1	BEFORE THE ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
2	ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
3	PUBLIC UTILITY REGULAR OPEN MEETING
4	
5	
6	
7	Chicago, Illinois October 25, 2011
8	Met, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 a.m.
9	
10	BEFORE:
11	MR. DOUGLAS P. SCOTT, Chairman (via videoconference)
12	MS. LULA M. FORD, Commissioner
13	MS. ERIN M. O'CONNELL-DIAZ, Commissioner
14	MR. SHERMAN J. ELLIOTT, Commissioner
15	
16	MR. JOHN T. COLGAN, Acting Commissioner (via videoconference)
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by
22	Auhdikiam Carney, CSR License No. 084-004658

1 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Pursuant to the provisions of 2 the Illinois Open Meetings Act, I now convene a 3 regular Open Meeting of the Illinois Commerce 4 Commission. With me in Springfield is Acting 5 Commissioner Colgan, in Chicago are Commissioners 6 Ford, O'Connell-Diaz, and Elliott, I'm Chairman 7 Scott.

8 We have a quorum.

Before moving into the agenda, 9 10 according to Section 1700.10 of Title II of the 11 Administrative Code, this is the time we allow members of the public to address the Commission. 12 13 Members of the public wishing to address the 14 Commission must notify the Chief Clerk's Office at 15 least 24 hours prior to the Bench Session. According to the Chief Clerk's Office, we have no request to 16 17 speak at today's session.

Moving into the agenda, Item 1 today is Docket No. 11-0661. This is American Transmission Company's Petition for authority to construct a new 345,000 volt transmission line in Lake County. Before us today is a motion made by Staff to extend

1	the statutory deadline for Commission action in this
2	Docket. ALJ Teague recommends granting the motion.
3	Is there any discussion?
4	COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Just a real quick
5	question for Judge Teague.
6	The additional 75 days then, that's
7	the statutory deadline?
8	JUDGE TEAGUE. Yes.
9	COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Thank you.
10	CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any further discussion?
11	(No response.)
12	Is there a motion to grant our request
13	an extension?
14	COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: So moved.
15	ACTING COMMISSIONER COLGAN: So moved.
16	CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?
17	COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Second.
18	CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded.
19	All in fair say "aye."
20	(Chorus of ayes.)
21	Any opposed?
22	(No response.)

1 The vote is 5-0 and the request is granted. We will use a 5-0 vote for the remainder of 2 today's agenda unless otherwise noted. 3 4 Item 2 is Docket No. 09-0269. This is 5 PlatinumTel Communications' application for designation as an eligible Telecommunications б Carrier. ALJ Riley recommends entry of an Interim 7 8 Order finding that PlatinumTel provide commercial mobile radio services using a combination of its own 9 10 facilities and resold services. 11 Is there any discussion? 12 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Chairman, if I 13 might inquire a simple question. 14 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Sure. 15 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Judge Riley, with 16 regard to the -- this is obviously an Interim Order so there will be -- in accordance with your memo and 17 your recommendation is that the Staff now will do an 18 investigation relative to this Petition. If there is 19 20 a finding that they do not qualify, is there a refund mechanism for those funds that, I think, will be 21 22 flowing based upon this Interim Order?

JUDGE RILEY: My best answer is, I don't know
 of any refund mechanism.

3 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: So that would be 4 something that we would need to address --JUDGE WALLACE: Commissioner --5 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Yes. б CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Judge Wallace. 7 JUDGE WALLACE: I believe there is a refund 8 mechanism, but I'm not sure how it works at this 9 10 point. 11 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Okay. 12 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is that something that could 13 be dealt with in the final order? 14 JUDGE WALLACE: Yes. COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: I sort of had a 15 16 fundamental question regarding how we make the 17 decision without the review. COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Yes. It's too 18 19 quick.

20 COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: If Staff has not had a 21 full opportunity to review the evidence, then I'm a 22 little troubled by the fact that we're assuming, at

least interim-wise, that there's sufficient evidence
 to make a finding.

JUDGE RILEY: What the Order is intended to do is to try to get the company back on solid economic footing. At the present time the payments have been stopped -- the universal service fund payments have been stopped and the company is in imminent danger of having to close its doors and suspend service, and they have a substantial number of customers.

10 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Okay. I see. 11 JUDGE RILEY: And so what they want to do is 12 just be able take this Order to the FCC and say, We 13 are a facilities-based operation. Please get the 14 universal service fund payments flowing again so we 15 can continue to provide the services. And then Staff can do its investigation with the evidence and the 16 17 testimony and whatever else it needs.

18 COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: But the idea is that the 19 evidence on it's own unrebutted is sufficient, in 20 your mind, to make this finding?

JUDGE RILEY: So far, yes. On an interimbasis, absolutely.

1 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: And Staff has
2 agreed to that to, haven't they?

JUDGE WALLACE: Yes. That's my understanding. COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: In fact, they say that there can be a threshold finding that there is sufficient evidence to find so; but they need to make a more critical analysis in this next proceeding that we'll be doing; correct?

9 JUDGE RILEY: Exactly. But the whole idea too 10 for the present time is to alleviate the economic 11 emergency for the company.

12 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Okay. You know, 13 those universal service funds, there's a lot of money 14 flowing around and they should go to the right 15 players and I think sometimes they don't. So we need 16 to be very cautious. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any further discussion?

18 (No response.)

19 Is there any objection to entering the 20 Interim Order?

21 (No response.)

22 Hearing none, the Interim Order is

1 entered.

Item 3 is Docket No. 11-0597. This is 2 Infotelecom's complaint against Illinois Bell seeking 3 4 interpretation of an Interconnection Agreement. This item has been noticed for discussion purposes. 5 ALJ Riley, would you like to give us a б short briefing -- or not so short depending on what 7 8 you need. JUDGE RILEY: Infotelecom and Illinois Bell 9 10 entered into a garden-variety negotiated agreement. 11 An issue arose as to what rate should be paid by 12 Infotelecom for the termination of this Internet 13 protocol PSPN traffic. Infotelecom saying that it 14 was the reciprocal compensation rate, which is lower than the switched access tariff rate. And what they 15 16 agreed to do was to have Infotelecom pay the lower 17 rate and then calculate on a monthly basis what they would have paid at the higher right and then escrow 18 that amount until the FCC -- to whom they have 19 20 submitted this dispute -- made a ruling. 21 And the dispute now arose as to what

22 is the -- what amount should be escrowed. And

1 Infotelecom is saying, We haven't reach -- the trigger amount was \$500,000 per month. 2 And Infotelecom is saying, We haven't calculated more 3 4 than \$500,000 in any month in any state involved. Illinois Bell is saying this is a cumulative amount 5 and it accumulates month by month over an entire 13 б state region, so there are millions of dollars that 7 8 should be in escrow right now and nothing is in And the written decision that I issued 9 escrow. 10 vesterday finds for Illinois Bell. 11 COMMISSIONER FORD: But in six states they 12 already have \$6.4 million total? 13 JUDGE RILEY: Yeah. There's huge sums of money 14 that Illinois Bell is saying is outstanding. 15 COMMISSIONER FORD: I see. 16 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: So essentially 17 you're waiting on the further briefing on this to give your final recommendation to the Commission? 18 19 JUDGE RILEY: Well, as a matter of fact, no. 20 But the statute says in a Section 13-515 case is that 21 once I've issued my decision -- the memo has a maze

22 of deadlines in it. What happens now is that the

1 party can request a Commission review of the written 2 decision that I issue, and they have five days to do that. And then any party may file a response three 3 4 days after that. So the time is about as tight as 5 can get. And 15 days after the issuance of the written decision, which was yesterday, is November 8. б That is the absolute final date for Commission 7 action. And the statute also says that the 8 Commission can either adopt this decision or write 9 10 its own.

11 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: So we have until 12 November 8th to take action in accordance with the 13 statute?

JUDGE RILEY: Right. And I understand there's a Bench Session on the 2nd and another meeting on the 8th.

17 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: So we'll know by the time of 18 our next session whether or not they filed? They 19 have to file by Halloween.

20 JUDGE RILEY: Exactly. Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Judge, I have a question22 with regard to the multistate issue. The issue

here -- the Commissions in other states were the same as just being a litigator are free to reach different conclusions. I guess the end result, assuming that something of that nature might occur, who is the ultimate arbiter? Is it the FCC? Because if states come to different conclusions, is the ultimate arbiter here the FCC or is it us?

8 JUDGE RILEY: I think it's -- I'm more inclined 9 to believe that it would be us because that's going 10 to determine whether or not the money goes into 11 escrow.

12 COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: If we had two 13 conflicting decisions by states, does it go to the 14 courts or does it go to the FCC?

15 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: I think we've got
16 Mr. Harvey who is the expert on this.

17 MR. HARVEY: Well, expert is a very generous 18 assessment. I believe that the matter would be taken 19 properly to the courts, but that's certainly 20 something we can find out for you and make some sort 21 of filing in the case, if that's going to assist the 22 Commission in reaching their determination.

1 COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: It's a 252 decision. It 2 would seem to me ultimately it's FCC if there's 3 disputes among the states. I'm a little confused 4 about that.

5 MR. HARVEY: Well, the Federal Courts have very 6 often reviewed Section 252.

7 COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: For multistate 8 discrepancies?

9 MR. HARVEY: Well, not even for that, the 10 individual state interpretations of -- terms and conditions of ICAs. I can think of a couple of cases 11 12 where it's happened here where a litigant has gone to 13 the Federal Court seeking some sort of an 14 interpretation of an interconnection agreement. And 15 in some cases the courts have remanded it back to us 16 to the extent that they can; in other cases, they've 17 decided the relevant issues.

There is also, I think, an election remedies issue here. That the aggrieved party might have any of several avenues open to it to vindicate its perceived rights. And we can certainly do some sort of an analysis for the Commission, if that would

1 be helpful.

2	COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: It would be helpful, I
3	think. I'm just trying to figure out where it goes
4	from here. Not that I disagree with any of the
5	conclusions, but I'm just wondering where it went
6	from here.
7	MR. HARVEY: I cannot, however, assure you that
8	that will be accomplished in 5 days. We're a little
9	backed up, but we will get right on that.
10	COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: Understood. Thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Anything further on that
12	issue?
13	(No response.)
13 14	(No response.) Okay. Thank you, Judge Riley.
14	Okay. Thank you, Judge Riley.
14 15	Okay. Thank you, Judge Riley. JUDGE RILEY: Sure.
14 15 16	Okay. Thank you, Judge Riley. JUDGE RILEY: Sure. CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Item 4 is Docket No. 11-0631.
14 15 16 17	Okay. Thank you, Judge Riley. JUDGE RILEY: Sure. CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Item 4 is Docket No. 11-0631. This is PEG Bandwidth's application for a
14 15 16 17 18	Okay. Thank you, Judge Riley. JUDGE RILEY: Sure. CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Item 4 is Docket No. 11-0631. This is PEG Bandwidth's application for a certificates of authority to provide resold and
14 15 16 17 18 19	Okay. Thank you, Judge Riley. JUDGE RILEY: Sure. CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Item 4 is Docket No. 11-0631. This is PEG Bandwidth's application for a certificates of authority to provide resold and facilities based local and interexchange
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Okay. Thank you, Judge Riley. JUDGE RILEY: Sure. CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Item 4 is Docket No. 11-0631. This is PEG Bandwidth's application for a certificates of authority to provide resold and facilities based local and interexchange telecommunications services in Illinois. ALJ Teague

1	It there any discussion?
2	(No response.)
3	Any objections?
4	(No response.)
5	Hearing none, the Order is entered.
б	Item 5 is Docket No. 11-0668. This is
7	Dex One's Petition seeking a waiver for the
8	requirement of Title 83, Section 735.180 sub A, sub
9	1, and sub D of the Administrative Code pursuant to
10	Section 13-513 of the Public Utilities Act. ALJ
11	Riley recommends that the Commission authorize an
12	investigation of the Petition on its own motion based
13	upon Staff's request.
14	I just should note that this was
15	noticed up in the agenda as being for discussion
16	only, but the request that's being made of us or
17	at least the recommendation is that we authorize an
18	investigation of the Petition on our own motion based
19	on Staff's request. So we checked with Judge Wallace
20	and, Judge, you were fine with us being able to take
21	it up as the recommendation is, even though it was
22	noticed up as just being for discussion only

1 purposes?

2	JUDGE WALLACE: Yes. The item is properly
3	listed on the agenda for Commission action. The tag
4	lines are something that we as Staff put up and the
5	Commission would not be bound by our tag lines. An
6	example would be that sometimes we recommended not
7	investigating a tariff, but then the Commission goes
8	ahead and investigates the tariff, things like that.
9	So the tag lines are just something that we as staff
10	put on there and I don't believe they bind the
11	Commission at all.
12	CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thanks. I just wanted to make
13	sure that that was cleared up in case that was a
14	question that anybody had.
15	Is there a discussion on this
16	particular issue?
17	(No response.)
18	Is there a motion to authorize an
19	investigation of the Petition?
20	COMMISSIONER ELLIOTT: So moved.
21	CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?
22	COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Second.

1 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded. All in favor say "aye." 2 (Chorus of ayes.) 3 4 Any opposed? 5 (No response.) The vote is 5-0 and the investigation б is authorized. 7 Item 6 is Docket Nos. 11-0059, 8 11-0141, and 11-0142 consolidated. This item will be 9 10 held for disposition at a future proceeding, but does anyone have questions for ALJ Teague on this item 11 12 today? 13 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: The deadline for 14 that is November 17th? 15 JUDGE TEAGUE: Yes. 16 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: November 17th on one and 17 November 23rd on the other two. 18 JUDGE TEAGUE: Yes. 19 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: Thank you. 20 JUDGE TEAGUE: I just wanted to update the Commission on the number of public comments that have 21 been received in this docket. There have been 19 22

1 public comments received regarding Great Northern's 2 increase, 67 regarding Camelot's and 2 regarding Lake 3 Holiday's. 4 COMMISSIONER FORD: Thank you. 5 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you. Any further discussion on that item б today? 7 8 (No response.) 9 Our final item today is Item 7, which 10 involves pending litigation and we'll go into closed 11 session to address it. 12 Is there a motion to go into closed 13 session? 14 COMMISSIONER O'CONNELL-DIAZ: So moved. 15 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second? 16 COMMISSIONER FORD: Second. 17 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded. 18 All in favor say "aye." 19 (Chorus of ayes.) 20 Any opposed? 21 (No response.) 22 The vote is 5-0 and the Commission

1	will go into closed session. Please let me know when
2	the room is ready in Chicago.
3	(Whereupon at this point pages
4	19 - 30 of the proceedings are
5	contained in a separate closed
6	transcript.)
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	

1 CONTINUATION OF PROCEEDINGS CHAIRMAN SCOTT: In closed session the 2 Commission discussed litigation involving TracFone 3 4 Wireless. I would move to grant Staff its 5 requested authority in this matter. б Is there a second? 7 ACTING COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Second. 8 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's been moved and seconded. 9 10 All in favor say "aye." 11 (Chorus of ayes.) 12 Any opposed? 13 (No response.) 14 The vote is 5-0 and the requested 15 authority is granted. Judge Wallace, is there any other 16 17 matters to come before the Commission today? That's all, Mr. Chairman. 18 JUDGE WALLACE: No. 19 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the meeting 20 stands adjourned. 21 Thank you, Mr. Harvey. 22 MR. HARVEY: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman,