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CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Pursuant to the provisions of the Open Meetings Act, I now convene a regular open meeting of the Illinois Commerce Commission. With me in Springfield is Commissioner Colgan, and with us in Chicago are Commissioner Ford, Commissioner O'Connell-Diaz and Commissioner McCabe. I am Chairman Scott. We have a quorum.

Before moving into the agenda, according to Section 1700.10 of Title 2 of the Administrative Code, this is the time we allow 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 Commission meetings.

According to the Chief Clerk's office, we have two requests to speak at today's meeting. Just a quick reminder that under the Commission's rules, public comment is limited to three minutes per commenter, and we won't respond to you. So it's not that we are not interested, but we will just take your comments and not respond. So it's just a warning in advance.
We'll start today with Mr. Bart Ellefritz from the office of Senator Dick Durbin.

Mr. Ellefritz, why don't you take a seat.

MR. ELLEFRITZ: Thank you, Chairman Scott.

Before we begin I wanted to acknowledge that Randy Pollard from Senator Kirk's office is here as well, and I will read a joint letter from Senator Durbin's office and Senator Kirk's office.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Very good.

MR. ELLEFRITZ: Dear Chairman Scott and Commissioners, we offer strong support for the inclusion of FutureGen in the Illinois Power Procurement Plan and urge the Commission to approve the proposed portfolio for energy Docket No. 12-0544.

The ICC is responsible for ensuring adequate, reliable, affordable, efficient and environmentally sustainable electricity for the state. FutureGen will ensure that Illinois remains a leader in clean generation -- clean coal generation, research and training, and will boost the local economy by creating approximately 2,000 direct and indirect jobs throughout the state.
Through the project FutureGen will retrofit a 200 megawatt unit at Meredosia with an advanced oxy-combustion technology. In addition, the project will sequester carbon dioxide at a regional sequestration facility in Morgan County.

FutureGen is critically important for our energy future, for Illinois coal and for our country. The project includes retrofitting a shuttered coal-fired power plant with state of the art oxy-combustion technology and a carbon sequestration facility. Oxy-combustion burns coal with a mixture of oxygen and carbon dioxide instead of air to produce a concentrated carbon dioxide stream for safe, permanent storage.

The technology also creates near zero emissions for criteria pollutants by reducing mercury, sulfur dioxide and other pollutants from the plant's emissions.

The power procurement plan that you are considering will ensure a market for the power generated when the state of the art facility comes online at Meredosia. The U.S. Department of Energy
is finalizing a cooperative agreement with the FutureGen alliance to transfer the Meredosia plant formally to the Alliance, at which point the project will enter the final design and pre-construction phase.

The ICC's approval of the inclusion of FutureGen in the state's power procurement plan will provide a necessary finance mechanism to ensure that this project can get up and running. We strongly urge the Commission to approve the inclusion of FutureGen in the proposed power purchase agreement.


CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Ellefritz. Thank you very much.

Next up is Mr. Timothy Drea. Mr. Drea today is representing the Illinois AFL-CIO.

MR. DREA: Good morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, Director. My name is Timothy Drea from the Illinois AFL -- Secretary/Treasurer of the Illinois AFL-CIO. We represent the people who -- skilled tradesmen and
women that want to build FutureGen. So it's all about the jobs, and as a -- actually a laid off coalminer myself, I know firsthand the importance of coal mining jobs in central Illinois and the economic impact they can have on our communities.

So we are happy to join with Senator Durbin and Senator Kirk to endorse this project and hope that the Commission will as well. Illinois has a unique opportunity to advance clean coal technology and spur economic growth through FutureGen 2.0. In addition to investing more than a billion dollars in central and southern Illinois economy creating an estimated 700 to 1,000 construction jobs, creating an additional 700 to 1,000 indirect jobs during the construction period and providing long-term good paying employment opportunities in plant operation, FutureGen 2.0 will create economic development for job starved areas of the state, increase protection for the environment and public health and establish Illinois as a national model of simultaneously pro-jobs, pro-environment and a pro-consumer state. Developing clean coal power is a win-win-win for
Illinois, good for our economy, good for the environment, good for consumers and good for everybody.

We urge you to include the clean coal power in the Illinois Power Agency's 2013 Electricity Procurement Plan by approving the power purchase agreement for FutureGen's 2.0 project. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Drea. That concludes the public comment portion of today's regular open meeting, and on behalf of the Commission, I would like to thank the commenters for their remarks today.

Moving on to the agenda for today's meeting, Item 1 concerns the approval of minutes from our October 24th Special Open Meeting. I understand amendments have been forwarded.

Is there a motion to amend the minutes?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MCCABE: Second.
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded.

All in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is five to nothing, and the amendments are adopted.

Is there a motion to approve the October 24th minutes as amended?

COMMISSIONER FORD: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded.

All in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is five to nothing and the October 24th minutes as amended are approved.

We will use this five to nothing vote for the remainder of today's regular open meeting unless otherwise noted.
Item 2 is Docket No. 06-0703. This is the rulemaking proceeding for Title 83 Part 280 of the Administrative Code. This item will be held for disposition at a future Commission meeting.

Item 3 is Docket No. 11-0289. This is a petition by ComEd concerning potential liability under Section 16-125(e) of the Public Utilities Act for actual damages from power outages caused by July 2010 storms. ALJ Hilliard recommends entry of an Order making a determination of no liability. Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Items 4 through 10 can be taken together. These items are customers' complaints against ComEd, Ameren and Spark Energy. In each case the parties have apparently settled there differences and have brought a Joint Motion to Dismiss, which the ALJ recommends we grant.
Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Joint Motions to Dismiss are granted.

Item 11 is Docket No. 12-0244. This is Ameren's AMI deployment plan currently on rehearing. We'll hold entry of the Order concerning plan approval for disposition at a future Commission proceeding, but also before the Commission today is a Petition for Interlocutory Review filed by the Attorney General concerning an evidentiary ruling striking discussion of certain customer impact metrics.

Is there any discussion on the petition for interlocutory review?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a motion with respect to the petition?

I would move to grant the petition and reverse the evidentiary ruling.
Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded. Is there further discussion on that motion?

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Mr. Chairman, could I understand your rationale for that, please?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Because I believe that the evidence was put -- it was actually placed into evidence at the time of the hearing, and I believe it was on Page 31 of the testimony from the witness from the AG's office asking that those metrics be included in this particular -- or testified they thought that those metrics should be included in this proceeding as it was in the ComEd proceeding as well.

And I think that procedurally, properly -- and not commenting on whether I think what the merit or the weight should be for that particular testimony as it pertains to the final Order, but I think clearly that that testimony was in place. I think it clearly pertains to this docket as it did in the docket where we found that it did pertain in the Commonwealth Edison case, and if the
company had wanted to eliminate that testimony or that line of testimony at that time, it could have filed a Motion to Strike the testimony, which they didn't do.

So I think to remove that at this point would be improper, and again, not attributing any particular weight to that particular testimony. That's for us to decide in the upcoming Order, but I think it would be improper to remove that testimony at this time, and that argument.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: I agree with what you just said, and if for no other reason, I think for consistency between this AMI deployment and the ComEd AMI deployment it's really important. So I support granting the interlocutory review.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE: I was -- I am concerned about consistency between our Orders as well, but I found the ALJ's motion persuasive given some of the procedural issues in this case.

COMMISSIONER FORD: That is exactly what I was going to say, Commissioner McCabe. Thank you. I certainly found those procedural issues. And I have
always been told that in order to grant an interlocutory review we have to have a preponderance of the evidence. Not being a lawyer and being on this Commission, that's what I was always told. So I cannot agree with that.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: I would agree with my two colleagues seated with me, and I am quite concerned given the fact that we do have appropriate procedural policies in place, and coming at the back end of this, even though Chairman Scott, I understand the point that you have made, I just think it's -- it really does deny the full development of this issue, since it was not brought out earlier in the proceedings, and so at that point you kind of get into the due process requirements that I think we should always have at play in our proceedings.

So I believe that the ALJ did make the right call on this, and so I would go along with what her ruling was.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And the only thing I would say -- and I appreciate your comments. The only thing I would say in response to that is if you are
the party that's putting in the testimony, what else are you supposed to do besides put the testimony in and then be able to argue off of testimony that's already there? I'm not sure -- you know, at the time the company had every right to offer other testimony, to offer other arguments, to do other things based on the testimony that's already there.

It's not like they were surprised that that issue just -- if it had just come up in a brief and hadn't been put into testimony at the beginning, I'd wholeheartedly agree with what you're saying, but this -- to me this isn't any different than any other testimony that ends up in the case that people then will argue that should take -- that that testimony should be part of the formulation of what goes into the final Order.

I'm not sure from a -- from the AG's standpoint, it was their testimony that was introduced. I'm not sure what else they were supposed to do, and I'm not sure how having that testimony in denies the company of -- because they had full knowledge that it was in. It was in the
testimony of the case. I'm not sure how we are just
denying them due process.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: I absolutely agree with
what you just said, and also, the company had an
opportunity to question the witness on this, and they
decided to pass that opportunity up. So I absolutely
agree.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And again, I'm not talking
about the weight of the testimony. I am just talking
about whether or not the testimony is in there, and
somebody ought to be able to argue off of it, because
that's all that this Motion for Interlocutory Review
is doing, is saying that people should have the
ability to argue about that particular testimony that
was in and say that it should be part of the final
Order, which obviously we get to decide a little bit
later on, but --

COMMISSIONER FORD: Mr. Chairman, not being a
lawyer, but I thought the due process issue was the
one that we were discussing because the Commission
has consistently found that consideration of
evidence, it should always have cross-examination and
a response. So that is my issue with the procedure that was taken in this issue. Even though it was in there -- I'm not going to argue in the case. I have already said that I was not going to vote for it.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yeah. I just don't know that the parties didn't have an opportunity to do that. I don't find that from any of the documents that we have got that that opportunity to cross-examine and present alternative testimony or rebuttal type testimony wasn't there. I don't see that.

COMMISSIONER FORD: I think the ALJ said it was already heard and taken. The record had been marked heard and taken.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Well, the record was marked heard and taken.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Right.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: This came in as part of the testimony for that record that was heard and taken. That's why I don't -- that's why, I guess, I'm just confused by that.

COMMISSIONER FORD: I'm not confused by the fact that the ALJ struck it, so --
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Well, they struck it, but we also know that the ALJ didn't tell us why they struck it. It just was struck. So we don't -- we are not --

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Well, that's normally how --

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: -- the beneficiaries of what the rationale was for striking the argument. We just found that it was struck. We are left to guess what that rationale was.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Well, that normally is how that occurs in cases. Very rarely will you see a supporting memo from the ALJ when they do such a ruling. So I agree with my colleagues here. So maybe we will just agree to disagree.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: That's fine. We can do that.

Is there any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The motion and the second is to grant the petition to reverse the evidentiary ruling.

All in favor of that motion, say aye.
COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Aye.

Opposed?

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Nay.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Nay.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE: Nay.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is two to three and that motion fails.

And I believe -- Mr. Wallace, I believe procedurally then that would be dispositive of that particular issue. We wouldn't have to have a second motion that would grant or -- that would deny the petition, correct?

JUDGE WALLACE: That's a trick question. I don't think we have had that come up.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: That's why I asked.

JUDGE WALLACE: I really -- I haven't looked into that. So I don't know.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Mr. Chairman, I will make a motion to support the ruling of the ALJ relative to this issue.

COMMISSIONER FORD: I'll second.
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. I assume we don't need any more discussion.

All in favor, say aye.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Aye.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE: Aye.

COMMISSIONER FORD: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Opposed?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Nay.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: No.

So that motion carries and the ruling of the ALJ is supported in this particular case, and again, the rest of the issue will be held for a further Commission proceeding.

Item 12 is Docket No. 12-0566. This is Resolution Power's application for a certificate to operate as an alternative retail electric supplier. ALJ Von Qualen recommends entry of an Order granting the certificate.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Items 13 and 14 can be taken together. These concern the initiation of citation proceedings against Peoples Gas in connection with pipeline safety issues. In each case Staff recommends entry of an Order initiating the citation proceeding.

Is there any discussion?

COMMISSIONER MCCABE: Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend the Staff for their reports on the alleged violations, and I think pipeline safety is a crucial issue both for human life and property as we have seen in Indianapolis recently, and we have got an aging infrastructure. So I wanted to commend them for the work they did on this.

COMMISSIONER FORD: I too, because on December 10th, I go to Washington DC to sit in on my last pipeline safety Commission meeting, and so I am very pleased with what our Staff has done with this issue.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I wholeheartedly agree.
COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: I would just comment that I agree and just as Commissioner McCabe noted, gas pipeline safety is such an issue. It's an issue across this country, and we know it's an issue in our service territories. And so it is important that our Staff is active and when we meet with our colleagues from other states we can share the stories of how our Staff is out there ensuring that we have -- without reconstruction we have the safest pipelines that we can afford our folks in Illinois.

So it is great to know that our Staff is out there ensuring that our companies are doing the right thing. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections to the entry of the Orders initiating the citation proceeding?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the initiating Orders are entered.

Item 15 is Docket No. 12-0595. This is a filing by Ameren seeking special permission for a change to its purchased gas adjustment rider.
Staff recommends granting the company's request for special permission.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, special permission for the requested tariff changes is granted.

Item 16 is Docket No. 12-0243. This is Nicor's petition for the confidential and/or proprietary treatment of its annual report. Nicor has moved to dismiss this matter, and ALJ Hilliard recommends entry of an Order granting that motion.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Item 17 is Docket No. 12-0325. This is Nicor's petition seeking a waiver of certain
provisions of Section 7-102 of the Public Utilities Act. The company has moved to withdraw its petition, and ALJ Jorgenson recommends granting that Motion to Withdraw.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Motion to Withdraw is granted.

Item 18 is Docket No. 12-0476. This is Barbara Taylor's complaint against Nicor. The parties have apparently settled their differences and brought a Joint Motion to Dismiss, which ALJ Haynes recommends granting.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Joint Motion to Dismiss is granted.

Item 19 is Docket No. 11-0597. This
is Infotelecom's complaint against Illinois Bell.
The parties have brought a Joint Motion to Dismiss this matter, and ALJ Riley recommends entry of an Order granting the Motion to Dismiss and allocating the costs of this proceeding evenly between the parties.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Item 20 is Docket No. 12-0411. This is Gwenesther Manning's complaint against Illinois Bell. The complainant has moved to withdraw her complaint, and ALJ Benn recommends granting that Motion to Withdraw.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objection?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Motion to
Withdraw is granted.

Item 21 is Docket No. 11-0668. This is DexOne's petition for a variance from certain requirements of Title 83, Section 785.180 of the Administrative Code. ALJ Riley recommends entry of an Order granting in part and denying in part the requested relief.

Commissioner Colgan, I believe you added some revisions?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Yeah. Thank you, Chairman. I am proposing amendment today to the post exceptions analysis and conclusions section of the Order. These amendments do not alter the ultimate conclusion of the Order, which remain to grant the petition in part and deny the petition in part. The edits that I am offering are intended to, No. 1, clarify the waivers the petitioner requested in this proceeding, what waiver petitioner received in the prior docket and what the Commission is granting and denying in this case.

No. 2, to specify the notice requirements to ensure that consumers are properly
notified when the residential portion of any white
pages directory will no longer be delivered; 3, to
continue the conditions imposed in Docket 07-0434 and
impose commitments made by petitioner in the course
of the instant proceedings; and 4, to grant the
waiver request for the City of Chicago and deny the
waiver request for outside Chicago as premature based
on a lack of specifics with respect to a schedule.
Petitioner should apply in a separate docket
proceeding when it actually proposes removal of the
core directory's residential white pages outside
Chicago.

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I
request your support for these edits and move that
they be approved.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I will second those.

Is there discussion on the revisions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor of the revisions,
say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is five to nothing, and the revisions are adopted.

Is there any further discussion on the Order?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I would move to enter the Order as revised.

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Second.

It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is five to nothing, and the Order as revised is entered.

Item 22 is Docket No. 12-0514. This is a joint petition for the approval of an amendment to an interconnection agreement between Frontier and
Comcast. ALJ Jorgenson recommends entry of an Order approving the amendment.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Item 23 is Docket No. 12-0517. This is a joint petition for the approval of an amendment to an interconnection agreement between Frontier and American Cellular Corporation. The parties have filed a Joint Motion to Dismiss this matter, and ALJ Jorgenson recommends granting that motion.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Joint Motion to Dismiss is granted.

Items 24 and 25 can be taken together.

These items are joint petitions by telecommunications
providers for the approval of amendments to
interconnection agreements. In each case the ALJ
recommends entry of an Order approving the amendment.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders are
entered.

Item 26 is Docket No. 12-0554. This
is a joint petition for the approval of an
interconnection agreement between Illinois Bell and
New Horizon Communications. ALJ Riley recommends
entry of an Order approving the agreement.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is
entered.

Item 27 is Docket Nos. 12-0576 and
12-0577. This is a request by Illinois-American
Water Company seeking permission to allow it to enter into an affiliated interest transaction with American Water Capital Corporation. ALJ Riley recommends entry of an Order granting the requested relief.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Item 28 is Docket No. 12-0424. This is an application by Enterprise TE Products Pipeline Company seeking a certificate under Section 15-401 of the Public Utilities Act and the cancellation of a prior certificate. ALJ Teague recommends entry of an Order granting the requested relief.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.
Item 29 is Docket No. 09-0592. This is the rulemaking proceeding for Title 83, Parts 412 and 453 of the Administrative Code. Dominion has filed an Application for Rehearing concerning some consistency issues with Section 412.110. ALJ Benn recommends denying the rehearing application.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections to denying rehearing?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, Dominion's Application for Rehearing is denied.

Item 30 is Docket No. 12-0499. This is HIKO Energy's application for a certificate to operate as an alternative retail electric supplier. The company has filed an Application for Rehearing in this matter and ALJ Von Qualen recommends granting the rehearing application.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections to
granting rehearing?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the application for rehearing is granted.

Judge Wallace, are there any other matters to come before the Commission today?

JUDGE WALLACE: I hate to bother you, but under Item 27, did we vote on both Orders?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes. We --

JUDGE WALLACE: They are not really consolidated, but they were put on together, and I probably misheard. I didn't know if --

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: We voted on the permission to allow it to enter into an affiliated interest transaction with American Water Capital Corporation.

JUDGE WALLACE: And then we have -- we have an information statement, and that needs a vote, too, I believe.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: An informational statement that --

JUDGE WALLACE: Allowing the loan or the debt.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay.
COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Judge Wallace, these on the docket sheet, these are consolidated.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Consolidated cases.

JUDGE WALLACE: My mistake then. I didn't --

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I think the Order covers them.

COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: The Chairman is right.

JUDGE WALLACE: Well, that's good. We are okay.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Very good. And given that, is there anything else to come before the Commission today?

JUDGE WALLACE: No. I think I am going to stop there.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Judge.

Hearing nothing, this meeting is adjourned.

(END OF PROCEEDINGS.)