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CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is everything ready in Springfield?

JUDGE WALLACE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Pursuant to the provisions of the Opening Meetings Act, I now convene a regularly scheduled Bench Session of the Illinois Commerce Commission. With me in Chicago is Commissioner McCabe, Acting Commissioner del Valle and Acting Commissioner Maye. I am Chairman Scott. We have a quorum. We should also have Commissioner Colgan available on the phone.

Are you there, Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Very good. Under the Commission's rules, we will have to vote to allow Commissioner Colgan to participate by phone.

I move to allow Commissioner Colgan's participation by phone. 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 four to nothing, and Commissioner Colgan may participate in today's meeting by phone.

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 no requests to speak at today's Bench Session.

(Whereupon, the Commission proceeded with the Transportation Agenda, the proceedings of which are enclosed in a separate transcript.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT:  Moving onto the Public Utility
agenda, we will begin with the approval of minutes from our May 15th Bench Session. I understand amendments have been forwarded. Is there a motion to amend the minutes.

COMMISSIONER McCABE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded.

All in favor of amending the minutes, 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 minutes as amended?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: 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 minutes from our May 15th Bench Session as amended are approved. Turning now to the Electric portion of today's agenda, Item E-1 concerns our assessment of Ameren's electric service reliability for the calendar year 2011, required pursuant to Section 16-125(d) of the Public Utilities Act. Staff recommends entry of an Order adopting the reliability performance report.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a motion to enter the Order adopting the report?

COMMISSIONER McCABE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: 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 Order is entered. We will use this five to nothing vote for the reminder of the Public Utility agenda unless otherwise noted.

Items E-2 and E-3 can be taken together. These items concern our implementation of Section 16-108.5(k) of the Public Utilities Act as they relate to the rates of ComEd and Ameren. In both cases, Staff recommends entry of an Order approving the rate adjustments.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders are entered.

I really want to thank Staff for the quick turnaround on this. This was something that
came as a result of the veto override that happened in the General Assembly two weeks ago, and so to get the turnaround on the rate adjustments this quick was really a good effort, and we really want to thank Staff for their work on that. Director Feipel, if you could pass that along to them, I would appreciate that. Thank you.

Item E-4 is Mt. Carmel's filing to modify its Rider D, Parallel Generation Service, by revising the credit per kilowatt hour as required by 83 Illinois Administrative Code Part 430. Staff concurs with the Company's filing, which results in lower rates, and recommends that the filing not be suspended.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections to not suspending the filing?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the filing is not suspended.

Item E-5 is Ameren's filing to cancel
Rider RTP-LI, Real-Time Pricing For Large Interruptible Service. Staff recommends granting the Company's request by not suspending the filing.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections to not suspending the filing?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the filing is not suspended.

Item E-6 is ComEd's filing to propose revenue-neutral changes related to the rate design of its performance-based formula rate pursuant to Section 16-108(e) of the Public Utilities Act. Staff recommends that the filing be suspended and the matter be set for hearing to allow the parties time to consider the proposed changes.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the filing is
suspended.

Item E-7 is Docket No. 11-0588. This is ComEd's petition to determine the applicability of Section 16-125(e) liability to events caused by the summer of 2011 storm systems. I believe there is some revisions to make to the Proposed Order. I will start with Commissioner McCabe.

COMMISSIONER McCABE: The legislation in this Order properly set a high bar for claims due to unpreventable damages during storm events. During oral arguments, there was useful discussion on how we might ensure that the right customers receive notice of their eligibility to file for damages in this case. In that light, this amendment directs ComEd to work with our Consumer Services Division on a written notice to the eligible customers. The notice will let them know what kind of evidence they can provide, be it in the form of receipts, photos, sworn descriptions of their losses or other evidence, and the notice will inform the customers of the procedural next steps to file for those damages.

With that, I move for the adoption of
these changes.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The edits have been moved to be adopted. Is there a second?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded. Any discussion?

(No response.)

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

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

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

Commissioner Maye?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: I added language that laid out the burden of proof. I thought it was extremely necessary to state that the burden of proof does lie with the consumer in proving damages. Therefore, I indicated language that was taken from Staff's brief in the proceeding, and with that, I move the -- for the amendment of these changes.
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The revisions have been moved.

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER McCABE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded.

Any further discussion?

Commissioner del Valle.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Commissioner McCabe indicated that the legislature set a high bar. I would like to make sure that that high bar doesn't become an unreachable bar. I agree with this -- with the language, but I want it to be clear that the language calls -- says that the evidence provided must provide a reasonable basis for determining the nature and extent of any damages or costs. Who determines what is a reasonable basis?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: Well, what the language is saying is that there does need to be a causal connection between the actual interruption or outage and the damages. I guess in determining if that was a reasonable basis or if there is an actual causal connection, that would go through the procedure that the utility, in this case ComEd, uses.
for their procedure in refunding or addressing
claimants.

. ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: So the utility
really defines reasonable basis?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Well, ultimately, it would
come to us if the --

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: And that's the
point I want to get at.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Right.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: So that it's
clear, I want the record to show that if the
individual making the claim determines that he or she
is not being treated fairly by the utility, they can
file a complaint in the Consumer Division, and if
they are not satisfied, the complaint can come
directly to us.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: That would end up coming to
us.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Because I think
it's important to note that this is the first time
that we deny a waiver, right, under this statute,
under this law? And so there is no precedent here.
We don't know how this process is going to play out.

JUDGE DOLAN: Commissioner, if I may, Section 16.125(h) actually defines how they are supposed to file a claim, and it actually indicates that they should file it just as if they were filing a consumer complaint. So it will go through that same process with the Commission, so --

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: I understand that, but this is -- this is different. This is the first time that individuals are going to be asked to dig up receipts for losses that they are claiming, right?

JUDGE DOLAN: Yes, you are correct.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: And so because it is the first time that people will be doing this, and maybe the last time, I hope, because with all this great modernization that's taking place, this is theoretically not going to happen again, right, for more than four hours. It shouldn't happen. It's not as likely as it was during those days when we had serious problems with the system.

I want to make sure that people are
treated fairly, and that they have recourse, because if it's the utility that's defining reasonable basis and the claimant feels that it's not reasonable, then they have to have a place to go to, and we are that place where they can go to. I just want the record to show that.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: Chairman, if I can speak on that?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Of course.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: Again, I think the key thing here is causal connection. I think -- I wanted to stress that in my mind what we don't want is an administrative nightmare. We don't want to give any consumer the false sense of expectation that, okay, because this Order has passed, you know, we are going to get such and such amount of dollars back. We wanted to make it very clear or I wanted to make it very clear that you do have to be able to connect this interruption to your damages. And, of course, we are now years later, and perhaps people don't have receipts, and people don't have -- I don't know -- anything to show that they did actually incur
this damage, but what we didn't want was to -- I
wanted to narrow the sense of expectation in that,
you know, 100,000 people think that they can come and
file a claim and be successful with that.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: And I think
time has -- so much time has passed that the group
has been narrowed quite a bit anyway. What we don't
want is to end up with a process that makes the
entire group disappear and makes it virtually
impossible to win a claim. So I support the
language. I just wanted the record to show that.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The revisions from
Commissioner Maye have been moved and seconded. All
in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The ayes have it five to
nothing, and the revisions are adopted.
And finally, I have two sets of revisions, neither of which change the conclusion of the Proposed Order. One is found in Section 4(e) of the Order on Pages 15 and 16. It indicates that the legislative history advanced by the Company is not supported by the record. There were no examples cited of cases where more than 30,000 customers had been interrupted before the legislation. So it seems fairly unsupportable to say that the General Assembly passed legislation that was responding to a problem that nobody had testified existed before the time they passed the legislation, and the types of equipment that could cause the interruption of 30,000 or more customers, the evidence of that in the record was lacking as well.

And I believe that the Company's interpretation if that were to be upheld would actually swallow the law that it was intended to be advancing, and so we have just added language that further supports the decision that was reached by the Judges.

The second set of revisions are two
different pieces in Section 5(e) on pages 29 and 30. The first is that we are clarifying that we are rejecting the ComEd argument that their compliance with the maintenance plan absolves them of any responsibility under Section 16-125. The interesting part here is that the EIMA, the Energy Infrastructure Modernization Act has a tremendous amount of money that's ratepayer money investments to steel the grid, extra money in certain places where there have been more interruptions and theoretically more problems. And performance metrics, which have been added, they are tied to the length and the number of interruptions, and to say here that all of the actions on maintenance that the Company undertakes would make all weather related interruptions unpreventable to me ignores EIMA and the Company's actions with respect to that legislation.

Also, the other set that we -- the other piece to that second set of revisions is reemphasizing the burden of proof in the case here lies with the Company throughout the entire process.
I think that's incredibly important. As we make decisions on these waivers, the use of coding to try to find the exclusions is what we have on the record here, but is certainly not ideal. I think in looking at the record I think we can find that that's not an ideal system for that. The Company can't escape the burden that they have, and in the future, you know, as the Company tries to prove up these waivers, if the Company doesn't think that coding is a very good system, as they said in oral argument, they are going to need to be mindful of that in terms of what evidence they actually put forward to prove up these waivers in the future.

So the revisions again do not change the ultimate conclusions, but they just draw out some of the points that were made both during the course of the case, the arguments and also in the oral argument as well, and with that, I would move those two sets of revisions.

Is there a second?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded.
Any discussion on those revisions?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The ayes have it five to nothing, and the revisions are adopted. Is there now a motion to enter the Order as amended?

COMMISSIONER McCabe: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded.

Any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor of approving the Order as amended, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is five to nothing, and the Order as amended is entered.
Item E-8 is Docket No. 11-0662, which is ComEd's petition to determine the applicability of Section 16-125(e) liability to events caused by winter of 2011 storm systems. The ALJ recommends approval of an Order granting the waiver.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections to that Order?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is adopted.

Item E-9 is Docket No. 12-0030. This is Serethea Matthew's complaint against ComEd as to billing charges. This item will be held for disposition to a future Commission proceeding.

Item E-10 is Docket No. 12-0372. This is Patrick Dillon's complaint against ComEd as to the location and the removal of the utility pole on his property. ALJ Riley recommends entry of an Order denying the complaint.

Is there any discussion? I believe there is some revisions.
COMMISSIONER McCabe:

This case involves a customer who complains that a utility pole was placed improperly on his driveway. My amendments do not change the outcome of the case, but do change the rationale used in reaching the outcome. In this case, the parties argued in some detail about the definition of highway as used in some of our rules. Mr. Dillon, the complainant, relied on the Illinois Department of Transportation definitions. The Company disagreed. While the Proposed Order rejected Mr. Dillon's definition of highway, we find it informative and are not so willing to reject it.

In this case, no conclusive evidence was presented as to which came first, the utility pole or the driveway. Thus, we need not adopt any definition of highway. With that, I move for the adoption of these changes.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded to adopt the revisions set forth by Commissioner
McCabe.

Is there any discussion on the revisions?

(No response.)

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

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is five to nothing, and the revisions are approved.

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

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER McCabe: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded.

Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is five to nothing, and the Order is entered.

Items E-11 and E-12 can be taken together. These are customer complaints against ComEd as to billing charges. In the first case, the ALJ recommends entry of an Order dismissing the complaint, and in the second, the parties have apparently settled their 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 Orders are entered and the complaints are dismissed.

Item E-13 is Docket No. 12-0556. This is Ameren's petition regarding its reconciliation of revenues collected under Rider TS, Transportation Services. ALJ VonQualen 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.

Item E-14 is Docket No. 13-0034. This is Phase 2 of the FutureGen clean coal project and sourcing agreement arising out of the Commission's Order and recent power procurement plan proceeding. This item will be held for disposition at a future Commission proceeding.

Item E-15 is Docket No. 13-0188. This is Ameren's request for waiver of certain contract provisions set forth in Part 466 of our administrative rules, which are applicable to interconnection of DG facilities. Because Part 466 does not contain a waiver provision, ALJ Albers recommends entry of an Order granting the Company's request through a declaratory ruling.

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

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Item E-16 is Docket No. 13-0302. This is Ethical Electric Benefit's application for a certificate of service authority to operate as an ARES in Illinois pursuant to Section 16-115 of the Public Utilities Act. ALJ Jorgenson 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 E-17 is Docket No. 13-0285. This item is our investigation regarding ComEd's progress in implementing its AMI deployment plan. S.B. 9 became law on May 22nd, 2013 and amends certain portions of the EIMA to increase the amount of
funding that ComEd will receive through that legislation. It also provides that the utilities shall accelerate the commencement of their meter deployment schedules. ALJs Sainsot and Kimbrel recommend entry of an Interim Order authorizing the implementation so that ComEd can deploy the smart meters as soon as possible.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

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

And I really want to say we appreciate the Judges' hard work. Like we talked about with E-1 and E-3, this was very quick turnaround time to get this to us. We really appreciate that very much, that -- again, two weeks after the veto was overridden to have that in front of us was really good work, and so we really appreciate the Judges' work on that as well.

Items E-18 through E-28 can be taken
together. These items are petitions for the confidential and/or proprietary treatment of petitioners' reports. In each case, the ALJ recommends entry of an Order granting the requested protective treatment.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders are entered.

Turning now to Natural Gas, Item G-1 is Docket No. 01-0705, 02-0067, 02-0725 consolidated. This is Nicor's Performance Based Regulation (PBR) program and reconciliation under Rider 6, Gas Cost Supply.

There are some revisions that I would propose to the Order. On the issue of storage manipulation, although we recognize that Section 9-224(c) and (d) of the Public Utilities Act does allow for Commission review to assess whether the program in this case was meeting its objectives and
was implemented in accordance with the Commission Order approving the program, after very carefully considering the evidence presented by all the parties, it was very difficult to determine whether indeed there was an issue with the way the GCPT was operating.

Further, we felt it was important to note that our analysis was based on the entire three-year program rather than a limited one-year period and may have presented an unrealistic picture of the program as a whole.

And on the issue of refund allocation methodology, we felt it was important to address the stipulation between Nicor and the Retail Energy Supply Association. Although RESA raised some valid concerns about the impact of this methodology on transportation customers, ultimately the stipulation did not provide substantial evidence for the Commission to adopt a different solution than the one proposed by Staff and adopted by the Proposed Order. So while neither of these revisions changes the conclusion, we think they add some clarification to
the rationale in the decision.

And with that, I would move to approve
the revisions. Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER McCabe: Second.

CHAIRMAN Scott: It's been moved and seconded.

Any discussion on the revisions?

(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 revisions are approved. Is there now a
motion to enter the Order as amended?

ACTING COMMISSIONER Maye: 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?
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is five to nothing, and the Order as amended is entered.

Item G-2 is Docket No. 12-0347. This is Endbridge's application pursuant to Sections 8-503, 8-509 and 15-401 of the Public Utilities Act and Common Carrier Pipeline Law, for a certificate of good standing, authority to construct and operate a petroleum pipeline and eminent domain authority in connection with the construction of that pipeline. Petitioner and Staff filed a Joint Motion to Reopen the Record and amend the Final Order to account for an error in the right of way granted for that pipeline. ALJ Hilliard recommends that the proceeding be reopened and that an Amendatory Order be entered.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the record is reopened, and the Amendatory Order is entered.
Item G-3 is Docket No. 12-0507. This is 8L26 Restaurant Corporation's customer complaint against Peoples Gas. ALJ Riley 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, and the complaint is dismissed.

Item G-4 is Docket No. 12-0511 and 12-0512. This is North Shore Gas Company and Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company's proposed general rate increase for gas distribution services. This item will be held for disposition at a future Commission proceeding.

Moving on to Telecommunications, Item T-1 is Docket No. 10-0218. This is WideOpen West Illinois' notification regarding the expansion of its cable service area footprint in accordance with Section 21-401(g) of the Cable and Video Competition Law of 2007.
Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there any objection to accepting the notification?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the notification is accepted.

Items T-2 and T-3 can be taken together. These are citations for a failure to maintain a corporate status with the Illinois Secretary of State. In both cases, ALJ Jorgenson recommends entry of an Order revoking respondent's authority to operate in Illinois.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders are entered.

Item T-4 is Docket No. 12-0699. This is Innovative Security Information System's petition to withdraw its certificate of service authority in
the State of Illinois. ALJ Baker recommends entry of an Order granting the Company's request.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered, and the certificate is withdrawn.

Item T-5 is Docket No. 13-0198. This is Time Warner Cable's application pursuant to Section 13-403 of the Public Utilities Act for authority to operate as a facilities based provider of telecommunications services in the State of Illinois. ALJ Benn recommends entry of an Order granting the requested certificate of authority.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Item T-6 is Docket No. 13-0304. This
is ItsOn's application pursuant to Section 12-401 of the Public Utilities Act for a certificate of authority to operate as a wireless telecommunications reseller in the State of Illinois. ALJ Riley 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 T-7 through T-9 can be taken together. These are petitions for modification of the 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone Number Systems. In each case, ALJ Haynes recommends entry of an Order granting the requested modifications.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders are
Items T-10 through T-13 can be taken together. These items are petitions for the approval of 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone Number Systems resulting from the dissolution of the North Suburban Joint ETSB. In each case, ALJ Haynes recommends entry of an Order approving the petitions and granting the relief requested.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders are entered.

Item T-14 is Docket No. 12-0550. This is Sprint's Petition For Arbitration pursuant to Section 252(b) of the Telecommunications Act. This item will be held for disposition at a future Commission proceeding.

Items T-15 through T-19 can be taken together. These items are joint petitions by telecommunications carriers seeking the approval of
new interconnection agreements or amendments to
existing interconnection agreements. In each case,
the ALJ recommends entry of an Order approving the
agreement or the amendment.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders are
entered.

Item T-20 is Docket No. 12-0685. This
is our rulemaking proceeding for Title 83, Part 735
of the Administrative Code. The second notice of the
proposed amendment was submitted to JCAR and JCAR has
no objection to these amendments. ALJ Wallace
recommends entry of an Order adopting the proposed
amendments with an effective date of July 1st, 2013.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is
entered, and the amendments are adopted.

   Item T-21 is Docket No. 13-0225. This is Nextlink Wireless' petition for the confidential and/or proprietary treatment of its 2012 annual report. This item will be held for disposition at a future Commission proceeding.

   Items T-22 through T-29 can be taken together. These items are petitions for the confidential and/or proprietary treatment of annual reports. In each 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.

   Onto Water and Sewer. Item W-1 is Aqua Illinois' filing seeking approval of QIP surcharge riders for various Sewer Divisions throughout Illinois. Staff recommends that the filing 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 filing is suspended.

Item W-2 is Docket No. 10-0738. This is IAWC's revised petition to reopen the record and for issuance of an Amendatory Order authorizing certain financial transactions and accepting the payment of certain fees pursuant to Section 6-102(d) of the Public Utilities Act. ALJ Jones recommends entry of an Order reopening the proceeding and approving the relief sought.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.

Items W-3 through W-6 can be taken together. These items are petitions for approval of
annual reconciliations of Purchased Water Surcharges pursuant to Section 9-220.2 of the Public Utilities Act. In each case, the ALJ recommends the entry of an Order approving the reconciliation.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders are entered.

We have one miscellaneous item on the agenda today, which is our rulemaking proceeding to implement the provisions of the Carbon Dioxide Transportation and Sequestration Act. Staff recommends entry of an Order initiating the proceeding and authorizing the first notice period.

Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is entered.
We have other -- one other item of business today, which is a meeting to address various administrative matters before the Commission.

First, let me ask Judge Wallace, are there any other matters to come before this part of the Commission meeting today, sir?

JUDGE WALLACE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to back up. On T-18 and T-19, I think those were Motions to Withdraw, rather than Orders. I just wanted to note that, but other than that, there is nothing else on the Bench Session today.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: You just clarified that T-18 and T-19, the Motions to Withdraw, were accepted. Is that correct?

JUDGE WALLACE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Thank you, sir. We will -- seeing there is no other business to come before this portion of the meeting, we will take a short recess and reconvene in about ten minutes. I have to give our court reporter time to get down the hall to the video conference room where we will have an administrative meeting to discuss internal
Commission business. So thank you, everyone, and we will reconvene in about ten minutes in the videoconference room.

(Whereupon, a short break was taken and the Administrative Meeting commenced in the videoconference room whereupon the Commission Members were joined by Staff; Director Jonathan Feipel, Randy Nehrt, Leigh Ann Myers, Jane Fields and Karl Pound.)

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's 11:19. Let the record reflect that we are back in session from our recess. We are still in Open Meeting. We have four items on our agenda today. First, a legislative update, and that's going to be -- John, is that you or Randy?

MR. FEIPEL: I think I was just going to give an overall for each one of these.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. That's fine.

MR. FEIPEL: And then as we get into questions in Springfield, key folks, right, and for -- you
know, we've got Randy, of course, Leigh Ann, Jane and Karl for questions on these issues as they come up. So we can go through that.

Sent around yesterday -- and obviously the legislative is kind of tied into the budget. So there is the two documents for legislative. One gives like a little paragraph summary for each of the bills that was sent to the Governor. There is also a chart that went along with it that shows all of the different legislation that we followed and tracked this past session.

The very short version is I would say that we had a very successful session; major initiatives that we worked on, you know, hand in glove with a number of different members, write language, help out. Key kind of just highlights and as we give questions or we can follow-up on this later on, too, but at the top, the budget. Our budget is successful enough to continue with our standard operations both for Public Utilities and Transportation side.

One of the key issues there was making
sure that we got a transfer from that Wireless
Carrier Reimbursement Fund of the $9 million to keep
Public Utility's budget whole. We were successful in
doing that and holding off some other attempts to use
the dollars for other things.

One of the most exciting things was we
actually got our own legislation passed. That's the
Senate Bill 1458 that sets up an expedited pipeline
safety process so every one of those cases doesn't
have to become a formal docketed complaint in front
of the Commission. It allows us to do some kind of
negotiation with the companies. If they feel that
they were actually wrong in the process, we can get
those resolved and we don't have to go through a long
drawn out thing. So that -- obviously, we just
talked about Senate Bill 9 --

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Was that our
only --

MR. FEIPEL: Yes.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: -- legislative
initiative?

MR. FEIPEL: Senate Bill 1458 was our own
initiative.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: 100 percent?

MR. FEIPEL: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER McCabe: It wasn't our only one, was it?

MR. FEIPEL: Well, technically, yeah. This is the only one that was 100 percent Commerce Commission driven. We have our hands in these other things, but, yeah.

COMMISSIONER McCabe: Okay.

MR. FEIPEL: So we just talked about the ComEd Senate Bill 9 and the override two weeks ago. From there, a number of different bills went through, like the -- you know, and just to pick some of the high points, we turned a water bill here that was going to do some, you know, capping of rate increases and the like. Instead it provides good notice now for customers as they are -- you know, before, during and after a water rate case. That passed and has moved forward. There is this wind energy task force that we are going to be a part of to look at offshore wind and Lake Michigan.
Just skipping through quickly, this House Bill 2856 is a 9-1-1 call transfer bill. This was originally some legislation that was talking about task forces and then studies and that, and instead we helped the representative craft it into a bill that actually now is going to address the problem of transfers between 9-1-1 systems.

Apparently, there were some serious problems in one area that drove this legislation in the first place. The Nicor depreciation rate bill, you will see that. That gets us approving these cases within four months as long as a whole slew of information is filed on the front end. These cases we typically do in about three months anyways. So that works out well.

Of course there is the big telecom rewrite, the AT&T bill, that passed with kind of a balance between what are important things to leave in place in terms of our regulatory oversight and what were some things that were, you know, kind of okay to let slip or change or do in a different way.

So that turned out well, and, of
course, one of the biggest ones is this rider, the Senate Bill 2266, the gas bill. That sets up very much like the Peoples rider for their advanced main replacement program. This codifies our authority to approve those riders for the three gas utilities, focusing on public safely.

So that's kind of the high points.

Again, there is this -- the chart we also included. That gives you an overview of all of the different legislation that we looked at and worked through. If you've got any questions right now or later, feel free, but I think that's the broad overall.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Well, I just want to congratulate you and Randy and Peggy and Mike, the whole staff, because there -- you kind of glossed over them, and I realize for time you have to, but there were some things that I thought were really potentially very damaging to us, to the Commission, to ratepayers, to customers throughout the state. And you all did great work getting the Commission's points of view heard and coming off of the session, where, you know, obviously, you know, what we had to
say didn't necessarily always carry the day.

I mean, following up in this session with the work that you did I think was great, and then when you add in the budget, which for Commissioner del Valle and Commissioner Maye, what a disaster that would be if those $9 million in funds weren't transferred into the Public Utilities Fund. It basically would have meant literally dozens of people gone from the Public Utilities Fund, which would mean the operations as we know it pretty much couldn't happen.

And so convincing the legislators -- convincing legislators at any time that there is a fund out there that's not being completely, fully utilized for the purpose it's there, but to just shift it within -- you know, within the agency and not to use it for some other purpose, because they have got lots of needs they are all looking at, I think that was great work. And there were lots of people who were trying to lay claim to those monies, and so congratulations to everybody. Because this, you know, getting a bill passed and getting the
budget looks fairly modest, but it's not, because that session and all of these bills that end up getting sent to the Governor, all of them had Staff's hands in it to get the language right or to get it in a way so that it wasn't really objectionable. So congratulations.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: I want to add to that. I think you did a tremendous job in working with the legislators and with staff, legislative staff, to craft language on a lot of these bills and to make sure that they know that the Commission is here to assist in the process and not to stand in the way of the process. So that's a tone that I think you have set, and it's a very positive tone.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: John, you are -- yeah. You've got a lot of background noise, so --

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Sorry. I just had a couple of quick questions for Jonathan.

No. 1, is what's the word out of the Governor's Office in terms of his signing or vetoing the gas bill?
MR. FEIPEL: I don't think we have got a good sense yet in terms of -- and there is, you know -- we're also trying to work through the issue of obviously the ComEd Senate Bill 9 getting overridden in the same week that the gas Bill passed, trying to sort through which is which and the differences between the two. I haven't heard a specific direction yet. I think they are still reviewing that and taking a look. Obviously lots of interest in some of the other big issues like the pensions and guns and that continues to still take some focus away. So no word yet.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Okay. Another question about that same bill, that bill doesn't have any bearing on the outcome of the existing rate case, right?

MR. FEIPEL: Right. Separate issue.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Separate issue, okay.

If they had passed that formula rate model bill, that may have had some significant impact
on the rate case, I think, right?

MR. FEIPEL: Right. And I don't want to get too far into this since the --

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Since the rate case is --

MR. FEIPEL: -- case is still open.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Yeah, right.

MR. FEIPEL: And I think that's starting to go toward that. If you guys have questions about what's the impact of this, I would suggest we deal with that in the case, and maybe even request a supplemental filing or something, but, yeah, let's be careful about --

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: But the rider type bill, the infrastructure replacement bill that did pass, specifically makes allowance for the rate case --

MR. FEIPEL: Right.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: -- that's ongoing now. So they -- that bill recognized that there is a rate case that's going on and made allowances for it in the bill.

MR. FEIPEL: Right.

COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Okay. All right. That
answers my question. And I won't add to, but I just
want to ditto the comments that the Chairman and
Commissioner del Valle made in terms of
congratulating you on a job well done, you and Randy
and Peggy and Mike and everybody involved.

MR. FEIPEL: Great. Other questions on the
legislative stuff?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: No.

MR. FEIPEL: Okay. We have already touched on
the budget. I'm just trying to move quickly, because
I know we are time constrained.

The budget, we have got the one page
there. Again, the very short version is this budget
works, versus some of the, you know, disastrous
outcomes that were possible. So the high points --
and remember again, too, that this top chart is
really talking about our appropriation and remember,
for the very quick right -- the General Assembly sets
the appropriation level.

That's the maximum amount we can
spend, but that's very different from our cash
balance, and the cash balance is what we get from
our, you know, fees and the like, you know, including this transfer from the wireless fund. That's the dollars that we actually get to spend, right?

So our appropriation levels are more than enough to cover operations. Our cash is something we continue to watch very closely, because, you know, as we talked before, the problem of the Commission is the same problem as the rest of the state where pension costs increase, contract costs for employees increase, and that's very quickly giving us an ever-growing structural deficit on the Public Utility side, and we are starting to see trends that that similar trend will happen on the Transportation side as well.

Especially some of the Collateral Recovery Act revenues aren't coming in as strong as we expected. So it's still something we are continuing to watch very closely in terms of the cash side and looking at potential permanent fixes, certainly on the Public Utility side, but then also on the Transportation side as well to see what we can do to get the cash balances to even out.
CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And that's where the 9 million comes in?

MR. FEIPEL: That's right. The 9 million covers our deficit problem on the Public Utility side. We don't yet have a problem on Transportation, but again, something we are watching.

The other kind of companion piece of the budget is our head count, and if you see there at the bottom, authorized head count, we actually got an increase. That's to respond to the Collateral Recovery Act. The biggest issue there is, as you kind of look through, we are -- even though we have a much higher head count than our current 242, even to spend out all of the dollars that we have, the cash we have, if you will, we would need to lock in somewhere around 267 as a maximum, leaving that room in the head count, that head room, if you will, because of having to absorb some of the contract raise increases and the like.

So even though we have got a much higher head count, we will never get up to it, and we will probably -- you know, it best behooves us to
stay really kind of where we are at for a while just because of the unknown of what the budget is going to be in the future.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: But you still want the head count to be high enough so that if revenues do come in --

MR. FEIPEL: Then we'd have the ability to do it.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: We have said the number of people we need to fully operate --

MR. FEIPEL: Right.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: And we are still going to fill the Collateral Recovery positions, the four positions?

MR. FEIPEL: We are looking at those. It might be that -- and this is, again, watching that Transportation balance. The goal is to get to all four of those. If we do two immediately and then look for two later on, that might be a way to do it.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: John, can you mute?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Okay. So we are -- there is no plans to fill all four?
MR. FEIPEL: Not right away.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: It's not because we don't want to, but because we have to stretch it?

MR. FEIPEL: Right. And the issue -- this is just in terms of where Collateral Recovery Act is. It's a lot of the money that we expected to come in from, you know, things like setting the little tickets that you have to have to be able to repo something in the state now. We were -- the original projections were much higher, that we would be getting lots more interest and selling lots more of these little pads of stickers, in short, but the demand has been less.

And right now we are not sure. There is an assumption that we are not getting the entire universe of repossession outfits in the state, right?

So there is --

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: So there is a dedicated fund for this?

MR. FEIPEL: It's part of the Transportation fund overall.
ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Overall.

MR. FEIPEL: But trying to watch obviously, you know, the other Transportation funds, plus blending in Collateral Recovery funds, we don't want to get too far ahead of ourselves and then be looking at a structural problem there either.

So it's hire a couple more police officers right away, ramp up enforcement, drive more revenue, and then we can then continue to staff up from there.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Because it's kind of a chicken and egg thing, isn't it?

MR. FEIPEL: Right, yes.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: If you don't hire the extra staff, you are not likely to capture --

MR. FEIPEL: You will never --

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: -- this revenue that we think is out there, but that we are not getting.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: Jonathan, I have a question. Is this 242 number as of June 4th, is that physical head count, we have 242, or is that positions available?
MR. FEIPEL: That's people.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: Oh, really.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: So there is -- in essence, there is 33 -- you know, we would technically have authorization from the General Assembly to hire 33 more people, but what Jonathan is saying, we can't do that, because we won't be in a cash position to go that high.

MR. FEIPEL: Right.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: I see. And my second question was, under 4(c) you talked about the merit comp increases. And I haven't been here long, but what I do hear daily is that merit comp people haven't had raises in, you know, ten years or something. So I'm curious to know, does that mean that all merit comp people -- which are people outside of the union, right?

MR. FEIPEL: Right.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: They will all be receiving raises on July 1st?

MR. FEIPEL: We have the approval to do that.

Now it's sorting through the -- how that looks
given -- you know, we have stole -- basically, we
have taken $9 million from a different fund and --

. ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: What would be the
perception of then giving raises to them?

MR. FEIPEL: Right. So that's something we've
got to talk through and work through.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: Yes. I just wasn't
sure if it was guaranteed. I was a little confused.
Okay.

MR. FEIPEL: Yeah. It is guaranteed in that we
have got approval to do it. Now, the decision rests
on whether it's the good thing to do.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: Right. Got you.
Okay. Thank you.

MR. FEIPEL: Sure. Other questions
budget-wise?

COMMISSIONER McCABE: Will there be anticipated
retirements that could help on that front?

MR. FEIPEL: I think so. It seems to be
especially -- you know, you hear constantly as a
potential pension deal gets closer, that may get some
people who are considering retirement to retire
quicker to lock in current benefits rather than
taking potential reductions. So we are looking at
constantly, yeah, there is all kinds of people
eligible for retirement, yeah.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And the lag, even if you
refill those, helps some with your budget.

MR. FEIPEL: Right.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Because as we know, it
doesn't -- approval doesn't happen right away. That
was just for you guys back there.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Sometimes it
does.

MR. FEIPEL: A couple days, right?

Other budget questions?

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Anything we missed, Jane?

MS. FIELDS: No. I think Jon covered it all.

MR. FEIPEL: Okay. Well, the next issue we
have got is I wanted to talk quickly about the new
AFSCME contract. That's been ratified here recently
by the union. So now we move into the next one. The
very short version of this is as it impacts us, there
is not a lot of change. In terms of kind of the
overall position on this, it was actually -- if I say
management, you know, that's CMS and the agencies
under the Governor, right? It's what CMS was pushing
in terms of changes were very, very drastic in terms
of the way their contract would be structured.

In the end, what turned out were not a
lot of changes at all to how actual employee
functioning works, because obviously the big focus
was on the economic part of the contract, right,
pensions and raises and potential -- you know, all
that kind of stuff, because, of course, the state was
looking for ways to cut back some of the costs,
because the state is facing some of the same budget
issues that we are, right?

So in the end, there was a deal cut
that locked in some raises for AFSCME folks in
exchange for some serious savings in terms of, you
know, overall retirement costs for retirees, and that
meant that a lot of the day-to-day functionality of
how the contract covers employees, most of that
stayed the same. There were some, you know, changes
around the edges like to travel policies and the
like, but it's all stuff that we were already doing anyway. So in terms of day-to-day, how this impacts our folks, there really won't be a lot of change. That's kind of the overall.

Leigh Ann, anything to add to that, too? Leigh Ann was, of course, in the trenches all throughout in the negotiation process, so --

MS. MYERS: The only other major thing that affects our employees was the -- our signing an MOU for working supervisors. A lot of our first line supervisors went into the bargaining unit. So the working supervisor MOU, which we don't have a copy of yet -- but it gives our managers the ability to perform the duties that they historically performed in supervisory and managerial functions. So it's not really going to change things for our people, because they were already doing them, but the contract now allows them to do that.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Leigh Ann, how many people do we have that aren't in the union out of our workforce? How many aren't in?

MS. MYERS: I think the last time it was like
50. Out of our workforce there's about 50.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. And are there any of the labor board cases that are still pending that would affect that? I'm getting some nods here.

MS. STEPHENSON-SCHROEDER: I am here, Leigh Ann. This is Mary.

MS. MYERS: There are a couple. There is the Senate Bill -- and I can't remember the number on it, the management bill that could affect some of those pending cases, and we still don't know the outcome of that yet.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Right. And that would actually keep more people out of the union, right?

MS. MYERS: Well, some of the titles that hadn't yet been decided were in that legislation as well. So it could take some out, and it also could keep some out that never went in.

MR. FEIPEL: And that bill or the way it's structured or law at this point, right, it's fairly discretionary on the part of the Governor to remove titles, and it's our understanding that a deal was made to limit the potential pool of those titles. So
CMS and the Governor's Office are still working through which ones to add up to the total number that's the kind of -- even though there is a much bigger number in the statute, there is a smaller number that's the agreement to number, and so going forward, we keep talking to push to say, hey, look, you know, this is what we have got in this, but we'll see what happens in the end.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. MYERS: You're welcome.

MR. FEIPEL: Other questions there? Okay.

Last one -- this is probably the most fun -- is Tanzania. Just for extra background, the Commission over the years mostly through NARUC, but also through the U.S. federal government has been partnered with various other countries. Kazakhstan comes to mind. We did --

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Kosovo.

MR. FEIPEL: Kosovo, we did. And it's, in essence, a small group, typically, you know, a Commissioner and a couple of staff would go over and help support the efforts of these countries to
improve their regulatory policies, open up markets and those kinds of things. Tanzania is the latest, and we were chosen by USAID, you know, a U.S. economic development organization, right -- by USAID and NARUC to be the partnering country with Tanzania. So we have got to quickly assemble a team. Again, what they have really asked us for is somebody high level like a Commissioner and then two staff people to work through -- I have been leaned on pretty heavily right now as of this point by the NARUC and USAID folks, and the other thing, too, that they are saying is different about this approach than it has been in the past is instead of a lot of just meetings, there is going to be really a push for strong deliverables to be -- you know, like actually draft the RFP, draft enabling legislation for, you know, the government of Tanzania to do X, Y and Z, write legal contracts for renewable energy to partner with this country.

So supposedly -- at least what I'm being told -- is it's a much more in depth process than it's been in the past.
The dates that they are looking at are mid-August, like the week of August 12th for the first delegation to go over, and that one would actually be our folks going to Tanzania to go through a signing ceremony that locks in the partnership, and then through a series of meetings where the first round of deliverables would be done, and then potentially in the fall a delegation from Tanzania coming here, and we would work through some issues.

My understanding is there would be one or two other states that send a couple of folks also, but we would be the lead state. So the key is if there is interest from Commissioners and one in particular in going, that would be good. Otherwise, we have got to also look at who our staff people are and what the team skill set looks like to meet the needs. I know that so far they have been talking about renewables is a very strong area of interest.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Energy efficiency.

MR. FEIPEL: Energy efficiency is another strong area of interest.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Procurement.
MR. FEIPEL: And procurement of power are the
two big -- three -- the two -- are the big three
issues they are very interested in talking over.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And again, Jonathan, can you
send the work plan and the invitation letter around?

MR. FEIPEL: Absolutely. Yeah, yeah.

So that's on that. If anybody is
interested -- or I will send around the documents
that we have got so far. Let me know, and I think
they want us to make a decision here pretty quickly.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MAYE: Well, I thought the
Chair -- I thought you were going.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It doesn't have to be. It
could be -- just a Commissioner and then probably two
staff people.

MR. FEIPEL: Right.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: One of them probably ought to
be a lawyer, I'm guessing, given what they want us to
do. If the deliverable is actually what they are
saying they want it to be, but so --

MR. FEIPEL: Yeah. Okay.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Anything else?
MR. FEIPEL: That's all I have got.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Anything else from Springfield?

MR. POUND: No.

MS. FIELDS: No.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay.

MR. FEIPEL: As always, if you have got any questions on any of these things, feel free to give me a call or stop by my office over the next couple of days.

CHAIRMAN SCOTT: If there is no other business to come before the Commission, this meeting stands adjourned. Thanks, everyone.

(END OF PROCEEDINGS.)