In The Matter Of:
Illinois Commerce Commission
Bench Session

Public Utility
March 19, 2014

Marzullo Reporting Agency
345 North LaSalle, 1605
Chicago, IL  60654
(312) 321-9365
BEFORE THE
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

BENCH SESSION
(PUBLIC UTILITY)

Chicago, Illinois
Wednesday, March 19th, 2014,

Met, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 a.m. in Hearing Room A, First Floor, Leland Building, 527 East Capitol Avenue, Springfield, Illinois.

PRESENT:

MR. DOUGLAS P. SCOTT, Chairman
MR. JOHN T. COLGAN, Commissioner, via teleconference
MS. ANN McCabe, Commissioner, via teleconference
MR. MIGUEL DEL VALLE, Commissioner
MS. SHERINA MAYE, Commissioner

MARZULLO REPORTING AGENCY, by
PAMELA A. MARZULLO, Reporter
CSR #084-001624
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Ready to go again, everybody?

COMMISSIONER MAYE: Yep.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Pursuant to the provisions of the Open Meetings Act, I now convene a regularly-scheduled Bench session of the Illinois Commercial Commission.

With us in Springfield are Commissioner Colgan, Commissioner McCabe and Commissioner Maye. With me in Chicago is Commissioner Del Valle. I'm 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 before the Commission meeting. 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'll begin with the approval of minutes from our February 20th Bench session. I understand amendments have been forwarded.

Is there a motion to amend the minutes?
COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Moved by Commissioner Del Valle. Second?

COMMISSIONER McCabe: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner McCabe. All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing, and the amendments are adopted.

Is there now a motion to approve the minutes as amended?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Moved by Commissioner Colgan. Second?

COMMISSIONER MAYE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner Maye. All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing, and the minutes from our February 20th Bench session as
amended are approved.

On to the electric portion of today's agenda. Item E-1 concerns filings by Ameren to clarify and make housekeeping tariff changes to its Customer Terms and Conditions and to its Rider Modernization Action Plan Metrics. Staff recommends and we approve the changes by not suspending the filings.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a motion to not suspend the filings?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Moved by Commissioner Colgan.

COMMISSIONER MCCABE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner McCabe. Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing, and the filings are not suspended. We will use this 5
to nothing vote for the remainder of today's public utility agenda, unless otherwise noted.

Item E-2 concerns the submission of a notice of proposed rulemaking to the Secretary of State for Part 415, which is the Uniform System of Accounts for Electric Utilities.

This rulemaking would amend the current Rule to reflect FERC's addition of new plan accounts and new operating and maintenance expense accounts for electric utilities. Staff recommends entry of an Order initiating the rulemaking procedure.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered, and the rulemaking proceeding is initiated.

Item E-3 is Docket No. 14-0135. This is CUB and ELPC's petition to initiate a rulemaking with notice and comment for approval of amendments to the Illinois Administrative Code Parts 466 and 467 concerning interconnection standards for distributed generation.

These amendments are intended to align
Illinois’ rules with best practices across the country and the recent Small Generation Interconnection Procedures updates by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. ALJ Haynes recommends the Commission direct the ALJ to commence the rulemaking process.

Is there any discuss?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a motion to direct the ALJ to commence the rulemaking process?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MAYE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Moved by Commissioner Colgan, seconded by Commissioner Maye.

All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing and the ALJ is directed to commence the rulemaking process.
Item E-4 is Docket No. 13-0324. This is our reconciliation of Ameren's Rider TS, Transmission Services, for the period of January 1st, 2012, through December 31st, 2012. ALJ Von Qualen recommends entry of an Order approving the reconciliation.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Items E-5 is Docket No. 13-0552. This is ComEd's submission of Rider NAM or non-AMI metering. ALJ Haynes recommends entry of a Amendatory Order to clarify certain issues related to the Smart Meter Refusal Charge line item on a customer's bill.

Is there any discussion? Commissioner Del Valle?

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to make a quick statement for the record.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Sure.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: I support the
clarifying Order in the manner that ComEd is proposing. The purpose of my edit in part was and remains to insure that customers are given clear and direct notice in their bill as to the reason for the charge and will more likely be incentivized to accept a AMI meter.

It is my belief that the way to accomplish this is with a bill line item titled "Smart Meter Refusal Charge." Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner.

Further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Amendatory Order is entered.

Item E-6 is Docket No. 13-0476. This is Ameren's filing to make revenue-neutral changes to tariff related to rate design. ALJ Von Qualen recommends entry of a Post Exceptions Order.

Commissioner Maye, I believe you had some joint edits with our office and Commissioner McCabe's office to propose.

COMMISSIONER MAYE: I do. Thank you, Chairman
Scott. I am proposing joint edits with Chairman Scott. As you mentioned, also in collaboration from Commissioner McCabe to the residential rate design section of the PEPO, which specifically is regarding the SFV rate design for DS-1 customer charge.

The PEPO abandoned the SFV rate design and adopts the AG's proposed rate design. I appreciate the people's concerns regarding the issue and acknowledge the merits of the AG's proposal, including the impact on low-use customers. I am not confident that the merits of the AG's proposal outweigh the negative effect on electric space-heating customers.

The magnitude of the shift the AG's proposal would create is made larger due to the fact that Ameren's next formula rate update case will likely reflect a rate increase due to new investments related to smart credit deployment.

In addition, the rate design will go into effect with the January 2015 billing cycle when usage for space-heating customers is at its highest. These factors combined have the potential to create rate shock for a significant number of electric space-heating customers, an effect the Commission
should make an effort to avoid.

   Therefore, the edits we have circulated
direct AIC to maintain the current percentage of
fixed-cost recovery for fixed charges at
44.8 percent, with the expectation that this issue
will be revisited in AIC's next electric rate design
proceeding.

   While as a policy matter, I believe the
Commission should strive to maintain consistency in
its proceeding. These edits also recognize the
distinction between this case and Docket
No. 13-0387, the ComEd rate design.

   With that, I move that these edits be
adopted.

   CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there second?
   COMMISSIONER McCabe: Second.
   CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner
McCabe. Further discussion? Commissioner Del
Valle?
   COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I
have questions for Judge Von Qualen?
   JUDGE VON QUALEN: Good morning.
   CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Good morning.
   COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Good morning. Judge
1 Von Qualen, looking at the record, it seems a little
2 unclear as to how many customers are affected, and
3 in what way was the record a little challenging in
4 this regard?
5        JUDGE VON QUALEN: Yes, it was. The record did
6 not contain the type of information that I would
7 have liked to see about this. That shortcoming
8 really did not appear until Ameren and also staff
9 filed their Briefs on Exception.
10             In Ameren's Brief on Exception, it focused
11 almost exclusively on the adoption of the AG's rate
12 design and the rejection of its straight fixed
13 variable and the rate shock.
14             It raised the rate shock issue at that
15 time. It was only at that time that the
16 shortcomings in the record became a concern.
17        COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Do we know how many
18 customers will see an increase in their bill under
19 the AG's proposal, and do we know how many customers
20 will see a decrease?
21        JUDGE VON QUALEN: No, we don't. Almost all of
22 the data provided by the AG compares the rates in
23 2007 to the rates under its proposed rate design in
24 2013. The same is true for Ameren's rate proposal
design. We do not have that kind of information from them.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Do we know what the percentage of a total bill at the 60,000-kilowatt hours would be made up of the delivery and service or charges?

JUDGE VON QUALEN: No, we do not. We don't have much information regarding total bills. Parties focused on the delivery service rate.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Does the record address the dollar amount which would shift from lower-use customers to larger-use customers, whether space heating or not, in the hypothetical 25 percent increase Ameren submits as Exhibit 7.1? Do we have any idea what the number might be?

JUDGE VON QUALEN: We do have some idea about that from Ameren Exhibit 7.1. If you look at it, you can see the increase for the largest non-space heat customers would be in the range of about $114 to $139 per year, which is about a 14- to 15-percent change.

In the non-space heat customers, with typical usage, would see a difference in their annual bill of less than $2, which is less than
1 percent annual change. The increase for the larger space-heating customers would be in the range of about 251 to 359, or 20 to 25 percent per year, depending on the rate zone.

And for the space-heating customers with a typical or average usage, they would see an increase in the range of about 32 to 54, or 5.5 to 7.6 per year. It does not speak to the monthly changes.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Further discussion?

Commissioner Colgan?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Yes, I support the PEPO in this case. I think the straight fixed variable issue is going to keep coming up.

The edits that have been proposed flip that decision away from the AG's proposal, citing the issue of rate shock, yet there is no evidence in the record that can show us what the rate shock would be on this issue; and the AG argued their case in the record, and other parties had every opportunity to provide ComEd's for the record contrary to that position, and they decided to not do that.

So, if we are concerned about rate shock
in this issue, and there may very well be some rate
shock here, I feel that the recommendation that we
had from ALJ Von Qualen would be to approve the PEPO
as it is, and then mention that maybe we could take
this issue up on rehearing where we could actually
put evidence in the record, in terms of what that
rate shock might be.

So, that's the position I have on this. I
think the straight fixed variable issue I understand
why this is an important issue that will continue to
come before us. I understand the dynamics of why
that plays a role, but until I see some protection
in there for low-use customers, this is not a good
proposal for low-use customers.

I think that impact would have to be
mitigated for me to support that point of view. So,
with that, I'll just conclude and say that I will
not support the edits.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Commissioner. Is
there further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The motion is on the proposed
edits. All if favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Opposed?

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: No.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: No.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 3 to 2 and the edits are adopted.

Are there other discussion or other comments?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there now a motion to enter the Order as amended?

COMMISSIONER MAYE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Moved by Commissioner Maye.

COMMISSIONER McCABE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner McCabe. Is any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: No.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: No.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 3 to 2, and the Order as amended is entered.

Items E-7 is Docket No. 11-0033. This is
Amcor Flexible's complaint against ComEd as to billing and request for oral argument.

ALJ Teague-Kingsley recommends the Commission deny Amcor's request for oral argument and recommends entry of an Order denying Amcor's complaint. This item will be held for disposition in a future Commission proceeding.

Items E-8 is Docket No. 12-0529. This is James and Linda Dorn's complaint against ComEd as to billing and/or charges in Rockton. ALJ Haynes recommends entry of an Order dismissing the complaint without prejudice.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Item E-9 is Docket No. 13-0240. This is Cornelius Crane's complaint against Ameren as to billing and/or charges in Makanda. ALJ Yoder recommends entry of an Order dismissing the complaint.

Is there any discussion?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Item E-10 is Docket No. 13-0360. This is Pamela McElligot's complaint against ComEd as to billing and/or charges in Monee.

It appears the parties have settled their differences and filed a Stipulation and Joint Motion to Dismiss, which ALJ Sainsot recommends we grant.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

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

Item E-11 is Docket No. 13-0450. This is the Village of East Dundee's complaints against ComEd as to easement issues in East Dundee. ALJ Riley recommends entry of an Order dismissing the complaint with prejudice. This item will be held for disposition at a future Commission proceeding.

Item E-12 is Docket No. 13-0488. This is
Garfield Plaza Apartment's complaint against ComEd as to billing and/or charges. Complainant has filed a Motion to Dismiss pursuant to a Cook County Circuit Court Agreed Order. ALJ Jorgenson recommends we grant the Motion and Dismiss the proceeding with prejudice.

Is there any discussion?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the motion is granted and the complaint is dismissed.

Item E-13 is Docket No. 13-0704. This is Emissions Consult, LLC's, application seeking authority to operate as an agent, broker or consultant engaged in assisting end users to procure electricity and power in the State of Illinois, pursuant to Section 16-115C of the Public Utilities Act. ALJ Kimbrel recommends entry of an Order granting the requested Certificate.

Is there any discussion?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Item E14 is Docket No. 14-0111. This is MP2 Energy NE's application for a Certificate of Service Authority to operate as an alternative retail electric in the State of Illinois, pursuant to Section 16-115 of the Public Utilities Act. ALJ Von Qualen recommends entry of an Order granting the requested certificate.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Items E-15 through E-19 can be taken together. These are Applications for certification as an installer at DG facilities, pursuant to Section 16-128A of the Public Utilities Act. In each case, ALJ Baker recommends entry of an Order granting the requested relief.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders are entered.

Item E-20 is Docket No. 13-0060, this is WRPV, XI Seneca Chicago's Petition for Waiver to allow redistribution of electricity for a multi-family building. Petitioner has filed a Motion to Dismiss, which ALJ Kimbrel recommends we grant.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER MAYE: Any objections?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER MAYE: Hearing none, the proceeding is dismissed.

Item E-21 is Docket No. 13-0313. This is ComEd, People's/North Shore, Ameren and Nicor's Petition for a Declaratory Ruling that leases entered into by the utilities and other public utilities do not constitute evidences of indebtedness within the meaning of the Public Utilities Act. ALJ Jorgenson recommends entry of an Order granting the petition.

Is there any discussion?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Items E-22 through E-26 can be taken together. These items are petitions for the confidential and/or proprietary treatment of petitioner's various compliance reports. The ALJ in each case recommends entry of an Order granting the requested relief.

Is there any discussion?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders are entered.

Items E-27 is Docket No. 14-0155. This is Southwestern Electric Cooperative and Ameren's Joint Petition for Approval of a Residential Customer Release. ALJ Albers recommends entry of an Order granting the requested relief.

Is there any discussion?
(No response.)
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Turning now to natural gas Items G-1 and G-2 can be taken together. These items are North Shore Gas Company and the People's Gas, Light and Coke Company's request for a general increase in gas rates. Staff recommends that both filings be suspended and the matter set for hearing.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the filings are suspended and the matters are set for hearing.

Item G-3 is Docket No. 13-0398. This is Consumers Gas Company's Petition, pursuant to Section 7-101 of the Public Utilities Act to enter into a gas storage contract. ALJ Yoder recommends entry of an Order granting the requested relief.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Item G-4 Docket No. 14-0115. This is Integrys Energy Service Natural Gas' Application for a Certificate of Service Authority to operate as an alternative gas supplier to residential and small commercial customers, pursuant to Section 19-110 of the Public Utilities Act. ALJ Sainsot recommends entry of an Order granting the requested certificate.

Is there any discussion? Commissioner Colgan?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Yes. In looking at this case, it is an application for an AGS' certificate. I didn't find in the Order any mention of complaints that would be pending or problems that customers have encountered with this company.

As I look back into this a little deeper, I saw and noticed that in their application, they mentioned that they didn't have any pending lawsuits or formal complaints with any regulatory agency, but it's not in the Order.

And I guess the question would be to the
ALJ is do we know anything about informal complaints of this company?

JUDGE SAINSOT: Good morning. To begin with, Joan Howard is usually assigned to these cases, and she was assigned to this particular case, and she does investigations.

So, if she had an issue, she would bring it to my attention, and she would bring it to Integrys' attention, so that they would have an opportunity to address that issue.

But keep in mind that Integrys is an Illinois company. So, we would have access to the records regarding, and Joan Howard certainly would have access to the records, regarding the informal complaints at the ICC, which increases the likelihood there's no issue.

Finally, I would point out that she would know the bad actors. She knows the bad actors in Illinois, because that's her job.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Okay. I understand that, but this is an issue that's come up for several years now. I would like to see it in the Order that we have followed up with, especially on AGS. We've had some really serious problems with AGS in
I don't want to be in a position to assume that a company is a good player. I understand your position and your comments, and I agree with all of that. Joan Howard would be the person in the know about that.

I would just like to see it documented in the record that we have looked into this effort; and if for no other reason, everybody, all the players in this market, should understand that there's a very clear focus on this issue by the Commission.

And, so, if we could have that documented in the Order. I look for it every time I see an AGS or an ARES application, I look for the issue of the complaints, the nature of the complaints, if there are some, the seriousness of those complaints.

You know, we're approving these people, these companies, to go out into the community and solicit business, and we need -- I'm not saying we don't know about this company, and I did notice their comment in their application.

I'm going to support the Order, but in the future --

JUDGE WALLACE: I will clarify that to everyone
that we will put a line in all the Orders concerning
their complaints.

JUDGE SAINSOT: One thing I would just add is
generally when I do the ALJ ruling that comes out,
because there's usually not enough evidence attached
to the initial application, I always just use the
word "complaint." I don't use formal or informal.

I can't remember specifically if I did it
in this case, but I usually do it; and the reason I
do it is because the term "formal complaint" is not
a legal term.

So, I'm a little afraid that whomever is
doing it or filling out the application wouldn't
really understand what a formal complaint is or an
informal complaint. So, I just ask for all of them,
but that also addresses your concern.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: I think a formal
complaint in our process is when there's a
complaint, and it can't be resolved at the first
step, and it goes into a deeper book. I think that
is where in our process it becomes a formal
complaint.

JUDGE SAINSOT: I totally understand that. I'm
sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt. I'm not sure
that the person filling out the application understands it, and I want to be as clear as I can.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Well, the people filling out the application need to understand what our process is, and there's no excuse for them to not know what that is. So, anyway, I'm going to vote in favor of this Order; but in the future, I just want to see it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thanks, Judge. Any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections to the order?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Items G-5 through G-7 can be taken together. These items are Petitions for the confidential and/or proprietary treatment of petitioner's various compliance reports. In reach case the ALJ recommends entry of an Order granting the requested relief.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders are entered.

Items G-8 is Docket No. 13-0447. This is Tony McKenzie's complaint against People's Gas as to billing and/or charges. ALJ Sainsot recommends entry of an Order dismissing the proceeding without prejudice.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Items G-9 is Docket No. 13-0554. This is our citation proceeding against Ameren for alleged violations of Federal Rules incorporated by the ICC regarding its Leak Classification Guidelines in its Operation and Maintenance Plan. ALJ Von Qualen recommends entry of an Order adopting the stipulation between Ameren and staff.

Is there any discussion? I would just like to say in light of some of the recent events that have happened around the country, I know how
hard our staff works on pipeline safety issues, and
I know how important this is not just in Illinois
but around the country as well.

I think as you will see in the Order, the
Order notes the violations alleged here are serious
ones. While the amount that is proposed is a
compromise for cases of this nature, $35,000 is a
fairly hefty sum to pay in fines.

So, I want to congratulate, thank
actually, our staff for their work on this issue as
well. I obviously ask them to continue to be as
diligent as they have been, and I know they will
continue to be, because obviously this is an issue
of the utmost importance throughout the country.

And I know all of us -- I think all of us
feel that same way. We've taken a lot of steps here
to do some things with pipeline replacement that are
very costly, but very necessary items here in the
state, and this is just one more part of protection
of the public. So, I appreciate the work that was
done on this and on other matters as well.

Any further discussion? Commissioner
Colgan?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: I ditto your comments. I
think in light of when you look at an issue like
this in retrospect, like they are in New York City
these days, you know, the seriousness of pipeline
safety is high.

It should be really high on our level and
I think it is. Our staff is on this case. Our
staff member, Darin Burk, who is the national
president of NIMSA Board these days and does a great
job.

On the issue of the fine, my thought was a
little different than yours, Chairman. I wondered
if $35,000 was enough of a fine, especially when you
look at some of the fines that we've seen come down
for violations that result in explosions.

You know, I think the seriousness of the
issue, and it's going to be more and more all the
time as we move further into the issue of natural
gas. Our staff is doing a great job. As a matter
of fact, I saw our staff was very prominently quoted
in a national article, was it the New York Times
about the incident that happened in New York? So,
we're doing good work here.

I think all the gas companies are aware
and need to be continually be aware that these are
ongoing and potentially very dangerous, serious
issues.

COMMISSIONER MAYE: I have a comment.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Commissioner Maye, sure.

COMMISSIONER MAYE: I was conferring with both
you and Commissioner Colgan, and this has been
something in recent weeks I had a conversation with
Gene Beyer and pipeline safety and Jonathan Feipel,
but I just wanted to take this moment to go on
record and state that as you mentioned, it is not
just a national issue.

We've been charged by our president of
NARUC, Colette Honorable, her theme of this year is
pipeline safety. We ask Commissioners and state
regulators to not only go back and make sure it's
known throughout our state that we are paying
attention and aware of pipeline safety issues, but
that would make a resounding effect that not just
our staff are out there but we are backing them.

I had to take this moment and say I think
that every single utility in our state ought to be
on notice that we are all paying very close
attention, and we take this very seriously, not just
because what happened in New York, but we want to
prevent any issues that can happen in this state, particularly in the great State of Illinois.

    So, we are on notice, and we are paying close attention to it, and hopefully that will serve as a wake-up call to anybody who is not, you know, in any form compliant.

    CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I think in discussion with Director Feipel, I think we may want to ask Darin, who also has a national leadership role on this particular issue as well, maybe if you could come in maybe at our next -- I think we have a ROM next week.

    If Darin can come in and just make a brief presentation to us about some of the efforts that are going on; and then perhaps somewhere a little bit down the road, we could bring the companies in to talk about the efforts that they are making right now, just so we've got the most up-to-date information that we can have as well.

    I think Director Feipel, I think that was something you mentioned that you thought Darin would be glad to so. So, I think that is something we would all like to see.

    DIRECTOR FEIPEL: Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections to the Order?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

On to telecommunications. Item T-1 is Docket No. 14-0092. This is Wide Voice's application for a Certificate of Service Authority to operate as a reseller and facilities-based carrier of local exchange and interchange, long-distance telecommunications services in the State of Illinois. 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 T-2 is Docket No. 13-0708. This is Entrix Telecom's Petition for Cancellation of its Service Authority, Certificate of Service Authority,
and Certificate of Prepaid Calling Service Provider Authority.

ALJ Riley recommends entry of an Amendatory Order to correct errors in the previous Order, which failed to cancel all the relevant certificates at issue.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Amendatory Order is entered.

Item T-3 is Docket No. 14-0144. This is the Bureau County Emergency Telecommunications of Princeton Illinois' Petition for Modification of a 911 emergency telephone number system. ALJ Haynes recommends entry of an Order approving the Petition.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Items T-4 through T-13 can be taken
together. These items are Petitions for Emergency Relief for the confidential and/or proprietary treatment of each petitioner's 2013 Annual Report. In each case, the ALJ recommends entry of an Order granting the requested relief.

Is there any discuss?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders are entered.

Item T-14 is Docket No. 13-0591. This is our amendment to 83 Illinois Administrative Code 730, which implements recent legislative changes to the telecommunications provision of the Public Utilities Act that provide that with respect to service quality, retail telecommunication services provided by competitive local exchange carriers are now regulated in the same manner and to the same extent as the competitive retail telecommunication services provide by electing providers.

ALJ Yoder recommends entry of an Order authorizing the submission of the second notice of proposed amendments notice to JCAR.
Is there any discussion?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

On to water and sewer. Item W-1 is Docket No. 13-0564. This is Galena Territories Utilities' Petition for Approval of a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity, as well as approval of accounting entries to record the transaction, approval of rates and regulations for providing water and sewer service in the Oakwood service areas, and approval of an asset purchase agreement for the purchase of substantially all of the water and sewer system assets of the Village of Oakwood. ALJ Yoder recommends 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.
We have two miscellaneous items on the agenda today. Item M-1 is Docket No. 13-0389. This is our proceedings to develop an administrative rule which establishes requirements for parties to receive a Certificate of Authority to construct and operate a carbon dioxide pipeline, which may be granted by the Commission, and also sets out certain notice requirements as required by the Carbon Dioxide Transportation and Sequestration Act 220 ILCS 72/20(e).

ALJ Haynes recommends entry of an Order adopting these rules as 83 Illinois Administrative Code 302.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Item M-2 is Docket No. 13-0420. This is our proceeding to adopt amendments to 83 Illinois Administrative Code 285, Standard Information Requirements for Public Utilities and Telecommunication Carriers in filing for an increase
in rates. The second notice period has ended and ALJ Jorgenson recommends entry of an Order adopting the amendments.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

On to Petitions for Rehearing. Item PR-1 is Docket No. 13-0495. This is ComEd's Petition for Approval of its Energy Efficiency and Demand Response Plan, pursuant to Section 8-103(f) of the Public Utilities Act.

The AG, CUB and ELPC jointly and IIEC separately have filed Applications for Rehearing, and ComEd has filed a Motion to Clarify and Correct; or in the Alternative, an Application for Rehearing.

ALJ Haynes recommends we deny AG, CUB, ELPC's Joint Petition and IIEC's Petition for Rehearing and grant ComEd's Motion for Clarification. ALJ Haynes also recommends entry of an Amendatory Order addressing Com Ed's motion.

A few comments to make with respect to
this. The AG, CUB, ELPC Petition for Rehearing brings up an important issue concerning the net-to-gross evaluation procedures and weight given to Shareholder Advisory Group input.

In the case of Ameren, the Commission adopted a procedure in which the independent evaluator is required to present its proposed net-to-gross values for each program to the Shareholder Advisory Group, and then to take that feedback into consideration when making the final determination of values to be used in the upcoming year.

In the instant ComEd case, however, the Commission's conclusion states that if no consensus is reached, the evaluator's last evaluation result becomes the default NTG value.

This could lead to an absurd result where knowing the evaluator's NTG value, the utility has no incentive to reach consensus on any NTG value that is less favorable for the company, regardless of how reasonable it might be, and whether all parties, and even the evaluators, themselves, agree, a different number is more appropriate.

In order to insure that future NTG
discussions incorporate SAG input and insure that the evaluator's selected NTG values incorporate the best, most up-to-date information, and reflect their best judgment of likely future actual NTG outcomes and are consistent with the framework established in the Ameren proceeding, I would move to grant rehearing on this issue only.

To be clear, rehearing would only address whether it is appropriate for the Commission to adopt the procedure adopted in the Ameren proceeding, as opposed to the method adopted in the Final Order, and would not address any other proposed procedure for review of NTG values.

Again, I would move to grant the request for rehearing in part only on the topic as I have outlined.

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner Del Valle.

Is there any discussion on this particular motion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor, say aye.
(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Vote is 5 to nothing, and the Petition for Rehearing on the topic outlined is granted.

Next I would move to deny the remaining Petitions for Rehearing. Are there comments on this?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MAYE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner Maye.

It's been moved and seconded. All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing, and the remaining Petition for Rehearing is denied.

Next I would move to grants ComEd's Motion for Clarification on the topic of the CFL carryover conclusion; and in conjunction, I would also move to enter the Amendatory Order reflecting this
clarification.

First, are there any comments on this item?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I'm making the motion? Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER McCABE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner McCabe. Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Again, the motion is to grant ComEd's Motion for Clarification, and to enter the Amendatory Order reflecting the clarification.

All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing. The Motion for Clarification is granted, and the Amendatory Order is entered.

Item PR-2 is Docket No. 13-0498. This is Ameren's Petition for Approval of their Energy Efficiency and Demand Response Plan, pursuant to Sections 8-103 and 8-104 of the Public Utilities
Ameren has filed a Motion for Clarification and/or Correction; or in the Alternative, an Application for Rehearing. The AG, CUB, ELPC have jointly filed a Petition for Rehearing, and ELPC and CUB have jointly filed an additional separate Petition for Rehearing.

ALJ Yoder recommends we deny the Motion for Clarification, as well as all of the Petitions for Rehearing.

I have a few comments on this as well. In the Final Order in this proceeding, we determined that it was necessary to allow Ameren some flexibility in administering its Energy Efficiency Portfolio, but that it was necessary to impose some limitations on that flexibility to protect rate payors.

We adopted the event-based limitations proposed by staff. In the ComEd proceeding, we documented the AG's proposal, which requires that any modifications that required a 20-percent budget shift be brought to the SAG and reported to the Commission.

The AG, CUB and the ELPC point out that it
may be more desirable to document the same methodology in the ComEd and Ameren proceedings to insure consistent program practices; and more importantly, to incorporate SAG stakeholder input.

These are both important goals and in my estimation worth giving a closer look. In addition, after reviewing the parties' petitions, motions and replies to motions, I am concerned that our adoption of staff's event-based limitations may have given the parties the mistaken belief that cost effectiveness is evaluated on a measure basis as opposed to a portfolio basis.

Adoption of the AG's proposal instead would also serve to avoid any confusion on this issue. Thus, at this time I would move to grant in part the AG, CUB and ELPC's request for rehearing, specifically on the topic of whether it is appropriate for the Commission to adopt the same portfolio flexibility procedure adopted in the Ameren proceeding in the current proceeding.

Is there a second to that motion?

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner Del Valle. Any discussion on the motion?
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing, and the Petition for Rehearing on the topic outlined is granted.

Next I would move to deny the remaining Petition for Rehearing. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Second by Commissioner Colgan.

All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing. The remainder of the petitions for rehearing are denied.

On the topic of Ameren's motion for clarification, Ameren is requesting that the Commission make a number of clarifications to its Final Order, and I find two of these clarifications to be appropriate and believe they should be handled in the Amendatory Order.
First the Final Order should be corrected to reflect that the funding levels for the OBF program discussed in the Order were maximum, not minimum funding levels; and second, the Final Order, when referring to AIC's portion of the approved gas spending limits instead reflects the total gas budget, which is inclusive of both AIC and DCEO's gas spending limits.

The Final Order should be corrected to reflect the correct gas spending limit for AIC only. I believe Commissioner McCabe also has a further clarification.

COMMISSIONER McCabe: Yes. The Commission's Final Order in this docket directed AIC to implement ELPC's Smart Devices Program. In its motion, AIC seeks to have the Commission clarify whether or not they should use the gas portion of the emergent technologies budget with the electric portion.

Looking at the record, ELPC's witness testified that the proposed program, quote, can lead to savings of both gas and electricity, end quote. Smart thermostats in particular have great potential for savings and can be used to offset gas heating system costs. I propose that the Commission
clarify through an Amendatory Order that the intent
was to use both electric and gas emerging technology
funds.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Further discussion on these
issues?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: At this time I would move to
grant Ameren's Motion for Clarification in part, and
direct the ALJ to provide the Commission with an
Amendatory Order at the next Commission meeting to
address the changes discussed by both myself and
Commissioner McCabe.

Is there a second to that motion?

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner Del
Valle. Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor? Yes, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: We're approving the
Motion for Clarification in the Amendatory Order on
the three issues that we just discussed?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Correct.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Okay. All right.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any further questions or
deferred discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing. The Motion for Clarification is granted in part, and the ALJ is directed to provide the Commission with the Amendatory Order at the next Commission meeting.

Item PR-3 is Docket No. 13-0506. This is the Commission's investigation of the applicability of Section 16-122 and 16-108.6 of the Public Utilities Act.

CUB has filed a Motion for Clarification, and ComEd has filed a Petition for Rehearing. ALJ Teague-Kingsley recommends that we grant in part and deny in part CUB's Motion for Clarification and ComEd's Application for Rehearing.

In addition, the ALJ Teague-Kingsley recommends entry of an Amendatory Order addressing CUB's Motion for Clarification.

With respect to these motions, I believe there was a significant amount of confusion...
regarding the parties' positions as to whether Section 16-122 permitted the release of anonymous data to third parties, including, but exclusively RESs.

In fact, it appears the term "third parties" was defined differently by different parties throughout the proceeding. In any case, I believe it's necessary for the Commission to provide clarification on this issue.

The Commission understands that sharing the synonymous aggregated data can have significant benefits to program administrators in designing customer programs, as well as significant benefits to research institutions on topics related to energy use.

However, the issue of customer privacy is also one which remains extremely important to the Commission. Thus, I believe it's very important for us to address the threshold question of whether or not Section 16-122 of the Public Utilities Act permits the release of anonymous data to third parties not otherwise enumerated in the Act.

It would be beneficial for the Commission to see legal briefs on this topic on which to base a
decision. Accordingly, I would move at this time to
grant ComEd's Application for Rehearing in part on
the issue as I've outlined.

Is there a second to that motion?

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner Del
Valle. Any discussion on that motion?

(No response.)

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing, and
ComEd's Petition for Rehearing is granted in part
and denied in part.

On the topic of CUB's Motion for
Clarification, I would move to grant it in part on
the topic of CUB's 15/15 rule and deny it in part.

Is there a second to that motion?

COMMISSIONER McCABE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Moved and seconded. Any
discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor, say aye.
(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing, and CUB's Petition for Clarification is granted in part and denied in part.

Last I would move to enter the Amendatory Order which clarifies that the anonymous data protocol is designed to be applied to customers within one customer class and which removes language which appeared to broaden the scope of the customer authorization requirements to parties other than RESs.

Any comments to this?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second to the motion?

COMMISSIONER McCABE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner McCabe. Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?
(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing on the Amendatory Order as entered.

We have three items of other business to consider today. First is the Commission's Resolutions supporting the week of March 17th to March 23rd, 2014 as Fix-the-Leak Week.

Commissioner Maye or McCabe, would you have comments on this?

COMMISSIONER MAYE: Yes. Thank you, Chairman Scott. Commissioner McCabe and I propose a Resolution providing Fix-a-Leak Week. Fix-a-Leak Week seeks to explain the benefits Illinois rate payors can gain by checking in homes or apartments for leaks.

One essential element of water conservation is raising public awareness about the value of water, and the ways that water can be used more efficiently. The U.S. EPA estimates the amount of water leaks from U.S. homes exceed more than one trillion gallons per year.

A few more facts from the EPA that shed light on how much water leaks out of our homes are that leaks can account for an average of
10,000 gallons of water wasted in the home every year.

Ten percent of the homes have leaks that waste 90 gallons or more per day, and the most common types of household leaks are easily correctable, like dripping faucet, leaking fluid flappers and leaking shower heads.

With that said, I would like to present the Resolution.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Commissioner Maye moves for adoption of the Resolution. Is there a second?

COMMISIONER McCabe: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner McCabe. A very original issue, one that used to trouble me in my former job, and as we spent a lot of money trying to get lots of leaks fixed because the amount of water that's wasted is incredible; and the numbers can be very staggering, as much as sometimes 70 our 80 percent of water going through a system ends up leaking out and never gets to its intended user.

So, obviously as this becomes more of an issue, not just here, but across the nation, something that's very, very important as well. So,
I applaud the Commissioners for working on this Resolution as well.

Further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All if favor of the Resolution, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing on the Resolution as adopted. Thank you, Commissioner.

The second and third items of other business can be taken together. These items both concern ComEd's Smart Grid Advanced Metering Infrastructure Plan and the deployment of Smart Meters in ComEd service territory.

ComEd has indicated it now has the ability to implement an accelerated AMI deployment plan, which would be deployed to customers under a schedule that concludes in December 2018.

Neither Section 16-108.5, nor 16-108.6, provide for ComEd to petition the Commission to modify the already-approved schedule, the practical effect of which would be a modification of the
approved AMI Plan.

However, in its staff report, our Commission staff notes that it would be in the public interest for the Commission to investigate and consider ComEd's request.

Thus, staff recommends the Commission:

One, reopen Docket Nos. 12-0298 and 13-0285 to consider the specific request made in ComEd's petition in Docket No. 14-0212, the scope of such reopenings to be limited by the petition; and two, consolidate all three dockets so that the consolidated Docket Nos. 14-0212, 13-0258 and 12-0298 consolidated are limited to ComEd's petition and its proposed accelerated schedule.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: I think it is important that the company has come to us. I think its good that they've come to us with the idea of speeding up the docket. It will likely benefit ratepayers who may be able to take advantage of the different operations that are available through the AMI. We'll see the benefits of Smart Meters in the Smart Grid sooner than they otherwise would
under the previous deployment schedule. So, I obviously think that this is a good thing that they brought to us, and that our staff is recommending that we adopt.

Is there a motion to reopen docket numbers, Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Mr. Chairman, I would also like, and I agree what you just indicated, but I would hope this also means that they're doing the acceleration of the consumer education that needs to take place so that people could take full advantage of this modernized system.

I would like to see ComEd share with us the information on how they plan to do that.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: That's a good comment. Thank you. Further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a motion to reopen Docket Nos. 12-0298 and 13-0285 to consider the specific request made in ComEd's petition in Docket No. 14-0212, the scope of such reopenings to be limited by the petition; and two, to consolidate all three dockets so that consolidated Dockets Nos. 14-0212, 13-0285 and 12-0298 consolidated are
limited to ComEd's petition and its proposed accelerated schedule?

Is there a motion to that effect?

COMMISSIONER MAYE: So moved.

COMMISSIONER McCabe: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: So moved by Commissioner Maye, seconded by Commissioner McCabe.

Further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor, say aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is 5 to nothing, and Docket Nos. 12-0298 and 13-0285 will be reopened to consider the request made in Docket No. 14-0212, and all three dockets will be consolidated.

Judge Wallace, we're all hoping you say no, but are there other matters to come before the Commission today?

JUDGE WALLACE: No, I think you've had enough.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, sir. Hearing none, this meeting stands adjourned. Thank you, everyone.
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