

1 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: We're going to move on to
2 our agenda, starting with our transportation
3 agenda. There are no edits to the May 27th, 2021,
4 transportation regular open meeting minutes. Are
5 there any objections to approving the minutes?

6 (No verbal response.)

7 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the minutes
8 are approved.

9 Under our railroad items, items RR1
10 and RR2 concern public safety improvement projects
11 at railway crossings. The orders approve the
12 project, extend project completion deadlines, and
13 approved costs apportionment. Are there any
14 objections to considering these items together and
15 approving the orders?

16 (No verbal response.)

17 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the orders
18 are approved.

19 Moving on to our motor carrier
20 items, item MC1, concerns an application for a
21 commercial rehabilitator's license. The order
22 grants the application. Finding the application,

1 excuse me, the applicant meets the requirements.
2 Are there any objections to approving the order?

3 (No verbal response.)

4 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is
5 approved.

6 Items MC2 and MC3 concern
7 applications for renewal of commercial
8 rehabilitator's licenses. The orders grant the
9 licenses, finding that the applicants meet the
10 requirements for a renewal. Are there any
11 objections to considering these items together and
12 approving the orders?

13 (No verbal response.)

14 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the orders
15 are approved.

16 Under the collateral recovery
17 items. Item CR1 concerns an application or renewal
18 of a Class E recovery permit. Commission staff has
19 reviewed the application and recommends granting
20 the renewal permit. The order grants the permit.
21 Are there any objections to approving the order?

22 (No verbal response.)

1 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is
2 approved.

3 Item RH1 concerns Union Pacific's
4 motion for rehearing in Docket Number T18-0116.
5 Union Pacific argues that the order erred by
6 concluding that the company should be responsible
7 for the ownership and maintenance costs of a new
8 grade separation structure. Union Pacific posits
9 that the County of Sangamon should bear this
10 responsibility because the county is the sole
11 beneficiary of any improvements that result from
12 this project. The ALJ recommends that the
13 Commission deny the motion because the order
14 addresses benefits that will flow both to the
15 county and to Union Pacific. Are there any
16 objections to denying the motion for rehearing?

17 (No verbal response.)

18 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the motion is
19 denied. This concludes our transportation agenda.

20
21
22