

STATE OF ILLINOIS
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY :
 :
Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience and :
Necessity, pursuant to Section 8-406.1 of the Illinois : No. 13-0657
Public Utilities Act, and an Order pursuant to Section 8- :
503 of Illinois Public Utilities Act, to Construct, Operate :
and Maintain a new 345 kilovolt transmission line in :
Ogle, DeKalb, Kane and DuPage Counties, Illinois :

**COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY’S RESPONSE IN
SUPPORT OF STAFF’S MOTION FOR LEAVE TO RESPOND TO THE
SKP GROUP AND URMIC REPLY TO COMMONWEALTH EDISON
COMPANY’S RESPONSES TO COMMISSIONERS’ QUESTIONS**

Commonwealth Edison Company (“ComEd”), under Section 200.190 of the Rules of Practice of the Illinois Commerce Commission (“ICC” or “Commission”), 83 Ill. Admin. Code § 200.190, and the Administrative Law Judges’ (“ALJs”) October 6, 2014 ruling, submits this response supporting Staff’s Motion for Leave to Respond to the SKP Group¹ and URMIC Reply to ComEd’s Responses to Commissioners’ Questions (“Motion”). As explained below, Staff’s Motion should be granted.

1. The Commission directed data requests to ComEd on August 28, 2014. The ALJs’ August 28 ruling allowed ComEd 14 days to respond and gave all other parties an additional 7 days to reply. ComEd timely provided substantive verified answers to each of the Commissioners’ data requests.

2. Only SKP/URMIC filed a “reply.” SKP/URMIC’s Reply did not address facts ComEd provided to the Commissioners in response to their questions, nor did it argue that

¹ Jerry Drexler, Kristine Drexler, William Lenschow, Thomas Pienkowski, Kristin Pienkowski, Robert and Diane Mason, John Tomaszewicz, and Ellen Roberts Vogel. Together, with Utility Risk Management Corporation, these parties are referred to as “SKP/URMIC.”

ComEd's responses exceeded the scope of the Commissioners' questions. Rather, as Staff states "[t]he SKP/URMC Reply ... raises for the first time in this docket issues and arguments of law that bear on the authority of the ALJs and the Commission to request and consider information in this proceeding." Motion at 2.

3. Because SKP/URMC's arguments are new, challenge the process established by the Commission, and do not specifically address ComEd's Responses to the Commission, ComEd concurs that "good cause exists to allow for responses to the SKP/URMC Reply by Staff and other parties." *Id.* Staff and other parties should have an opportunity to respond to these new arguments.

WHEREFORE, ComEd respectfully requests that Staff's Motion be granted and that Staff and parties be given the opportunity to respond to SKP/URMC's reply.

Dated: October 8, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY

By: 

One of its Attorneys

Thomas S. O'Neill
Senior Vice President & General Counsel
COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY
440 S. LaSalle Street, Suite 3300
Chicago, Illinois 60605
312-394-7205
thomas.oneill@comed.com

Anastasia O'Brien
Richard G. Bernet
10 S. Dearborn, Suite 4900
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 394-5400
richard.bernet@exeloncorp.com

E. Glenn Rippie
Conor B. Ward
ROONEY RIPPIE & RATNASWAMY LLP
350 W. Hubbard Street, Suite 600
Chicago, Illinois 60654
(312) 447-2800
glenn.rippie@r3law.com
conor.ward@r3law.com