

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
PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULAR OPEN MEETING
Thursday, June 24, 2021
Chicago, Illinois

Met pursuant to notice via videoconference
at 11:30 a.m.

PRESENT:

- CARRIE ZALEWSKI, Chairwoman
(via Chicago Office)
- D. ETHAN KIMBREL, Commissioner
(via Chicago Office)
- MARIA S. BOCANEGRA, Commissioner
(via videoconference)
- MICHAEL T. CARRIGAN, Commissioner
(via Chicago Office)

BRIDGES COURT REPORTING
BY: Michael J. Duffy, CER
Notary Public

1 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Good morning. Under the
2 Open Meetings Act and in accordance with the
3 Governor's Executive Orders, I call the June 24,
4 2021, regular open meeting to order. Before we
5 proceed, for the clarity of the record, I would ask
6 everyone to state their names and to speak slowly
7 and clearly so that the court reporter can capture
8 everything that is said. I have checked that we
9 have all four commissioners with us. We have a
10 quorum.

11 Today we have three requests to
12 speak. Going in the order we've received the
13 request to speak, we'll hear from the following
14 three people: First, Beau Barber; second, Allen
15 Axelrod; third, Anthony Walraven. Under 2 Illinois
16 Administrative Code Section 1700.10, any person
17 desiring to address the Commission shall be allowed
18 up to three minutes. My adviser, Tetyana Rabczak
19 will have the timer on the screen. Only one person
20 may speak on behalf of any organization. Please
21 note that the Commission will not respond directly
22 to any comments. Any person wishing to provide

1 further comments may submit a written statement to
2 the Commission. The written comments may be
3 submitted by going to the ICC website,
4 icc.illinois.gov, go on the e-docket system and
5 look for the related docket, and in that docket,
6 click "file a comment." You can also call the ICC
7 Consumer Services Division at (800) 524-0795 and
8 they can help you submit the comment.

9 First, Mr. Beau Barber, are you
10 on?

11 MR. BARBER: Yes. Can you hear me?

12 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: We can hear you,
13 Mr. Barber. Please state and spell your name and
14 then we'll start the clock and you can proceed.

15 MR. BARBER: Okay. My name is Beau Barber,
16 spelled, B-E-A-U, and then B-A-R-B-E-R. I am a
17 democratic precinct committee person for the Ogden
18 1 precinct, and I'm here to talk today about the
19 importance of having utility shut-off moratorium.
20 So recently there was a resolution passed by Cori
21 Bush and Jamaal Bowman, which the opening of it was
22 talking about how the United States must establish

1 electricity as a basic human right in public good
2 and eradicate the reliance on monopolized property
3 driven utility corporations and providers, and the
4 flawed regulatory regime that has failed to
5 regulate these utilities in the public interest.

6 It goes on further to say, whereas,
7 investor owned utilities and state utility
8 commissions tasked to regulate them are failing to
9 meet them. Collective mandates to serve the public
10 interest and provide customers with just and
11 reasonable electricity rates. She did not mention
12 you specifically, but I would imagine that she
13 would be mentioning -- talking about commissions
14 like yours because the problem that we're seeing is
15 that, you know, there's several errata that's
16 happening. There's voices that are not being
17 listened to.

18 And, for instance, the most recent
19 thing that we saw was in the last meeting on June,
20 what was it, June 10? You said, at the end of the
21 meeting, people can apply for LIHEAP and there's a
22 problem -- there's just one problem with that, that

1 was June 10th, LIHEAP registration ended on May
2 31st, and it's kind of problematic to have such
3 errata when people are already struggling enough as
4 it is and COVID's still not over. We are not even
5 at like 70 percent vaccinated for just the state of
6 Illinois alone, let alone the country, and people
7 in the CDC and people like Dr. Fauci, have said
8 that in order to get rid of this virus for good, we
9 need to be at least like 75 or even 85 percent
10 vaccinated.

11 And now we have the Delta strain to
12 worry about. Since, I have my stats here, current
13 -- like the stats that we've had so far on
14 breakthrough cases of COVID-19, which is the people
15 got COVID-19 and, you know, despite being fully
16 vaccinated we -- there was -- there's been about 18
17 percent of what? Of 6,000 cases, I believe that
18 were fatal cases. You can fact-check me on that
19 number, but the problem is is that we still have a
20 lot going on, we're not in the clear yet, and in
21 Illinois alone, there's been 124 deaths since April
22 due to COVID-19 breakthrough -- vaccine

1 breakthrough, and that's accounted for 1.86 percent
2 of the COVID deaths since January 1st.

3 So you know, do your job, get more
4 intimate with the matter because like I told you
5 months ago, with an engineering degree, and I know
6 you have one, the one thing that we learned during
7 our education was you make mistakes, people die.
8 You're making mistakes. People are dying. Thank
9 you.

10 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Barber.
11 Next is Mr. Allen Axelrod (phonetic). Mr. Axelrod,
12 are you on? Second call for Mr. Axelrod, and I'm
13 looking, and I don't see your name, sir. Checking
14 one last time. Yes. No, Mr. Axelrod.

15 Finally, Anthony Walraven.
16 Mr. Walraven, are you on? Second call for
17 Mr. Walraven. I'm looking, I don't see your name
18 as well, sir. Okay. So this concludes our public
19 time in session.

20 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: We're going to move on to
21 our public utilities agenda. There are edits to
22 the May 27th, 2021, public utility special open

1 meeting minutes. Are there any objections to
2 approving the minutes as edited?

3 (No verbal response.)

4 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the minutes
5 are approved.

6 Under our electric item. Item E1
7 concerns the Ameren filing to make minor
8 housekeeping changes to its electric service tariff
9 pages. Commission staff recommended not suspending
10 the filing. Are there any objections to not
11 suspending the filing?

12 (No verbal response.)

13 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the filing is
14 not suspended.

15 Item E2 concerns a citation issued
16 against Great American Power for failure to comply
17 with Part 412 of the Commission's rules governing
18 alternative retail electric suppliers. Commission
19 staff, Great American, the attorney general, and
20 the Citizen's Utility Board filed a joint motion to
21 approve a settlement agreement that they determined
22 to be fair and equitable to all customers and all

1 parties. The order approves the settlement finding
2 its terms reasonable. Before calling the vote, are
3 there any comments on this docket?

4 MS. BOCANEGRA: Chair Zalewski, I have
5 comments, but I'll wait until after the vote if
6 that's okay.

7 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Okay. I will call the vote
8 to approve the order. If you are in favor of
9 approving the order, please, say "aye", and if you
10 are opposed, please say "nay". Commissioner
11 Bocanegra.

12 MS. BOCANEGRA: Nay.

13 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Commissioner Carrigan.

14 MR. CARRIGAN: Aye.

15 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Commissioner Kimbrel?

16 MR. KIMBREL: Aye.

17 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: I vote aye. The three ayes
18 have it and the order is approved.

19 MS. BOCANEGRA: Chair Zalewski and Court
20 Reporter, this is Commissioner Bocanegra for the
21 record. I just want to note the basis for my
22 disagreement today. Although this particular

1 docket is captioned as a settlement agreement, in
2 my opinion, a plain reading of the statute, this
3 should not be going to LIHEAP funds. I think it's
4 a diversion of funds, and so for those reasons, I
5 voted nay. Thank you.

6 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Thank you. Items E3
7 through E9 concern applications for a certificate
8 of service authority to operate as an installer of
9 distributed generation facilities in Illinois. The
10 orders grant the certificates, finding that the
11 applicants meet the requirements. Are there any
12 objections to considering these items together and
13 approving the orders?

14 (No verbal response.)

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

17 Items E10 and E11 concern
18 petitions to cancel certificates to operate as
19 retail electric agents, brokers, or consultants in
20 Illinois. The orders cancel the certificates and
21 direct the petitioners to file any outstanding
22 annual reports with the Commission. Are there any

1 objections to considering these items together and
2 approving the orders?

3 (No verbal response.)

4 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the orders
5 are approved.

6 Item E12 through E14 concern
7 applications for certificates of service authority
8 to act as retail electric agents, brokers, or
9 consultants in Illinois. The orders grants the
10 licenses finding that the applicants meet the
11 requirements. Is there any objections to
12 considering these items together and approving the
13 orders?

14 (No verbal response.)

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

17 Items E15 through E21, concern
18 requests for confidential treatment of information
19 in the petitioner's reports. The orders grant the
20 protection, finding that the information is highly
21 proprietary and confidential. Are there any
22 objections to considering these items together and

1 approving the orders?

2 (No verbal response.)

3 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the orders
4 are approved.

5 Item E22 concerns Docket 21-0155 in
6 which ComEd requests approval of its 2022 through
7 2025 energy efficiency and demand response plan and
8 associated stipulation agreement. The order finds
9 that the plan meets the statutory requirements and
10 also notes that all parties agree with the
11 Commission that the Commission should approve the
12 plan and the stipulation agreement. The order
13 approves the plan and stipulation agreement. Are
14 there any objections to approving the order?

15 (No verbal response.)

16 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is
17 approved.

18 Item E23 concerns a complaint
19 against Sperian Energy alleging the company was not
20 authorized to become the complainant's electric
21 supplier. The parties filed a joint motion to
22 dismiss, stipulating that all matters in dispute

1 have been resolved, and requesting that the
2 Commission dismiss the complaint. Are there any
3 objections to granting the joint motion to dismiss?

4 (No verbal response.)

5 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the motion is
6 granted.

7 Items E24 through E33 concern
8 requests to cancel certificates of service
9 authority to install energy efficiency measures in
10 Illinois. The orders cancel the certificates. Are
11 there any objections to considering these items
12 together and approving the orders?

13 (No verbal response.)

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

16 Items E34 through E42 concern
17 applications for certifications to install energy
18 efficiency measures in Illinois. The orders grant
19 the certificates, finding that the applicants meet
20 requirements. Are there any objections to
21 considering these items together and approving the
22 orders?

1 (No verbal response.)

2 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the orders
3 are approved.

4 Moving on to our gas items. Item G1
5 concerns MidAmerican's filing to make minor
6 housekeeping changes to its gas service tariff
7 pages. Commission staff recommends not suspending
8 the filing. Are there any objections to not
9 suspending the filing?

10 (No verbal response.)

11 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the filing is
12 not suspended.

13 Item G2 concerns an order
14 initiating a rulemaking proceeding and authorizing
15 a first notice period for proposed amendments to
16 Part 590 of the Commission's rules. The purpose of
17 the rulemaking is to modify Part 590 of the
18 Commission's rules to reflect and incorporate the
19 most recent revisions to federal regulations
20 governing the minimum safety standards for the
21 transportation of gas and for pipeline facilities.
22 Are there any objections to approving the order?

1 (No verbal response.)

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

4 Item G3 concerns Liberty's request
5 to reconcile revenues under its Rider Gas
6 Uncollectable Adjustment or Rider GUA for 2018.
7 The order approves the reconciliation as set in the
8 appendix to the order, finding that the cost during
9 the reconciliation period were prudently incurred.
10 Are there any objections to approving the order?

11 (No verbal response.)

12 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is
13 approved.

14 Item G4 concerns Docket 20-0722,
15 which is Nicor Gas' request for an approval of an
16 alternative rate regulation program under Section
17 9-244 of the Public Utilities Act for a new pilot
18 program. The proposed pilot program would allow
19 renewable natural gas production facilities to
20 interconnect with Nicor's system and place into
21 effect Rate 81 which would provide allowances
22 covering a portion of RNG facilities'

1 interconnection costs.

2 We have subsequent edits to the
3 order approving Nicor's program, finding that it
4 meets the requirements of an alternative rate
5 regulation program. This RNG pilot allows Illinois
6 to explore innovative approaches to addressing
7 greenhouse gas reduction and sustainable gas
8 production in the gas industry, and presents the
9 Commission with the opportunity to have Illinois
10 join those states that are taking a leading role in
11 furthering the development of RNG as an
12 environmentally beneficial fuel source.

13 According to the American Gas
14 Association, 24 states have some type of program in
15 place to encourage local distribution companies to
16 include RNG in their portfolio of fuel sources.

17 Understanding whether RNG
18 production is viable in northern Illinois, and if
19 it will bring the environmental and local community
20 benefits that have been experienced in other parts
21 of the country, are key learnings needed for the
22 Commission and all stakeholders to assess future

1 regulatory action in RNG.

2 The pilot can help stakeholders
3 assess whether the potential environmental and
4 economic benefits seen in other parts of the
5 country could be replicated in Nicor Gas' service
6 area.

7 The order includes additional
8 requirements for reporting on various aspects of
9 the pilot to ensure that we capture the important
10 and relevant information for the pilot.

11 The edits reduce the overall and
12 per project cap of the proposed investments to
13 reduce the impact on rate payers.

14 Does anyone else have comments
15 before I call the vote?

16 MS. BOCANEGRA: Chair Zalewski, like last
17 time, I have remarks, but I would like to reserve
18 those following the vote.

19 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Okay. So I would move the
20 item. Is there a second?

21 MR. KIMBREL: Second.

22 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Okay. I will now call a

1 roll for approving the edits of the order. If you
2 are in favor of adopting the edits, please say
3 "aye", and if you are opposed, please say "nay".
4 Commissioner Bocanegra.

5 MS. BOCANEGRA: Nay.

6 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Mr. Carrigan.

7 MR. CARRIGAN: Aye.

8 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Mr. Kimbrel.

9 MR. KIMBREL: Aye.

10 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: I'm voting aye. The three
11 ayes have it and the edits are approved. I will
12 now call a roll for approving the order as edited.
13 If you are in favor of approving the order, please
14 say "aye", and if you are opposed, please say
15 "nay". Commissioner Bocanegra.

16 MS. BOCANEGRA: Nay.

17 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Mr. Carrigan.

18 MR. CARRIGAN: Aye.

19 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Mr. Kimbrel.

20 MR. KIMBREL: Aye.

21 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: I vote aye. The three
22 ayes have it and the order as edited is approved.

1 MS. BOCANEGRA: Chair Zalewski, if I may.
2 This is Commissioner Bocanegra for the record. I
3 would like to share some remarks following today's
4 vote.

5 I want to start by saying that I
6 am in favor of Nicor's proposed RNG pilot program.
7 My vote today is not about being opposed to the
8 pilot program itself, but about my disagreement
9 with certain evidentiary findings in the legal
10 analysis conducted in the final order which
11 compelled me to vote nay today.

12 I want to share some observations
13 on my differences with the majority. First, the
14 record, the briefings, and the proposed order were
15 more or less completely devoid of any mention of
16 244(a) and whether Nicor had met its burden under
17 that provision. I think this underscores the
18 importance and the benefit of oral arguments,
19 because it became very evident to me while
20 listening to CUB's pretty impressive presentation,
21 that 244(a) was, in my opinion, a disputed issue.
22 So I was glad to see that the majority adopted my

1 recommendation that a 244(a) analysis needed to be
2 included.

3 However, we have fundamental
4 differences on how to read the evidentiary record,
5 much less what constitutes the record. The
6 majority spends a great deal explaining why Nicor
7 filed under 9-244, but doesn't really address how,
8 if at all, Nicor actually meets its burden under
9 244(a). In contrast, I think what the record does
10 give us is that Nicor's witness testified that this
11 is a form of alternative rate regulation because
12 the costs would be higher under traditional rate
13 regulation. This testimony was unrebutted and
14 unrefuted by any witness offered by any intervenor.
15 To me, that alone is sufficient to satisfy 244(a).

16 Second, I disagree with the
17 majority's decision to lower the investment cap to
18 \$16 million with a \$3.2 million allocation per
19 project, as this too, is not supported by the
20 record. Again, there are fundamental differences
21 in the way in which we choose to read a record,
22 rely on it, and make findings and conclusions from

1 it. Equally important is the rationale the
2 majority provides for this. Given the first record
3 before us proves absolutely nothing to support
4 lowering Nicor's proposed investment cap of \$20
5 million. There was no testimony, nor any exhibit,
6 that could support a seemingly random number of
7 \$3.2 million. And although Nicor's brief on
8 exceptions may have invited the Commission to lower
9 its investment cap, briefs are not part of the
10 record, yet the majority completely ignores some of
11 these basic foundations of evidence. And if we're
12 going to consider both the record and the arguments
13 made at either in briefings or even in oral
14 arguments, then the orders finding that lowering
15 the investment cap will reduce risk to rate payers
16 is also unsupported by the record and the non-
17 record.

18 Nicor indicated several times that
19 the proposed program is of no risk to rate payers.
20 If you recall, Nicor said as much repeatedly during
21 its oral argument. To find it necessary to reduce
22 rate payer risk when we have necessarily agreed

1 that there is no risk, is confusing to me. But
2 more importantly, the statute at issue, 244(b) (1)
3 through (8) does not at all address reducing risk
4 to rate payers. Instead, the statute, with respect
5 to customers and rate payers, discusses lowering
6 rates, substantial and identifiable benefits
7 realized by customers, and, finally, provisions for
8 an equitable sharing of any net economic benefits
9 between the utility and its customers if those
10 arise. Somehow reducing rate payer risk is brought
11 in under the analysis in 244(b)(8).

12 In an odd pivot, the majority
13 moves from saying that the RNG pilot produced no
14 net economic benefits for the company to be shared,
15 which is a statutory element that needs to be
16 addressed, to stating that other economic benefits
17 might accrue yet the risk to rate payers of a \$20
18 million subsidy for interconnection agreement is
19 too great a risk. Which, as noted previously, is
20 not addressed in the statute. The majority offers
21 no statutory basis from bringing this cost-benefit
22 analysis in here or at any point in the analysis.

1 If this is part of the Commission's discretionary
2 powers with respect to the Public Utilities Act,
3 then it should be stated as such and not couched as
4 an unwritten statutory requirement.

5 Equally concerning for me in
6 justifying lowering the \$20 million cap, the
7 majority's finding that Nicor has not satisfied the
8 criteria under 244. The order spends a great deal
9 of time, in fact, finding that Nicor has met all
10 the criteria, only to conclude that they have not.
11 Here, I would have found that because Nicor clearly
12 has met its burden. It is entitled to proceed with
13 the full \$20 million.

14 I just want to conclude by saying
15 that although today's meeting is not subject to the
16 doctrine of res judicata, what we are saying here
17 about not just 9-244, but also about things like
18 RNG and innovation have important consequences.
19 We'd have to recognize that although the Commission
20 may be open to utility innovation, emerging
21 markets, or groundbreaking ideas, we have to do it
22 in a way that adheres to the language drafted by

1 the legislature and the breadth of the authority
2 provided to us under the statute. Thank you.

3 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Thank you. Any other
4 comments?

5 MR. KIMBREL: Yes, Madam Chair, I do.
6 Respectfully, Commissioner Bocanegra, I always
7 appreciate the passion that you have for your
8 positions in our dockets, but I think that your
9 need to be right here is a bit shortsighted, in my
10 opinion. Your fingerprints were all over the edits
11 in this proposal. However, the majority just did
12 not agree with all of your suggestions. As you've
13 expressed, this case represents an enormous
14 opportunity. The bigger picture here is to find
15 multiple approaches and solutions as we strive for
16 a net zero greenhouse gas emissions economy. And I
17 believe we all agree, or had agreed, that this
18 docket is a step in that direction. I'll always
19 respect your position as I will of the other
20 offices, but I'm a bit disappointed that you would
21 attempt to take the majority to task here because
22 we disagreed with a couple of your edits. The

1 opportunity to learn from this pilot is too
2 important to let our egos get involved as each of
3 us compromise to reach an agreement here. That's
4 all I have to share.

5 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Thank you. Any other
6 comments? If not, we will move on to G5. It
7 concerns a billing complaint filed against The
8 Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company. The parties
9 filed a stipulation and joint motion to dismiss,
10 stating that all matters in dispute have been
11 resolved. Are there any objections to granting the
12 joint motion to dismiss?

13 (No verbal response.)

14 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, motion is
15 granted.

16 Item G6 concerns North Shore's and
17 Peoples Gas' request for a limited exemption from
18 meter requirements in Section 501.240 of the
19 Commission's rules in order to facilitate a pilot
20 program to deploy single-path ultrasonic gas
21 meters. The order grants the exemption finding the
22 pilot program technically and economically sound

1 and that it will not compromise the safety,
2 liability, or service obligations of the company.

3 Are there any objections to approving the order?

4 (No verbal response.)

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

7 Items G7 and G8 concern requests
8 for confidential treatment of information in the
9 petitioner's report. The orders grant the
10 protection, finding that the information is highly
11 proprietary and confidential. Are there any
12 objections to considering these items together and
13 approving the orders?

14 (No verbal response.)

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

17 Item G9 concerns Docket 21-0426
18 which is Nicor Gas' petition to issue and file up
19 to \$350 million in long-term debt. The order
20 authorizes the issuances, noting that there are no
21 contested issues in the case. Staff concludes that
22 the issuance of debt will not impair the company's

1 financial strength and is not contrary to public
2 interest. Are there any objections to you
3 approving the order?

4 (No verbal response.)

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

7 Under Telecommunications items,
8 item T1 concerns Spectrotel of Illinois, LLC's,
9 application for a certificate of service authority
10 to provide telecommunications services in Illinois.
11 The order grants the certificate and finds out that
12 the applicant meets the requirements. Are there
13 any objections to approving the order?

14 (No verbal response.)

15 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is
16 approved.

17 Under the Water and Sewer items.
18 Item W1 concerns Utility Services of Illinois'
19 filing proposing rate increases for water and sewer
20 service. The Commission suspended the proposed
21 rate increases on March 4th in order to investigate
22 the filing. The Commission's investigation in this

1 matter has not concluded and it is necessary to
2 extend the period of suspension for a further
3 period of six months. The order re-suspends the
4 filing through January 3rd of 2022. Are there any
5 objections to approving the order?

6 (No verbal response.)

7 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the order is
8 approved.

9 Item W2 concerns Illinois
10 American's application for a certificate of public
11 convenience and necessity to provide water service
12 to certain areas in Logan County. Illinois
13 American is requesting an approval to purchase
14 certain assets of the City of Mount Pulaski in
15 Logan County. Illinois American also requests an
16 approval of the appraiser's engagement agreement
17 for the water system to be acquired. The interim
18 order approves the agreement, finding them
19 reasonable. Are there any objections to approving
20 the interim order?

21 (No verbal response.)

22 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the interim

1 order is approved.

2 Moving on to our miscellaneous
3 items. Item M1 concerns AT&T Illinois and Direct
4 TV's notice of transfer and application to provide
5 video services in the existing AT&T service area
6 footprint and to use, occupy and construct
7 facilities in the public rights-of-way for the
8 delivery of video service. Staff's review
9 concluded that the notice complied with the
10 requirements and recommended granting the
11 authorization requested by the applicants. Are
12 there any objections to granting the service
13 authorization?

14 (No verbal response.)

15 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the
16 authorization is granted.

17 Under petitions for rehearing, item
18 PR1 concerns a petition for rehearing in Docket
19 20-0606 which is Nicor Gas' proposed revenue
20 neutral tariff filing to address issues arising
21 from the storage study. After the Commission
22 entered a final order on May 13th of 2021, the

1 Illinois Competitive Energy Association, the Retail
2 Energy Supplier Association, and the Illinois
3 Industrial Energy Consumers filed an application
4 for rehearing and Illinois Competitive Energy
5 Association and Retail Energy Supply Association
6 also jointly filed a motion to stay. The
7 administrative law judge recommends that the
8 Commission deny the application for rehearing,
9 noting that the joint applicants proposed no new
10 facts or law that need to be considered. The ALJ
11 also recommends that the Commission deny the motion
12 to stay because the moving parties are not likely
13 to prevail on their application for rehearing or
14 any appeals on their merits. Are there any
15 objections to denying the application for rehearing
16 and deny the motion to stay?

17 (No verbal response.)

18 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the
19 application and the motion are denied.

20 Under Other Business, item 01
21 concerns approval of batches, contracts and
22 confirmations under the Illinois Adjustable Block

1 Program and the Solar For All Program. Are there
2 any objections to approving the program
3 administrators submissions?

4 (No verbal response.)

5 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing none, the
6 submission is approved.

7 Item 02 concerns the Commission's
8 post Technical Conference comments to be filed with
9 FERC in Docket Number AD21-12-000 on
10 Electrification and the Future of the Grid. The
11 comments highlight Illinois' efforts in the field
12 of electrification and electric vehicle
13 advancement. The comments are due to be filed at
14 FERC on July 1st. Are there any objections to
15 approving the submission on the Commission's
16 comments?

17 (No verbal response.)

18 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Hearing done, the comments
19 are approved.

20 Item 03 concerns the Commission's
21 comments in FERC Docket Number RM21-14-000, which
22 is FERC's Notice of Inquiry on the Participation of

1 Aggregators of Retail Demand Response Customers in
2 Markets Operated by Regional Transmission
3 Organizations and Independent System Operators.
4 We're going to hold this item for later
5 disposition.

6 This concludes our Public
7 Utilities Agenda. Judge Teague-Kingsley, do we
8 have any other matters to come before the
9 Commission today?

10 MS. TEAGUE-KINGSLEY: No, Madam Chairman.

11 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: Do you, or the
12 commissioners, have any other business to discuss?

13 (No verbal response.)

14 CHAIR ZALEWSKI: I just want to remind again
15 that if customers do receive a disconnection notice
16 and that you can avoid being shut off from service
17 if you act quickly calling your utility and work
18 out a deferred payment arrangement. The utility
19 can also tell you whether you qualify for bill
20 payment assistance to reduce what is owed in
21 arrearages.

22 And then finally, just another

1 resource that the Illinois Commerce Commission
2 stands ready to assist customers navigate their
3 options. The ICC has both English and Spanish
4 speaking consumer counselors who can help you file
5 a complaint Monday through Friday 8:30 to 5:00.
6 The number is 1-800-524-0795. There is also
7 additional information on our ICC website at
8 icc.illinois.gov under the "Consumers" tab.

9 Hearing no other comments and
10 without objection, the meeting is now adjourned.

11 Thank you.

12 (Whereupon, the above-entitled
13 matter adjourned at 12:05 p.m.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22