

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

BEFORE THE
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:)
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION,)
On Its Own Motion,)
Complainant,) DOCKET NO.
vs.) 12-0649
MT. CARMEL PUBLIC UTILITY CO.)
Reconciliation of revenues collected)
under fuel adjustment charges with)
actual costs prudently incurred.)

Springfield, Illinois
Thursday, September 12, 2013

Met, pursuant to notice, at 11:00 a.m.

BEFORE:

LARRY JONES, Administrative Law Judge

APPEARANCES:

SCOTT TOLSDORF
Illinois Commerce Commission
527 East Capitol Avenue
Springfield, Illinois 62701
(Appearing on behalf of the Illinois
Commerce Commission.)

ERIC BRAMLET
Kroger & Bramlet, P.C.
316 1/2 Market Street
P.O. Box 278
Mt. Carmel, Illinois 62863
(Appearing via teleconference on
behalf of Mt. Carmel Public Utility
Co.)

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES
by: Dorothy J. Hart, RPR, CSR
CSR #084-001390

1		INDEX	
2	WITNESSES		PAGE
3	(None)		
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	EXHIBITS	IDENTIFIED	ADMITTED
9	Mt. Carmel Exhibit 1.0	10	12
10	Mt. Carmel Exhibit 2.0	10	12
11	Mt. Carmel Exhibit 3.0	11	12
12	Mt. Carmel Exhibit 4.0	11	12
13			
14	ICC Staff Exhibit 1.0	12	13
15	ICC Staff Exhibit 1.1	13	13
16	ICC Staff Exhibit 2.0	13	13
17	ICC Staff Exhibit 2.1	13	13
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

PROCEEDINGS

JUDGE JONES: Good morning. I call for hearing Docket Number 12-0649. This is titled, in part, Illinois Commerce Commission on its own motion versus Mt. Carmel Public Utility Company, Reconciliation of revenues collected under fuel adjustment charges with actual costs prudently incurred.

We will at this time take the respective appearances orally for the record. If you appeared at the earlier hearing in this matter, you need not restate your contact information unless it has changed or you simply prefer to do that.

We'll start with the appearance or appearances on behalf of Mt. Carmel Public Utility Company.

MR. BRAMLET: Appearing on behalf of Mt. Carmel Public Utility Company, my name is Eric Bramlet.

JUDGE JONES: Okay. Thank you. Commission Staff?

MR. TOLSDORF: Yes, Your Honor. Appearing on behalf of the Illinois Commerce

1 Commission, my name is Scott Tolsdorf.

2 JUDGE JONES: Thank you.

3 Are there any other appearances?

4 (No response)

5 JUDGE JONES: Let the record show there
6 are not.

7 It's my understanding that the
8 preference of the parties is to proceed today with
9 the presentation of your testimony and other
10 evidentiary items. Is that correct?

11 MR. BRAMLET: Yes, Your Honor.

12 JUDGE JONES: All right, Mr. Bramlet,
13 do you want to go ahead and proceed with that on
14 behalf of Mt. Carmel?

15 MR. BRAMLET: Thank you, Your Honor.

16 Mt. Carmel has filed on e-Docket on
17 April 17th, 2013, Mt. Carmel Exhibit 1.0, which
18 consisted of 12 pages of the direct testimony of
19 Margaret E. Felts. That testimony also included
20 Attachments E-1 and E-2.

21 Also, Mt. Carmel filed Mt. Carmel
22 Exhibit 2.0 on e-Docket and that was the
23 Certificate of Publication in accordance with the
24 statute.

1 Mt. Carmel also filed on e-Docket Mt.
2 Carmel 3.0, which are a data response -- data
3 request responses, both public and proprietary
4 versions.

5 And also filed Mt. Carmel Exhibit 4.0
6 on e-Docket, which is an affidavit of Margaret E.
7 Felts, verifying the other exhibits.

8 We move those four exhibits be admitted
9 into evidence.

10 JUDGE JONES: Thank you.

11 Any objections or clarifications?

12 MR. TOLSDORF: No, Your Honor.

13 JUDGE JONES: Let the record show that
14 those exhibits are hereby admitted into the
15 evidentiary record as they appear on e-Docket.

16 Exhibit 1.0 is admitted as filed on
17 April 17th, 2013.

18 Mr. Bramlet, with respect to those
19 attachments to Exhibit 1.0, E-1 and E-2, do you
20 want those treated as stand-alone exhibits or as
21 part of Exhibit 1.0?

22 MR. BRAMLET: Part of Exhibit 1.0.

23 JUDGE JONES: All right. Those
24 attachments will be treated accordingly.

1 Also admitted as filed on e-Docket on
2 September 9th, 2013, is Mt. Carmel Exhibit 2.0.

3 Mt. Carmel Exhibits 3.0 and 4.0, which
4 were also part of the motion, are admitted as they
5 were filed on e-Docket on September 11, 2013. As
6 Mr. Bramlet indicated, 3.0 was filed in both a
7 public and proprietary version.

8 (Whereupon Mt. Carmel Exhibit
9 Numbers 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, and 4.0
10 were admitted into evidence.)

11 JUDGE JONES: Do the parties have
12 anything else with respect to the exhibits offered
13 by Mt. Carmel Public Utility Company and admitted?

14 MR. TOLSDORF: No, Your Honor.

15 MR. BRAMLET: Mt. Carmel has nothing,
16 Your Honor.

17 JUDGE JONES: All right. Thank you.
18 Turning to the Commission Staff.

19 MR. TOLSDORF: Yes, Your Honor. Staff
20 moves for the admission of the following four
21 exhibits:

22 The direct testimony of Scott Tolsdorf
23 identified as ICC Staff Exhibit 1.0 that was filed
24 on e-Docket August 22nd, 2013; the affidavit of

1 Scott Tolsdorf identified as ICC Staff Exhibit 1.1
2 that was filed on September 9th, 2013; the direct
3 testimony of Yassir Rashid identified as ICC Staff
4 Exhibit 2.0 that was filed on August 22nd, 2013;
5 and the affidavit of Yassir Rashid, which is ICC
6 Staff Exhibit 2.1, which was filed September 10th,
7 2013.

8 JUDGE JONES: Thank you.

9 Are there any objections or
10 clarifications regarding that request?

11 MR. BRAMLET: Mt. Carmel has no
12 objection.

13 JUDGE JONES: Let the record show that
14 the request to admit those testimonies and other
15 exhibits by the Commission Staff is granted. Those
16 exhibits are admitted as they appear on e-Docket on
17 the date filed. The file date and the exhibit
18 numbers were identified in the motion, so I will
19 not restate those at this time.

20 (Whereupon ICC Staff Exhibit
21 Numbers 1.0, 1.1, 2.0, and 2.1
22 were admitted as evidence.)

23 JUDGE JONES: Are there any questions
24 with respect to the Staff exhibits?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

(No response)

JUDGE JONES: All right. Let the record show there are not.

To briefly discuss post-hearing scheduling, we hereby go off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

JUDGE JONES: Back on the record. There was an off-the-record discussion for the purposes indicated. I believe the utility, Mt. Carmel, and the Staff are in agreement on some post-hearing scheduling. The end result of that would be the filing by Mt. Carmel of a draft or suggested Order on October the 11th.

There are some steps that precede that. I don't know if the Staff and the Company want to identify those interim steps for the record or not as part of the post-hearing scheduling. So if you do, feel free to step in at this point and identify those dates. Does anyone want those in the record?

MR. BRAMLET: It doesn't matter to me, Your Honor.

JUDGE JONES: All right.

MR. TOLSDORF: No.

JUDGE JONES: Okay. That concludes the

1 post-hearing scheduling.

2 I believe that will be it then, but let
3 me make sure. Do any of you have anything else to
4 take up on or off the record before we mark this
5 matter heard and taken?

6 MR. TOLSDORF: Not from Staff.

7 MR. BRAMLET: No, Your Honor.

8 JUDGE JONES: At this time then let the
9 record show that today's hearing in this docket is
10 over. In accordance with that, this matter is
11 hereby marked heard and taken.

12 (End of hearing: 11:12 a.m.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

