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CHAIRMAN BOX: Pursuant to the provisions of the Illinois Open Meetings Act, I now convene a special open meeting of the Illinois Commerce Commission. With me in Springfield is Commissioner Elliott. Joining us from Chicago via videoconference are Commissioners Ford and O'Connell-Diaz. I am Chairman Box.

We do have a quorum.

Before moving into the agenda, 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 this bench session. According to the Chief Clerk's office, there are two requests to speak.

The first is from Russell and Shirley Dietz. Mr. and Mrs. Dietz?

MRS. DIETZ: I am just Shirley.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Just Shirley, okay. You want to step up here to the table and the microphone?

MRS. DIETZ: And I can start?
CHAIRMAN BOX: Yes, please.

MRS. DIETZ: My name is Shirley Dietz. My husband and I are farmers and landowners in Madison County along the 55 miles of pipeline that will be abandoned following construction of a new 2.2 miles as explained in the administrative law judge's proposed Order.

We are concerned that IGTC will not hold true to their word in removing the pipe from our property after the new line is in service. The judge is requiring the company to make monthly compliance reports following details made to every landowner on the abandoned portion of the line over a two-year period.

In recent correspondence -- and I quote -- "Upon review of the criteria, IGTC has decided to remove the pipeline within the easement that crosses your property after all replacement facilities are in place and functioning. The existing pipeline has been decommissioned and all necessary permits and clearances associated with the removal are obtained."
What kind of permits or clearances would tillable farm ground need? Our concern is that all this activity may take longer than the two years the judge set forth in his monthly reports. The company wants to get the new interconnection finished in 2009. 2009 is about over, putting all other dates behind schedule. It may take longer than two years before abandoned pipeline can be removed if IGTC follows through.

I feel that once the two years are up, landowners will be left by the wayside. This pipe can be dangerous to farming operations if it is hit. Therefore, we are asking the Commission to put in your final ruling that IGTC remove the pipe from the abandoned line from all landowners who request the pipe be removed within a two-year period from the time the new line goes into service. This was encouraged by IGTC staff.

If the company is unable to comply in that time frame, extend it another year. We feel that adding a year to the ruling should give the company ample time to get all necessary permits and
activities related to abandonment finished, including removing the pipe from any landowner who wants the pipe removed. After that time, do whatever is meant by "will not be viewed favorably by the Commission" as stated in the proposed order, page 18, and inform landowners what recourse we may have if IGTC does not remove the pipe from our ground in that time frame.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Thank you. Second request is from Mr. Darrell Becker.

MR. BECKER: I am here regarding Docket 09-0054. And I am Darrell Becker, and I am representing my parents Clifford and Mildred Becker who are landowners of property the pipeline owned by IGTC/CenterPoint Energy passes through that is going to be abandoned.

First, we are requesting that a timeline or time limitation for CenterPoint Energy to remove the pipeline and all equipment from the landowners' property be imposed by the ICC. While we do have a letter from Dustin Green, manager of
right-of-ways for CenterPoint Energy, agreeing to remove the pipeline from our property, they have not agreed to a definitive time frame within which this would be done. Their statement of within one year after all activities for the abandonment of the entire pipeline is completed, quote, seems to be very vague, open ended and non-committal.

We are concerned that they will in fact follow through with this agreement and do so in a reasonable amount of time. The pipeline is unsafe on our farm for farming operations, as it is too shallow and prevents normal tillable activities.

We have repeatedly requested a more restrictive or definitive time frame but have not received it. We request that the one-year time period be based on completion and usage of the new pipeline and the discontinued use of the old pipeline being abandoned. We request that ICC include this or a similar requirement as to the removal of the pipeline and all other equipment within a certain amount of time.

Secondly, we are requesting that
either the ICC require CenterPoint Energy to remove
the pipeline and all equipment from all landowners'
property that request it, as per Mr. Mark Maple's
testimony and his recommendation, or that the ICC put
in place some type of recourse or process for appeal
for landowners who do not feel that they are being
treated fairly or are not having their request for
removal of the pipeline honored by CenterPoint
Energy.

We do not feel that Judge Albers
recommendation that CenterPoint Energy be required to
file reports with ICC for a period of two years
regarding their dealings with landowners is
sufficient unless CenterPoint Energy is required to
have all landowner requests settled by that time
frame. As CenterPoint Energy has stated, this
process may not be completed within the two years.

It also does not provide for any
requirement that the landowners be notified of
CenterPoint Energy's reports to the ICC or allow for
a reporting or field process for the landowners in
order for them to seek resolution to any conflicts or
disputes with CenterPoint Energy regarding the removal of the pipeline and other equipment within a reasonable amount of time.

We feel this is necessary in order for the landowners to have some degree of assurance that they will be treated fairly and in a timely manner and to have some recourse.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Thank you, Mr. Becker.

On the Transportation agenda, Item 1 is a petition by DuPage County to construct a bicycle-pedestrian bridge over the Elgin, Joliet and Eastern Railway. The project is estimated to cost $1,925,700 and will be funded by a federal grant and the County's own matching funds. No Grade Crossing Protection Funds have been requested. Administrative Law Judge Kirkland-Montaque recommends entering the Order, granting the petition.

Is there a motion to enter the Order?

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Second.
CHAIRMAN BOX: It's been moved and seconded.
All in favor say "aye."

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Any opposed?

The vote is 4-0. The Order is entered.

Ms. Kelly, are you with us in Chicago?

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: No, she is not.

(Whereupon the meeting concluded matters pertaining to Transportation.)
(Whereupon the meeting turned to Public Utility matters.)

CHAIRMAN BOX: Moving on to the Public Utility agenda, first of all we are holding Item 11.

Items 1, 3, and 5 will be taken together. These are tariff filings by the three Ameren Illinois utilities governing the purchase of receivables and utility consolidated billing for customers of ARES. Staff recommends not suspending the filings, allowing them to go into effect.

Is there a motion to not suspend the filings?

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOX: It has been moved and seconded.

All in favor say "aye."

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Any opposed say "nay"?

The vote is 4-0. The filings will not be suspended.
We will use this 4-0 roll call vote for the remainder of the Public Utilities agenda, unless otherwise noted.

Items 2, 4 and 6 will be taken together. These are tariff filings by the three Ameren Illinois utilities to modify their Rate DS-5 (Lighting Service), Rider RMC (Rate Mitigation Credit) and Rider CRM (Commercial Rate Mitigation Credit). These filings are to implement recent legislative changes in Congress and the Illinois General Assembly. Staff recommends not suspending the filings.

Is there any discussion? Any objections? Hearing none, the filings will not be suspended.

Item 7 is Docket 09-0249. This is a billing complaint between Deborah Ying-Thomas and Commonwealth Edison Company. The parties have settled and moved to dismiss. Administrative Law Judge Sainsot recommends dismissing this docket with prejudice.

Is there any discussion? Any
objections? Hearing none, this docket is dismissed, with prejudice.

    Item 8 is Docket 09-0263. This matter concerns the AMI Pilot Program filed by Commonwealth Edison Company. This culminates the AMI workshop process initiated by Commonwealth Edison's last rate case. Administrative Law Judges Sainsot and Kimbrel recommend entering the Order.

    Administrative Law Judges Sainsot and Kimbrel, are you with us in Chicago?

    JUDGE SAINSOT: We are.

    CHAIRMAN BOX: Can you please explain this Order to us briefly?

    JUDGE SAINSOT: I will give you a brief overview of the program. This program was originally authorized by the Commission in Docket 07-0566 which is ComEd's last rate case. In that docket this Commission permitted right of recovery of the cost of a program for advanced meters after workshops were conducted to develop the program. The workshops have now taken place and ComEd has developed that program.

    In this program ComEd will install
approximately 131,000 advanced meters and some infrastructures in nine towns that surround its Maywood operating area. There will also be some meters deployed to Chicago residents and the residents of Tinley Park. Most of the participants will be residential or small commercial customers.

ComEd's program -- oh, the total cost is approximately 61 and a half million dollars. ComEd's program, which hopefully will be half funded by federal stimulus funds, tries to change customer behavior. It does this by arming participants with knowledge about how they can save money through the use of the advanced meters for altering their electricity usage. The program also amasses the effect that a person's demographic information has on that person's energy consumption data.

The program will test consumer reactions to six different types of alternative rates in conjunction with advanced meters. All of the alternative rates discourage usage during peak time. Teaching people to change their usage
patterns can benefit all of ComEd's customers. Reducing the use of big ticket electrical items like air conditioning during peak times reduces the need for very expensive electric peaking plants which in turn reduces the costs of electricity for everyone.

And, finally, this program will include a detailed report to the Commission regarding any cost savings that ComEd experiences. There will also be an annual reconciliation of the expenses, and there is a 110 percent cap on the expenditures for the customer application program which is part of the whole program.

Any questions?

CHAIRMAN BOX: Judge, if I can refer you to page 51 of your Order, can you just briefly tell us, where you speak to the $50 payment or credit, who would receive that and the conditions under which, I think, the initial survey and final survey must be completed for them to be eligible for the $50?

JUDGE SAINTOS: Right.

CHAIRMAN BOX: And the equipment would be removed if they wanted it removed?
JUDGE SAINSOT: Right.

CHAIRMAN BOX: But in order to get the $50, they would have to be involved from the beginning survey and the survey at the end of the pilot program?

JUDGE SAINSOT: That's correct. The only -- what this addresses is the customers that switch to an alternative supplier. And what this portion of the Order does is find that these alternative -- that even if a customer switches to an alternative supplier, that customer will still receive these benefits.

CHAIRMAN BOX: But they would also have to complete the final survey at the end.

JUDGE SAINSOT: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Okay. That's all the questions I had. Any other questions of the judge?

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Judge Sainsot, with regard to -- in that same area of the Order with regard to the requirement of ComEd to notify program participants that they can take service from a RES, what exactly does that mean? Does that mean -- what
does that mean? An advertising program or what does it mean?

JUDGE SAINSOT: Just a statement when they initially interview these people. You don't have to take electricity from us; you can take it from an alternative supplier.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: So it doesn't -- the Company is not going to incur costs borne by other ratepayers for advertising the program relative to this notification process?

JUDGE SAINSOT: No, I wouldn't think so. I would think it would be simple and neat.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Any further questions for the judges? Okay. Any discussion?

The administrative law judges recommend entering the Order. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Order is entered.

I would like to thank the judges and all the participants in this. I know we moved up the timetable about a month ago to get this done as soon as possible so that, obviously, the company would be eligible for federal funds, at least put their best
proposal forward, and it required a lot of hard work on everybody's part. I want to thank you for doing that.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Chairman, before you move on, I know that our assistants were all working on some minor typographical and grammatical revisions to the Order. I believe those have been circulated. There are no substantive changes contained in those changes, and I would move for approval of those changes to the Order before us.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOX: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor say "aye."

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Opposed?

The Order is approved. The amendments to the Order are approved.

Is there a motion to accept the Order as amended?

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Second?
COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN BOX: It has been moved and seconded to accept the order as amended. All in favor say "aye."

COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Opposed?

The Order is adopted as amended.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: And, Chairman, I would also like to thank our judges and all the parties. I know we have upped the time schedule on this and probably caused some sleepless nights for folks. But this is -- I think the Commission has viewed this as a very important, critical step moving forward, and I appreciate them accomplishing those deadlines that we changed on them, and understand that a lot of hard work went into this. So I thank all parties.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Item 9 is Docket 09-0414. The Royal Bank of Scotland has petitioned for a certification as an ARES. The Order finds that the applicant has failed to demonstrate that it meets the requirements, and Administrative Law Judge Yoder
recommends entering the Order denying the requested certificate.

Is there any discussion? Any objections? Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Item 10 is 09-0426. Commonwealth Edison Company has petitioned to enter a credit arrangement that includes a party with an affiliated interest. Staff has determined that compensation paid to the party in question is commensurate with compensation paid to other participating institutions. Administrative Law Judge Hilliard recommends entering the Order approving the request.

Is there any discussion? Any objections? Hearing none, the Order is entered.

As indicated earlier, we are holding Item 11.

Item 12 is Docket 09-0054.

CenterPoint Energy has petitioned to construct a 2.2-mile natural gas pipeline to replace a 55-mile section of deteriorated pipe which will be abandoned. Administrative Law Judge Albers recommends entering the Order granting the requested relief in part.
Judge Albers, are you available? Can you brief us on this?

JUDGE ALBERS: Right here. In this docket IGTC operates 73 miles of pipeline down in the Monroe County area and they are proposing to -- I am sorry, the Madison County area. And they are proposing to abandon 55 miles of that because inspections reveal that it has deteriorated, is no longer practical or even safe to use in the future. And they believe they can replace that with a 2.2-mile pipeline that will link up at another point on someone else's pipeline and still serve the same customers the same amount of gas.

The primary issues in this were whether or not the pipeline should be ordered to remove all of the pipe as whenever requested by an owner of the easement, of the property adjacent to the easement, and whether or not the Commission has authority to require the company to give back the easement once the pipeline has been abandoned.

I can go into detail on those two issues.
CHAIRMAN BOX: If you would.

JUDGE ALBERS: Sure. On the question of whether or not the Commission has authority to require the pipeline be removed, I believe under Section 8-503 the Commission has such authority. However, I stopped short of recommending the company be required to remove it whenever requested by a property owner because, not being familiar with each parcel of land, I am not sure there would be circumstances which would override a particular property owner's request the pipeline be removed.

Therefore, I suggest that the Commission require the company to work with each individual property owner to evaluate their particular situation, and then I also recommend adopting Staff's suggestion that the company would be required to file monthly reports detailing how they have resolved each landowner's request. There was no particular deadline or time frame for submitting those reports. So I said two years. If the Commission believes three years or four years is more appropriate, I don't see any problem with that.
it is my impression from the record the company would not object to that, either.

CHAIRMAN BOX: What were the timetables for Staff's --

JUDGE ALBERS: Just for how long they should file monthly reports.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Judge Albers?

JUDGE ALBERS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORD: How many property owners are we talking about in this 55-mile stretch?

JUDGE ALBERS: I can answer that, but it might take a minute.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Fine. And another situation was, were they paid up front for these easements?

JUDGE ALBERS: These easements, I believe some of them are close to 80 years old. So whatever they were paid was whatever the market value was then.

COMMISSIONER FORD: That's fine.

JUDGE ALBERS: And it might have been different owners, as well.

COMMISSIONER FORD: I guess because I sit on
that National Pipeline Committee, if it is
deteriorated and over a hundred years old, I would
think that the property owners would be very
appreciative of the fact that they can replace that
pipe within 2.2 miles.

JUDGE ALBERS: Nobody -- I am sorry, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Go on.

JUDGE ALBERS: Nobody objects to the
abandonment of the pipeline.

CHAIRMAN BOX: But the question is the removal,
when does it occur and at whose initiation.

JUDGE ALBERS: Right.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Is the issue about, you
know, other agencies, and you talk about some of them
in the Order, you are unsure of who would be -- is
it, I mean, I am looking at it from the perspective
they were granted the ability to put in the pipeline.

JUDGE ALBERS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: So the assumption is
that something has changed since that date where
there may be some historical or archeological aspects
attributed to the land that for some reason --
JUDGE ALBERS: The record doesn't reflect. I just don't know, is the short answer. The record doesn't reflect any details about any particular parcel. So I don't, you know, want to assume nothing has changed.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Assume the law has changed with the land use over the last hundred years, it is easy to assume.

CHAIRMAN BOX: I think you also said that this Commission has the authority to order removal.

JUDGE ALBERS: I believe so.

In answer to your question of how many property owners are affected by the removal -- I am sorry, going to be careful with the words I use -- by the abandonment of the pipeline, there were 267 parcels identified to receive notice of the abandonment.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Okay.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Judge Albers, with regard to these monthly reports that our staff will be filing, if it appears that there is a necessity to increase the time that these activities
are going on to accomplish the removal of these -- or, yeah, the removal of the pipe, wouldn't that be something that staff would alert the Commission to and, in fact, we would revisit the issue of the period of time that is provided for in this order?

JUDGE ALBERS: Well, yeah, I contemplated that and I alluded to it in the Order, that staff would be reviewing these monthly reports as they came in. And then if there were some reason to revisit these issues, I would expect staff to bring it to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: So technically we would like reopen the record or --

JUDGE ALBERS: I would think that would be one way -- the way to do it, yes.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: So from what you are saying, the timelines that are covered in this Order are not concrete timelines, but are timelines that in fact will be responsive to the reports that our staff will be filing on a monthly basis. So we could tailor it to the particular situations as they may or may not arise.
JUDGE ALBERS: Right. There was no particular reporting period proposed. And in the absence I thought there ought to be some limit on how long the company should have to file reports. And because I understand the company is wanting to get this project done in roughly two years, that being construction, initiated and completed, and removal of those facilities they have already identified that they want to remove being done in two years, I just figured two years was reasonable. But, again, if someone feels that more time is appropriate, I certainly wouldn't argue against that.

CHAIRMAN BOX: So you are saying there is certain facilities the company would want removed?

JUDGE ALBERS: They can came in and offered that they were going to remove any aboveground facilities already.

CHAIRMAN BOX: What about individual landowners or parcel holders that would like it removed from their property? What is the method of how they would go about getting it removed or at least beginning the discussion?
JUDGE ALBERS: They would approach the company or the company would approach them in terms of, you know, as far as the dialogue that would occur. That individual property owner would, as I understand it, make the request that this pipeline on my property be removed, and then the company has some criteria that they identified that they would evaluate that request under those criteria to see if there was, as indicated earlier, you know, other governmental regulations that would relate to that request, and evaluate how that request should be resolved.

CHAIRMAN BOX: How would that -- if there was a difference of opinion, the homeowner saying that they wanted it out or it should be out and the company is saying it doesn't meet the criteria, how would that be resolved?

JUDGE ALBERS: I suspect that would show up in the report to staff and, additionally, I believe the property owners are free to come back to the Commission and request that this matter be reopened to address the company acting in bad faith, if they believe the company is acting in bad faith.
COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: But if it is another agency, a state agency or something affected with land use issues that raises the objection that shows up, would they be able to seek relief through that agency or -- that's what I am --

JUDGE ALBERS: Could the property owner seek relief through the other agency?

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Right. It seems like it is not our jurisdiction at that point; it becomes someone else's.

JUDGE ALBERS: I am not sure, to be honest with you. I don't know what the agency rules are.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Can the staff handle this? Say you had 140 owners who want it removed. Do they have the staff to go through it timely, review all the information, go through the criteria and make the recommendation?

JUDGE ALBERS: Does the company?

CHAIRMAN BOX: The company, yes.

JUDGE ALBERS: They say they will address all the requests they receive. So I can take that for whatever it is worth.
COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: It appears they have indicated a willingness to work with the landowners to do this.

JUDGE ALBERS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Barring any restrictions outside of their --

JUDGE ALBERS: Right, anything beyond their control. I sense that some of the landowners just are concerned that the company may not honor their commitment to work with them once they get the permission to build the 2.2-mile segment.

CHAIRMAN BOX: But your Order is strong enough to know that there is a process for them to use with the company if there is no satisfaction there, to reopen this case and it would get back to the Commission.

JUDGE ALBERS: It doesn't spell that out. But I mean, given what our rules are, they are free, if they believe -- the Order requires the company to act in good faith with the property owners and that's spelled out. If they don't act in good faith, even though it is not spelled out in the order, I believe...
the property owners are free to come back to the Commission and request the Commission revisit this.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Was there any evidence during the hearing in the case of certain areas that would be removed because it is too shallow or other things that might have occurred over the years that might make it environmentally sound to do it now?

JUDGE ALBERS: Yes. In particular it sounds like there are areas of agriculture, of farm fields, where just through erosion and natural processes there is less soil above the pipeline, and the company indicated that where the pipeline has been exposed through erosion, they would be removing that as well. And I put in the order that, if it just even comes close to the surface but not actually exposed, that should be considered and removed as well, assuming no other prohibitions.

CHAIRMAN BOX: You would think they would want to do it in anyway because, if the equipment is damaged, if there has been a dispute and they say, no, we are not going to take it out, it is not deep enough or it is down far enough, they would, I think,
open themselves up to liability.

JUDGE ALBERS: I would think so, but that would be my speculation. But I would think so, too, that they would be interested in trying to avoid those problems.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Any other questions or comments for the judge?

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL'DIAZ: Just so that I am clear, Judge Albers, as I see it we have two avenues of redress for landowners. It is the interaction with the company and the staff reports that will be filed over the two-year period that will keep the Commission apprised as to what's going on and problems.

Additionally, since this is an easement situation, a court of competent jurisdiction -- which is not the Commission because we do not have jurisdiction in that area -- could also entertain an action at any time relative to the easement, the return of the easement or anything having to do with that easement.

Would that be two avenues of redress
for landowners?

JUDGE ALBERS: I agree.

COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: And I think a third
would be that, you know, if the good faith question
comes into mind, that they could certainly come to
the Commission and request to reopen this proceeding
and take a further in-depth look at this issue.

JUDGE ALBERS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Any further questions for the
judge?

The judge recommends entering the
Order. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the
Order is entered. Judge, thank you very much.

Items 13 (09-0261) and 15 (09-0366)
will be taken together. These are petitions by
telecommunications providers to discontinue and/or
cancel their certificates. Administrative Law Judge
Haloulos recommends entering the Orders granting the
requests. Is there any discussion? Any objections?
Hearing none, the Orders are entered.

Items 14 (09-0339) and 16 (09-0394,5)
will be taken together. These are applications by
various companies for certificates to provide various telecommunications services. Administrative Law Judge Riley recommends entering the Orders granting the certificates. Is there any discussion? Any objections? Hearing none, the Orders are entered.

That concludes today's agenda. Judge Wallace, anything else to come before us today?

JUDGE WALLACE: Not today. Our next meeting will be November 13.

CHAIRMAN BOX: In Chicago?

JUDGE WALLACE: It is in Chicago.

CHAIRMAN BOX: Anything else to come before us? Hearing none, the meeting stands adjourned.

MEETING ADJOURNED