

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

BEFORE THE  
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION  
BENCH SESSION  
(PUBLIC UTILITY)  
Wednesday, June 24, 2015  
Chicago, Illinois

Met, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 A.M.,  
at 160 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Illinois.

- PRESENT:
- BRIEN J. SHEAHAN, Chairman
  - ANN MCCABE, Commissioner
  - SHERINA E. MAYE, Commissioner
  - MIGUEL del VALLE, Commissioner
  - JOHN R. ROSALES, Commissioner
- SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by  
PATRICIA WESLEY  
CSR NO. 084-002170

1 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Good morning. Are we ready to  
2 proceed in Springfield?

3 MR. MATRISCH: Yes, we are, Mr. Chairman.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Pursuant to the Open Meetings  
5 Act, I call the June 24, 2015 Bench Session of the  
6 Illinois Commerce Commission to order.

7 Commissioners McCabe, del Valle, Maye  
8 and Rosales are present with me in Chicago. We have  
9 a quorum.

10 We have no requests to speak and we  
11 will, therefore, move onto our Regular Open Meeting.

12 Moving onto our Public Utility agenda,  
13 there are edits to the Minutes of our June 3, 2015  
14 Public Utility Bench Session. Are there any  
15 objections to approval of the Bench Session Minutes  
16 of June 3, 2015 as edited?

17 (No response.)

18 Hearing none, the Minutes are  
19 approved.

20 Item E-1 involves an Order initiating  
21 a proceeding to consider a third-party evaluation of  
22 On-Bill Financing Programs for energy efficiency.

1                   Is there any objections to approving  
2 the proposed Order?

3                                   (No response.)

4                   Hearing none, the Order is approved.

5                   Item E-2 involves ComEd's revision of  
6 its Government Aggregation Protocols.

7                   Are there any objections to not  
8 suspending the filings?

9                                   (No response.)

10                   Hearing none, the filings are not  
11 suspended.

12                   Our consideration of E-3 will be  
13 postponed to a future meeting.

14                   Item E-4 involves dismissal of a  
15 consumer complaint against ComEd.

16                   Are there any objections to approving  
17 the Order?

18                                   (No response.)

19                   Hearing none, the Complaint is  
20 Dismissed.

21                   Item E-5 involves the Illinois  
22 Department of Transportation's Petition for Approval

1 to Exercise the Right of Eminent Domain of Certain  
2 Properties Owned by ComEd.

3 I believe that Commissioner McCabe has  
4 some questions regarding this item.

5 Commissioner.

6 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Yes. Judge Hilliard, did  
7 the parties submit or receive a draft Order?

8 JUDGE HILLIARD: The short answer is, yes, but I  
9 would like to give you a little background in this  
10 case if I might.

11 The Commission's responsibility in  
12 regard to these cases are only two. We have to  
13 determine that the action by the Department of  
14 Transportation is a public purpose and that the end  
15 result will be a public entity is going to own or  
16 control the property. In each case, the Department  
17 of Transportation filed a verified complaint that  
18 the allegations are sworn to by the attorney for the  
19 department.

20 ComEd never contests any of the  
21 allegations in the verified complaint; therefore,  
22 they stand as admitted, and in each one of those

1 complaints they established the actions that the  
2 Commission need to take are matters of fact.

3                   In this particular case, and in some  
4 of the other cases, apparently there are outstanding  
5 issues as to compensation, but that really doesn't  
6 come before us and doesn't concern the Commission.  
7 But when one of those cases goes to hearing, I infer  
8 that what's really going on is that they haven't  
9 come to terms yet on how much money is going to  
10 change hands, which is what is suppose to happen in  
11 these cases. In this particular case, we had a  
12 hearing and that was continued for ComEd to produce  
13 a witness.

14                   On April 30th I was advised by the  
15 ComEd attorney that the matter had been settled. On  
16 May 1st I sent both attorneys an e-mail asking them  
17 if they were going to submit a draft Order and the  
18 response from the Department of Transportation he  
19 was awaiting Mr. Goldstein's approval. He's the  
20 attorney for ComEd, and, shortly after,  
21 Mr. Goldstein came back that he approved the Order.  
22 They did submit an Order, and that Order is

1 essentially what is before you.

2 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Okay. We get these kinds  
3 of cases several times a year.

4 JUDGE HILLIARD: A number of times a year. It  
5 kind of depends on how active the Department of  
6 Transportation is. In each case it's more or less  
7 the same, and ComEd's response is always that they  
8 admit the department has the ability to do what  
9 they're doing.

10 However, in terms of the paperwork  
11 that needs to be done, they don't want to give the  
12 department an affidavit saying that they protect the  
13 department by claimed unknown owners; therefore,  
14 there has to be an Order entered and they go to the  
15 Circuit Court and file an eminent domain action and  
16 the Circuit Court gives the department clear title  
17 to the property.

18 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Thank you.

19 JUDGE HILLIARD: Sure.

20 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Any other questions?

21 (No response.)

22 Are there any objections to approving

1 the proposed Order?

2 (No response.)

3 Hearing none, the proposed Order is  
4 approved.

5 Item 6 involving a billing complaint  
6 filed against Energy Plus Holdings, are there any  
7 objections to granting the parties' Joint Motion to  
8 Dismiss?

9 (No response.)

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

12 Item E-7 concerns Ameren's Petition  
13 for Reconciliation of Revenues Collected under its  
14 Power Procurement Riders.

15 Are there any objections to approving  
16 the proposed Order?

17 (No response.)

18 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

19 Item E-8 is Energy.Me's Petition for  
20 the Confidential Treatment in its Reports of  
21 Continuing Compliance as an Alternative Retail  
22 Electric Supplier ("ARES").

1                   Are there any objections to approving  
2 the proposed Order?

3   (No response.)

4                   Hearing none, the Order is approved.

5                   Items E-9 and 10 are Applications  
6 Requesting Certificates of Service Authority as  
7 Alternative Retail Electric Suppliers ("ARES") in  
8 Illinois pursuant to the Public Utilities Act.

9                   Are there any objections to  
10 considering these items together and approving the  
11 proposed Orders?

12   (No response.)

13                   Hearing none, the Orders are approved.

14                   Items G-1 and G-2 concern Peoples  
15 Gas/North Shore Gas Company's modification to its  
16 gas tariffs to comply with its Docket No. 06-0703  
17 Implementation Plan.

18                   Are there any objections to  
19 considering these items together and not suspending  
20 the filings?

21   (No response.)

22                   Hearing none, the filings are not



1 suspended.

2 Item G-3 involves a billing complaint  
3 filed against Peoples Gas.

4 Are there any objections to approving  
5 the proposed Order denying the complaint?

6 (No response.)

7 Hearing none, the Order denying the  
8 complaint is approved.

9 The Commission will postpone its  
10 consideration of Item G-4 until a future meeting.

11 G-5 on our agenda, Docket No. 14-0496,  
12 the Wisconsin Energy and Integrys Merger.

13 We have a number of edits to the ALJ's Proposed  
14 Exceptions Proposed Order and Appendix A. We will  
15 adopt these edits and then each Commissioner will  
16 have an opportunity to offer a statement and discuss  
17 the Final Order and Appendix A as edited.

18 I will make the first statement, and  
19 then we will hear from Commissioner McCabe,  
20 Commissioner del Valle, Commissioner Maye and  
21 Commissioner Rosales.

22 At the conclusion of our statements,

1 we will vote on the Final Order and Appendix A as  
2 edited.

3 I move that we adopt the edits to the  
4 Post Exceptions Proposed Order and Appendix A.

5 Is there a second.

6 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Seconded.

7 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: All those in favor, say aye.

8 (Chorus of ayes.)

9 Opposed, say nay.

10 (No response.)

11 The edits are adopted by a unanimous  
12 vote.

13 Let me begin by thanking the ICC  
14 Staff, ALJs, the Commissioners' legal and policy  
15 advisors and intervenors for their important  
16 contributions to the outcome of this case.

17 Mergers of this size are difficult  
18 administrative matters that involve complex issues  
19 and consume many months of hard work.

20 I would like to especially thank the  
21 Attorney General and her staff, the City of Chicago,  
22 CUB, and other intervenors for their tireless

1 advocacy on behalf of consumers. Their role in this  
2 process has resulted in a stronger and better final  
3 Order.

4 After many, many years of significant  
5 challenges, Peoples and North Shore Gas will have an  
6 opportunity to turn the page under new management.  
7 We have very high expectations for WEC. The  
8 company, with the Commission's oversight, must  
9 embark on a necessary turn-around of one of the  
10 largest infrastructure projects in the nation at the  
11 same time balancing the safety, reliability and cost  
12 of the system.

13 Our decision today to approve the  
14 merger is conditioned on a number of critical  
15 factors, among the 47 conditions is a requirement  
16 that the company implement all of the  
17 recommendations made by the Liberty Audit Report.

18 To the extent that the company and  
19 Staff cannot agree on implementation of  
20 recommendations, the Commission, with the  
21 involvement of intervenors, like the Attorney  
22 General's Office, City of Chicago and CUB, will

1 determine how, not whether, but how, the  
2 recommendations will be implemented. To accomplish  
3 this, the company must also improve its  
4 communications and relationship with the City of  
5 Chicago.

6           The Order acknowledges important  
7 points raised by the Attorney General and others  
8 that the 2030 completion date for the AMRP is  
9 unlikely to be met and certain to put undue pressure  
10 on ratepayers.

11           While the Commission does not believe  
12 that this is the appropriate docket for  
13 reconsideration of the 2030 time frame, the project  
14 schedule and cost will be the subject of the  
15 continuing Liberty audit process and transition plan  
16 that we will require which Commissioner McCabe will  
17 discuss in greater detail.

18           The Order also preserves Illinois  
19 employment levels but gives the company requested  
20 flexibility in terms of deployment and requires that  
21 current labor agreements be honored.

22           The Order reflects our expectation

1 that additional employees above the current levels  
2 will be required for the successful implementation  
3 of reforms to the AMRP.

4 Finally, the Order provides for a  
5 two-year rate freeze for customers which the  
6 Commission believes strikes an appropriate balance  
7 between stability during the transition and the  
8 potential for rate check.

9 The role of the ICC is to ensure safe,  
10 reliable and cost-effective service. Today the  
11 majority of the Commissioners believe that approval  
12 of the merger is the most effective way to deliver  
13 this commitment to Illinois customers.

14 With that, I will yield to  
15 Commissioner McCabe.

16 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
17 We make a number of edits to Pages 28 through 31 of  
18 the PEPO.

19 While the Commission agrees that the  
20 merger docket is not the forum for requiring AMRP  
21 improvements, the Commission has serious concerns  
22 with Peoples Gas' ability to complete the Advanced

1 Main Replacement Program by 2030. Concerns include  
2 project costs, schedule and effectiveness.

3 Peoples is already required, as part  
4 of the AMRP audit process, to provide (1) an  
5 Implementation Plan for the Liberty Audit  
6 recommendations; (2) an AMRP Scheduling Master Plan,  
7 and (3) a Cost Plan Model.

8 In addition, in Condition No. 5, the  
9 Commission requires Wisconsin Energy and Peoples Gas  
10 to provide an AMRP Transition Plan to ensure a  
11 seamless transition that avoids a diminishment in  
12 service.

13 These four Improvement Plans shall  
14 include updated, detailed information regarding the  
15 appropriate size, scope, schedule and cost for the  
16 AMRP.

17 The four Implementation Plans will be  
18 submitted to the Commission within 75 days of the  
19 final Order. Staff will report to the Commission on  
20 the progress of these plans by September 30th, and  
21 the report will be published on the ICC website.

22 The Commission is and will be paying

1 close attention to the Liberty Audit implementation  
2 process.

3                   Upon review of the Staff's report, if  
4 the Commission is not satisfied with the results of  
5 the Joint Applicants' Improvement Plans, the  
6 Commission will initiate an additional  
7 investigation.

8           CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Commissioner del Valle.

9           COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10                   I would first like to acknowledge the  
11 work the Commissioners have done to move this Order  
12 in the right direction through their edits. But,  
13 unfortunately, I do not believe the Order before us  
14 can be rescued from its fatal flaws.

15                   In fact, the Order leans so much on  
16 conditioned, future commitments, and vague,  
17 unenforceable phrases, that I find that imposing  
18 just one condition would have put us in the same  
19 place, that condition being "Peoples Gas and North  
20 Shore will not allow its new owner to violate  
21 Section 7-204 of the PUA," and then just cross our  
22 fingers and hope for the best.

1                   The law and the scale of this deal  
2 demands that the Joint Applicants build a complete  
3 record. This deal roughly doubles the size of WEC  
4 and its holdings, includes a significant premium and  
5 transaction costs, establishes WEC in two states  
6 where they haven't owned companies before, and adds  
7 \$1.5 billion, in debt, to their books. The group is  
8 also inheriting a deeply troubled AMRP program which  
9 may be the biggest main replacement program ever.

10                   But instead of detailing how they  
11 would manage the large merger, the Joint Applicants  
12 continued the tradition of large utility holding  
13 companies asserting that they are above examination  
14 merely because the ICC can investigate their  
15 subsidiaries. In fact, the Joint Applicants  
16 conducted themselves as if there is no uncertainty  
17 or risk for Illinois ratepayers in this  
18 multi-billion dollar deal.

19                   The Joint Applicants did not bring  
20 substantial evidence but instead relied on vague and  
21 conditioned future commitments, as well as pointing  
22 to the Commission's existing PUA authority to render



1 Section 7-204 of a toothless checklist.

2                   They also shifted the burden of proof  
3 from themselves onto the intervening parties and the  
4 Commission. According to the Joint Applicants, the  
5 outgunned advocates and underresourced Commission  
6 Staff must take the petitioners' incomplete record  
7 of facts and, from that, prove that risk of adverse  
8 impacts exists. Further, although the law requires  
9 these findings now, the Order, in some cases,  
10 postpones the work to future dockets.

11                   This Order should be protecting  
12 ratepayers from adverse rate increases now. The  
13 Order should be requiring tracking protocols and a  
14 longer rate freeze which would incent the AMRP and  
15 operations to achieve cost savings and efficiencies  
16 as soon as possible. Instead, the Order relies on a  
17 future rate case which will involve complex cost  
18 recovery methodologies that the Order doesn't even  
19 attempt to analyze.

20                   The Order before us should be  
21 protecting ratepayers against the holding company's  
22 shareholders prioritizing their profit over the

1 health of our utilities. Instead, it uses a  
2 two-year commitment of capital and Moody's credit  
3 reports as a substitute for a long-term assurance of  
4 access to capital.

5           The Order before us should be  
6 requiring performance metrics to protect ratepayers  
7 against the rate impacts and safety concerns  
8 resulting from the mismanagement of a crucial  
9 capital project, but, instead, we get closed-door  
10 meetings, plans submitted after the record is closed  
11 and after the transition has been underway for  
12 months, and we decline to require future involvement  
13 of the ultimate decision maker, Wisconsin Energy  
14 Corporation.

15           At the very least, we should demand  
16 evidence in the record of integration planning and  
17 continuity across all business functions at both of  
18 the Illinois Gas Companies. Instead, we get only a  
19 vague Full-time Equivalents commitment, and a future  
20 transition report unnecessarily limited to just the  
21 AMRP program.

22           Conditioned future commitments cannot

1 substitute for material evidence to make up for  
2 these failings. Vague and unforceable promises  
3 cannot substitute for material evidence.

4 I'm very disappointed with the policy  
5 implications of this Order. We should have used  
6 this Order to ensure a fix of this troubled company  
7 and troubled project. Unfortunately, we squandered  
8 this opportunity by allowing Wisconsin Energy  
9 Corporation to hide behind a legal fiction to avoid  
10 scrutiny of its proper responsibility and liability.

11 The Wisconsin Energy Corporation  
12 successfully defined the terms of this docket, while  
13 bringing no evidence and daring the parties to try  
14 to prove that their leadership will not further  
15 diminish the already struggling company.

16 So, while the edits proposed do move  
17 the Order in the right direction, for the reasons  
18 I've stated and others, I will be voting "no" on  
19 this merger and will file a dissenting opinion with  
20 the Clerk's Office. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

22 Commissioner Maye.

1           COMMISSIONER MAYE: Good morning and thank you,  
2 Mr. Chairman.

3                       Very short and sweet comments. I do  
4 agree with those that have been made before me by  
5 Mr. Chairman and Commissioner McCabe.

6                       We took this Order in this case very,  
7 very seriously. We evaluated every page. We  
8 evaluated the record and we analyzed the arguments.  
9 We understand it's very controversial, but, at the  
10 end of the day, I believe that everything in the  
11 record set it straight that this is what is in the  
12 best interest for our consumers.

13                      I think that I am personally looking  
14 forward to the days ahead for Peoples Gas and very  
15 excited. At the same time, I have very high  
16 expectations for the company that they will meet  
17 those expectations, because we have discretion to  
18 determine those expectations whether or not they  
19 meet those. I am looking forward to working with  
20 them and very excited, and thank you for the  
21 opportunity to give some comments.

22           CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you.

1 Commissioner Rosales.

2 ACTING-COMMISSIONER ROSALES: Thank you,  
3 Mr. Chairman. After reviewing every piece of  
4 evidence presented by the parties in this case, the  
5 Commission will hold the Joint Applicants to  
6 conditions they have agreed to with expectations  
7 that the additional resources will result in an  
8 improved infrastructure for Illinois at the highest  
9 level of safety, reliability and cost efficiency.

10 With that said, I vote to approve this  
11 merger.

12 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you.

13 Commissioners, are there any further  
14 discussion?

15 (No response.)

16 I move that we adopt the Final Order  
17 and Appendix A as edited.

18 Is there a second?

19 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Seconded.

20 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: There is a motion and a  
21 second.

22 All those in favor of adopting the

1 Order and Appendix A as edited which approves the  
2 merger of Wisconsin Energy and Integrys, say aye?

3 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Aye.

4 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Aye.

5 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Aye.

6 Opposed, say nay.

7 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Nay.

8 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: The vote is 4 to 1 and the  
9 Motion to Adopt the Final Order and Appendix A as  
10 edited are approved.

11 Item T-1 concerns Zoom-i-Net  
12 Communications' petition to withdraw authority to  
13 conduct business in the State of Illinois.

14 Are there any objections to approving  
15 the proposed Order?

16 (No response.)

17 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

18 Item W-1 concerns Illinois-American  
19 Water Company's petition seeking approval of the  
20 reconciliation of its Qualified Infrastructure Plant  
21 Riders for 2011.

22 Are there any objections to approving

1 the proposed Order?

2 (No response.)

3 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

4 Item W-2 concerns the Annual  
5 Reconciliation of Charmar Water Company's purchased  
6 water surcharge.

7 Are there any objections to approving  
8 the proposed Order?

9 (No response.)

10 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

11 Item W-3 concerns the Annual  
12 Reconciliation of Harbor Ridge Utilities' purchased  
13 water surcharge.

14 Are there any objections to approving  
15 the proposed Order?

16 (No response.)

17 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

18 Item W-4 involves a complaint filed  
19 against Illinois American Water Company regarding  
20 alleged inaccurate billing in Washington Park.

21 Are there any objections to approving  
22 the proposed Order denying the complaint?

1 (No response.)

2 Hearing none, the Order denying the  
3 complaint is approved.

4 Item W-5 concerns Aqua Illinois'  
5 Motion to Withdraw a Petition regarding issuance of  
6 \$23 million in long-term indebtedness.

7 Are there any objections to granting  
8 the Motion to Withdraw?

9 (No response.)

10 Hearing none, the Motion to Withdraw  
11 is granted.

12 Under Petitions for Rehearing, Item  
13 PR-1 concerns a request for rehearing of Virgin  
14 Mobile USA's Application for Limited Designation as  
15 an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier.

16 Are there any objections to denying  
17 the Application for Rehearing?

18 (No response.)

19 Hearing none, the Application for  
20 Rehearing is denied.

21 Item PR-2 involve Applications for  
22 Rehearing filed regarding Ameren Transmission's



1 Illinois Rivers Project which was approved by the  
2 Commission on May 12, 2015.

3 Is there a motion to deny the  
4 Applications for Rehearing?

5 COMMISSIONER McCABE: So moved.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there a second?

7 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Seconded.

8 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Any discussion?

9 (No response.)

10 All those in favor of denying the  
11 Applications for Rehearing, say aye.

12 Aye.

13 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Aye.

14 COMMISSIONER Maye: Aye.

15 ACTING-COMMISSIONER ROSALES: Aye.

16 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Opposed, say nay.

17 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Nay.

18 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: The motion carries 4 to 1.  
19 Applications for Rehearing are denied.

20 The next item on the Agenda is the  
21 Approval of the Procurement Administrator's  
22 Recommendations on Selection of Winning Bids

1 pursuant to Section 1-56(1)(5) of the Illinois Power  
2 Agency Act.

3 Is there a motion to approve the  
4 report?

5 COMMISSIONER McCABE: So moved.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there a second?

7 ACTING-COMMISSIONER ROSALES: Seconded.

8 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Any discussion?

9 (No response.)

10 All those in favor, say aye.

11 (Chorus of ayes.)

12 Opposed, say nay.

13 (No response.)

14 The ayes have it and the report is  
15 approved.

16 The next item on the agenda pertains  
17 to litigation against the MISO filed with the FERC  
18 by the Illinois Attorney General, Public Citizen,  
19 Inc., and the Southwestern Electric Cooperative  
20 Regarding the 2015-2016 Planning Resource Auction  
21 which is FERC Docket Nos. EL15-70, 71 and 72.

22 Is there a motion to enter into closed

1 session to discuss this litigation?

2 COMMISSIONER MAYE: So moved.

3 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there a second?

4 ACTING-COMMISSIONER ROSALES: Seconded.

5 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: All those in favor, say aye.

6 (Chorus of ayes.)

7 Opposed, say nay.

8 (No response.)

9 The motion carries. We will clear the  
10 rooms of all non-Staff for discussion of this  
11 pending litigation.

12 (Whereupon, Closed Session  
13 commenced from Page 27  
14 to Page 41)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1                   We are back in open session.

2                   In closed session we have been  
3 discussing FERC Docket Nos. EL15-70, 71 and 72, and  
4 proposed comments regarding litigation.

5                   Is there a motion to approve and  
6 submit the comments to FERC?

7           COMMISSIONER McCABE:    So moved.

8           CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN:    Is there a second?

9           ACTING-COMMISSIONER ROSALES:    Seconded.

10          CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN:    Any discussion?

11                                    (No response.)

12                   All those in favor, say aye.

13                                    (Chorus of ayes.)

14                   Opposed say, nay.

15                                    (No response.)

16                   The ayes have it and the comments are  
17 approved.

18                   Judge Kimbrel, do we have any other  
19 matters to come before the Commission today?

20          JUDGE KIMBREL:    No, we don't, Mr. Chairman.

21          CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN:    Thank you.

22                   Commissioners, do we have any other

1 business to discuss?

2 (No response.)

3 Hearing none, we stand adjourned.

4 Thank you.

5 (Whereupon, the above matter

6 was adjourned.)

7

8

9

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

10

11 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
12 ) SS:  
13 COUNTY OF COOK )

14

TITLE: BENCH SESSION (PUBLIC UTILITY)

15

16 I, PATRICIA WESLEY, do hereby certify  
17 that I am a court reporter contracted by  
18 SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, of Chicago, Illinois;  
19 that I reported in shorthand the evidence taken  
20 and the proceedings had on the hearing on the  
21 above-entitled case on the 24th day of June  
22 A.D., 2015; that the foregoing 30 pages are a  
true and correct transcript of my shorthand  
notes so taken as aforesaid, and contains all

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

of the proceedings directed by the Commission  
or other person authorized by it to conduct the  
said hearing to be stenographically reported.

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this  
1st day of July, A.D., 2015.

-----  
Reporter.