MAY 23 1989

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS: Mich. State Law Library

There is no information at present.

ARGUMENTS:

For:

The PSC's exemption from the Open Meetings Act has already proved a success. In two major cases recently, commissioners were able to do their jobs more effectively and more efficiently as a result of face-to-face deliberations. At the same time, the interests of the consuming public were protected by the usual numerous opportunities to be involved in the many public hearings. Remember that the administrative hearings are entirely open to the public; only the final decision-making phase of a case is closed. While some people would prefer that the sunset be repealed entirely and the exemption be made permanent, the bill would extend the sunset for two more years.

Against:

While a two-year extension of the sunset is preferable to an outright repeal, the fact remains that the Public Service Commission should be fully subject to the Open Meetings Act. It is not the purpose of that act to make it easier for public bodies to make their decisions nor to make government more efficient. Rather, it aims at ensuring that the public is aware of what its public officials are doing and at giving the public a voice in public policy decisions. The PSC's responsibility for seeing that essential services are available at reasonable rates sets it apart from the other administrative bodies that are exempt from the Open Meetings Act (such as the Worker's Compensation Appeal Board). The PSC makes far-reaching public policy decisions and ought to do so publicly. Furthermore, consumer advocates are concerned about reports that in a recent case the PSC met privately with one party to the case (its own advocacy staff) but not with the other parties. Extending the sunset at least makes it more likely that the effects of the exemption will be evaluated in the future.

POSITIONS:

The Public Service Commission supports the bill as reported by the House Public Utilities Committee. (3-16-89)

The Michigan State Chamber of Commerce supports the bill. (3-15-89)

Detroit Edison supports the bill. (3-15-89)

The Michigan Citizens Lobby is opposed to the exemption in principle but prefers the sunset extension to a repeal of the sunset. (3-15-89)

H.B. 4321 (3-20-89)