

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

BEFORE THE
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

IN THE MATTER OF:)
)
COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY)
)
Annual formula rate update and) No. 16-0259
revenue requirement)
reconciliation under Section)
16-108.5 of the Public)
Utilities Act.)
)

Chicago, Illinois
August 24th, 2016

Met, pursuant to notice, at 1:30 p.m.

BEFORE:

MR. TERRANCE HILLIARD and
MS. HEATHER JORGENSON, Administrative Law Judges

SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by
Devan J. Moore, CSR
License No. 084-004589

1 APPEARANCES:

2 ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION, by
3 MR. JOHN FEELEY
4 MS. MARCY A. SHERRILL
5 160 North LaSalle Street, Suite C-800
6 Chicago, Illinois 60601
7 appearing for Office of General Counsel;

8 MS. KAREN L. LUSSON
9 MS. SUSAN L. SATTER
10 100 West Randolph Street, 11th Floor
11 Chicago, Illinois 60601
12 appearing for
13 the People of the State of Illinois;

14 MS. CHRISTIE REDD HICKS
15 309 West Washington, Suite 800
16 Chicago, Illinois 60606
17 appearing for Citizens Utility Board;

18 ROONEY, RIPPIE & RATNASWAMY, by
19 MR. E. GLENN RIPPIE
20 350 West Hubbard Street
21 Chicago, Illinois 60606

-and-

22 MR. CLARK STALKER
10 South Dearborn Street, Suite 4900
Chicago, Illinois 60603
appearing for Commonwealth Edison Company.

1 JUDGE HILLIARD: On behalf of the Illinois
2 Commerce Commission we call Docket 16-259,
3 Commonwealth Edison Company, Annual Formula Rate
4 Update And Revenue Requirement Reconciliation.

5 Can the parties, beginning with Staff,
6 identify themselves for the record, please.

7 MR. FEELEY: Representing Staff of the Illinois
8 Commerce Commission, John Feeley and Marcy Sherrill,
9 Office of General Counsel, 160 North LaSalle Street,
10 Suite C-800, Chicago, Illinois 60601.

11 MS. SATTER: Appearing on behalf of the People
12 of the State of Illinois, Karen L. Lusson and
13 Susan L. Satter, 100 West Randolph Street, Chicago,
14 Illinois 6001.

15 MR. STALKER: Appearing on behalf of
16 Commonwealth Edison Company, Clark Stalker, 10 South
17 Dearborn, Suite 4900, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

18 MR. RIPPPIE: Good afternoon, your Honors. Also
19 on behalf of Commonwealth Edison Company, Glenn
20 Rippie. The firm is Rooney, Rippie & Ratnaswamy,
21 LLP. I'll spell it later, if you need it. It's at
22 350 West Hubbard, Suite 600, Chicago 60654.

1 MS. HICKS: On behalf of the Citizens Utility
2 Board, Christie Hicks, 309 West Washington, Suite
3 800, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

4 JUDGE HILLIARD: Are there any other
5 appearances?

6 (No response.)

7 JUDGE HILLIARD: Okay. There seems to be an
8 agreed matter preceding this. So why don't whoever,
9 by consensus, is going first do whatever you want to
10 do.

11 MR. RIPPIE: Good afternoon again, your Honors.
12 Glenn Rippie. Your Honors, the Company filed with
13 the Commission a written motion to take a
14 administrative notice of an order of the Federal
15 Communications Commission that's appended to that
16 motion. There has been no written objection or
17 response filed; and we understand from talking to the
18 parties that there is no objection to that motion.

19 We also understand that other parties
20 also have some oral requests that they wish to make
21 with respect to the administrative notice.

22 JUDGE HILLIARD: Are there other appearances or

1 petitions to intervene that we haven't granted before
2 we go any further?

3 JUDGE JORGENSON: I believe there are two. We
4 haven't ruled on the petitions to intervene as a
5 member of the Illinois Industrial Energy Consumers
6 filed by the University of Illinois and the FCA US,
7 LLC. To the extent that we haven't granted those,
8 those will be granted.

9 JUDGE HILLIARD: Okay. Proceed anybody who's
10 got a presentation to make.

11 MS. SATTER: I have one preliminary matter.
12 I've spoken to the Company, and they don't have an
13 objection. We would move to ask for administrative
14 notice of the 2015 -- it is called the Smart Grid
15 Advanced Meter and Annual Implementation Progress
16 Report, which is available on the ICC's web site and
17 is filed under Section 16108.5. We're asking for
18 administrative notice of the 2015 and the 2016
19 report.

20 MR. RIPPIE: And, your Honors, the Company has
21 no objection to that request.

22 JUDGE HILLIARD: All right. There being no

1 objection, the Commission will take administrative
2 notice of the 2015 and 2016 reports.

3 What's next?

4 MR. RIPPIE: Your Honors, we also would request
5 a ruling on our written motion with respect to the
6 FCC order.

7 JUDGE JORGENSON: The motion for administrative
8 notice will be granted.

9 MR. RIPPIE: Thank you.

10 JUDGE HILLIARD: What else? Anything?

11 MR. RIPPIE: There are several groups of data
12 requests which the parties have discussed, and we
13 understand that there will be no objection to
14 admitting.

15 There is one data request that there
16 may be some discussion on. I believe it's probably
17 the most efficient if we offer into evidence, at this
18 point, those data requests to furbish their no
19 objection, which may be used in cross-examination.
20 And then we'll deal -- we'll propose to deal with the
21 other administrative matters, including the admission
22 of other exhibits, after the close of

1 cross-examination of Ms. Brinkman.

2 Your Honors, the Company would offer,
3 in lieu of cross-examination of the witnesses and
4 several data request responses rendered by the Office
5 of the Attorney General and/or their witnesses, two
6 Commonwealth Edison Company data requests.

7 We would propose to file on e-docket
8 an electronic compilation of those responses in a
9 single document. And we can also, of course, provide
10 hard copies, if your Honor wishes.

11 Those data requests would be ComEd to
12 all parties, 1.02, insofar as answered by the AD's
13 Office on behalf of or through Mrs. Fagan and Chang.
14 ComEd to AG, 2.01; once again, the answer supplied by
15 the AG's Office by or with Mrs. Fagan and Chang. And
16 the answers to ComEd to AG 3.01 and 3.02.

17 Those are included in the packet that
18 you have before you.

19 JUDGE HILLIARD: And those are the responses
20 admitted by agreement in lieu of cross-examination?

21 MR. RIPPIE: Yes, your Honor.

22 JUDGE JORGENSON: Are you going to call this a

1 group exhibit, or do you want to do it separately?

2 MR. RIPPIE: We'll designate that ComEd Group
3 Exhibit 1. Let's call it ComEd Group
4 Cross-Examination Exhibit 1. Thank you.

5 JUDGE HILLIARD: What's next?

6 MR. RIPPIE: I thought you wanted to do the
7 agreed DRs that you had first.

8 MS. SATTER: We have two data requests that we
9 would like to offer into evidence. They are AG
10 Cross-Exhibit 1 and AG Cross-Exhibit 2.
11 Cross-Exhibit 1 is ComEd's response to AG Data
12 Request 4.01. And Cross-Exhibit 2 is ComEd's
13 response to AG Data Request 15.01. We're offering
14 these not in lieu of cross, but by agreement.

15 And my question is, should we submit
16 these on e-docket?

17 JUDGE JORGENSEN: Yes. That would be easier.

18 JUDGE HILLIARD: That'll be good.

19 MS. SATTER: Okay. We'll do that. And I do
20 have copies.

21 JUDGE JORGENSEN: Copies for us?

22 MS. SATTER: Yes.

1 MS. LUSSON: (Tendering.)

2 MS. SATTER: So I'd move for their admission.
3 4.01 is Exhibit 1, and 15.02 is -- 15.01 is Exhibit
4 2.

5 MR. STALKER: Susan, did you also intend to
6 introduce Responses to 19.01 and 19.02?

7 MS. SATTER: I thought we'd wait till...

8 MR. RIPPIE: Your Honors, in the course of
9 discussion amongst parties prior to the commencement
10 of trial, it has been represented that the only
11 Company witness for which any party has
12 cross-examination is Ms. Brinkman.

13 Ms. Brinkman is present if the hearing
14 room, and the Company would offer her as their first
15 and only live witness; and she is available to be
16 sworn.

17 JUDGE HILLIARD: Please raise your hand to be
18 sworn.

19 (Whereupon, the witness
20 was sworn.)

21 JUDGE HILLIARD: All right.

22

1 CHRISTINE M. BRINKMAN,
2 called as a witness herein, having been first duly
3 sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

4 DIRECT EXAMINATION

5 BY

6 MR. RIPPIE:

7 Q Good afternoon, Ms. Brinkman. Could you
8 please state and spell your full legal name for the
9 record.

10 A Christine M. Brinkman. C-h-r-i-s-t-i-n-e,
11 M., B-r-i-n-k-m-a-n.

12 Q And, Ms. Brinkman, have you caused to be
13 prepared by yourself or by others under your
14 direction and control direct testimony for submission
15 to the Illinois Commerce Commission in this
16 proceeding?

17 A Yes.

18 Q I refer you to the document before you
19 that's been designated Commonwealth Edison Exhibit
20 1.0, and I'd ask you if that is a copy of such
21 testimony?

22 A It is.

1 Q Is there an attachment thereto designated
2 Commonwealth Edison 1.01, which you intend to be an
3 exhibit to that testimony?

4 A Yes.

5 Q If I were to ask you the same questions
6 that appear on Commonwealth Edison Exhibit 1.1 (sic)
7 today, would you give the same answers?

8 A Yes.

9 JUDGE HILLIARD: Exhibit 1.1 or 1.01?

10 MR. RIPPIE: I'm sorry. 1.0 and 1.01. I
11 apologize. Thank you, Judge.

12 BY MR. RIPPIE:

13 Q Is it your intention that the narrative
14 contained in Commonwealth Edison Exhibit 1.0 be
15 treated by the Commerce Commission as your direct
16 testimony in this case?

17 A Yes.

18 Q Have you also prepared, or caused to be
19 prepared, rebuttal testimony for submission to the
20 Illinois Commerce Commission in this proceeding?

21 A Yes.

22 Q Is ComEd Exhibit 8.0 that document?

1 A Yes.

2 Q Do you have any additions or corrections to
3 make to Commonwealth Edison Exhibit 8.0?

4 A I have one correction to make.

5 Q What page and line number is that
6 correction on?

7 A On Page 10, Line 191, it should read, The
8 \$500,000,000 of investment stated in connection with
9 the proposed legislation.

10 Q So the only change is the insertion of the
11 two words "connection with"; is that correct?

12 A That's correct.

13 MR. RIPPIE: Your Honors, would you prefer that
14 we file a corrected version on e-docket; or, given
15 that that's the only correction, is the oral
16 statement sufficient?

17 JUDGE HILLIARD: We don't think it's necessary
18 to file the corrected version.

19 MR. RIPPIE: Thank you, Judge.

20 BY MR. RIPPIE:

21 Q Ms. Brinkman, with the exception of that
22 single correction, if I were to ask you the questions

1 that appear in Commonwealth Edison Exhibit 8.0, would
2 you give me the same answers?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Is the document attached thereto as
5 Commonwealth Edison Exhibit 8.1 (sic) the exhibit
6 that you intend to be referred to by the narrative
7 testimony?

8 A 8.01, yes.

9 Q And is it your intention that the narrative
10 in Commonwealth Edison 8.0 be your rebuttal testimony
11 before the Commission in this case?

12 A Yes.

13 Q Have you also prepared or caused to be
14 prepared for submission to the Commission surrebuttal
15 testimony?

16 A Yes.

17 Q Is Commonwealth Edison Exhibit 12.0 that
18 testimony?

19 A Yes.

20 Q If I were to ask you the same questions
21 that appear on that document, would you give me the
22 same answers today?

1 A Yes.

2 Q And is it your intention that those answers
3 stand as your surrebuttal testimony before the
4 Commission in this proceeding?

5 A Yes.

6 MR. RIPPIE: Thank you, Ms. Brinkman. I have
7 no further questions.

8 Your Honors, I would offer into
9 evidence at this time Commonwealth Edison Exhibits
10 1.0, 1.01, 8.0, 8.01, and 12.0.

11 JUDGE HILLIARD: Objections?

12 (No response.)

13 JUDGE HILLIARD: Hearing no objections, ComEd's
14 exhibits identified by Counsel will admitted into the
15 record.

16 (Whereupon, ComEd Exhibit
17 Nos. 1.0, 1.01, 8.0, 8.01, 12.0
18 were admitted into evidence.)

19 MR. RIPPIE: The witness is available for
20 cross.

21 MS. SATTER: Thank you.

22

1 CROSS-EXAMINATION

2 BY

3 MS. SATTER:

4 Q Good afternoon, Ms. Brinkman.

5 A Good afternoon.

6 MS. SATTER: For the record, Susan Satter,
7 appearing on behalf of the People of the State of
8 Illinois.

9 BY MS. SATTER:

10 Q I might have a couple of questions for you,
11 starting with your rebuttal testimony.

12 On Page 12, Line 238, you say that
13 "ComEd has evaluated, piloted, and installed
14 point-to-point solutions". And, at Line 244, you
15 talk about an exploring phase.

16 So my question to you is, do you
17 believe that ComEd is in the exploring phase in
18 considering a data analytics solution?

19 A Can I take a moment just to get some
20 context?

21 Q Yes.

22 A So when I speak to in the exploring phase,

1 I'm referring to the BCG benchmarking study attached
2 as AG Exhibit 2.6. And so in that exhibit, on Page
3 5, it speaks to, "Analytics is a journey with 3
4 phases: exploring, engaging, and establishing."

5 In some instances we are in the
6 exploring stage. In some instances we are engaging.
7 In some we are establishing, depending on the
8 individual solution.

9 Q So in some you are exploring, and in other
10 you are...?

11 A We may be in the more mature phases.

12 Q What term did you use? You said,
13 "exploring" and...?

14 A On Page 5 of Exhibit 2.6 there is a chart
15 that talks about exploring, engaging, and
16 establishing.

17 Q So engaging? Your second phase is
18 engaging?

19 A That's right.

20 Q Okay. Do you know what phase the other
21 Exelon utilities are in?

22 A I do not.

1 Q Are you familiar with Baltimore Gas &
2 Electric's data analytics practices?

3 A I'm aware that BGE is looking at data
4 analytics just as ComEd is, but I'm not familiar
5 specifically with what all they're doing.

6 Q And what about PECO?

7 A The same.

8 Q Do you know if there's somebody else at
9 Commonwealth Edison that would know what the other
10 Exelon utilities are doing?

11 A We are currently --

12 So ComEd is currently looking at the
13 BI/DA strategy and how we can implement BI/DA
14 throughout the organization. There are folks at
15 ComEd, as well as the other utilities, that are
16 considering this. So I don't think it's one specific
17 person to speak with.

18 JUDGE HILLIARD: Could you define those
19 acronyms that you used.

20 THE WITNESS: Sure. BI/DA, Business
21 Intelligence and Data Analytics.

22 BY MS. SATTER:

1 Q And when you say, "BI/DA", that's BI/DA;
2 correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q And maybe you can just describe what that
5 is for the record.

6 A BI/DA -- "BI/DA" -- is a set of tools and
7 solutions that work together to analyze data for
8 different outcomes.

9 Q And that would apply to both operations and
10 business performance?

11 A I would say it differently. It would apply
12 to both operations; so grid operations as well as
13 customer operations.

14 Q Do you know whether the Data Analytics
15 Program that was adopted BGE, Boston Gas & Electric,
16 was also offered to Commonwealth Edison?

17 A I'm not sure what you mean by the Data
18 Analytics Program adopted by BGE.

19 Q You're not familiar with what BGE has done;
20 is that correct?

21 A That's correct.

22 Q Okay. Reading your surrebuttal testimony

1 at Page 6, Line 105, if you want to reference it,
2 it's my understanding that ComEd's Data Analytics
3 Strategy is basically the same as the Exelon
4 strategy. Would you agree?

5 A We provide in discovery and in my
6 testimony, as well as the AG Exhibit 2.4, a
7 description of the BI/DA strategy that is being
8 looked at across the Exelon utilities as well as at
9 ComEd.

10 Q So it's the same; is that correct, the
11 overall strategy?

12 A The overall strategy is the same.

13 Q Now, I want to refer you to an attachment
14 to Mr. Fagan and Mr. Chang's testimony; it's Exhibit
15 2.9. I need to make a caveat here that this exhibit
16 will be introduced not for the truth of the matter
17 asserted in the document but for the fact that it was
18 produced, that it was created.

19 So with that caveat I wanted to ask,
20 Ms. Brinkman, if you have reviewed the McKenzie Study
21 which is attached to Mr. Fagan and Chang's testimony
22 as Exhibit 2.9?

1 A I have looked through it, as it's an
2 attachment to their testimony, yes.

3 Q Do you recall seeing it before this docket?

4 A No.

5 Q Do you know whether anybody in the ComEd
6 organization would have been responsible for looking
7 at a document such as that?

8 A I don't know specifically who may have seen
9 it. I'm not certain that this is a ComEd initiated
10 document.

11 Q Do you know whether ComEd reviewed a
12 proposal by C3 Internet Of Things to manage ComEd's
13 data?

14 A A specific document?

15 Q Yeah, like an RFP, a response to an RFP.

16 MR. RIPPIE: To ComEd?

17 MS. SATTER: Yes, or to Exelon or the Exelon
18 utilities.

19 THE WITNESS: I'm not sure.

20

21 BY MS. SATTER:

22 Q Okay. Now, would you agree with me that

1 ComEd data analytics efforts will be implemented over
2 a period of more than 2 years?

3 A I'm not certain how long it will take to
4 implement the strategy. The strategy is robust.
5 There's a data analytics platform and several domains
6 that go with that, but I'm not sure how long it would
7 take to implement.

8 Q Do you think the decisions made in 2016 in
9 connection with data analytics solutions could affect
10 expenditures in 2018, 2019, and into the future?

11 A I'm not sure what you mean by impact
12 expenditures in those years.

13 Q Increase or decrease expenditures that the
14 Company would make; for example, in revenue
15 protection or AMI operations.

16 A Again, I'm not sure I understand your
17 question.

18 Q Okay. Let me try to rephrase it one time.
19 Do you think that decisions concerning
20 data analytics solutions that are made in 2016 would
21 affect the Company's costs going forward; in other
22 words, in the years after 2016?

1 A I think if ComEd were to implement a
2 solution in 2016, or make a decision to implement a
3 solution in 2016, if it is a capitalized asset, that
4 something that -- yes, that decision could impact
5 2018.

6 Q I want to ask you some questions about the
7 voltage optimization. In your testimony you refer to
8 the 2015 annual implementation progress report that
9 we have requested administrative notice of.

10 MR. RIPPPIE: Susan, which testimony?

11 MS. SATTER: I believe it's in the rebuttal.

12 MR. RIPPPIE: Thank you.

13 MS. SATTER: I believe it's 7A, if you want to
14 reference it.

15 BY MS. SATTER:

16 Q Do you agree that there was an Applied
17 Energy Group Report included in the 2015 Annual
18 Implementation Progress Report in Appendix A?

19 A Yes.

20 Q And are you familiar with that report?

21 A I have looked at the report. Admittedly,
22 it is incredibly technical, but I have looked at the

1 report.

2 Q For ease, I'm going to hand you a copy of
3 some pages from the two reports.

4 MR. RIPPIE: And while we're doing this,
5 perhaps as a matter of clarification, so the record
6 is crystal clear, when you sought leave to take
7 notice of the 2015 AIPR -- and, for that matter, the
8 2016 -- and I did not object, is it fair to say that
9 you intended that to include the appendices?

10 MS. SATTER: Yes.

11 MR. RIPPIE: I just think we should make that
12 clear for the record.

13 MS. SATTER: On the ICC's web site the entries
14 for the report are multiple.

15 MR. RIPPIE: There are multiple entries.

16 MS. SATTER: It's a big report, so there are
17 appendices, and attachments, and all kinds of things.

18 JUDGE HILLIARD: Okay.

19 MS. SATTER: I have excerpted a few pages, for
20 ease; and I haven't marked them as an exhibit. If
21 you'd like, I can mark them as an exhibit. These are
22 the sections that address voltage optimization and

1 validation studies in particular.

2 JUDGE HILLIARD: That would be a good idea to
3 mark them.

4 MS. SATTER: Okay. So, for the record, I'd
5 like to mark the documents -- the excerpts that's
6 marked in advance meter Annual Implementation
7 Progress Report submitted by Commonwealth Edison
8 April 1st, 2015 as AG Cross-Exhibit 3, and the
9 document with that title page that says April 1st,
10 2016 as AG Cross-Exhibit 4.

11 (Whereupon, AG Cross-Exhibit
12 Nos. 3 and 4 were marked for
13 identification.)

14 MS. SATTER: And I've handed copies of these
15 documents to the witness.

16 BY MS. SATTER:

17 Q And I would just like you to direct your
18 attention, Ms. Brinkman, to Page A13 of AG
19 Cross-Exhibit 3. That would be the 2015 report.

20 A Okay.

21 Q And would you agree with me that Section D
22 refers to a Planned ComEd Validation Project?

1 A That's the title of the section, yes.

2 Q And have you reviewed the recommendations
3 here?

4 A Again, I've read this. We had a witness,
5 John Prueitt, that spoke to the validation project in
6 great detail, but I've read this.

7 Q I'm asking you if you're familiar with this
8 recommendation?

9 A I've read this.

10 Q Okay. And to the best of your knowledge,
11 has ComEd agreed with the recommendations contained
12 in this Subsection D?

13 MR. RIPPIE: Let's call it a request for
14 clarification rather than an objection. Do you mean
15 simply the check marked recommendations on A13, or
16 are you asking her whether the Company agrees with
17 all of the recommendations in the referenced AEG
18 report?

19 MS. SATTER: I'm talking about the Section D.

20 MR. RIPPIE: Fair enough. Thank you.

21 THE WITNESS: I can't speak to any of the
22 technical aspects of this. ComEd is engaging in a

1 validation project, looking at VO technologies, and
2 plans to assess and report learnings from that
3 validation project.

4 JUDGE JORGENSON: What does that phrase
5 "learnings" -- or word "learnings" mean in this
6 context? Does that mean you have conclusions, or you
7 have data, or ideas? What does it mean?

8 THE WITNESS: So, your Honor, within the 2015
9 AIPR we talked about doing a validation project,
10 validating the findings from a larger voltage
11 optimization feasibility sense.

12 And in looking at a validation
13 project, we would look to see whether the
14 technology -- and I apologize because I'm not an
15 engineer, so it's technical -- whether the technology
16 is appropriate, whether it provides the results that
17 we're looking for, and to see if in that sampling
18 that we're looking at it is appropriate for further
19 deployment.

20 JUDGE HILLIARD: So does "learnings" mean
21 conclusions or something to that effect?

22 THE WITNESS: "Conclusions" I think is a fair

1 word; a conclusion on whether something works or
2 needs further study.

3 JUDGE HILLIARD: Okay.

4 BY MS. SATTER:

5 Q Now, I'd like to turn your attention to
6 AG Cross-Exhibit 4, specifically A10, Page A10 at the
7 very top. And you would agree with me that in that
8 study -- well, let me step back for a minute.

9 Did ComEd prepare this part of the
10 AIPR?

11 A I'm not involved in the preparation of the
12 AIPR. It is a ComEd-sponsored document.

13 Q Okay. So at the very top you agree with me
14 that the paragraph that begins, "This study
15 recommended at VO validation project", that describes
16 the validation project that is the \$4 million dollar
17 expense that was addressed in Mr. Moy's testimony?

18 A I believe it was addressed in Mr. Moy's
19 testimony. It was definitely addressed in Mr.
20 Pruitt's. But, yes, it's the validation project that
21 we're currently working on.

22 Q And on Page A11, Subsection C, is Budget

1 and Cost Recovery. And you talk about the -- and
2 ComEd addresses the preliminary expense of \$4 million
3 and states that, "Recovery of the validation project
4 costs will be addressed further in ComEd's 2016
5 formula rate update proceeding"; is that right?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Now, also in AG Cross-Exhibit 4, on Page
8 All there is a table. It says, VO Validation Project
9 Milestone and Time Line; correct?

10 A That's correct.

11 Q And that's the same table that you have in
12 your Exhibit 8.01?

13 A Yes, that is the same exhibit in a data
14 request included in 8.01.

15 Q Okay. And, to the best of your knowledge,
16 that's the same time line that Mr. Fagan and Chang
17 used in their testimony?

18 A I can't speculate on what they used.

19 Q Okay. Now, this time line has the contract
20 being awarded in the second quarter of 2016. Do you
21 see that?

22 A I believe you're referring to the stuff

1 that says, "Evaluate, Select, Award Voltage
2 Optimization Vendor Application"?

3 Q Yes.

4 A Yes.

5 Q And do you know whether that has happened?

6 A No, we have not selected a vendor at this
7 point.

8 Q Do you have any estimation of when that
9 will occur?

10 A I believe we answered in discovery that we
11 anticipate that happening in Q3.

12 Q So, in other words, by the end of
13 September?

14 A That's correct.

15 Q Do you know, as you sit in here, how many
16 vendors submitted responses to the RFP?

17 A I am not closely involved with the RFP. I
18 believe an estimate of about 4 or 5 vendors.

19 Q 4 or 5 vendors. Thank you.

20 Do you know whether under the
21 substation feeder design phase, whether those 3
22 milestones will have to be done after the vendor is

1 selected?

2 A Again, I am not the expert on how a
3 validation project works. It's my understanding that
4 some of this may be done in parallel, so we're not
5 waiting completely until a vendor is selected.
6 Anything would be firmed up once a vendor is
7 selected.

8 Q If the validation study is not finished by
9 December 31st, 2016, when would you expect the costs
10 to be in ComEd revenue requirement?

11 A When they're incurred.

12 Q So have the costs been incurred to date?

13 A In the current proceeding the estimated
14 costs related to the validation project are included
15 in the 2016 projective plans edition.

16 We still anticipate the project to be
17 complete by the end of the year. But if the project
18 were to extend past the end of the year -- assuming,
19 hypothetically, that it went into 2017 -- then those
20 costs would be incurred in 2017.

21 JUDGE HILLIARD: All of the costs?

22 THE WITNESS: Potentially, all of the costs.

1 If it's all capitalizable costs, they would go into
2 revenue requirement when they go in service. If
3 there are any expense costs, those would be incurred
4 in the year end.

5 BY MS. SATTER:

6 Q So if the cost for the validation study is
7 different from the costs included in the projected
8 plans, is it correct that under the formula rate
9 process ComEd would account for the difference in its
10 reconciliation?

11 A I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question one
12 more time.

13 Q If cost of the validation study is
14 different than the \$4 million that are included in
15 projected plans, isn't it correct that ComEd will
16 account for that difference in its reconciliation
17 docket for the year 2016?

18 A That's correct.

19 Q So ComEd will be compensated for its costs
20 whether they are more or less than the projected
21 costs?

22 A Assuming a prudent and reasonable finding

1 by the Commission, yes.

2 Q Thank you. Good point.

3 And do you know whether there are
4 costs associated with the Oak Park study related to
5 voltage?

6 A I'm not sure, specifically. Again,
7 Mr. Pruitt was the expert on this -- on the Oak Park
8 work. As I recall, the studies that we provided were
9 dated in 2016, so there may be costs in the current
10 revenue requirements, but I don't know for sure.

11 Q Would those be considered ordinary ongoing
12 expenses of the utilities?

13 A I'm not sure what you mean by "ordinary
14 ongoing expenses".

15 Q If the costs associated with evaluating the
16 voltage control efforts in the Oak Park substation,
17 are the cost associated with that activity and
18 expense as opposed to plans?

19 A Again, I don't know all of the work that's
20 been done at Oak Park, so I can't opine on whether
21 it's all capital expense or a hybrid of both.

22 MS. SATTER: Okay. I have no further

1 questions.

2 JUDGE HILLIARD: Anybody else have any cross?

3 (No response.)

4 JUDGE HILLIARD: Go ahead.

5 MS. SATTER: Then I would like to move for the
6 admission of AG Cross-Exhibits 3 and 4 which, again,
7 are excerpts from our AIPR.

8 MR. RIPPIE: Your Honors, we have no objection
9 because the Commission has taken notice, or you've
10 granted the motion. I just want to be clear that the
11 entire document, including all the context, is
12 available in the record to be cited, not simply these
13 excerpts.

14 But with that clarification, we
15 obviously don't have any problem with these excerpts
16 being in.

17 JUDGE HILLIARD: Okay. AG Cross-Exhibits 3 and
18 4 are admitted in the record subject to ComEd's and
19 Counsel's caveats.

20 (Whereupon, AG Cross-Exhibit
21 Nos. 3 and 4 were admitted into
22 evidence.)

1 JUDGE JORGENSEN: I don't think we've admitted
2 AG Cross-Exhibits 1 and 2 yet either --

3 JUDGE HILLIARD: Okay.

4 JUDGE JORGENSEN: -- as well as ComEd's
5 Cross-Exhibit 1.

6 JUDGE HILLIARD: Are there any objections to
7 any of those exhibits?

8 (No response.)

9 JUDGE HILLIARD: Hearing no objections, they
10 will be admitted in the record, also with the caveats
11 of counsel.

12 MR. RIPPPIE: Your Honor, if I could have 30
13 seconds, I believe I have exactly one redirect
14 question.

15 JUDGE HILLIARD: Okay.

16 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

17 BY

18 MR. RIPPPIE:

19 Q Ms. Brinkman --

20 MR. RIPPPIE: Okay. There's two. The first one
21 is the foundation question.

22 BY MR. RIPPPIE:

1 Q Do you recall being asked whether the
2 overall business intelligence/data analytics strategy
3 is the same or similar between the various Exelon
4 utility operating companies?

5 A I do.

6 Q So that the record is clear, does that
7 mean -- let me make the question simpler.

8 Would the fact that the Exelon utility
9 operating companies have the same or similar strategy
10 mean that every solution or implementation is also
11 identical?

12 A I'm sorry. Can you repeat the question?

13 Q Sure.

14 Does the fact that there is a common
15 Exelon utilities strategy across the operating
16 companies imply that every individual program,
17 software, package, and its implementation would be
18 identical across those utilities?

19 A No. You can have a similar strategy across
20 the utilities, but implement different solutions in
21 order to execute on those strategies.

22 MR. RIPPIE: That's all of the questions I

1 have. Thank very much.

2 JUDGE HILLIARD: Any recross?

3 MS. SATTER: No thank you judge.

4 JUDGE HILLIARD: Anything further for this
5 witness from any other parties?

6 (No response.)

7 JUDGE HILLIARD: You're excused, ma'am. Thank
8 you very much.

9 (Whereupon, the witness was
10 excused.)

11 JUDGE HILLIARD: Do you want to break so the
12 people that don't have to be here can leave? And
13 then you can do your admitting. Let's take 5
14 minutes.

15 (Whereupon, a brief recess was
16 taken.)

17 JUDGE HILLIARD: All right. We wanted to
18 mention that we think it would be a great idea to
19 have a joint outline for the briefs here so that
20 we're all on the same page.

21 MR. STALKER: Your Honor, we're on top of that.
22 And, in fact, earlier today we did send a draft

1 common outline around to the parties, which we all
2 have with us. I don't know if the parties wanted to
3 comment on that now.

4 MR. FEELEY: We'll get back to you later in the
5 week with any comments.

6 JUDGE HILLIARD: Just as long as it's something
7 on your to-do list.

8 MR. STALKER: Oh, yeah, it's been circulated.
9 I think we're close, but we'll take edits or
10 comments.

11 JUDGE HILLIARD: All right. Who wants to begin
12 here?

13 MS. LUSSON: Your Honor, in lieu of cross of
14 Ms. O'Brien -- ComEd's witness Anastasia O'Brien, we
15 would like to introduce as Cross-Exhibit -- AG
16 Cross-Exhibit 5, which is the Company's response to
17 the AG Data Request 19.01; and AG Cross-Exhibit 2
18 (sic), which is the Company's response to AG Data
19 Request 19.02.

20 And it's our understanding that the
21 Company has no objection to that.

22 MR. STALKER: That's right.

1 MR. RIPPIE: That is correct.

2 JUDGE HILLIARD: Didn't we do a Cross-Exhibit
3 2? This is 5; right?

4 JUDGE JORGENSON: You said Cross-Exhibit 2. I
5 think you meant Cross-Exhibit 6.

6 MS. LUSSON: We're on 6. Those are 5 and 6.

7 JUDGE HILLIARD: Okay. Do you want to do --
8 are you going to move to admit your direct testimony
9 today?

10 MS. LUSSON: We can do that, too. That's
11 Mr. Bosch. This was in lieu of cross of Ms. O'Brien;
12 so I don't know if ComEd wanted to move for that --

13 JUDGE HILLIARD: However you want to do it is
14 fine with us.

15 MR. RIPPIE: Now that those cross-exhibits are
16 admitted, your Honor, I'll just go through the ComEd
17 exhibits.

18 JUDGE HILLIARD: I don't know that we
19 actually -- let's say for the record that, hearing no
20 objection, AG Cross-Exhibits 5 and 6 are admitted
21 into the record.

22

1 (Whereupon, AG Cross-Exhibit
2 Nos. 5 and 6 were admitted into
3 evidence.)

4 MS. LUSSON: Thank you, your Honor.

5 MR. RIPPPIE: Your Honors, Commonwealth Edison
6 submitted, at the time of filing the petition,
7 additional a direct testimony assessment, and
8 subsequently submitted both rebuttal and surrebuttal
9 testimonies of other witnesses.

10 The parties have indicated that they
11 have no cross-examination for those witnesses. And
12 we have submitted to the Commission affidavits
13 attesting to the foundation for admission of those
14 narrative testimonies in the attached exhibits.

15 For the record, those exhibits are the
16 testimonies of Mr. Chad Newhouse, which is ComEd
17 Exhibit No. 2, his Direct, together with Exhibits
18 2.01 through 2.12, and 2.12_AP01 through 2.12_AP09.
19 Those were filed on e-docket on or about the 13th of
20 April 2016.

21 Ms. Newhouse's Rebuttal Testimony
22 ComEd Exhibit 9.0, together with attached Exhibits

1 9.01 through 9.11, filed on e-docket on or around the
2 21st of July 2016. And the surrebuttal is
3 Commonwealth Edison Exhibit 13.0 together with
4 attachments the 13.01 through 13.07, filed on or
5 about the 19th of August.

6 MR. STALKER: August, yes.

7 MR. RIPPIE: In addition, we have filed on
8 e-docket ComEd Exhibit 13.08, which is Mr. Newhouse's
9 affidavit attesting to the foundation of those
10 previously identified exhibits.

11 Mr. Christ, C-h-r-i-s-t, Siambekos,
12 S-i-a-m-b-e-k-o-s, submitted direct testimony that
13 was marked Commonwealth Edison Exhibit 3.0, together
14 with the Attachment 3.01, on or about April 13th.
15 ComEd Exhibit 3.02 was Mr. Siambeko's affidavit
16 attesting to the foundation for the admission of the
17 aforementioned narrative testimony and exhibits.

18 ComEd submitted the testimony of Ms.
19 Jennifer Montague as Exhibit 4.0, together with
20 Attachments 4.01 through 4.04, on or about the 13th
21 of April. Exhibit 4.05 is Montague's affidavit
22 attesting to the foundation of those previously

1 identified exhibits.

2 Mr. Michael Moy caused to be prepared
3 and submitted ComEd Exhibit 5.0, together with the
4 attachments thereto, 5.01 through 5.05. Those were
5 filed on e-docket on or about the 13th of April.
6 ComEd Exhibit 5.06 is Mr. Moy's affidavit attesting
7 to the foundation for the admission of those
8 aforementioned exhibits.

9 Mr. Frank A. Leudtke, L-e-u-d-t, as in
10 Tom, k-e, filed ComEd Exhibit 6.0, together with
11 Exhibit 6.01 attached thereto. ComEd Exhibit 6.02 is
12 Mr. Leudtke's affidavit attesting to the foundation
13 for the admission of those previously identified --
14 that previously identified testimony and the
15 attachments.

16 Mr. John Leick -- spelled,
17 L-e-i-c-k -- submitted ComEd Exhibit 7 on or around
18 the 13th of April; attached thereto were Exhibits
19 7.01 through 7.08. Exhibit 7.09 is his affidavit
20 attesting to the foundation for their admission.

21 Mr. John Prueitt, P-r-u-e-i-t-t,
22 submitted rebuttal testimony on or around July 21st,

1 marked ComEd Exhibit 10, and surrebuttal testimony
2 marked ComEd Exhibit 14.0 on or around the 19th of
3 this month ComEd Exhibit 14.01 is his affidavit
4 attesting to the foundation of that rebuttal and
5 surrebuttal narrative testimony.

6 And Ms. Anastasia O'Brien submitted
7 Commonwealth Edison Exhibit 11 on or about the 21st
8 of July; attached thereto were Exhibits 11.01 through
9 11.04, and ComEd Exhibit 11.05 is her affidavit
10 attesting to the foundation of the narrative
11 testimony in the attached exhibits.

12 Based on the affidavits filed on
13 e-docket we offer into evidence the aforementioned
14 exhibits. I will not repeat them all.

15 JUDGE HILLIARD: Is there an Exhibit 12?
16 Because you've got a 13.

17 MR. RIPPPIE: Exhibit 12 is Ms. Brinkman's
18 surrebuttal, which you previously admitted.

19 JUDGE HILLIARD: Okay. Fine. Any objections?

20 (No response.)

21 JUDGE HILLIARD: Hearing no objections, the
22 ComEd exhibits identified by Counsel will be admitted

1 into the record.

2 (Whereupon, ComEd Exhibit
3 Nos. 2, 2.01 - 2.12,
4 2.12_APO1 - 2.12_APO9, 9.0,
5 9.01 - 9.11 13.0,
6 13.01 - 13.07, 13.08 3.0,
7 3.01, 3.02, 4.0, 4.01 - 4.04,
8 4.05, 5.0, 5.01, 5.05, 5.06,
9 6.0, 6.01, 6.02, 7, 7.01 -
10 7.08, 7.09, 14.0, 14.01, 11,
11 11.01 - 11.04, 11.05 were
12 admitted into evidence.)

13 MR. RIPPIE: Thank you your Honor. That would
14 conclude the Company' evidentiary case in support of
15 its rate update.

16 JUDGE HILLIARD: Did anybody else want to go?

17 MS. LUSSON: Sure. Thank you, your Honor.

18 At this time we would move for the
19 admission of the direct and rebuttal testimony of
20 Michael L. Brosch. That direct testimony was filed
21 on e-docket on June 28th, 2016, marked as AG
22 Exhibit 1.0 with attachments 1.1 through 1.4. We

1 also move for the admission of rebuttal testimony of
2 Mr. Brosch, which was filed on e-docket on August
3 11th, 2016. That testimony is marked as AG Exhibit
4 3.0.

5 We'd also move for the admission of AG
6 Exhibit 5.0, which is the affidavit of Mr. Brosch.

7 JUDGE HILLIARD: Is that it?

8 MS. SATTER: And we would move for the
9 admission of AG Exhibits 2.0 through 2.10, which is
10 the direct testimony exhibits Robert M. Fagan and
11 Maximilian Chang on behalf of the People of the State
12 of Illinois.

13 Pursuant to an agreement with ComEd's
14 counsel, Exhibit 2.9 is being offered as the document
15 referred to in the testimony of Mr. Fagan and
16 Mr. Chang to show that the report was produced but is
17 not being offered for the truth of the matters stated
18 in the report.

19 We are also offering AG Exhibit 4.0
20 and the attached exhibit 4.1. Those are confidential
21 exhibits. And we have an affidavit by each of the
22 offers of testimony by Robert Fagan and Maximilian

1 Chang that's identified as AG Exhibit 6.0; it's a
2 2-page exhibit. And we would offer the testimony
3 into the record and file the affidavit on e-docket.

4 MR. RIPPIE: Your Honors, if I may, just for
5 the record, we have expressed, both at the time of
6 submitting our rebuttal testimony and thereafter, an
7 objection to the relevance of certain statements and
8 conclusions made throughout the testimonies of
9 Mr. Chang and Fagan, but have indicated that, rather
10 than pursuing that as an evidentiary matter by a
11 motion to strike other otherwise, we would present
12 arguments concerning the relevance of those
13 conclusions and the materiality of the facts that
14 they might support or not to the Commission,
15 essentially, with the case.

16 And we simply want to make clear that
17 by not objecting to the admission at this stage we
18 are in no sense agreeing that they are relevant to
19 the ultimate decision of the case or waiving our
20 right to make that argument before the full
21 Commission. We simply believe that it's a more
22 cost-effective and reasonable way to pursue that

1 argument than by evidentiary motion to strike.

2 JUDGE HILLIARD: Subject to those comments, are
3 there any other objections to the exhibits offered by
4 the Attorney General.

5 MR. RIPPIE: And given the stated limitation to
6 the that Ms. Satter made on the record concerning
7 2.9, we then have no objection.

8 JUDGE HILLIARD: Those exhibits will be entered
9 in the record with those caveats.

10 (Whereupon, AG Exhibit Nos. 1.0,
11 1.1 - 1.4, 3.0 , 5.0, 2.10,
12 2.9, 4.1, 6.0 were admitted
13 into evidence.)

14 JUDGE HILLIARD: Who's next?

15 MR. FEELEY: I'll go next.

16 Staff has testimony, direct and
17 rebuttal, for 3 witnesses. The first is the Direct
18 Testimony of Scott Tolsdorf marked for identification
19 as Staff Exhibit 1.0; attached to it is the following
20 schedule -- is the summary schedule 1.01 FY through
21 1.10 FY; 1.01 RY through 1.07 RY; and 1.10 RY. That
22 was filed on e-docket on June 29th.

1 Next is Mr. Tolsdorf's rebuttal
2 testimony marked for identification as Staff Exhibit
3 4.0, and attached to it are Schedule Summary 4.01 FY
4 through 4.10 FY, 4.01 RY through 4.07 RY, and 4.10
5 RY. That was filed on e-docket on August 11th, 2016.
6 And Mr. Tolsdorf's affidavit is marked for
7 identification as Staff Exhibit 4.1, filed on
8 e-docket on August 23rd.

9 JUDGE HILLIARD: Excuse me. When you were
10 doing your recitation, you had 4.1 to 4.7?

11 MR. FEELEY: 4.01 RY through 4.07 RY; and then
12 there was a 4.10 RY.

13 JUDGE HILLIARD: Okay. Thank you.

14 MR. FEELEY: The next witness is Richard W.
15 Bridal, II. Mr. Bridal's direct testimony is marked
16 for identification as Staff Exhibit 2.0. He has
17 attached Schedules 2.01 through 2.04, and he has
18 Attachments A through E, file on e-docket on June
19 29th.

20 Mr. Bridal's rebuttal testimony is
21 marked for identification as 5.0. He has Schedule
22 5.01, and Attachments A through C, filed on e-docket

1 on August 11th. And then Mr. Bridal's affidavit is
2 marked for identification as 5.1, filed on e-docket
3 on August 23rd.

4 Staff's last witness is Janis Freetly.
5 She has direct rebuttal testimony -- her direct
6 testimony is marked for identification Staff Exhibit
7 3.0, and she has an attached Schedule 3.01, filed on
8 June 29th. Ms. Freetly's rebuttal testimony is
9 marked for identification as Staff Exhibit 6.0, filed
10 on e-docket on August 11th. And Ms. Freetly's
11 affidavit is marked for identification as Staff
12 Exhibit 6.1, filed on August 23rd.

13 Staff would move to admit the
14 previously mentioned testimony, attachments, and
15 schedules for those 3 witnesses plus their
16 affidavits.

17 JUDGE HILLIARD: Objections?

18 MR. STALKER: None.

19 JUDGE HILLIARD: All right. Hearing no
20 objections, Staff's exhibit and schedules as
21 identified will be admitted into the record.

22

1 (Whereupon, Staff Exhibit
2 Nos. 1.0, 1.01 FY - 1.10 FY;
3 1.01 RY - 1.07 RY; and 1.10 RY,
4 4.0, 4.01 FY - 4.10 FY, 4.01 RY
5 - 4.07 RY, and 4.10 RY, 4.1,
6 2.0, 2.01 - 2.04, 5.0, 5.01,
7 5.1, 3.0, 6.0, 6.1 were
8 admitted into evidence.)

9 JUDGE HILLIARD: Anything further?

10 (No response.)

11 JUDGE HILLIARD: Do we have a briefing
12 schedule?

13 JUDGE JORGENSEN: We already set a briefing
14 schedule. So, unless I'm wrong, we have initial
15 briefs due September 9th with reply briefs due
16 September 21st, and position statements, draft orders
17 September 26th.

18 MR. STALKER: That's correct.

19 JUDGE HILLIARD: Anything else? Do we have any
20 late-filed exhibits to worry about?

21 JUDGE JORGENSEN: Just the cross-exhibits.

22 MR. RIPPIE: Just the electronic copies of the

1 cross-exhibits that were mentioned today, Your Honor.

2 JUDGE HILLIARD: Okay. Subject to the receipt
3 of those exhibits, the record will be heard and
4 taken.

5 Ms. LUSSON: And our affidavits are being filed
6 this afternoon on e-docket.

7 JUDGE HILLIARD: The same with regard to the
8 AG's affidavits. Thank you very much.

9 HEARD AND TAKEN.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22