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CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Good morning. Are we ready to start in Springfield?

CHIEF CLERK: Yes, we are.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Pursuant to the Open Meetings Act, I call the July 28, 2015 Bench Session of the Illinois Commerce Commission to order.

Commissioners McCabe, Del Valle and Rosales are present with me in Chicago. We have a quorum. Commissioner Maye is participating by phone.

Commissioner Maye, are you there?

COMMISSIONER MAYE: Yes, I'm here.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: I move to allow Commissioner Maye to participate by phone.

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER McCabe: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

All in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed, say nay.

(No response.)
The ayes have it and Commissioner Maye is granted permission to participate by phone. Commissioner Maye is a little under the weather and so I'm going to introduce Nakhia Crossley, her new assistant.

Why don't you stand up just for the benefit of the people here. Welcome aboard. We are excited that you are with us.

We have also one request to speak, Laura Harmon, Senior Counsel of the Illinois Farm Bureau, regarding Docket No. 15-0278.

Ms. Harmon, are you with us?

MS. HARMON: Appearing by phone, yes, I am. I am sorry. Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you. You may proceed.

MS. HARMON: Good morning. My name is Laura Harmon and I'm the Senior Counsel for the Illinois Farm Bureau.

On May 18th, the Illinois Farm Bureau and several other intervenors filed motions before this Commission seeking to dismiss Grain Belt Express' application for a certificate under
Section 8-406.1 that Grain Belt Express is not a public utility and not qualified to use the expedited review process.

What we are asking the Commission to do is to apply the law under 406.1 as clearly written. This is a legal issue of first impression. It is a jurisdictional and threshold issue, and this issue is not a technicality.

In 2010 the legislature amended the Public Utility Act to provide for a new special process for public utilities to seek expedited review for new high-voltage transmission line projects. Since 2010, 406.1 has been used solely by public utilities.

Grain Belt Express is the first applicant that is not a public utility seeking to use the expedited review process. To be clear, this Commission has never allowed a newly-formed new market entrant that's not a public utility to utilize the expedited review process.

406.1, which is the expedited review process, is not a replacement option or the same as
the review process provided for under the Public
Utility Act under Section 406A and B. Again, 406.1
is not 406A, nor a review process under a truncated
time schedule.

As Staff and the Administrative Law
Judge pointed out to the Commission, both the
language, the process and also the authority granted
under 406.1 versus 406A is different.

The issue and the language that's
before this Commission is under 406.1 is a
non-public utility may apply for a certificate under
this section. The legislature clearly and expressly
limited the use of this threshold expedited review
process to a public utility as being qualified to
use a special process is not in our concept.

Grain Belt Express compared this case
to Rock Island Clean Line; however, this is not Rock
Island Clean Line which this Commission decided in
Docket 12-0560. Rock Island Clean Line is the first
commercial line project filed before the Commission
by the same parent company.

Rock Island Clean Line filed under
406, and, as the Staff and the Administrative Law
Judge have pointed out to this Commission, 406.1
contains no provisions under which a non-public
utility may request and be granted authority to
transact business as a public utility.

The second important distinction
between 406.1 and 406 is that the award of authority
under 406.1 can compel this Commission to enter an
Order under Section 503 which authorizes or directs
the construction of a high-voltage transmission
line.

In essence, 503 is a fast track to
granting eminent domain authority and, as this
Commission is well aware in considering granting 503
authority to Rock Island Clean Line, which is a
similar project filed by the same parent company,
the same business plan, and considering whether to
grant 503 authority, this Commission did not grant
503 authority to Rock Island Clean Line and still
has not granted 503 authority to Rock Island Clean
Line; thus, if this Commission grants an Order under
406.1 to Grain Belt Express, it will be compelled to
grant an Order which it refused to grant and has not
granted to Rock Island Clean Line.

Grain Belt Express will not be
prejudiced by granting the motion in the proceeding
as recommended by the Administrative Law Judge.

Based upon the latest round of testimony that was
recently filed in this case will create at least an
additional round of testimony which traditionally
occur at the normal review process.

This Commission's ruling on June 16th
is contrary to the clear and plain language of the
statute, the legislative history, the 406.1 and
Commission precedent. It's not in its best interest
to create public issues that, in effect, could force
us to re-litigate this entire proceeding.

On behalf of the Illinois Farm Bureau,
we respectfully request that you grant a motion to
allow this case to proceed as recommended by the
Administrative Law Judge. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you, Ms. Harmon.

We will now move into our Regular
Public Utility Agenda. There are edits to the
Minutes of our June 24th and July 8th 2015 Public Utility Bench Session Minutes.

Are there any objections to approving of the minutes of the 24th and 8th as amended?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the minutes as edited are approved.

Moving onto our Electric Agenda, Item E-1 concerns ComEd's provisions to the Basic Electric Service Hourly Pricing Rate and Purchased Electricity Rider.

Are there any objections to not suspending the filing?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the filing is not suspended.

Item E-2 concerns ComEd's filing to cancel its 2014 Refund Application Mechanism Rider.

Are there any objections to not suspending the filing?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the filing is not
Item E-3 concerns revisions to ComEd's Treatment of Underground Cable Service for certain residential customers.

Commissioner McCabe, I believe you have some questions.

COMMISSIONER McCabe: Yes. Good morning, Scott.

MR. STRUCK: Good morning.

COMMISSIONER McCabe: I wondered whether you or the analysts had an overview of the current way that non-standard underground service is handled.

MR. STRUCK: Sure. What ComEd proposes to do here is to change the way it handles replacing underground service cable in excess of a hundred feet that's divided for standard service.

What's behind this is that ComEd began installing conventional underground service about 50 years ago that was starting to reach the end of its service life and it appears a situation where most of the reconnections are underground and overhead.

The way this works is ComEd currently
provides up to a hundred feet of underground service
cable to a residential customer as standard service.
Anything in excess of that, the customer use for
utility installation.
The company currently also seeks to
recover the cost to replace the cable, the
non-standard portion of the individual residential
customer, when that cable reaches the end of its
useful life.

What ComEd proposes to do with this
filing is to revise the treatment of this
residential underground service cable so that while
the customer was looking to repay the cost of the
initial installation at the time it was installed,
the company will then maintain to replace that cable
as part of its provisional standard service.

In other words, the company would
still seek to recover the initial cost of the
installation from the customer at that premise but
then replace the cable, and any maintenance costs
involved, the company would treat that as
outstanding rather than standard service rather than
charging the individual customer.

The company's reasoning is that typically due to a long service life of the cable, the current residential customer is unaware that there's a cost to replace the non-standard portion and generally is not prepared to pay that cost, and in some cases those costs can be significant, and then at the time the customer is not able to pay the replacement, the company's left with costly maintenance, increasing unreliable cable subject to defects because it's beyond its life.

In addition, also sometimes in the case of a fault situation when they go out to do the repairs, it's difficult to distinguish between how much of that relates to the standard portion and how much relates to the non-standard portion.

Another observation would be that even if the company's proposal of the initial customer who makes the decision to request the non-standard service causes the cost to be incurred paying for that service, that would change the company's proposal.
The reason they give for it, just as an overview context, ComEd estimates it has approximately 2000 residential customers with non-standard underground cable, and that would be about 2000 residential customers out of about 3 1/2 million.

COMMISSIONER McCabe: Thank you.

Do we have any -- do we know the number of customers? Do we have any sense of what the costs?

MR. STRUCK: Yes. In about approximately the last year or so ComEd has had 12 customers who have had a cable fault situation and it cost ComEd about $42,000 to go out and repair those fault situations. An estimate of the cost to replace the cable for each of those 12 customers is estimated about $2,000 of replacement for a total of 120,000 for all 12.

COMMISSIONER McCabe: Thank you. And could we see a similar tariff in the future for overhead lines?

MR. STRUCK: I think that's a possibility, and my understanding is that ComEd is not willing to pursue
that at least at this time. I think a couple of
things behind that is that the cost for the
underground service is a lot more exclusive as far
as the cost of the components and the cost of the
installation, and also I think there's additional
complications with above ground wires on the
customer's premises and locating those in relation
to trees and other things that complicates above
ground that aren't there with underground at this
point.

COMMISSIONER McCabe: Thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there a motion to not
suspend the filing?
COMMISSIONER ROSALES: So moved.
CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there a second?
COMMISSIONER McCABE: Seconded.
CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: All those in favor of not
suspending the filing, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed, say nay.

(No response.)

The ayes have it and the filing is not
suspended.

Item E-4 concerns an Order initiating a proceeding against Sperian Energy Corp., an ARES, to show cause as to why the Commission should not revoke its certificate for alleged violations of the Public Utilities Act and its obligations as a Retail Electric Supplier.

Commissioner Del Valle, I believe you have a statement.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, just a very brief statement.

This proceeding before us is neither the first nor I assume the last time we'll need to investigate an ARES for their marketing practices. This is the third ARES before the Commission in 2015 previously addressed by our Consumer Services Division now at the Commission.

I'm deeply concerned this is the sign of what may be a systematic problem in our retail market, and if that is the case, it begs the question what is it going to take to put a stop to this behavior in our retail market.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you. Are there any objections to approving the proposed Order.

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item E-5 concerns a citation filed against Aurora Energy for failure to maintain its status as an agent, broker, or consultant in Illinois.

Are there any objections to approving the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item E-6 concerns Ameren's Petition for Approval of the Fourth Amended Utility Money Pool Agreement.

Are there any objections to approving the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item E-7 concerns Ameren's motion to withdraw its Petition for Approval of the Fourth Amended Utility Money Pool Agreement.
Are there any objections to approving the motion to withdraw?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the motion to withdraw its petition is granted.

The disposition of Item E-8 will be postponed to a future meeting.

Item E-9 concerns an Investigation of ComEd’s Supply Rate Subsidies for Non-residential Space Heat and Lighting Customers.

Are there any objections to approving the proposed Order dismissing the proceeding?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved and the proceeding is dismissed.

Item E-10 involves a complaint filed against ComEd regarding billing in Cherry Valley, Illinois.

Commissioner Del Valle, you have some questions on this?

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a few procedural questions about stipulated
agreements between residential complainants and retailers.

JUDGE HILLIARD: I misunderstood. I thought this was another case.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Ethan, who's the judge on this?

JUDGE KIMBREL: Jessica Cardoni. She was handling it.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Yes, she just had a baby.

JUDGE KIMBREL: Yes. She sent me a text message 30 minutes after she had the baby and said that she would do anything to avoid questions.

(laughter.)

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Do we have another judge?

JUDGE KIMBREL: No. It was originally my docket and it was reassigned to her, but I'm prepared to answer.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: I think these are general questions.

JUDGE KIMBREL: I was shocked. I didn't know what was going on when Judge Hilliard came.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Thank you. When a
customer is in a formal complaint procedure before the Commission and the utility approaches them to settle, what role, if any, does Staff or the ALJs have in those conversations and who usually initiates the settlement discussions? Do you know?

JUDGE KIMBREL: Yes. Staff is not normally involved in the formal complaint process and they certainly wouldn't provide any legal advice, the same with the ALJ. The ALJ would explain to them -- to the parties. They would try and help the parties meet on common ground so that eventually they could settle, if at all possible, but these conversations would probably be initiated by the utility.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: So for residential customers who may have limited knowledge on how all of this works, and I guess it is most customers who are also without legal representation, because of the cost or otherwise, does anyone on the Commission Staff discuss or explain the settlement process to the customer at any stage between the first contact with the formal complaint through to the joint dismissal? Is it clear to the customer that they
will be on their own during that process?

JUDGE KIMBREL: It's certainly clear to the complainant that they would be on their own if they showed up without counsel, and this process would be thoroughly explained to them by the ALJ from the initial hearing -- prior to the initial status right before the ALJ would introduce the parties and leave them in the room to hopefully discuss the issues and find some basis to settle if at all possible.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: So that explanation includes what a stipulated agreement is?

JUDGE KIMBREL: Normally that would come at the end. If they come to a settlement, then the parties would -- I think the counsel for the utility would explain to the complainant what exactly they're signing and then the ALJ will follow up and also explain to them what exactly they signed and that they were agreeing to dismiss the case.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: So the ALJ follows up?

JUDGE KIMBREL: Say that again.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: The ALJ follows up?

It's not just from the utility's lawyer?
JUDGE KIMBREL: No. No.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Do the ALJs ask for or require confirmation of an executed settlement agreement before the proposal to dismiss the case?

JUDGE KIMBREL: No. The ALJs simply are waiting for the motion to dismiss along with the joint stipulation but not the actual agreement, no.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: For those where the executed settlement is not presented, on what basis does the ALJ determine, other than the contents of the motion to dismiss, that the parties have resolved their differences? Are there copies of settlement agreements retained by the Commission in some form?

JUDGE KIMBREL: No. The copies of the agreement are not. What we do, if the motion is in the joint stipulation, that's what the ALJ is waiting for. Once the parties say they agree and once we see that's been filed on e-docket, and that's when we present the matter to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAH: Is the joint stipulation
signed by both parties?

JUDGE KIMBREL: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Are there any other questions?

(No response.)

Are there any objections to approving
the proposed Order granting ComEd's motion to
dismiss?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the proposed Order is
approved and the complaint is dismissed.

Item E-11 involves a proceeding to
approve a Community Solar Pilot Program utilizing
Virtual Net Metering in the service territory of
ComEd.

I believe Commissioner Del Valle would
like to make a statement then propose an edit.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

While I'm assuming this will not be
adopted, I would like to proceed with my edits. It
doesn't change the Order's conclusion but the edits
direct Staff to conduct informal workshops to
evaluate ComEd's consideration of the community
Solar Program as required under Section 16-107.5;
whereas, the Order without my edits leaves the
question of ComEd's consideration and the merits of
its conclusion in the dark, my edits would shine
light on the process to ensure that ComEd has taken
its obligation seriously and ensures that the
consideration is done in a manner that provides for
accountability and transparency in the process.

Virtual Net Metering and Community Solar Pilot are programs that promise significant
benefits to ratepayers who participate as well as to
the environment in Illinois.

So let's get going. We cannot let
maneuvering get in the way of progress. We must
move forward without delay so that the ratepayers
can move quickly to enjoy what I feel is inevitable.
We can talk about this a bit in the future, and the
future is now. ComEd's obligation to consider such
promising programs under the law should be done in
transparency, and that's what my edit accomplishes.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Any seconds?

(No response.)
There is no second and the motion fails for lack of a second.

I move to approve the proposed Order granting ComEd's Motion to Dismiss.

Is there a second to that motion?

COMMISSIONER ROSALES: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

All those in favor of approving the proposed Order, say aye.

(No response.)

Opposed, say nay.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Nay.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: The vote is 4 to 1 and the Order is approved.

E-12 involves a complaint filed against ComEd regarding billing in Darien, Illinois.

Is there any objection to granting the parties joint motion to dismiss?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the motion is granted and the complaint is dismissed.
1 Item E-13 concerns Nordic Energy Services' Petition for the Confidential Treatment of its Part 451 Compliance Report.

Are there any objections to approving the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item E-14 concerns Ameren Transmission's petition for approval to exercise eminent domain over certain properties involving its Illinois Rivers Project.

Are there any objections to approving the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Items E-15 and 16 concern joint petitions seeking approval of the release of commercial customers pursuant to Sections 2 and 6 of the Electric Supplier Act.

Are there any objections to considering these items together and approving the proposed Orders?
(No response.)

Hearing none, the Orders are approved.

Item E-17 involves the approval of ComEd's reconciliation of revenues collected under its Environmental Cost Recovery Adjustment Rider.

Are there any objections to approving the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item E-18 involves an application requesting a Certificate of Service Authority as an Installer of Distributed Generation Facilities under the Public Utilities Act.

Are there any objections to approving the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item E-19 involves a petition filed by the Illinois Department of Transportation for approval to exercise eminent domain over certain properties owned by ComEd in Cook County.

Are there any objections to approving
the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item E-20 involves three Motions for Reconsideration regarding Clean Line's Grain Belt Transmission Project.

I move that we deny all of the Motions to Reconsider.

Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER ROSALES: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there any discussion?

(No response.)

All those in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed, say nay.

COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Nay.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: The vote is 3 to 2 and the Motions to Reconsider are denied.

Item G-1 concerns Ameren's filing to clarify its natural gas tariffs and conditions to comply with its Code Part 280 Implementation Plan.

Is there any objection to suspending
the filing?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the filing is suspended.


Are there any objections to approving the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item G-3 involves Nicor's Reconciliation of Revenues collected under its Energy Efficiency and On-Bill Financing Programs.

Are there any objections to approving the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item G-4 involves a complaint against Nicor as to billing charges in Lyons, Illinois.

Are there any objections to approving the proposed Order and dismissing the complaint?

(No response.)
Hearing none, the Order is approved
and the complaint is dismissed.

Item G-5 involves Liberty Utility's
Application for a Certificate of Public Convenience
and Necessity of provide natural gas service in
Williamson County, Illinois.

Are there any objections to approving
the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item G-6 involves a complaint against
Hudson Energy Services as to overbilling in
Westmont, Illinois.

Are there any objections to approving
the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved
and the complaint is dismissed.

Item G-7 involves a complaint filed
against Spark Energy regarding unauthorized charges
in Chicago.

Are there any objections to granting
the parties' joint motion to dismiss?

Hearing none, the motion is granted and the complaint is dismissed.

Moving onto our Telecommunications Agenda, Item T-1 concerns VanCo's Application for a Certificate of Authority to Operate as a Reseller of Long Distance and Local Exchange Telecommunications in the State of Illinois.

Is there a motion to dismiss the proceeding?

COMMISSIONER ROSALES: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER McCABE: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: All those in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed, say nay.

(No response.)

The ayes have it and the motion is dismissed and the petition is granted.

Item T-2 involves Frontier Communication's request for termination of certain conditions imposed pursuant to the Commission's
final Order in the proceeding.

Are there any objections to approving

the proposed Order granting the requested relief?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item T-3 is Linkup Telecom's motion to

withdraw its Application for Designation as an

Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of

Illinois.

Are there any objections to granting

its motion to withdraw.

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item T-4 is Cypress Communication's

Petition for Decertification and Discontinuation of

Services in Illinois.

Are there any objections to approving

the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Items T-5 and T-6 concerns

Applications for Certificates of Local and

Interexchange Authority to Operate as Resellers of
Facilities-Based Carriers of Telecommunications Services throughout Illinois.

Are there any objections to considering these items together and entering the proposed Orders?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Orders are entered.

Moving onto our Water and Sewer Agenda, Item W-1 concerns Del-Mar Water Company's Petition for the Approval of its Annual Reconciliation for and the resulting change in its surcharge for purchased water.

Is there any objection to approving the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item W-2 concerns Aqua Illinois' Petition requesting a Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity to Operate a Water Distribution System; Approval of an Asset Purchase Agreement with the Village of Norridge; and the Approval of Rate, Accounting entries and
Depreciation.

Are there any objections to approving the proposed Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Order is approved.

Item W-3 concerns Aqua Illinois' and the Attorney General's requests for Oral Argument regarding Approval of Amendments to the Commission's Part 656 Qualifying Plant Surcharge.

Is there a motion to deny the requests for Oral Argument?

COMMISSIONER ROSALES: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER McCabe: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: All those in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed, say nay.

(No response.)

The ayes have it and the requests are denied.

Item W-4 concerns Aqua Illinois' Petition for Approval of an Asset Purchase

Are there any objections to entering the Interim Order?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Interim Order is approved.

Moving onto our Petitions for Rehearing section of our agenda, PR-1 concerns a Complaint filed against North Shore Gas Company as to billing in Riverwoods, Illinois.

Are there any objections to denying the application request for rehearing?

(No response.)

Hearing none, the Application request for rehearing is denied.

Moving onto other business, we have an item on our agenda concerning ICC's Reply Comments in FERC Docket Nos. EL15-70, 71 and 72 regarding various complaints as to MISO's 2015-2016 capacity
auction results.

Additionally, we must discuss the status of the proceeding in FERC Docket No. EL05-121-009.

These items involve potential litigation and so we will enter into closed session for discussion.

Is there a motion to enter into closed session?

COMMISSIONER McCabe: So moved.

CHAIRMAN Sheahan: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER Rosales: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN Sheahan: All those in favor, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed say nay.

(No response.)

The ayes have it and we will enter into closed session. We'll ask our guests in the audience to leave the room.

(Whereupon, Pages 35 to 46 were held in closed session:)
We are back in open session, so let's open the doors.

MR. VANDER LAAN: Excuse me, sir. You didn't vote on the MISO comments.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: We can't do that in closed session, Bill, so we are going to do that right now.

MR. VANDER LAAN: Very good. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the following proceedings commenced in open session.)

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: So we have been in closed session. We have been discussing the two FERC docket items that I mentioned, actually several FERC docket items.

I would like to entertain a motion to approve the ICC's reply comments regarding various complaints as to MISO's capacity auction results.

COMMISSIONER ROSALES: So moved.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER McCABE: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Any discussion?

(No response.)
All those in favor of approving the reply comments, say aye.

(Chorus of ayes.)

Opposed, say nay.

(No response.)

The ayes have it. The comments are approved.

Judge Kimbrel, do we have any other items for consideration this morning?

JUDGE KIMBREL: No, Mr. Chairman. That's all.

CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Commissioners, do we have any other items of business to discuss?

(No response.)

I'm hearing none, the meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

(Whereupon, the above matter was adjourned.)
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