

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION**

Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC	)	
	)	
	)	Docket No. 15-0277
Application for an Order Granting Grain Belt	)	
Express Clean Line LLC a Certificate of Public	)	
Convenience and Necessity pursuant to Section	)	
8-406.1 of the Public Utilities Act to Construct,	)	
Operate and Maintain a High Voltage Electric	)	
Service Transmission Line and to Conduct a	)	
Transmission Public Utility Business in Connection	)	
Therewith and Authorizing Grain Belt Express	)	
Clean Line pursuant to Sections 8-503 and	)	
8-406.1(i) of the Public Utilities Act to Construct the	)	
High Voltage Electric Transmission Line.	)	

**INITIAL BRIEF OF THE STAFF  
OF THE ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION**

CHRISTINE F. ERICSON  
JOHN L. SAGONE  
Office of General Counsel  
Illinois Commerce Commission  
160 N. LaSalle, Ste. C-800  
Chicago, IL 60601  
Phone: (312) 793-2877  
Fax: (312) 793-1556  
Email: [cericson@icc.illinois.gov](mailto:cericson@icc.illinois.gov)  
[jsagone@icc.illinois.gov](mailto:jsagone@icc.illinois.gov)

Counsel for the Staff of the  
Illinois Commerce Commission

September 11, 2015

## Table of Contents

I.	Introduction .....	1
	A. Overview and Summary of Party’s Position .....	1
	B. Description of Grain Belt Express and the Project .....	2
	C. Procedural History .....	4
	D. Legal Standards.....	5
II.	Grain Belt Express’ compliance with Section 8-406.1 Pre-Filing Meeting and Notice, Application Content, and other Section 8-406.1 Requirements .....	6
III.	Grain Belt Express’ Right to Utilize Section 8-406.1 as an Entity that is not a Public Utility .....	7
IV.	Section 8-406.1(f) Criteria for a Certificate.....	7
	A. Section 8-406.1(f) – Grain Belt Express’ Promotion of the Public Convenience and Necessity .....	7
B.	Section 8-406.1(f)(1) .....	13
	1. Necessary to Provide Adequate, Reliable, Efficient Service .....	13
	2. Promote the Development of an Effectively Competitive Electricity Market .....	13
	3. Least Cost.....	17
	C. Section 8-406.1(f)(2) – Capability to Efficiently Manage and Supervise the Construction Process .....	20
	D. Section 8-406.1(f)(3) – Capability to Finance the Construction of the Project without Significant Adverse Financial Consequences.....	21
	E. Proposed Conditions relating to Grant of the CPCN .....	24
	E. Other Considerations Under Section 8-406.1 .....	24
V.	Proposed Route of the Project in Illinois and Land Acquisition .....	24
	A. Description and Development of the Proposed Route .....	24
	B. Selection of Proposed Route vs. Alternate Route .....	24
	C. Proposed Revisions to the Proposed Route (Rex Encore and Branch Properties parties) .....	25
	D. Proposed Design Aspects of the Project.....	25
	1. Easement Widths .....	25
	2. Structure Types and Other Design Parameters .....	25
	E. Grain Belt Express’s Approach to Land Acquisition (including issues relating to easement document) .....	25
	F. Landowner Concerns about Impacts of Construction on their Properties (including AIMA provisions and proposed conditions relating to preventing/mitigating impacts).....	26
	F. Interactions with Pipelines and Railroads .....	26
	1. Rockies Express Pipeline.....	26
	2. Illinois Central Railroad and BNSF Railroad .....	26
VI.	Request for Authority under Section 8-503 .....	26
VII.	Grain Belt Express’ Accounting-Related Requests .....	27
	A. Use of the FERC Uniform System of Accounts.....	27
	B. Request to Maintain Books and Records Outside of Illinois.....	27
	C. Request for Proprietary Treatment of Certain Information .....	27
VIII.	Other.....	27

IX. A. Multi-Driver Projects..... 27  
Conclusion..... 28

**STATE OF ILLINOIS  
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION**

Grain Belt Express Clean Line LLC	)	
	)	Docket No. 15-0277
Application for an Order Granting Grain Belt	)	
Express Clean Line LLC a Certificate of Public	)	
Convenience and Necessity pursuant to Section	)	
8-406.1 of the Public Utilities Act to Construct,	)	
Operate and Maintain a High Voltage Electric	)	
Service Transmission Line and to Conduct a	)	
Transmission Public Utility Business in Connection	)	
Therewith and Authorizing Grain Belt Express	)	
Clean Line pursuant to Sections 8-503 and	)	
8-406.1(i) of the Public Utilities Act to Construct the	)	
High Voltage Electric Transmission Line.	)	

**INITIAL BRIEF OF THE STAFF  
OF THE ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION**

Staff of the Illinois Commerce Commission (“Staff”), by and through its undersigned counsel, pursuant to Section 200.800 of the Rules of Practice of the Illinois Commerce Commission (“Commission” or “ICC”) (83 Ill. Adm. Code 200.800), respectfully submits its Initial Brief in the instant proceeding.

**I. Introduction**

**A. Overview and Summary of Party’s Position**

This matter comes before the Commission on the Grain Belt Clean Line LLC (“Grain Belt,” “GBX” or “Company”) Petition for a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity (“CPCN” or “Certificate”) pursuant to Section 8-406.1 of the Illinois Public

Utilities Act (“Act”), 220 ILCS 5/8-406.1, and an Order pursuant to Section 8-503 of the Act, 220 ILCS 5/8-503, to Construct, Operate and Maintain a New High Voltage Electric Service Line in the Counties of Pike and Clark, Illinois (“Application” or “Petition”).

Staff’s position is described in detail below.

**B. Description of Grain Belt Express and the Project**

Grain Belt proposes to construct a nominal  $\pm 600$  kilovolt (“kV”), high voltage, direct current (“HVDC”) transmission line and associated facilities (“Project”) that will be capable of delivering (i) 500 megawatts (“MW”) of power from renewable energy projects located in western Kansas (the “Resource Area”) to an interconnection with the Midcontinent Independent System Operator, Inc. (“MISO”) in Ralls County, Missouri, and (ii) 3,500 MW of power from renewable energy projects in the Resource Area to an interconnection point with the PJM Interconnection, LLC (“PJM”) at the Sullivan/Breed Substation of American Electric Power Company (“AEP”) in Sullivan County, Indiana. (Petition, 2-4.)

The Project will originate in Ford County, Kansas; traverse northern Kansas and northern Missouri to an interconnection point with the 345 kV system of Ameren Missouri in Ralls County, Missouri, where a direct current (“DC”)-to-alternating current (“AC”) converter station will be located; cross the Mississippi River at a location approximately 2.5 miles south of Saverton, Missouri, between Mississippi River miles 299 and 300; enter Illinois approximately 6.5 miles west of New Canton, Illinois, in Pike County; traverse Illinois for approximately 202.7 miles to a location near West Union in Clark County, Illinois, where a DC-to-AC converter station will be located; extend an additional 3.6 miles to the Illinois-Indiana border; and continue approximately 1.6 miles in Indiana to the AEP Sullivan/Breed Substation in Sullivan County, Indiana, where it will interconnect with the

AEP 345 kV transmission system. *Id.*

The HVDC transmission line will terminate at the converter station to be located in Clark County, Illinois, and a double circuit 345 kV AC line will be constructed from the converter station approximately 5.2 miles to the point of interconnection at the AEP Sullivan/Breed Substation. *Id.* The total length of the transmission line from Ford County, Kansas, to Sullivan County, Indiana, including the Proposed Route of the Project in Illinois, is approximately 780 miles. *Id.* The Sullivan and Breed substations are owned by AEP's local operating company, Indiana-Michigan Power Company, but are referred to in the Application and in Grain Belt Express testimony and exhibits as the AEP Sullivan/Breed Substation. *Id.* The Project will deliver renewable energy to buyers in Missouri, Illinois and Indiana, and, through existing transmission facilities and/or additional transmission arrangements, to other states located on the MISO and PJM grids. *Id.*

As GBX witness Mr. Galli indicated in his direct testimony, HVDC technology has many advantages over high voltage alternating current ("HVAC") technology in the transmission of large amounts of electric energy for long distances. (GBX Ex. 2.0, 8.) Some of these advantages include: lower power loss, less construction cost, and narrower horizontal clearance for the transmission line, which means the DC transmission line can operate safely and reliably inside a narrower Right of Way ("ROW"). *Id.* at 8 – 9. However, HVDC technology requires an AC-to-DC converter and/or a DC-to-AC converter at each point of interconnection with AC systems. (Staff Ex. 1.0, 8.) These converter stations are considerably more expensive than the typical AC-AC transmission substations used through most of the transmission and distribution grid. *Id.* Thus, to

retain the cost advantage of HVDC technology, the number of such conversion stations must be limited, which effectively limits the application of HVDC technology to long-distance transmission. *Id.* Therefore, an HVDC transmission project is likely to be utilized primarily by those electricity producers and consumers located in proximity to the limited number of converter stations along the transmission line. *Id.*

### **C. Procedural History**

On April 10, 2015, GBX filed its Application for a CPCN pursuant to Section 8-406.1 of the Act initiating the above-captioned matter. Among other things, the Act requires the Commission to enter an Order granting, granting in part, or denying the Application pursuant to an expedited schedule. 220 ILCS 5/8-406.1(g).

The following parties have intervened or entered appearances in this matter: the Illinois Agricultural Association a/k/a the Illinois Farm Bureau, Concerned Citizens & Property Owners, Landowners Alliance of Central Illinois (“LACI”), Rex Encore Farms LLC, Rex Encore Properties LLC, Ameren Illinois Company d/b/a Ameren Illinois, Mary Ellen Zotos, Rockies Express Pipeline LLC, John Barry Julian, Brown Branch LLC and JAR Branch LLC, Infinity Wind Power (“Infinity”), International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Locals 51 and 702, AFL-CIO, Wind on the Wires (“WOW”), the Building Owners and Managers Association of Chicago, and the Illinois Central Railroad Company.

On July 1, 2015, the ALJ set the procedural schedule in this expedited docket. Pursuant to that schedule, Staff and other parties filed testimony in this proceeding. An evidentiary hearing was held on August 19-21, 2015. Witnesses testified and evidence was admitted into the record, and the proceeding was continued generally. (Tr., 1159:9-10, Aug. 21, 2015.)

#### **D. Legal Standards**

Section 8-406.1 of the Act establishes expedited procedures for construction of new high voltage transmission lines. If the Commission finds, based upon the application filed and the evidentiary record, that the project will promote the public convenience and necessity and that all the applicable criteria are met, then it shall grant a certificate. 220 ILCS 5/8-406.1(f). A public utility must, among other things, establish three elements to support the granting of a CPCN.

Section 8-406.1(f) provides as follows:

The Commission shall, after notice and hearing, grant a certificate of public convenience and necessity filed in accordance with the requirements of this Section if, based upon the application filed with the Commission and the evidentiary record, it finds the Project will promote the public convenience and necessity and that all of the following criteria are satisfied:

- (1) That the Project is necessary to provide adequate, reliable, and efficient service to the public utility's customers and is the least-cost means of satisfying the service needs of the public utility's customers or that the Project will promote the development of an effectively competitive electricity market that operates efficiently, is equitable to all customers, and is the least cost means of satisfying those objectives.
- (2) That the public utility is capable of efficiently managing and supervising the construction process and has taken sufficient action to ensure adequate and efficient construction and supervision of the construction.
- (3) That the public utility is capable of financing the proposed construction without significant adverse financial consequences for the utility or its customers.

220 ILCS 5/8-406.1(f).

Section 8-406.1(i) provides as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, a decision granting a certificate under this Section shall include an order pursuant to Section 8-503 of this Act authorizing or directing the construction of the high voltage electric service line and related facilities as approved by the Commission, in the manner and within the time specified in said order.

220 ILCS 5/8-401(i).

Section 8-503 of the Act (order to construct), provides, in part, as follows:

Whenever the Commission, after a hearing, shall find that additions, extensions, repairs or improvements to, or changes in, the existing plant, equipment, apparatus, facilities or other physical property of any public utility or of any 2 or more public utilities are necessary and ought reasonably to be made or that a new structure or structures is or are necessary and should be erected, to promote the security or convenience of its employees or the public or promote the development of an effectively competitive electricity market, or in any other way to secure adequate service or facilities, the Commission shall make and serve an order authorizing or directing that such additions, extensions, repairs, improvements or changes be made, or such structure or structures be erected at the location, in the manner and within the time specified in said order; provided, however, that the Commission shall have no authority to order the construction, addition or extension of any electric generating plant unless the public utility requests a certificate for the construction of the plant pursuant to Section 8-406 and in conjunction with such request also requests the entry of an order under this Section.

220 ILCS 5/8-503.

**II. Grain Belt Express' compliance with Section 8-406.1 Pre-Filing Meeting and Notice, Application Content, and other Section 8-406.1 Requirements**

GBX's petition included the information listed in Section 8-406.1(a)(1) of the Act.

(See *generally*, Petition.) Additionally, GBX indicates that it has held three public meetings in each county as required by Section 8-406.1. According to GBX:

Grain Belt Express hosted three Public Meetings in each county crossed by the Project to present information about the Project, present Potential Routes, and seek input from the general public. The meetings were held in week long 'rounds,' during which one meeting was held in each county where the Project may be located. The first round of Public Meetings was held in the first week of December 2014 (1st through the 5th), the second in the first week of February 2015 (2nd through the 6th), and the third in the first week of March 2015 (2nd through the 6th). Approximately 3,160 recorded attendees came to the 27 Public Meetings in Illinois.

(GBX Ex. 8.2, 39.)

GBX filed its application on April 10, 2015. On April 29, 2015, GBX filed proof that

it published the required notice in the Breeze-Courier (the official State newspaper) on April 15, 2015. GBX appears to have dedicated a website about the project at least three weeks before it held its first public meeting, and it appears to have maintained that website since that time. (Staff Ex. 1.0, 15-16.) GBX's website address is <http://www.grainbeltexpresscleanline.com/site/home>. GBX paid the application fee of \$100,000, and it was processed on April 13, 2015. (Staff Ex. 1.0, 14-15.)

### **III. Grain Belt Express' Right to Utilize Section 8-406.1 as an Entity that is not a Public Utility**

[Left Intentionally Blank]

### **IV. Section 8-406.1(f) Criteria for a Certificate**

#### **A. Section 8-406.1(f) – Grain Belt Express' Promotion of the Public Convenience and Necessity**

Illinois courts have established that “necessity” as used in the PUA does not necessarily mean “indispensably requisite,” but rather that the service proposed to be provided should be “needful and useful to the public.” See, e.g., *Eagle Bus Lines, Inc. v. ICC*, 3 Ill. 2d 66, 78, (1954); *Gernand v. ICC*, 286 Ill. App. 3d 934, 945, (4th Dist. 1977); *King v. ICC*, 39 Ill. App. 3d 648, 653, (4th Dist. 1976) (where a service is needful and useful to the public, it is necessary). Further, Illinois courts have held that the relevant convenience and necessity is that of the public and not of any individual or number of individuals. See, e.g., *Illinois Hwy. Transp. Co. v. ICC*, 404 Ill. 610, 619, (1950); *Gulf Transp. Co. v. ICC*, 402 Ill. 11, 18, (1949); *Lakehead Pipeline Co. v. ICC*, 296 Ill. App. 3d 942, 954, (3d Dist. 1998).

The “necessity” standard was further explained by the Supreme Court in *Wabash, Chester & Western R.R. Co. v. ICC*:

When the statute requires a certificate of public convenience and necessity as a prerequisite to the construction or extension of any public utility, the word “necessity” is not used in its lexicographical sense of “indispensably required.” If it were, no certificate of public convenience and necessity could ever be granted . . . . [A]ny improvement which is highly important to the public convenience and desirable for the public welfare may be regarded as necessary. If it is of sufficient importance to warrant the expense of making it, it is a public necessity . . . . A strong or urgent reason why a thing should be done creates a necessity for doing it. \* \* \* The word connotes different degrees of necessity. It sometimes means indispensable; at others, needful, requisite or conducive. It is relative rather than absolute. No definition can be given that would fit all statutes. . . . , The Commerce Commission has a right to, and should, look to the future as well as to the present situation. Public utilities are expected to provide for the public necessities not only today but to anticipate for all future developments reasonably to be foreseen. The necessity to be provided for is not only the existing urgent need but the need to be expected in the future, so far as it may be anticipated from the development of the community, the growth of industry, the increase in wealth and population and all the elements to be expected in the progress of a community.

*Wabash, Chester & Western R.R. Co. v. ICC*, 309 Ill. 412, 418-19, (1923).

Thus, Illinois courts have held that what constitutes public convenience and necessity is within the Commission’s discretion to determine in each case, thereby permitting consideration of a broad range of factors as applicable to the particular case. *Commonwealth Edison Co. v. ICC*, 295 Ill. App. 3d 311, 317, (2d Dist. 1998); *New Landing Util., Inc. v. ICC*, 58 Ill. App. 3d 868, 871, (2d Dist. 1977). In considering “necessity” under Section 8-406, Staff believes that the Commission should consider whether the public utility has demonstrated that: (1) the benefits of the Project are ‘needful and useful to the public;’ (2) the benefits outweigh the costs; and (3) the Project will not prevent the attainment of a greater net benefit through an alternative project or some combination of alternative projects.

While it cannot be said that Grain Belt has demonstrated that the proposed Project is “indispensably requisite,” and, in fact, acknowledged that there is no actual need for it at this time, whether the Project is “needful and useful” to a degree sufficient to justify the

granting of a CPCN should be ascertained, among other things, by comparing the Project's benefits to its costs.

In support of its position, Staff presented the testimony of Staff witness Richard Zuraski, who stated, "I expect that the [GBX] Project will promote the public convenience and necessity." (Staff Exhibit 3.0, 3.) He further testified that, by providing access to additional and larger markets for electricity, the Project would facilitate development of wind farms in western Kansas – an area that is particularly rich in the underlying wind resource, explaining that wind farms located there can generate electricity at a significantly lower average cost than wind farms located in and around Illinois. *Id.*, 4. Thus, the Project would promote the public convenience and necessity by providing load serving entities in Illinois and other states access to lower cost electric supply, which could lead to retail price decreases. *Id.* In addition, for firms serving retail electric customers within states like Illinois, purchases of electricity and/or renewable energy credits from new wind farms located in western Kansas could lower the cost of complying with state-imposed renewable portfolio standards, and also may help states like Illinois lower the cost of complying with new federal regulations pertaining to carbon dioxide emissions. *Id.*

Mr. Zuraski relied, in part, upon cost estimates and electricity market price projections supplied by GBX. *Id.* For instance, GBX witness David Berry constructed a financial model comparing the cost of producing electricity with Kansas wind farms and transporting it with the GBX Project to the cost of producing electricity with more local wind farms or combined cycle natural gas-fired generators without the GBX Project. (GBX Ex. 11.0, 38-46.) Under a wide variety of scenarios, he showed that the Kansas-wind/GBX option was the least expensive of the three options. *Id.* He further showed

that, under the same wide variety of scenarios, the combined costs of the Kansas-wind/GBX option would be less than the revenues available from the electric energy market. *Id.*

LACI witness Dr. Michael Proctor raised some concerns with the GBX cost estimates, including concerns with the financial model used to make those estimates as well as some of the inputs to that model. (LACI Ex. 3.0 Rev.) Mr. Zuraski responded to Dr. Proctor's concerns by reconstructing the financial model and making some changes to model inputs. (Staff Ex. 5.0.) Mr. Zuraski's analysis confirmed his previous conclusions, and those of GBX witness Berry, about the cost-effectiveness of the Project. *Id.* at 3-4. Mr. Zuraski did not accept certain input changes proposed by Dr. Proctor because he found Dr. Proctor's arguments supporting those changes to be unpersuasive. *Id.* at 3. Company witness Berry provided a more detailed review and refutation of those other input changes proposed by Dr. Proctor. (GBX Ex. 11.13, 41-58.) Mr. Berry also showed that, after making a correction to a simple coding error, Dr. Proctor's own model and own assumptions also show that the GBX Project is cost effective. *Id.* at 42-43.

More fundamentally, Mr. Zuraski opined that, for purposes of determining whether the Project is likely to promote the public convenience and necessity, it is not absolutely necessary that the Kansas wind farm projects are able to produce energy at a lower cost than combined cycle generating units. (Staff Ex. 5.0, 4-5.) According to Mr. Zuraski, both non-dispatchable no-fuel technologies like wind generators and dispatchable fuel-fired technologies like combined cycle generators play somewhat different roles, satisfy different requirements, and entail different risks, so comparing their levelized costs of energy side-by-side is not dispositive of how interested utilities and merchant generators

will be in building one versus the other. *Id.* There likely will be continued interest in building both types of generating facilities. *Id.* On the other hand, it is reasonable to expect that the relative strength of interest in one technology versus the other, all else being equal, will be related to their relative levelized costs of energy. (Staff Ex. 5.0, 4-5.) While not a necessary condition, it is a good sign for the ultimate success of the Project as well as the welfare of consumers if we can reasonably expect that wind generated electricity can be produced at a low levelized cost of energy relative to other alternatives, like combined cycle generators. *Id.*

Similarly, Mr. Zuraski testified that, even if the expected cost of Kansas wind farms (including the cost of the Project) exceeded the expected cost of Illinois wind farms, there would be value in the increased geographical diversity introduced by integrating the Kansas wind into the rest of the grid. *Id.* at 5-6. That additional geographic diversity decreases the degree to which total wind-generated electricity varies over time, rendering the collective wind resource less like a non-dispatchable resource and more like a base load resource. (Staff Ex. 5.0, 4-5.) In addition, to the extent to which, over time, fewer and fewer prime locations within Illinois remain available for wind farm development, building new wind farms in the more wind-rich areas of Kansas may become the next best alternative, even if they are not presently the best alternative. *Id.* The levelized cost analyses presented in this case do not take into account these factors (value of geographic diversity and the eventual depletion of prime locations within Illinois). *Id.* On the other hand, for purposes of determining whether the Project is likely to promote the public convenience and necessity, it is reasonable to consider the relative costs of Kansas versus Illinois wind projects. (Staff Ex. 5.0, 4-5.) Even without taking into account such

factors as the value of geographic diversity and the eventual depletion of prime locations within Illinois, the levelized cost analysis presented by Mr. Zuraski shows that the Kansas wind option is less expensive than the Illinois wind option in the base case, on average (over 13,122 sensitivity cases), and in 73% of those cases. *Id.* According to Mr. Zuraski, this is a reasonably good sign that the GBX Project is likely to be successful and to promote the public convenience and necessity. *Id.*

Further support for the Project promoting the public convenience and necessity was provided by WOW witness Michael Goggin, who testified that bringing low-cost Kansas wind power to market is needed to help retail electric suppliers lower the cost of meeting various states' renewable portfolio standards (WOW Ex. 1.0, 2-5) and to help states lower the cost of meeting the U.S. EPA's Clean Power Plan regulations on carbon dioxide emissions. *Id.* at 8-14. According to Mr. Goggin, transmission is essential, both for allowing wind resources to be developed and enabling already developed wind resources to not have their wind energy output curtailed. *Id.* at 14. In areas where transmission constraints prevent wind energy from being delivered to customers, there is no cost-effective substitute for increasing transmission capacity to alleviate those constraints. *Id.* According to Mr. Goggin, a major difficulty in coordinating wind and transmission development is the mismatch between the relatively brief period required to develop a wind project versus the longer period required to develop a transmission project. *Id.* Thus, transmission development that pro-actively plans transmission to interconnect areas with high wind resource areas before wind projects have been built is an essential aspect of bringing wind power to market. *Id.* at 14-15.

## **B. Section 8-406.1(f)(1)**

### **1. Necessary to Provide Adequate, Reliable, Efficient Service**

The proposed project is not necessary to provide adequate, reliable and efficient electric service to Illinois ratepayers. (Staff Ex. 1.0, 8–9.) In its Petition, GBX lists several benefits that it claims the proposed project will provide. (Petition at ¶15.) GBX does not argue, however, that its proposed project is needed or necessary to maintain the reliability of the electric system in Illinois. (Staff Ex. 1.0, 9.) GBX witness Robert Zavadil presented an analysis of Loss of Load Expectation (“LOLE”) as it pertains to PJM in GBX Ex. 6.0. Based on this LOLE analysis, Mr. Zavadil concludes that the proposed project would “positively impact resource adequacy and electric reliability in the [S]tate of Illinois...” (GBX Ex. 6.0, 12.) However, the LOLE analysis does not discuss whether the resource adequacy the proposed project brings to PJM justifies the \$2.75<sup>1</sup> billion price tag of the project. (Staff Ex. 1.0, 9.) GBX’s main argument for the proposed project is that it will promote the development of competitive electricity markets, which will reduce the cost of electricity in Illinois; and that it is needed to help meet certain renewable portfolio standards policies. *Id.*

### **2. Promote the Development of an Effectively Competitive Electricity Market**

In considering whether the utility has shown that the Project “will promote the development of an effectively competitive electricity market that operates efficiently, is equitable to all customers, and is the least cost means of satisfying those objectives,” the Commission may consider many factors. In particular, the Commission may consider

---

<sup>1</sup> Per GBX Ex. 11.0, 84-85, the estimated Project cost as of March 31, 2015 is \$2.75 billion.

whether the utility has shown that: (a) the Project contributes to increasing the degree of competition for electric energy, capacity availability, renewable energy credits, or other electricity market goods and service; (b) the benefits of the increased competition outweigh the costs of the Project; and (c) the Project will not prevent an even greater degree of competition being attained through an alternative project or some combination of alternative projects. In addressing this issue, Staff presented the testimony of Staff witness Zuraski, who stated, “I expect that the [GBX] Project ... will promote the development of an effectively competitive electricity market that operates efficiently, is equitable to all customers, and is the least-cost means of satisfying those objectives.” (Staff Ex. 3.0, 3.) Mr. Zuraski agreed with GBX witness Dr. McDermott who predicted that the Project would promote increased competition and create downward pressure on prices in the wholesale electricity market. (Staff Ex. 3.0, 7; GBX Ex. 4.0, 3.) Mr. Zuraski further agreed that, by providing access to new and currently untapped potential renewable resources, the Project should have the effect of providing competitive pressure on prices in renewable energy credit markets as well as competitive pressure on prices in markets for renewable energy. (Staff Ex. 3.0, 7; GBX Ex. 4.0, 3.)

Staff’s position also is supported by the testimony of WOW witness Michael Goggin. Mr. Goggin argued that the transmission line can promote the development of an effectively competitive electricity market by delivering electricity at a lower cost, through long-term power purchase agreement prices, which serve as a hedge against volatile fuel prices, and by reducing the potential for generators to exercise market power. (WOW Ex. 1.0, 15-16.)

Staff notes that Section 8-406.1(f)(1) refers to “an effectively competitive electricity

market that operates efficiently.” 220 ILCS 5/8-406.1(f). Mr. Zuraski further testified that competitive markets generally operate efficiently. (Staff Ex. 3.0, 8.) However, like non-competitive markets, competitive markets can yield inefficient levels of production and consumption of goods and services if there are uncorrected market imperfections. *Id.* For example, some forms of electricity production also produce pollutants, which impose costs on people other than the producer and the producer’s customers. Such costs are called “externalities.” *Id.* at 8-9. According to Mr. Zuraski, Federal and state governments already use several policy tools ostensibly aimed at correcting that type of market imperfection. *Id.* In the production of electricity, these policy tools have increased the cost of fossil fuel resources relative to certain renewable energy resources (like wind farms). *Id.* The increase in the relative cost of generating electricity with fossil fuels effectively “internalizes” external costs from fossil-fuel related pollution. *Id.* The fact that the wind farms utilizing the GBX Project are expected to be profitable is due, at least in part, to such policies. *Id.* Granting a CPCN to GBX can be seen as complimentary to those policy tools that have favored wind energy as an efficiency-enhancing means of addressing externalities. *Id.*

Staff notes that Section 8-406.1(f)(1) refers to “an effectively competitive electricity market that ... is equitable to all customers.” In this regard, Mr. Zuraski testified that, while the Act does not specify to which electricity market the provision refers, wholesale or retail, the wholesale electricity market is the most directly relevant “competitive electricity market” in the context of the GBX project. *Id.* at 9. Generally, the wholesale electricity market is one where wholesale customers pay the marginal cost of production, and these costs are passed along to retail customers after a degree of averaging. *Id.* Mr.

Zuraski further opined that that there was nothing about these wholesale and retail markets, or the Project itself, that strikes him as particularly inequitable. *Id.* at 9-10.

While agreeing with Dr. McDermott's assessment of the Project's potential to contribute to the continued development of effectively competitive electricity and renewable energy markets, Mr. Zuraski cautioned that such increased competition could lead to electric plant retirements that are not already accounted for in the projection of energy market prices prepared by Dr. McDermott's colleague, GBX witness Robert Cleveland. (Staff Ex. 3.0, 7-8.) Mr. Zuraski cited reports that Exelon has been actively announcing that the electricity market is not providing its generating company with enough revenue to profitably operate three of its six Illinois nuclear power stations and has warned that it might retire these unprofitable generating stations to stem losses. *Id.* In that circumstance, GBX witness Cleveland's energy market price projections would overstate the net impact of the Project on reducing energy prices. *Id.* Similarly, the increased competition from western Kansas wind farms could lead to the postponement or cancelation of other new electric generating projects. *Id.* Thus, it is reasonable to assume that some portion of the energy price decreases due to the Project may be only temporary. *Id.* Mr. Zuraski offered a similar caveat with respect to estimates of the Project's impact on the Illinois economy that were presented by GBX witness Dr. Loomis in GBX Ex. 5.0. (Staff Ex. 3.0, 10-11.) In particular, Dr. Loomis did not account for the possibility and extent to which the Project could lead to delays or cancelations in other new generation projects or to the retirement of other existing generating plants in Illinois. Such delays, cancelations, and retirements of other projects and plants would involve the loss of jobs, labor income, output, and tax revenue. *Id.*

In their rebuttal testimony, several GBX witnesses responded to Mr. Zuraski's caveats. First, GBX witness Berry analyzed the impact of Project-induced wholesale price decreases on the revenues and profitability of Exelon's Illinois nuclear plants and, based on that analysis, concluded that it is "highly unlikely the Project would be a determinative factor in any retirement decisions." (GBX Ex. 11.13, 30-36.) Second, Dr. McDermott explained that changes in the behavior of other generators may reduce the number of years of wholesale power price savings, but the benefit would remain significant. (GBX Ex. 4.2, 2-4.) Third, Mr. Berry explained that fewer years of wholesale power pricing savings would not affect his levelized cost of energy analysis. (GBX Ex. 11.13, 37.) He also showed how fewer years of wholesale power pricing savings would affect his present value analyses. In particular, he testified that if wholesale power price savings were assumed to last only one year, rather than five years, the Project would still cost less than projected market power prices in 63% of the scenarios included in his sensitivity analysis, rather than in 80% of the scenarios with five years of LMP savings. *Id.* at 37-38. Fourth, Dr. Loomis explained that it would be problematic to attempt to measure the economic impact of the closure of the Exelon plants (even assuming such closures were "caused" by the Project), as it would be just one of many tertiary economic impacts from the Project that were not considered by his analysis. (GBX Ex. 5.3.) Taken as a whole, Staff considers this response to adequately address the caveats raised by Mr. Zuraski.

### **3. Least Cost**

As stated above, Section 8-406.1(f) requires in part:

That the Project is necessary to provide adequate, reliable, and efficient service to the public utility's customers and is the least-cost means of satisfying the service

needs of the public utility's customers or that the Project will promote the development of an effectively competitive electricity market that operates efficiently, is equitable to all customers, and is the least cost means of satisfying those objectives.

Staff examined the least cost requirement of Section 8-406.1(f)(1) from both an economic and engineering perspective. In support of its position, Staff presented the testimony of Staff witnesses Zuraski, providing an economic assessment, and Rashid, providing an engineering perspective. In addition to the analyses described above, Mr. Zuraski observed from an economic perspective that GBX had examined several alternatives and alternative designs to its proposed project, finding them all generally to be more costly. (Staff Ex. 5.0, 3-4.) Mr. Rashid offered a more guarded assessment from an engineering perspective:

Staff is cognizant of the fact that HVDC transmission has many benefits over HVAC transmission when it comes to delivering high volumes of electricity over long distances. However . . . any additional interconnections between GBX and AC circuits would require installing additional converter stations, at a significant cost. Therefore, if the purpose of the proposed project is to be solely dedicated to deliver wind energy from western Kansas to MISO and PJM, the analysis [presented by GBX witness Galli] is valid and the proposed project meets the least-cost standard, and in this case the proposed project will not be able to serve Illinois producers. Mr. Galli's analysis and conclusion would likely be different if one or more converter stations will be needed in the future to allow energy producers in central Illinois to use the GBX transmission line.

(Staff Exhibit 1.0, 10.)

There is no question that the proposed purpose of the GBX Project is primarily to deliver wind energy from western Kansas to MISO and PJM. (GBX Ex. 1.0, 4.) Furthermore, the record supports the proposition that there are considerable economic benefits associated with fulfilling that purpose. (See section IV.A and IV.B.2, *infra*) Finally, in the absence of the Project, there are considerable barriers to utilizing the natural wind resources of Kansas. (GBX Ex. 1.0, 6.) For instance, as GBX witness Skelly testified,

prospects for construction of new wind generation facilities in western Kansas are limited because of the lack of adequate long-distance, inter-regional transmission infrastructure to bring the electricity generated from future facilities in western Kansas to load and population centers such as Illinois. *Id.* For new, low-cost wind generation to be constructed in western Kansas to meet the demand for renewable resources in Illinois and other states, additional long-distance transmission capacity between these areas must be built. *Id.* at 7. In Mr. Skelly's view, developers are unlikely to construct new wind generation facilities in western Kansas without reasonable assurances and expectations that transmission infrastructure will be in place on a timely basis to bring the output of the wind generation facilities to markets like Illinois and PJM. *Id.*

Mr. Skelly's view of the Project's primary purpose was echoed by Infinity witness Langley, who stated that "Grain Belt satisfies a missing link in modernizing the nation's electric power infrastructure," and that the Project "will allow Infinity and companies like it to deliver inexpensive power from some of the most productive sites in the country to the load centers where it is needed most." (Infinity Ex. 1.0, 3.) According to Mr. Langley, the GBX Project "is the solution to this very real delivery problem." *Id.* at 4. Mr. Langley further testified that there are no other economically feasible ways to export wind energy from Kansas into the more populous load centers within MISO and PJM. *Id.* He explained that, to export power today, a generator in Kansas must work with multiple utilities and transmission operators to acquire the rights to export. *Id.* Many of those agreements are short in term, and very expensive. *Id.* This makes it very difficult to obtain the financing needed to construct a wind farm. *Id.* Grain Belt is the best solution to this problem. *Id.* at 4-5. According to Mr. Langley, when assessing the need for GBX, it is appropriate to

analyze the alternatives to utilizing the transmission that will be built by the Project. *Id.* at 6-7. In looking at these alternatives, it is clear that there is no existing project or combination of projects that can yield similar results. *Id.* The obvious alternative to building the Grain Belt line is to attempt to use the existing infrastructure to accomplish the same goal. *Id.* The problem is that the current system is not designed to deliver a large quantity of power over long distances. *Id.* Additionally, there are constraints associated with moving energy from one RTO into the next. *Id.* GBX addresses both of these concerns. *Id.*

In summary, given the economic benefits associated with bringing Kansas wind power to market and the lack of any viable alternatives to the Project as the means to accomplish that task, particularly in a less expensive manner, the Project appears to be reasonable and consistent with the requirement that the Project must be the least cost means of satisfying the objective of promoting the development of an effectively competitive electricity market.

**C. Section 8-406.1(f)(2) – Capability to Efficiently Manage and Supervise the Construction Process**

GBX has not made an adequate showing that it is capable of efficiently managing and supervising the construction of the project. (Staff Ex. 1.0, 14.) GBX witness Mr. Skelly indicated that GBX has assembled a team of different individuals with experience in developing, constructing, and operating similar facilities effectively. (GBX Ex. 1.0, 32–33.) Mr. Skelly listed the qualifications of those individuals in GBX Ex. 1.2. However, GBX has not provided any evidence that it or its parent company have ever managed or supervised a single transmission line project; let alone a transmission line project of this

magnitude and complexity. *Id.* According to the available information, GBX has never built a transmission line project of any kind or of any size. *Id.* The proposed project is of a large scale and uses HVDC technology that, while not new, is rather uncommon. (Staff Ex. 1.0, 14.) In the entire United States, there are only a few HVDC lines. *Id.* Staff does not believe that a startup company like GBX will effectively and efficiently manage and supervise the construction of a \$2.75 billion project. *Id.* Therefore, the Company has not met the requirement of Section 8-406.1(f)(2) of the Act.

**D. Section 8-406.1(f)(3) – Capability to Finance the Construction of the Project without Significant Adverse Financial Consequences**

Section 8-406.1 of the Act states that the Commission shall grant a certificate if, based upon the application filed with the Commission and the evidentiary record, it finds, among other things, “that the public utility is capable of financing the proposed construction without significant adverse financial consequences for the utility or its customers.” 220 ILCS 5/8-406.1(f)(3).

In his direct testimony (GBX Ex. 11.0, 84), Company witness David Berry stated that Grain Belt Express is willing to accept the same requirement for this CPCN that the Commission adopted in its certificate order for Rock Island in Docket No. 12-0560. That requirement made applicable to Grain Belt Express is as follows:

Grain Belt Express will not install transmission facilities for the Grain Belt Express Clean Line Project on easement property until such time as Grain Belt Express has obtained commitments for funds in a total amount equal to or greater than the total project cost. For the purposes of this condition:

- (i) “install transmission facilities” shall mean to affix permanently to the ground transmission towers or other transmission equipment, including installation of bases and footings for transmission towers, but shall not include (A) preparatory work such as surveys, soil borings, engineering and design, obtaining permits and other approvals from government bodies, acquisition of options and easements for right-of-way, and ordering of

equipment and materials, and (B) site preparation work and procurement and installation of equipment and facilities on property owned in fee by Grain Belt Express including converter station sites;

(ii) “easement property” shall mean property on which Grain Belt Express has acquired an easement to install transmission facilities;

(iii) “has obtained commitments for funds” shall mean (A) for loans and other debt commitments, that Grain Belt Express has entered into a loan agreement(s) with a lender(s) and has received the loan funds or has the right to draw down the loan funds on a schedule that is consistent with the need for funds to complete the Project, and (B) for equity, that Grain Belt Express or its parent company has received funds from the equity investors or that the equity investors have entered into a commitment to provide funds on a schedule that is consistent with the need for funds to complete the project; and

(iv) “total project cost” shall mean the total estimated remaining cost, at the time that Grain Belt Express is prepared to begin to install transmission facilities, for the following Project activities: engineering, manufacturing and installation of converter stations; transmission line engineering, transmission towers; conductor; construction labor necessary to complete the Project; right of way acquisition costs; and other costs necessary to complete the Project. For reference, the total estimated project cost as of March 31, 2015 is \$2.75 billion including estimated costs for network upgrades.

To allow the Commission to verify its compliance with this condition, Grain Belt Express shall submit the following documents to the Director of the Financial Analysis Division and the Director of the Public Safety & Reliability Division at such time as Grain Belt Express is prepared to begin to install transmission facilities:

a) On a confidential basis, equity and loan or other financing agreements and commitments entered into or obtained by Grain Belt Express or its parent company for the purpose of funding the Grain Belt Express Clean Line Project that, in the aggregate, provide commitments for funds for the total project cost;

b) An attestation certified by an officer of Grain Belt Express that Grain Belt Express has not, prior to the date of the attestation, installed transmission facilities on easement property; or a notification that such installation is scheduled to begin on a specified date;

c) A statement of total project cost, broken out by the components listed in the definition of “total project cost,” above, and certified by an officer of

Grain Belt Express, along with a reconciliation of the total project cost in the statement to the total project cost as of March 31, 2015 of \$2.75 billion (including estimated costs for network upgrades); and

d) A reconciliation statement, certified by an officer of Grain Belt Express, showing that the agreements and commitments for funds provided in (a) are equal to or greater than the total project cost provided in (c).

(Petition, 35-37; GBX Ex. 11.0, 84-85:1839–1899.)

To ensure that GBX does not begin construction of the project without sufficient funding in place to complete it, Staff witness Janis Freetly recommended that the Commission impose the conditions proposed and set forth above, in their entirety, in any Order that grants a certificate to GBX to construct the proposed transmission line. (Staff Ex. 2.0). These conditions would require that the financing for the total project cost be secured before construction can begin in Illinois. *Id.*

In Docket No. 12-0560, the Commission found that this condition “offers the flexibility necessary for a merchant transmission project to be feasible, while operating within the parameters of our current regulatory structure.” *Rock Island Clean Line LLC*, ICC Order Docket No. 12-0560, 151 (Appeal pending, Illinois Appellate Court, Third Judicial District, Case Nos. 3-15-0099, 3-15-0103 & 3-15-0104). The Commission said, “[i]t is important that the decisions made here do not unfairly disadvantage merchant transmission line projects across the board by setting a precedent that would not allow them to operate within their business model. At the same time, the Commission must ensure that said business model will not harm ratepayers and that the utility meets all of its requirements under [the statute].” *Id.* Staff believes that the same protections should apply here. *Id.* By so doing, if GBX does not raise all of the capital needed to construct the entire project, construction will not begin and GBX and its customers will not suffer

significant adverse financial consequences. (Tr. 339:14-24, Aug. 17, 2015.) Further, GBX will not be able to install transmission facilities on landowners' property unless such commitments are obtained, thereby establishing proper protections for landowners. (GBX Ex. 11.0, 84.) Therefore, as long as the Commission imposes these protective conditions, Staff does not see any significant adverse financial consequences for the utility or its customers.

**E. Proposed Conditions relating to Grant of the CPCN**

See Section IV.D above.

**E. Other Considerations Under Section 8-406.1**

[Left Intentionally Blank]

**V. Proposed Route of the Project in Illinois and Land Acquisition**

**A. Description and Development of the Proposed Route**

In its Petition and in GBX Exs. 8.0 through 8.7, GBX provided a detailed description of the Proposed and Alternate Route, as well as the Illinois Route Selection Study, which describes the methodology that GBX used to select these routes.

**B. Selection of Proposed Route vs. Alternate Route**

GBX witness Mr. Skelly indicated that GBX retained Louis Berger to assist with the selection of the Proposed Route and the Alternative Route for the proposed project. (GBX Ex. 1.0, 31.) Mr. Timothy Gaul of Louis Berger testified for GBX on the development of the Proposed and Alternative Routes. Mr. Gaul indicated that these routes were determined through route development and public outreach that is detailed in the Routing Study. (GBX Ex. 8.0, 4.) In his direct testimony, Mr. Gaul describes the criteria and methodology that the routing team used to determine the Proposed and Alternative

routes. *Id.* GBX witness Mark Lowlar describes the public outreach that is required under Section 8.406.1 in GBX Ex. 7.0. GBX held 27 public meetings (three public meetings in each county that the Proposed and the alternative routes will traverse). (GBX Ex. 8.0, 10.) Additionally, GBX held 14 roundtables where GBX met with community leaders and local officials. *Id.*

**C. Proposed Revisions to the Proposed Route (Rex Encore and Branch Properties parties)**

[Left Intentionally Blank]

**D. Proposed Design Aspects of the Project**

**1. Easement Widths**

GBX requests a 200 feet ROW for both the HVAC and the HVDC portions of the transmission line. (GBX Ex. 2.0, 18.) Mr. Galli indicated, however, that there are some locations where GBX requests more than a 200 feet ROW. Mr. Galli lists those locations on pages 20 and 21 of GBX Ex. 2.0.

**2. Structure Types and Other Design Parameters**

GBX indicated that it would use monopole structures for the transmission line except when there is a necessity to use lattice structures in places where a longer span is required. (GBE Ex. 2.0, 17.) The optimum span length between tubular steel monopoles and lattice mast structures typically would be 1,200 feet. *Id.* Mr. Galli indicated that pole heights would be between 100 feet and 175 feet (typically 110 to 140 feet) depending on different factors, including the location of each pole. *Id.*

**E. Grain Belt Express's Approach to Land Acquisition (including issues relating to easement document)**

[Left Intentionally Blank]

**F. Landowner Concerns about Impacts of Construction on their Properties (including AIMA provisions and proposed conditions relating to preventing/mitigating impacts)**

On January 9, 2015, GBX signed an Agricultural Impact Mitigation Agreement (“AIMA”) with the Illinois Department of Agriculture (see GBX Ex. 7.15). One of the issues that the agreement addressed was GBX’s potential use of the lattice tower structure design, which requires a larger base than the monopole structure design. Paragraph 3.A of the “Construction Standards and Policies” section of the agreement states:

Tangent structures (straight-line, non-turning structures) will utilize only single, drilled pier type concrete foundations or direct embed type foundations that are typical of single pole type structures. Clean Line will not utilize multi-foundation lattice type structures for tangent structures, though such structures may be used for turns, long spans such as river crossings, and similar situations where specific engineering and environmental challenges are present.

Paragraph 3.A of the “Construction Standards and Policies” section of the agreement states, in part:

The use of guy wires will be avoided to the extent feasible. If guy wires are required, they will be marked with highly visible guards.

**F. Interactions with Pipelines and Railroads**

[Left Intentionally Blank]

1. **Rockies Express Pipeline**
2. **Illinois Central Railroad and BNSF Railroad**

**VI. Request for Authority under Section 8-503**

Section 8-503 of the Act, in relevant part, states:

Whenever the Commission, after a hearing, shall find that additions, extensions, repairs or improvements to, or changes in, the existing plant, equipment, apparatus, facilities or other physical property of any public utility or of any 2 or more public utilities are necessary and ought reasonably to be made or that a new structure or structures is or are necessary and should be erected, to promote the

security or convenience of its employees or the public or promote the development of an effectively competitive electricity market, or in any other way to secure adequate service or facilities, the Commission shall make and serve an order authorizing or directing that such additions, extensions, repairs, improvements or changes be made, or such structure or structures be erected at the location, in the manner and within the time specified in said order . . .

220 ILCS 5/8-503.

Pursuant to Section 8-406.1(i), a decision granting a certificate under Section 8-406.1 must include an order pursuant to Section 8-503 of the Act authorizing or directing the construction of the high voltage electric service line and related facilities as approved by the Commission, in the manner and within the time specified in the order. 220 ILCS 5/8-406.1. Therefore, Staff believes that if the Commission grants a certificate under Section 8-406.1, it must also include an order authorizing the construction of the line and related facilities as approved by the Commission in the manner and within the time specified in the order. *Id.*

## **VII. Grain Belt Express' Accounting-Related Requests**

[Left Intentionally Blank]

- A. Use of the FERC Uniform System of Accounts**
- B. Request to Maintain Books and Records Outside of Illinois**
- C. Request for Proprietary Treatment of Certain Information**

## **VIII. Other**

### **A. Multi-Driver Projects**

For informational purposes, Staff Witness Mark Hanson described a new component of PJM's transmission planning process concerning Multi-Driver Projects. (Staff Ex. 4.0.) Mr. Hanson stated that the purpose of his testimony was to expand on

some aspects of PJM's transmission planning processes that he believed were not adequately addressed in the testimony of GBX witness Berry (Staff Ex. 4.0, 3).

Mr. Hanson described recent changes to PJM's transmission planning process that allow for the development of Multi-Driver Projects. *Id.* Multi-Driver Projects are projects that combine transmission projects intended to resolve specific drivers such as reliability, market efficiency, or public policy. *Id.* The premise underlying Multi-Driver Projects is that combining projects may lead to a lower cost solution to solve the problems that individual projects were intended to resolve. *Id.* at 4.

Mr. Hanson also described transmission cost allocation associated with Multi-Driver Projects. *Id.* He emphasized that, as is the case with stand-alone public policy projects, costs associated with the public policy component of a Multi-Driver Project will only be recovered from states willing to incur the costs. *Id.* at 5. Costs associated with other drivers of the Multi-Driver Project will be recovered on the same basis as the stand-alone projects with one exception. *Id.* If a Multi-Driver Project is boosted to a voltage over 345 kV double circuit by the addition of a public policy component, a special cost allocation is used where 20% of the project costs net of the public policy component is recovered on a load share ratio basis throughout PJM and the remainder of the non-public policy costs are recovered on the same basis that a standalone project would use. *Id.* at 5-6. The costs associated with the public policy component are always recovered from states willing to incur the costs. *Id.* at 6.

## **IX. Conclusion**

For the reasons set forth *supra*, Staff respectfully requests that the Commission's Final Order in the instant proceeding reflect Staff's recommendations consistent with this

Initial Brief.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

---

CHRISTINE F. ERICSON  
JOHN L. SAGONE  
Office of General Counsel  
Illinois Commerce Commission  
160 N. LaSalle, Ste. C-800  
Chicago, IL 60601  
Phone: (312) 793-2877  
Fax: (312) 793-1556  
Email: [cericson@icc.illinois.gov](mailto:cericson@icc.illinois.gov)  
[jsagone@icc.illinois.gov](mailto:jsagone@icc.illinois.gov)

Counsel for the Staff of the  
Illinois Commerce Commission

September 11, 2015