BEFORE THE
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

BENCH SESSION
(PUBLIC UTILITY)

Chicago, Illinois
Wednesday, January 5, 2011

Met, pursuant to notice, at 3:30 p.m. in
the N808, Eighth Floor, 160 North LaSalle Street,
Chicago, Illinois.

PRESENT:
MANUEL FLORES, Acting Chairman
LULA M. FORD, Commissioner
ERIN M. O'CONNELL-DIAZ, Commissioner
SHERMAN J. ELLIOTT, Commissioner
via videoconference
JOHN T. COLGAN, Acting Commissioner
via videoconference

SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by
Alisa A. Sawka, CSR
License No. 084-004588
PROCEEDINGS

(The Transportation portion of the proceedings was held at this time and is contained in a separate transcript.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Pursuant to the provisions of the Illinois Open Meetings Act, I now convene a regularly scheduled session -- Bench session of the Illinois Commerce Commission. With me in Chicago are Commissioner Ford and O'Connell-Diaz, and with us in Springfield are Commissioners Elliott and Colgan. I am Chairman Flores. We have a quorum. Before moving into the agenda, according to Section 1700.10 of the Illinois Administrative Code, this is the time we allow the members of the public to address the Commission. Members of the public wishing to address the Commission must notify the Chief Clerk's Office at least 24 hours prior to the Bench session. According to the Chief Clerk's Office, we have no requests to speak at today's Bench session.

Moving on to the Public Utility
agenda. We will begin with the Electric portion.

Item E-1 concerns ComEd's proposed tariff sheet to revise the purchased electricity adjustment of factor Rider PE by extending the maximum amortization period from 3 months to 12 months. Staff recommends that the Commission allow the Company's request by not suspending the filing.

I will make a motion to not suspend the filing.

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER FORD: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Thank you. It's been moved and seconded.

All in favor say "aye."

(Chorus of ayes.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Any opposed?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: The vote is 5-0, and the filings will not be suspended.

We will use the 5-0 vote for the remainder of the Public Utility agenda unless otherwise noted.
Item E-2 concerns Docket No. 10-0467.

This is the ComEd rate case and before us today is a Petition for Interlocutory Review brought by the Attorney General concerning a motion to strike portions of the testimony of Roger Colton that was granted by the Administrative Law Judges in this case, Administrative Law Judges Dolan and Sainsot recommend that the Commission deny the petition.

Any discussion by any of the Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: If I might have the ALJs kind of walk us through this matter.

JUDGE SAINSOT: Briefly, the testimony that's at issue chiefly concerns the bad state of the economy in the United States and the fact that poor people or the working poor have a tougher time of it in bad economic situations. And I think the AG rightfully pointed out that Section 1-102 of the Public Utilities Act always requires us to consider the impact of rates on people who are struggling economically.

And I think our problem with this
testimony is not that the subject of the evidence is wrong, it's that these are facts that we know these are not -- these are facts that are obvious, just like it's cold in Chicago in wintertime. These are not facts that are properly the subject of expert testimony because they are obvious.

And I would also point out, additionally, that there are other ways to get this type of evidence into the record without using an expert. And the reason this is important is because experts are supposed to guide us. They're supposed to teach us things. Experts are supposed to bring us up to speed in a certain area. The testimony that's at issue here doesn't do that. It just tells us what every man on the street already knows and what we know.

So, again, certainly Judge Dolan and I are very concerned about the state of the economy. And we're also very concerned about the impact that any rate increase that ComEd -- that this docket might ultimately impose, any impact that would have on poor people or the working poor.
But we also have to follow the rules of evidence. And the rules of evidence don't allow experts -- expert opinions on everyday facts that everybody knows otherwise. So that is the basis for granting the motion.

JUDGE DOLAN: And then, of course, just the other part of it is we also struck his testimony concerning the alternative regulation plan because it's not pertinent to our docket. It's another docket that's actually being held by Judge Haynes, and that testimony was more appropriate for that docket. And we've also struck some ComEd testimony that also addressed that issue. We're trying to just keep our docket straight without bringing in testimony of another docket that has nothing to do with our case. So...

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: So this motion, in fact, is a two-pronged motion seeking to include information or have us import information from another docket. Is that fair?

JUDGE DOLAN: Well, he addresses the alternative regulation.
COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: His testimony does?

JUDGE DOLAN: Yes. Exactly. Yes.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Exactly. Right.

Which is another docket, so that would be appropriate in that docket and not this docket.

JUDGE DOLAN: Exactly. Yes.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: And this is a motion filed by the AG?

JUDGE DOLAN: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Well, certainly, I mean, it's -- I believe that anytime the Commission looks at any cost issue it's about how's that going to impact rates, how that's going to impact the people on the street. I find it kind of funny because I think last week we were voting on energy efficiency matters and I think it was the CUB witness that said, Yeah, there's going to be a cost, we're not sure if there's going to be a benefit, but let's go do it.

So I find this -- you know, there's always costs involved in things and the notion that
the Commission is not cognizant on that on every single move that we make in our deliberations and in our thought process is troubling that someone would think we don't think about that.

And from what I'm hearing this is -- from what you're suggesting that this information contained in this -- many page -- is something that we could almost take administrative notice of, you know, there's economic meltdown and hopefully we're maybe on the upside of that, but it's a very big challenge for people to -- and not just working for families for people to meet their expenses. So it's something germane to the public. I don't think -- I agree with you. I think it's something that we don't need an expert to come and tell us that there's problems in our financial sector of the country.

So...

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Any comments? Questions?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: I disagree with the fact that this is common knowledge. I don't think it is. I think this is an expert -- a nationally known
expert. He makes a case whether or not any of us would consider it in the final decision would be our own choice, but the Public Utilities Act requires us to give a fair treatment to consumers and investors.

I see no harm in allowing this evidence to be in the record. The witness comes to some conclusions in his testimony and all of these conclusions are supported by the evidence. And if we remove the evidence, then what basis do we have to consider his conclusion? So I'm in favor of leaving it in.

COMMISSIONER FORD: I guess my only situation was does this request exceed the boundaries of the Rules of Evidence?

JUDGE SAINSOT: The request to -- for Mr. Colton's --

COMMISSIONER FORD: Mm-hmm.

JUDGE SAINSOT: Well, that's the whole basis -- well, let me back up so I'm clear. The request to keep Mr. Colton's evidence in, although --

JUDGE DOLAN: Testimony.

JUDGE SAINSOT: Sorry -- testimony -- keep in
mind that the evidentiary hearing starts next week so it hasn't been admitted.

But that's the whole basis for our granting the motion to dismiss is experts -- expert testimony is supposed to be testimony that's about things that common -- that are not common knowledge. And if you read Mr. Colton's testimony, I didn't find anything in there -- any of his conclusions, at any rate, that I didn't know from being an American citizen. And that is -- was the basis.

And, again, I think we're very cognizant of the fact that we have to consider the economic impact of any rate increase that might occur. That is not what the ruling is about, rather -- or the ruling striking Mr. Colton's testimony is about. Rather Judge Dolan and I feel that we ought not to get in the habit of having experts testify about things that are not expert --

JUDGE DOLAN: Subjects.

JUDGE SAINSOT: -- subjects. Thank you, Judge Dolan.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Of course, on the
flip side of this, given that the hearings are going
to take place next week then this would be ripe for
cross-examination or disregard by the trier of fact
as not relevant once that's developed on the witness
stand.

So I guess -- I think you have a
position of precedent. If we start doing this, we
kind of open up the door to a lot of other things
that should not be, kind of to Commission Ford's
point. But, again, on the other side, is there great
harm in that there is a way to clear up or for the
inquiry to be had of this proffered testimony?

JUDGE SAINSOT: Well, it would depend on the
cross-examination. It would depend on their -- we
only looked at this one factor. It's possible -- and
I can't speak for Judge Dolan's mind, and I can tell
you that my mind is totally blank, but it's possible
that the evidence is inadmissible for other reasons.
I just haven't thought about that and nothing's hit
me in the face. So there are other reasons.

But the record --

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: But that will
become evident at the hearing, though.

JUDGE SAINSOT: It should.

JUDGE DOLAN: Yeah.

JUDGE SAINSOT: Yeah, it should.

The record in this case is voluminous, though.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Any other comments?

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: I just -- I would comment I'm generally in favor of having more in the record than less, and I'm comfortable with giving whatever weight the testimony is due.

So I would be inclined to -- in this particular case, accept that -- as an economist I have no problems being reminded of the state of the economy. I think sometimes when we're engaged in these mundane matters day to day, sometimes we don't lift our heads to look and see what the average guy on the street is looking at.

So to be reminded is -- I see no harm. And, you know, I give the evidence what it's due. So I would support including it in the record.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Very well.
COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: So you support both of the -- it seems like there's two prongs to --

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: No, I -- the alt reg testimony is -- I would see as a little troubling if it's not germane to the rate case.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Right.

That -- I would go with that suggestion also. That that's -- preferring more evidence regarding another subject and another docket. So I would like to see that taken out also. But I could -- we can have more evidence if that's -- and the ALJs can work it out.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: So the concern -- so if I can just make sure that the record is clear. So are we talking -- is there some consensus that the alternative regulation testimony, should that be included or excluded?

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Excluded.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Excluded.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Excluded.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Commissioner Colgan?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: I agree.
ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Okay. And so that the information provided by Mr. Colton on the state of the economy, the impact on low-income, moderate increase ratepayers, that stays in?

COMMISSIONER FORD: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Very well. Okay. I also -- just so that the record is -- reflects my personal statements, my personal sentiment on this matter, I'm also interested in having more -- having a more complete record. So to the extent that the expert can provide expert testimony on the state of the economy, I believe that that is germane and it should be allowed.

But I also agree that there are limits to expert testimony. And that if it is concerning testimony regarding another pending case, that there would be no prejudice done to the intervenor that they would have the opportunity to bring on that expert in that particular docket for the purposes of providing that testimony.

So I would also hold with the -- with my colleagues here in that we allow -- that we
overrule the -- in part the Administrative Law
Judges' recommendation to deny the motion as it
speaks to the expert testimony provided by Mr. Roger
Colton on the issue of the state of the economy as
well as the impact on low income and -- on the impact
on ratepayers.

I would -- we sustain the ruling that
the expert testimony on the issue of the alternative
regulation is outside the scope and that it is --
that it should be heard in another case if the
intervenor so decides to introduce that evidence in
that case.

So I did say that I was going to use
the most -- the last most favorable vote, which is
5-0. So I will use that vote for both of those
rulings.

Very well. Moving on to Items E-3
through E-5. They will be taken together. These
items are applications for licensure as an Agent,
Broker and Consultant under 16-115C of the Public
Utilities Act. In each case Administrative Law Judge
Yoder recommends that the Commission enter an Order
granting the requested certificate.

Any discussion.

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Any objections?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Hearing none, the

Orders are entered and the Certificates are granted.

Item E-6 is Docket No. 10-0640. This

is the ComEd's petition regarding the Payment

Assistant Plan including its Percentage of Income

Payment Plan or PIPP. The parties to this case have

entered into a stipulated agreement settling all

issues in this docket and Administrative Law Judge

Kimbrel recommends that the Commission enter an Order

approving the plan.

Commissioner Colgan, any discussion?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Yeah, I'm going to recuse

myself from this case -- this docket and not vote.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Very well.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: I was just too involved

in the negotiations on PIPP.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Very well. Thank you,
Commissioner Colgan.

Just so that the record is accurate,
I'd like to take a roll call.
Commissioner Ford.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Commissioner O'Connell-Diaz.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Commissioner Elliott.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Chairman Flores votes aye and Commissioner Colgan has recused himself from voting on this matter. The vote is 4-0 to approve the plan.

Turning now to the gas, Item G-1 is Docket No. 10-0562. It is Nicor's Energy Efficiency case. Before us today is a Petition for Interlocutory Review brought by Northern Illinois Municipal Franchise Gas Consortium concerning a motion to exclude testimony from the Consortium that was granted by Administrative Law Judge Kimbrel in this case. Administrative Law Judge Kimbrel
recommends that the Commission deny the Consortium's Petition for Interlocutory Review.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Very well. I believe that the interlocutory review should be granted. I read the material in this matter, some of the testimony and obviously also Judge Kimbrel's position. I do believe that the Consortium has made valid points about the role of collaboration in developing Energy Efficiency Plans. And included in this testimony is consistent with a breadth of issues that we had -- that had been in part of -- that have been part of the testimony in previous energy efficiency dockets.

So while I recognize that this proceeding is clearly not the place to revise the franchise agreements, which is I don't think what the intervenor here is trying to do, the interrelationship between those agreements and the energy efficiency docket is a subject of interest and that I would like to have as part of record in this
proceeding.

You know, as indicated in the previous case, you know, I believe that it's consistent with some of the views that have already been expressed here that it's -- you know, in my view good public policy for us to have a fuller record. We have to make -- we're limited to the decisions that we make based on the evidence that is provided in the record. And while there are limits, we must follow the Rules of Evidence and remain germane to the issues at hand.

Given that we are talking about an Energy Efficiency Program here, I believe that -- and given the testimony that was provided, that it meets the threshold to have this testimony provided on the record.

So I'd like to make a motion to -- actually to reverse the ruling made by the Administrative Law Judge. So I'd like to make a motion on that matter.

Is there a second?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: I don't hear a second,
but I want the record to reflect that, you know, when we are talking about the energy efficiency portfolio standard, the concept of collaboration is one that includes many stakeholders. And that we -- you know, we can't just pick and choose who's going to participate because then you wouldn't have the full breadth of collaboration that we would want and that I believe the state legislature has called for for the purposes of achieving a very aggressive energy efficiency portfolio standard.

I would hope -- and, again, I recognize that this may not be the place to decide -- and I don't think, again, that the parties -- the intervenor here is asking us to decide on the issue of the arrangement -- the consortium that they're looking for, but that we are -- the franchise agreement. But that we do have an opportunity here to hear an issue concerning energy efficiency.

So I just -- to the extent and, I -- you know, this is not a ruling, obviously. But to the extent that we can foster increased collaboration, speaking as an individual
Commissioner, I would greatly encourage all the parties in the spirit of full collaboration to discuss issues of energy and possibilities of energy efficiency, especially if there is an opportunity to save ratepayers more money. Because as we just indicated on the record, one of our primary responsibilities is to ensure that we allow for the most affordable possible rates for the ratepayers in the State of Illinois.

So those are my comments.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Mr. Chairman, I -- I'm not going to be able to support your motion, but I do support a lot of what you just said. You know, I think the collaboration issue is really important. And I think we should find ways to encourage the collaboration anywhere we possibly can.

I kind of come down on this in the terms of statutory authority to do that. And, you know, I have looked for it and didn't see it. So -- but at the same time I think that we should encourage people to do full collaboration on the wide range of issues and this being a -- I agree with everything
you said about the importance of energy efficiency.

So...

COMMISSIONER FORD: And I certainly agree with

COMMISSIONER FORD: And I certainly agree with

collaboration. But I guess the problem that I have

is the model franchise agreement because I know that

different territories have different issues. And I
do not believe one size fits all. So I certainly

believe in collaboration.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: And I would echo those

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: And I would echo those

comments. I think that -- you know, there's -- I

think more than a little merit in what they're

attempting to do, but I don't believe that is the

forum to engage in that. And, I, too, looked for the

statutory support in this and found it lacking. So,

I just think it may be the right idea but the wrong

forum.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Well, someone's going

to have to make a motion because --

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Well. I will make a

motion to adopt the recommendation of the ALJ with

regard to the interlocutory.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Second.
ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Very well.

Commissioner Ford.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Commissioner O'Connell-Diaz.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Commissioner Elliott.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Commissioner Colgan.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: And Chairman Flores votes no.

Moving on to Telecommunications, Item T-1 is Docket No. 10-0513. This is Telrite Corporation's application for a Certificate of Service Authority to provide resold wireless communication services in Illinois. Administrative Law Judge Riley recommends entry of an Order granting the requested Certificate of Service Authority.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Any objections?
(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: We will use the most favorable -- the last most favorable vote on this matter. So hearing none, the Order is entered and the Certificate is granted by a vote of 5-0.

Item T-2 is Docket No. 10-0593. This is Stargate Mobile's application for a Certificate of Authority to operate as a reseller of wireless telecommunications services statewide throughout Illinois. Administrative Law Judge Riley recommends that the Commission enter an Order granting the requested Certificate.

Any discussion?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Any objections?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Hearing none, the Order is entered and the Certificate is granted.

Item T-3 is Docket No. 10-0644. This is Mosaic Networx's application for a Certificate of Local Exchange and Interexchange Authority to operate as reseller and/or facilities-based carrier of
telecommunications services throughout Illinois.

Administrative Law Judge Riley recommends that the Commission enter an Order granting the Certificates.

Any discussion?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Any objections?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Hearing none, the Order is entered and the Certificates are granted.

Item T-4 is Docket No. 10-0661. This is TDS Long Distance Corporation's application for a Certificate of Wireless Authority to operate as a reseller of telecommunications services in the State of Illinois. Administrative Law Judge Riley recommends that the Commission enter an Order granting the requested Certificate.

Any discussion?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Any objections?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Hearing none, the Order is entered and the Certificate is granted.
Item T-5 is Docket No. 08-0550. This is Intrado's Petition for Arbitration pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to establish an interconnection agreement with Verizon North, Incorporation, and Verizon South, Incorporation. Intrado now seeks to withdraw its petition and to terminate this docket. And Administrative Law Judges Gilbert and Benn recommend that the Commission grant the Company's request.

Any discussion?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Any objections?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Hearing none, the Petition is withdrawn.

Items T-6 through T-10 can be taken together. These times each concern joint petitions for amendments to interconnection agreements under 47 -- under 47 U.S.C. Section 252. In each case Administrative Law Judge Teague recommends entering an Order amending an existing interconnection agreement.
Any discussion?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Any objections?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Hearing none, the

Orders are entered.

We now move to the Water and Sewer

portion of today's agenda. Item W-1 concerns a

filing by Illinois-American Water Company of proposed
tariff sheets to update its sanitary sewer rules,
regulations and conditions of service. Staff
recommends that the Commission allow the Company's
request by not suspending the filing.

Any discussion?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Any objections?

(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Hearing none, the

filing will not be suspended.

Item W-2 is Docket No. 10-0736. This
is Illinois-American Water Company's proposed tariff
sheets to effectuate its purchased water surcharges,
qualifying infrastructure plant water surcharges,
purchased sewage treatment surcharges and qualifying
infrastructure plant sewage surcharges on less than
the required notice. Staff recommends the Commission
allow the Company's proposal by granting the
Company's request for special permission.

Any discussion?
(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Any objections?
(No response.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Hearing none, the
request for special permission is granted.

There is one other matter that I'd
like to bring up before we officially adjourn the
Commission -- this meeting, rather.

I want to recognize someone who we
have tremendous amount of respect for, someone who's
been part of the ICC family for some time, and that
is Mr. Wil Nagel.

This is from the bottom of my heart
and I just wanted to say thank you, Wil, for your
work and your commitment and -- you know, I've been
here almost a year and I've been able to -- I've noticed myself just the amount of workload that you've carried on behalf of the ICC in your division, and we're really grateful for your dedication. So personally I wanted to say thank you and you've done an outstanding job and you're going to be missed.

MR. NAGEL: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: I know that the other Commissioner also would like to say a few remarks.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Certainly I'd like to concur with everything the Chairman has said. You've certainly been a nice person and you've been very friendly in that corner and you've allowed me to enter the door when I -- so good luck on your -- wherever you want to go and be very successful as I know you will.

MR. NAGEL: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Well, I think this is our second good-bye because Wil left us for a little bit but we were lucky enough to get him back and he just came at a time that we really needed someone of his legal knowledge and experience and he
came in and saved the day. And now he's --

COMMISSIONER FORD: Gone again.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: -- moving on to
greener pastures, and I mean that in the dollar
amount. But as I always tell everybody, you know,
the Commission is a big dysfunctional family and
we're like the mafia. So once you're in, you're
really never out. So we look forward to seeing you
at other Bar Association's things and we wish you the
best and know whoever -- I know you're going to a
firm -- and I don't even think you're going to be
doing transportation stuff, are you?

MR. NAGEL: No, I don't believe so.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: No, I don't think
so. So -- but our paths cross at the Commission or
otherwise, wish you the best and you've served the
Commission well and we will miss you.

MR. NAGEL: Thank you. Thank you very much.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Hold on. Hold on.

Hold on, Mr. Nagel.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: We got to layer
it on.
COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Best wishes for a continued success, and as Erin noted, the door's always open here at the Commission if you find it's not a good fit and you're not happy and you miss all the excitement and enjoyment that you've gotten out of your years here -- welcome back anytime. And good luck and best wishes for a continued success.

MR. NAGEL: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Ditto to what everybody said and wish you the very best.

MR. NAGEL: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Now, you know --

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Happy New Year, Wil.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: I always do this when we have good-byes, I always have the lead of the division say a few remarks.

So, Mary, I'm going to ask that you --

MS. STEPHENSON-SCHROEDER: I'm not really the lead of the division. I think very highly of Wil and --

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: You're the lead attorney.
MS. STEPHENSON-SCHROEDER: Well, actually
that's Steve's role.

MR. NAGEL: He snuck out.

MS. STEPHENSON-SCHROEDER: Steve snuck out.

I know we all think very highly of Wil
and we wish him well. He's been a pleasure to work
with and we know he'll be very successful.

MR. NAGEL: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: That was -- she's
speaking on behalf of Steve.

MR. NAGEL: I wanted to thank you all very much
for letting me come back three years ago. And
just -- it's been wonderful opportunities for me.
I've learned an enormous amount and --

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: All the secrets
stay here, though, all the bad behavior that you saw.

MR. NAGEL: Of course. Of course.

And just -- you know, I said it
before, I wasn't looking. This was an offer that was
just a wonderful opportunity for me and it was a very
hard decision for me to make. But I feel I've made
the right decision and I'm very -- just thankful for
my time here.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Wish you well.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: Godspeed, my friend.

Okay. Judge Wallace? Your Honor?

JUDGE WALLACE: Yes, I'm here.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: You know what, I'm going to get a gavel -- or a horn. I'm going to get a horn.

Are there any other matters to come before us today, sir?

JUDGE WALLACE: I think that should do it.

ACTING CHAIRMAN FLORES: That's great. Thank you, sir.

Hearing none, this meeting stands adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED