BEFORE THE

ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULAR OPEN MEETING

Wednesday, April 27, 2022

Chicago, Illinois

Met pursuant to notice at 11:30 a.m., at 160 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Illinois.

PRESENT:

CARRIE ZALEWSKI, Chairwoman

MARIA BOCANEGRA, Commissioner

ANN McCABE, Commissioner

D. ETHAN KIMBREL, Commissioner

MICHAEL T. CARRIGAN, Commissioner

BRIDGES COURT REPORTING
BY: Jennifer Orozco,
Notary Public

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Under the Open Meetings Act, I call the April 27, 2022, Regular Open Meeting to order.

Commissioners Bocanegra, Carrigan, Kimbrel, and McCabe are with me in Chicago. We have a quorum.

We have no requests to speak and no Transportation Agenda.

Moving on to our Public Utilities Agenda.

Item O-4 on our agenda concerns the Baseline Grid Assessment Reports prepared by The Liberty Consulting Group pursuant to Section 16-105.10 of the Public Utilities Act. And for logistical reasons, we're going to hear this item first.

So we have John Antonuk from Liberty Consulting Group's -- he's the co-founder and president. So I'm just going to go ahead and turn over to Mr. Antonuk before we open up to Commissioner questions.

MR. ANTONUK: Thank you.

I have to start by saying I began my

career as a staff for the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission --

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: I don't know if your mike is on. Sorry --

MR. ANTONUK: I began my career as a staff for the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission some years ago. I'm not sure that sitting here like this again makes me feel young or just confirms my advancing age. But in any event, it's a pleasure, and I look forward to chatting with you today.

We undertook our work in support of the Energy Transition Act, which became effective about six months ago. It calls for a number of things. Most relevant to our work being developing programs, initiatives, and directives to further safe, reliable, and affordable electricity while transitioning to clean energy; supporting a responsible transition away from carbon-intensive generation; and most particularly relevant to what we have done, increasing public participation in utility breakdown processes, particularly planning for the future of the distribution grid.

Our engagement responded to a subset of requirements. Specifically, those calling for independent baseline assessments of the distribution grids of Commonwealth Edison and Ameren. We performed a number of solicitation attachments that subsets elements, and there are basically seven of them. Producing independently verified data sets that helps set a baseline for planning future grid spending and activities, describing current grid conditions and capabilities, examining capital projects undertaken between 2012 and 2020, including but not limited to those addressing advanced metering infrastructure or AMI; summarizing noncapital initiatives, basically asset management, intended to optimize grid reliability in facilities. Things like inspection, and maintenance, and management as examples.

Creating a data baseline to provide stakeholders a data-rich tool when the -- multi-year integrated planning process in which they'll participate. And identifying deficiencies in data material distribution planning. And I don't want to return to that issue when I speak, but I want to say we

did not.

And at Staff request, we also added a description of the system planning organizations practices and methods now in place at each of the two utilities.

A robust participating grid planning process takes broad and detailed information, and the Act recognizes that in setting up the three-part sequence. Hard work focuses on the first step, which is to set a foundation for the more important work to come. Basically, those three elements are the independent baseline assessment, which I'm here to talk about, workshops now underway and proceeding well, as we understand it, to provide for stakeholder review and data input into the MYIGPs, which is Multi-Year Integrated Grid Plan. And I don't know why this occurred to me, if you change those letters around, it spells PYGMI, which I think is probably a very inept description for the size of the task and the importance of the results that are to follow.

The Staff absolutely kicked off the work that we began. They solicited the audit we were

selected to perform, and they also submitted data requests to companies back in September. And I mention that because I want to commend that we had a tight time schedule. They produced a really good baseline set of data requests. We went to school on those answers, and I don't think we'd have met the schedule without their help, so I would be remiss in not commending them for getting the ball rolling for us.

We did study those responses. We issued many additional requests. The companies were very supportive. Probably got a little tired of us, but never gave up trying to get us the data we asked for. We conducted a number of interviews to understand the data and the processes used for planning. We performed independent analysis of that data trying to sort it and categorize it. We categorized information about system conditions and all its components: investments made, activities performed, cost above any changes in service reliability, trying wherever we could to align these different aspects of promoting reliability by common purpose and spending.

Our team as -- they're about all as

veteran as I am in the industry, so we applied that a lot of years of judgment formed in the industry about grid planning, design, engineering, operation, maintenance, and performance measurement -- all of which were important in producing the reports. And what we tried to do is create a structure for providing stakeholders in the coming planning processes, a comprehensive and multi-dimensional picture of how the network has changed since 2012, how spending amounts in the balance among those spending categories have changed, what the network can do now, and in what condition the stakeholders will find it when they begin their planning processes.

The report did not examine, nor did we make judgments about the networks future direction. Instead, we sought to provide a detailed yet effectively categorized description that will facilitate stakeholders when they formulate those judgments as they go through the planning process.

Our role did include providing an understanding of the value obtained through capital and O&M spending on the activities they produced over the

nine years we studied. We look for that value through changes in industry accepted measures of performance, what's called those outputs. Things like outage frequency and duration and changes and outages by cause. For example, tree contacts, tree falls, equipment failures, and even animal contacts, which, here, not surprisingly, was a material cause of alleges. We did the same for the inputs that produced those outputs. Those inputs reflect investments of work activities, and they drive those outputs. Things like automation, replacement of aging equipment, introduction of new technology, inspection, and maintenance.

We also provided descriptions of capital and O&M programs and initiatives and their costs and the changes in them over time. I want to strongly emphasize, however, that we were not tasked with addressing, nor did we form judgments about whether the benefits that we talked about in the report were large enough or whether they were in full proportion to the costs in obtaining them or whether different patterns or levels of expenditure would have

produced greater or lesser results. We did the best we could to identify the benefits, but kind of making value judgments about the degree to which those benefits were worth the money spent was not a part of our scope, nor, to be honest with you, do I understand how you could feasibly even attempt to do that over a period that is so long and was set by so many different factors, and applicable to programs that all contribute to reliability but not always in ways that are clearly measurable.

The Multi-Year Integrated Grid Plans -- the non-PYGMIs -- to come will require a tremendous amount of historical, current, and projected data that has to be applied through planning using values, methods, and practices -- processes that are still in the process of being determined as the workshops proceed and as things will play out when the actual planning process commences.

The Act establishes 11 goals for the plans and I'm going to focus on what a number of those goals require as specific outputs, which I think will help put our work in perspective.

One of those outputs is a description of the utilities distribution system planning process. We believe we've done that for both utilities.

Next, is a detailed description of the current operating conditions for the distribution system by operating area and including baseline system data about substation capacity, distributed energy resources, and things of that nature. We have begun to do that. I think we've made a strong contribution there, but there is still development in that area to come. And that development will come as the stakeholders in working with the Company -- the Company understands better what stakeholders are looking for and stakeholders understand better what the Company is capable of providing and what limits on public access to network data need to be preserved, because there are vulnerable parts of the network and publishing certain kinds of information about them would allow folks with bad intent to take advantage of those vulnerabilities.

So I believe we've made a start to that, but -- and hopefully provided a framework for its

future development. But that's an area I expect will undergo significant advancement as the state -- as the workshops in the planning process contributes.

The next output is for each of the preceding five years: distribution, operation, and maintenance expense. I think we've done that for the period through 2020. And in cases where we saw significant changes in 2021, we tried to capture some of those as well.

The next output is a five-year-long range forecast -- five-year-long range forecast distribution system capital investments and operational and maintenance expenses. That's a result of the planning process that comes, so we haven't touched that.

Next, system data on distributed energy resources on each utility's distribution system. We've provided that as well. And, again, that's something that as we go forward, certainly all hope -- we'll see significant development.

Next, is the hosting capacity and interconnection requirements for each of the two

utilities available on the website. Again, we've tried to do a description of what exists now, but I believe everybody's hopeful that the process that's beginning through the workshops, and will continue through the planning process, will refine and advance that aspect of the expected outputs as well.

And then finally, a narrative discussion of the utilities' vision for the distribution system over the next five years. Again, our focus was on what happened through 2020 and in some cases through 2021, so that -- we didn't touch that either.

The specific things we do provide in the report -- there's a chapter for each -- are: "System Description and Configuration." What does the system look like now? By area, by customer type, by resource, and network type. "Capital Investment and O&M Spending." To what did the money go and how our expenditures changed the configuration and capabilities of the system since 2012. That's an aspect of value that's important because it tells us what the network can do now that it couldn't do before, and it tells us

what it can do better. And I think it also lays a platform for deciding what we want it to do better in the future.

The next chapter is "Distribution System Condition." The question we try to answer there is: What is the shape of the system now? Does it show the benefits of sound care and feeding? As is not unexpected, the systems here have significant levels of age and equipment. They take care and feeding, and they take a balance between when it is best to replace and when it is best to essentially put more money into maintenance.

Next is "Distribution System Performance." That chapter seeks to answer the question of: How has the system performed? Have its performance results shown improvement or degradation since 2012? That to us is the most central aspect of identifying value in a tangible way.

The next chapter addresses "Advanced Meeting Infrastructure," or AMI. The question we try to answer there is: Is it fully deployed? How is it performing? And how do its costs compare with what

were expected?

Next, as I mentioned, "Distributed Energy Resources." We discussed penetration levels in the current interconnection process. As I mentioned, we have a chapter on distribution system planning, and I think that's useful primarily for the stakeholders in understanding how this massive information is being used by the utilities to perform planning. And it should help the stakeholders to figure out what aspects of the planning process their participation can be most useful in influencing.

And lastly, we produced the database which compiles key distribution, performance, investment, and asset-related data. And there's just a world of that information. Not easily penetrable, but what the database does is it provides every bit of -- essentially every bit of data we had, and it's in a format that allows interested parties to query that database in an almost endless variety of queries that they're free to define as they see fit and as fits their needs. We obviously use that database to produce the report. The goal was to try to allow stakeholders

to use it the same way we did, based on whatever their values, their goals, their interests, and concerns are.

The EIMA, the Energy Infrastructure Modernization Act, had a lot of influence on our work. A lot of money was spent on those programs. And those -- and the EIMA also called for performance-based rates, too, which makes those performance measures I was talking about earlier irrelevant. The EIMA called for infrastructure spending of about 2.6 billion for ComEd and just over 700 million for Ameren to be spent over 10 years. So obviously that work is essentially complete. And I'll talk a little bit about it in a minute. In fact, I'll do it right now.

ComEd spent the money expected. It was split just about equally between Smart Grid-related investments and reliability-related investments. That's about 1.3 million dollars for each. Of the 1.3 that went to Smart Grid, AMI was about $900 which is very close to what it was estimated to be.

For Ameren, it was authorized to spend 441 million on Smart Grid upgrades and 274 million on system modernization and upgrades. Of the 441 that was

assigned to Smart Grid for Ameren, they spent about 300 million for AMI, which is close to the expected amount.

In terms of ComEd's expenditures for both capital and O&M over the period, the total amount spent was $16.9 billion from 2012 to 2020. And those expenditures began at a $1.3 billion per year pace in 2012, and they peaked at $2.3 billion in 2016. They had been moderately lower thereafter, although the 2020 level got back to 2.2 billion which is pretty close to the 2016 peak.

I think what's most interesting about that is that while the IIP additions were substantial at $2.5 billion, they were only 15 percent of the dollars spent. Non-IIP plan additions were roughly three times more at 48 percent. Operation and maintenance, kind of the -- not necessarily the stepchild in the industry, but often the forgotten actor when you're talking about money -- accounting for 25 percent. It was 4.2 billion compared to the 2.5 in IIP investments. And then there is another general category, and I'll talk about that in a minute. And that amounted to 12 percent.

Basically, that general category -- general and intangible -- it amounts -- it covers things like tools and vehicles, real estate, and IT projects. That's best seen as a -- kind of a supporter of the direct categories. You don't build vehicles, like, for the same reason you build a line. A line transports electricity, and a vehicle gets the workers to the line to build it. So all those G&I categories are basically that kind of supporting expense. And I think it's important to point that -- because they're substantial and they're also often forgotten. And they're not avoidable, but it is hard to tie them to any specific level of enhancement.

When you look at the capital additions, they were 12.5 million of that 16.9. And a full 15 percent of them were in this G&I category. The two categories that are most -- I'll call subject to adjustment -- where I would expect the planning process to have the most impact are "Corrective Maintenance" at 23 percent and "System Performance" at 30 percent. So that's, roughly, about half.

The other categories are much less

within control or at discretion. And let me explain what they are so you'll see that.

Capacity Expansion: When you can't deliver electricity within reliability guidelines. Capacity expansion has taken eight percent of the expenditures. Customer operations, six percent. Relocation of facilities at public request near highways and streets, three percent. And New Business, customers show up and the facilities aren't there to serve them, 14 percent.

If you add those categories together with G&I, you come up with 46 percent of the total dollars spent on capital at ComEd over the nine-year period, which suggests that when you're talking about the degree to which planning discretion applies, you're not talking about anything close to 100 percent of the capital. A lot of these dollars are essentially bespoke dollars.

Even corrective maintenance, which is one of the two discretionary categories, is driven in large part by the work needed to recover from storms. So you would have to also consider a significant part

of that as nondiscretionary as well. So the value -- one of the values of doing this categorization -- and it kind of shows the amount of money that is kind of in play in terms of applying different values and different approaches or whatever balance of values and priorities the stakeholders and the Commission find -- determine is appropriate.

In terms of results, under the category set by the EMI, System Average Frequency of Interruptions. That tells you, on a system basis, how often interruptions occur. And the other one is called CAIDI -- Customer Average Interruption Duration Index. So CAIDI is duration, how long outages last. SAFI is how frequently they occur. And there's a third category I'll get to in a minute.

But EIMA sets targets for SAFI and CAIDI, and Commonwealth Edison bettered those targets in each year between 2012 and 2020. And when you measure performance excluding major event days, principally major storms, their frequency index performance improved by 41 percent since 2012, and their duration index performance improved by 26 percent

since 2012. Those are notable improvements. And as I was pointing out before, you know, $16.9 billion behind those improvements. So they were not free.

The EIMA also set targets for reducing the number of what are called CERT customers. That's Customers Exceeding Reliability Targets. They're the customers who get the worst performance, either in terms of how frequently they're interrupted or how long they're interrupted. They're measured by numbers of customers and ComEd's CERT customers went from more than 18,000 in 2012 to 649 in 2020. So that's a pretty dramatic improvement in that result.

Turning now to Ameren. Their dollars were much less. I think I said 16.9. Their expenditures were six. Their split between capital and IIP, and capital and non-IIP is similar, though. They spent the 700 million dollars on IIP that was targeted. They spent 3.4 billion -- you have to forgive me. I keep saying "million." I guess I'm so old it's just hard for me to think in billions. It's a Doctor Evil thing. I don't know if you saw that movie where he was going to hold up the world for $5 million and he was

reminded that that's not a real number anymore.

But anyway, their distribution between IIP capital expenditures and non-IIP is similar. They spend 55 percent of their total CapEx on non-IIP and 11 percent or roughly one-fifth on IIP. And their O&M also was very sizable -- 34 percent of their capital and O&M expenditures of 6 billion. And their portion of the IIP spent of that 700 for AMI was 300, which again, was at targeted level.

Their SAFI And CAIDI performance shows different results -- pretty significantly different. They did succeed in meeting or bettering the EIMA targets for both frequency -- or for frequency, rather, and duration. They actually improve their frequency index performance by 18 percent over the nine years. However, their duration performance, while meeting the EIMA target, actually declined by 80 percent. It was -- that's not a wholly surprising direction. I don't want to talk about the values, but directionally, it's logical for a company that's much more non-urban to experience those remaining customers whose performance has been approved to suffer longer

durations. The farther out, they're harder to get to. There are fewer of them on circuits, and therefore, when you're prioritizing restoration, they don't always tend to be the place you go first, because the -- you know, the hours and the dollars you spend to get them back up are higher than they are for customers where fixing the facilities that are down will restore a larger number of customers.

So directionally, I think that's not an illogical result. But why CAIDI declined in the face of the improvements they made is not a question that we were able to dig into and analyze and answer.

Their CERT customers dropped against the frequency target. They were small to begin with. There were only 23 of them that were interrupted with enough frequency to make the CERT designation. That fell to zero. On the duration side, however, they did not meet the target. The numbers were still fairly low. They went from 319 in 2012 to 1,095 in 2020. So the numbers are not within target, but they don't show it worsening. That's kind of more than -- probably within the kind of estimating area you're dealing with

when you're talking about 1.2 million customers.

The last area I want to talk about is AMI. Both finished on schedule and within budget and with, you know, pretty remarkable success in customers opting in. Ameren finished in 2019, ComEd in 2018. Both started in 2013. Ameren only had 3100 customers opt out, out of 1.2 million who had AMI meters installed. And for ComEd, the numbers were similar. They only had 5600 opt out, out of a total of 4.2 million meters installed.

The costs were as expected and our observation of the results -- and there's a, you know, I have a list of 12 to 14 areas where we looked at how AMI has changed performance, and we saw results that were in line with what we would expect in terms of improved performance. And their costs for installations were -- per meter -- were roughly comparable as well.

That pretty much brings me to the end of what I was sure I wanted to tell you. Now, I think it's up to you to tell me what else you'd like to hear.

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Antonuk.

Actually, I want to ask a question kind of where you ended on AMI. And I know that you said you're -- you know, you're not -- with this report you're collecting data and not necessarily characterizing it, whether the improvements matched costs. And you talked about these lists of improvements. I have -- I'm looking at both Ameren's and ComEd's -- the list on page 79 on Ameren and page 96 on ComEd. And I'm doing quick scan, and there's a number of bullet points listed. But if there's a bullet that is on the ComEd report that's not on Ameren, are we to assume that that benefit was not realized because of AMI? Is that a fair way to read the reports in comparing and contrasting different utilities?

MR. ANTONUK: I would say -- and Chris Kozlosky, whose on the phone -- she does work for us -- she'll correct me if I'm wrong. I think that that list -- those lists, while they're pretty much in common, are kind of tracking from the companies -- kind of rack up of expected benefits. Unless she can tell me something different in the next minute or so, we would have to --

and we're certainly happy to do this -- is take a look and try to line up the improvements identically. And we can do that. You know, we can do that. And then also if it is a case where it appears that there was a lag or a lack of improvement in one versus the other, we can tell you that.

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: I don't know if you're able to speak to your experience if there are -- if there exists additional benefits not listed here that could be realized from the AMI infrastructure that's currently in place. It's an open-ended question.

MR. ANTONUK: That's a pretty complete list. And Chris has looked at AMI installations for us and for others, and we've looked at it as well many times. So that list is not a surprising list. I don't think there's anything missing. I think the -- it's not easy to see exactly what the stakeholders, through your process, are going to want to see changed. So I would not rule out the possibility that additional benefits or uses could be identified, but I think this is a pretty comprehensive list.

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Okay. Thank you. I want

to ask you something on the DER interconnection time. I'm looking at a chart on page 104 of the ComEd report, and the chart speaks to the average days between DER application and interconnection -- and I'm going to quickly turn it so I have it in front of me.

And there's chart on the top of the page, and there's years 2015 to 2020. And there's three bar graphs: Residential -- and other. And we see a downward slope in the amount of time between application interconnection. So for 2015, it goes down until 2017 and then starts inching back up -- 2018, 2019, 2020. For example, in 2018, you see an upward trend. 2019, you have average day for residential DER interconnection of 109. In 2020, it goes to 133 days. And similar things are happening, particularly in "Other." In 2019, the "Other" category has 771 days average between application interconnection going up to 790.

So my question is -- I mean, I think this is an obvious answer, but it seems like there is an upward trend in the time between application interconnection and -- so were you able to ascertain

the reasoning -- is there anything that you were able to capture as to why there's an increase of delay between application and interconnection.

MR. ANTONUK: We did not. We did not kind of analyze the -- kind of the fundamentals of what was dragging that performance. We did see that -- what you saw. And I think the -- kind of where we saw our mission was kind of saying, "Here's the data," and the assumption is that the folks who were applying and the folks who will be participating in the process will kind of have their own views about what's going on and whether it's satisfactory, whether the nature of the application is changing. So we felt it was important to highlight the data so that the folks who are going to be engaged in the process could kind of see that and in effect, ask the right questions and do the analysis.

We tried to -- we applied a lot of judgment in assessing what we think is important information. What we tried to stop at was kind of saying, "What's our opinion about the quality of the underlying performance?" I thought that was just getting a step ahead of the game, you know, for us to

be injecting that when we were tasked really with kind of saying, "Give us the data so that we can use it to probe questions like you're asking," and a lot of other questions. You know, why did -- you know, if ComEd's CAIDI and SAFI have performed so well, should they still be spending money on the things that improve it or have they tapped that out? Conversely, should Ameren be worried more?

So we deliberately said to our team, "Don't go there." Because the fear was now, we're basically, in effect, setting the agenda -- what we think is important versus kind of saying, "Here's all the data for everybody to say what is important." Now, I will say we have been retained to assist the staff in participating in the planning process. So I will tell you I look forward to jumping into those questions at this point. But frankly, we just felt we weren't being fair to the process if we start to drive what we were doing by those kinds of considerations.

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Thank you. And then just finally, I referenced this chart for the ComEd report. I'm not seeing a similar chart in the Ameren report.

So I'm either missing it or if you could explain why the same analysis, to that degree, wasn't performed for Ameren.

MR. ANTONUK: No. I can find out what we have got on that. And we can even do more than that if we didn't get that information from Ameren. We did the best we could to kind of keep the reports as close as we could, but the time was tight and the -- you know, the responses were different from company to company. ComEd's response in this based on the size of the Company was obviously -- you know, they brought capabilities to answering questions that were, I guess, both admirable but also a function of how big they are. So I can tell you that it -- we'll dig that out if we have it, and if we don't, we can get it and will do so if you'd like us to.

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: I appreciate that. Thank you.

Other Commissioners have questions?

COMMISSIONER BOCANEGRA: I do.

Commissioner Bocanegra. Thank you for the presentation. I just have one question.

To what extent was it asked, or whoever was requesting the information -- or is it of any value to look at any sort of transmission-related or even generation-related issues that might have impacted this baseline distribution grid assessment?

MR. ANTONUK: We did look at the -- kind of the top end of the distribution grid as the receiver of power energy from the transmission grid. We did not look at all at -- generation, which is basically, you know, a power pull -- regulated function now. We did not see anything on the transmission side that indicated that there was a lack of sources serving the top end substations. So I think we were comfortable with that. Now, the state of those transmission resources, how well they're backed up, and all those things -- we didn't look at. But we did look at whether it appeared to us that the sources that were available to those highest level substations at the distribution grid were well connected.

COMMISSIONER BOCANEGRA: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KIMBREL: Hi, sir. In your ComEd report, you highlighted some discretionary categories?

MR. ANTONUK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KIMBREL: I'm not seeing that in the Ameren report. Did you do that as well? I'm just looking at the table of contents.

MR. ANTONUK: We did not -- probably to that same level. I know we had an ability to get from ComEd data that, in some cases, was more detailed and divisible, if you will. I think with Ameren, the issue was there was data but the ability to kind of assemble it in the same way, in the time we had, was much more difficult.

By the way, the answer I got from our folks is ComEd's -- while the response time increased, the number of applications is increasing. So in that, suggests to me, it's basically -- was a resource issue. They had an increase in the number, and that number stressed the system. So which of course suggests -- not necessary, but certainly fixable, a fixable situation.

And frankly, I think when you're done getting through this planning process, you're probably going to see the structure that both companies use to respond is one -- is going to change for a lot of

reasons, not the least of which is just the numbers of applications.

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Last call for questions.

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: All right. Mr. Antonuk, thank you for taking the time to present and answer our questions. We appreciate it.

MR. ANTONUK: It was great to be here.

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Okay. We are going to go ahead and proceed with the rest of our agenda.

There are edits to the April 7th, 2022, Regular Open Meeting Minutes.

Are there any objections to approving the Minutes as edited?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the Minutes are approved.

Under Electric Items, Item E-1 concerns Mount Carmel Utility Company's proposed Rider D - Parallel Generation Service. This filing is an annual adjustment made in accordance with directives of Part 430 of the Commission's rules and will slightly

increase the rates pertaining to purchases of electricity from cogeneration and small power production facilities. There is -- rates will go into effect on June 1, 2022. Commission Staff has reviewed the revisions, finds them to be reasonable, and recommends not suspending the filing.

Are there any objections to not suspending the filing?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the filing is not suspended.

Item E-2 concerns a complaint against ComEd for alleged voltage issues. We will be holding this item for later disposition.

Item E-3 concerns a complaint against ComEd for alleged overbilling. The parties filed a stipulation and Joint Motion to Dismiss, indicating that all issues have been resolved and requesting that the Commission dismiss the complaint with prejudice.

Are there any objections to granting the Motion to Dismiss?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the Motion is granted.

Item E-4 concerns Ameren's petition to reopen Docket 21-0158 concerning its 2022-2025 Energy Efficiency and Demand Response Plan. The Commission entered a final order in this proceeding on July 22, 2021, approving the plan and the associated stipulation. However, Ameren filed a petition for reopening, asking the Commission to reopen the docket to modify the plan and provide an updated stipulation in conformance with Public Act 102-0662's amendment to Section 8-103B of the PUA. The ALJ has recommended that the Commission reopen the docket on its own motion, for the limited purpose of considering the modified 2022 plan and the 2022 stipulation.

Are there any objections to granting the petition to reopen for the limited scope recommended by the ALJ?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the petition is granted.

Item E-5 concerns ComEd's petition to

reconcile revenues collected under its Rider Zero Emission Adjustment for the period of June 1 of 2020, through May 31 of 2021. The order approves the reconciliation as set in the appendix to the order, finding that the costs during the reconciliation period were prudently incurred.

Are there any objections to approving the order?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is approved.

Item E-6 concerns a citation for failure to file required quarterly and annual reports. Respondent has filed all reports, and the Commission on March 3 granted respondent's position to relinquish its license to operate as an ARES in Illinois. The order dismisses the citation with prejudice and waives penalties against the respondent.

Are there any objections to approving the order?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is

approved.

Items E-7 through E-9 concern applications for authority to install distributed generation facilities in Illinois. The order grants the certificates, finding that the applicants meet the requirements.

Are there any objections to considering these items together and approving the orders?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the orders are approved.

Items E-10 and E-11 concern applications for certificates of service authority to install, maintain, and repair electric vehicle charging stations. The order grants the certificates, finding that the applicants meet the requirements.

Are there any objections to considering these items together and approving the orders?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the orders are approved.

Item E-12 concerns a petition for

confidential treatment of petitioner's report. The petitioner filed a motion to withdraw the petition.

Are there any objections to granting the motion to withdraw.

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the motion is granted.

Items E-13 and E-14 concern requests for proprietary treatment of information in the petitioner's reports. The orders grant the protections, finding that the information is highly proprietary and confidential.

Are there any objections to considering these items together and approving the orders?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the orders are approved.

Items E-15 through E-17 concern MidAmerican's, ComEd's, and Ameren's proposed revisions to their respective Rate Net Energy Metering of Eligible Renewable Electrical Generating Facilities tariffs. On January 20, 2022, the Commission suspended

all three companies' proposed submissions through May 12, 2022. The Commission's investigation in this matter has not been concluded and it is necessary, therefore, to extend the period of suspension for an additional six months through November 12 of 2022. The order suspends the filings.

Are there any objections to considering these items together and approving the resuspension orders?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the orders are approved.

Item E-18 concerns Mt. Caramel's proposed rate increases for electric and gas service. On January 20 of 2022, the Commission suspended the proposed rate increases through May 18 of 2022. The Commission's investigation in this matter has not concluded, and it is necessary, therefore, to extend the period of the suspension for an additional six months through November 18 of 2022.

Are there any objections to approving the resuspension order?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is approved.

Items E-19 through E-22 concern proceedings to terminate abandoned ABC licenses. Respondents failed to appear at the hearings and had not provided evidence that they filed their compliance recertification reports or that they are in good standing with the Illinois Secretary of State -- or that they possess valid licenses or permit bonds. The orders terminate the abandoned licenses and note that the respondents are not relieved from the requirements to file their reports or to pay any penalty for failure to do so.

Are there any objections to considering these items together and approving the orders?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the orders are approved.

Items E-23 through E-27 concern applications for certifications to install energy efficiency measures in Illinois. The orders grant the

certificates, finding that the applicants meet the requirements.

Are there any objections to considering these items together and approving the orders?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the orders are approved.

Moving onto our Gas Items. Item G-1 concerns RESA and ICEA's emergency motion to reopen on the Commission's own motion and for interim order in Docket 20-0606, which is Nicor's proposed revenue-neutral tariff filing to address issues arising from the storage study in Docket No. 18-1775. The motion raised concerns related to customer billing associated with the pending elimination of Rider 25, set for May 1, 2022, which was established when the Commission approved changes to Nicor's transportation tariffs.

Nicor Gas filed its verified response to the motion on April 20 of 2022, which set forth an agreed resolution of the concerns raised in the motion. No party opposes the proposed resolution. The order

reopens the record on the Commission's own motion to postpone the scheduled elimination of Rider 25 until May 1 of 2023. The order directs Nicor to file compliance tariffs for its Rider 25 and Rider 34 consistent with the language changes set forth in Exhibit 1 to the response. The order also directs Nicor to modify its process processes on or before April 30, 2023, to ensure that customers moving from Rider 25 to Rate 74 on May 1 of 2023 will be billed on a calendar month basis, consistent with the practice for current Rate 74 customers.

Are there any objections to granting the motion to reopen and approving the order on reopening?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the motion is granted, and the order is approved.

Item G-2 concerns a complaint against Nicor alleging various charges regarding gas service disconnection and reconnection to petitioner's property. Nicor has filed a motion to dismiss. The order grants the motion and dismisses the matter with

prejudice, finding that the Complainant has failed to state a cause of action upon which relief may be granted and that portions of the allegations are barred by the statute of limitations. The order also denies Complainant's motions to file a second amended complaint, finding that the underlying operative facts alleged in these motions have not effectively changed and, therefore, do not provide a basis for granting.

Are there any objections to approving the order?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is approved.

Item G-3 concerns a complaint against Peoples Gas for certain charges. Peoples states that the issues central to the complaint have been resolved and that Complainant seeks no further relief. Peoples has attempted to execute a joint stipulation with the Complainant, but the Complainant has failed to appear at two consecutive status hearings. The order dismisses the complaint for want of prosecution.

Are there any objections to approving

the order?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is approved.

Item G-4 concerns an application for certification to operate as an alternative gas supplier. The order grants the certificate, finding that the applicant meets the requirements.

Are there any objections to approving the order?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is approved.

Moving onto our Telecommunications Items. Item T-1 concerns a petition for determination of the amount and form of supplemental assistance to be provided by local exchange telecommunications carriers. The order also finds that Illinois operates a statutorily-mandated telephone assistance program, which provides state support for the federal Lifeline program, and determines that the Universal Telephone Service Assistant Program should provide connection fee

assistance to the eligible new subscribers for an amount up to $35. The order also authorizes eligible telecommunications carriers to continue to pass through to their qualified low-income customers the full amount of federal Lifeline support, which is $5.25.

Are there any objections to approving the order?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is approved.

Items T-2 and T-3 concern applications for a certificate of authority to provide telecommunications services in Illinois. The orders grant the certificates, finding that the applicants meet the requirements.

Are there any objections to considering these items together and approving the orders?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the orders are approved.

Items T-4 through T-8 concern requests for confidential treatment of the petitioner's reports.

The orders grant the protection, finding that the information is highly proprietary and confidential.

Are there any objections to considering these items together and approving the orders?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the orders are approved.

Moving on to our Water and Sewer Items. Item W-1 concerns a joint petition by Aqua Illinois, Aqua Water Holdings, and Essential Utilities for approval of restructuring and for a proposed updated Affiliated Interest Agreement. The restructuring will create a water utility holding company within the Essential Utilities corporate structure. The order approves the restructuring and approves Aqua Illinois' updated Affiliated Interest Agreement with Aqua Services as set in the appendices, finding that they are in the public interest.

Are there any objections to approving the order?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is

approved.

Moving on to our Other Business. Item O-1 concerns approval of batches, contracts, and confirmations under the Illinois Adjustable Block Program.

Are there any objections to approving the program administrator's submissions?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the submissions are approved.

Item O-2 concerns April 2022 Solicitations of Bids to Sell Zonal Resource Credits to Ameren. Are there any objections to approving the procurement administrator's recommendations on selection of winning bids?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the recommendations area approved.

Item O-3 concerns approval of batches, contracts, and confirmations under the Illinois Solar For All program.

Are there any objections to approving

the program administrator's submissions?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the submissions are approved.

Item O-4 concerns the Baseline Grid Assessment Reports prepared by The Liberty Consulting Group pursuant to Section 16-205.10 of the Public Utilities Act. We already heard this item at the beginning of the meeting today, so no further action is taken under this item.

So this concludes our Public Utilities Agenda.

Judge Teague Kingsley, do we have other matters to come before the Commission today?

JUDGE TEAGUE KINGSLEY: No, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Do the Commissioners have other business to discuss?

(No verbal response.)

CHAIRWOMAN ZALEWSKI: Hearing none and without objection, the meeting is now adjourned. Thanks.

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter was adjourned.)