

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 MEETING
PUBLIC UTILITY
Wednesday, November 18, 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 EDWARDS, 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
2 to proceed in Springfield?

3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SMITH: Yes, we are,
4 Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Pursuant to the Open Meetings
6 Act, I call to order the November 18, 2015 Bench
7 Meeting of the Illinois Commerce Commission.

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

11 We have no requests to speak.

12 Moving on to our Public Utility
13 Agenda, we have no Minutes to approve today.

14 Item E-1 concerns updates to Ameren's
15 tariffs complying with the new Illinois
16 Administrative Code Part 280.

17 Are there any objections to not
18 suspending the filing?

19 (No response.)

20 Hearing none, the filing is not
21 suspended.

22 Items E-2 and 3 concern various

1 complaints filed against ComEd.

2 Are there any objections to
3 considering these items together and granting the
4 Joint Motions to Dismiss?

5 (No response.)

6 Hearing none, the Joint Motions to
7 Dismiss are granted and the complaints are
8 dismissed.

9 Item E-4 concerns a complaint filed
10 against Ameren. Are there any objections to
11 granting the Motion to Dismiss?

12 (No response.)

13 Hearing none, the motion is granted
14 and the complaint is dismissed.

15 Item E-5 concerns the Commencement of
16 Reconciliation Proceedings regarding MidAmerican's
17 Fuel Adjustment Charges.

18 Are there any objections to approving
19 the proposed Order?

20 (No response.)

21 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

22 Item E-6 concerns Illinois Department

1 of Transportation's Petition to Authorize Use of
2 Eminent Domain.

3 Are there any objections to approving
4 the proposed Order?

5 (No response.)

6 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

7 Item E-7 concerns SmartEnergy
8 Holdings' Application for a Certificate of Service
9 Authority.

10 Are there any objections to approving
11 the proposed Order?

12 (No response.)

13 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

14 Item E-8 concerns CMC Electric's
15 Application for Certification of an Installer of
16 Distributed Generation Facilities.

17 Are there any objections to approving
18 the proposed Order?

19 (No response.)

20 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

21 Item E-9 concerns a Joint Petition for
22 Approval of Amendment No. 2 to the Service Area

1 Agreement between EIEC and Ameren Illinois.

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

4 (No response.)

5 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

6 Items E-10 through 14 concern various
7 Joint Petitions for Approval of Residential Customer
8 Releases.

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 Item E-15 involves Ameren's Request to
15 Authorize the Issuance of up to \$200 million in
16 principal amount of Senior Secured Notes.

17 Are there any objections approving the
18 proposed Order?

19 (No response.)

20 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

21 Moving on to our Gas Agenda, Item G-1
22 concerns Peoples Gas' motion to modify its Gas

1 Tariff to comply with Code Part 280.

2 Are there any objections to not
3 suspending the filing?

4 (No response.)

5 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

6 Item G-2 concerns North Shore Gas'
7 Filing to Modify its Gas Tariff to Comply with Code
8 Part 280.

9 Are there any objections to not
10 suspending the filing?

11 (No response.)

12 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

13 Item G-3 concerns a penalty assessed
14 to Peoples Gas for violation of the Illinois Gas
15 Pipeline Safety Act.

16 Commissioner del Valle, I believe you
17 have some questions.

18 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Yes. Thank you,
19 Mr. Chairman.

20 I believe Mr. Smith is available to
21 answer questions.

22 MR. BEYER: This is Gene Beyer and not

1 Matt Smith of the Pipeline Safety Program.

2 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Good morning.

3 MR. BEYER: Good morning.

4 Commissioner del VALLE: Gene, we discussed this
5 at length yesterday, and, as I indicated to you, I
6 have a couple of questions.

7 We did forward some questions to you
8 and you indicated that you will get a response to
9 us, because at the time Mr. Smith wasn't available,
10 but let me ask you these three questions, and if you
11 don't have a response, I will be glad to wait for a
12 written answer when it's possible.

13 In the March 24th letter the company
14 indicates it will modify the engineering basis for
15 the blocking procedure. The question is how has
16 Staff confirmed that the new engineering procedures
17 satisfies the intent of Staff's corrective action
18 number three?

19 MR. MATT SMITH: This is Matt Smith, and I can
20 answer that by saying that on July 31st 2015 Peoples
21 Gas submitted a letter to us that included new
22 procedures and with that the attachments had the

1 procedure that engineering basically included the
2 weight of the thrust log and the pressure of the
3 exhibit on the end cap, and this clearly identified
4 that the new procedure met the requirement.

5 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: You say the new
6 procedure met the requirement, but this case before
7 us demonstrates that the procedures surrounding the
8 blocking mechanism is not adequate. This issue was
9 brought up after the first case. I'm talking about
10 the case that led to a death; is that correct?

11 MR. MATT SMITH: These procedures -- the
12 procedures that were in place when this incident
13 occurred were adequate. The problem that we
14 identified is that they failed to follow the
15 procedures. There was an issue, and the supervisor
16 and personnel they did reference in one of the
17 letters inadequate procedures, but that was
18 referencing a shutdown procedure instead of a
19 locking and braking procedure.

20 So their letter did appear to kind of
21 confuse the situation by talking about a different
22 procedure that was inadequate.

1 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: So what mechanisms do we
2 have in place for ensuring ongoing compliance?

3 MR. MATT SMITH: Currently what we would do is to
4 conduct field audits and construction audits at
5 Peoples Gas in Chicago to verify that the procedures
6 are followed as they evolve. That is the mechanism
7 that we are using.

8 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Again, if Peoples agreed
9 with Staff's recommendations and penalties as
10 recorded in the letter dated April 29, 2015, that
11 was the \$200,000 penalty amount as well as the
12 implementation of four out of five recommendations,
13 can you explain why we are seeing this more than six
14 months later if there's a general agreement? Staff
15 had reached the agreement with Peoples and Peoples
16 and indicated they were ready to pay the fine.

17 MR. BEYER: This is Gene Beyer. Allow me to
18 address that. By getting these matters in before
19 you for your action is ultimately my responsibility.

20 I think our track record for previous
21 submissions involve them timely, and I have no doubt
22 we are going to be timely down the road.

1 For this one, for whatever reason, I just didn't
2 submit in a timely manner.

3 Again, that's not indicative of past
4 or future practice, and I believe I could have
5 gotten it to you probably the July Bench Session. A
6 few months late isn't acceptable. I will make sure
7 that I correct that. That is primarily my
8 responsibility to get it on the Bench.

9 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

11 Are there any objections to approving
12 the proposed Order?

13 (No response.)

14 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

15 Items G-4 and 5 involve complaints
16 filed against Peoples Gas regarding billing in
17 Chicago.

18 Are there any objections to
19 considering these items together and approving the
20 parties' Joint Motions to Dismiss?

21 (No response.)

22 Hearing none, the motions are granted.

1 Item G-6 concerns an Order Initiating
2 an Investigation Concerning Alleged Violations of
3 Section 5-202.1 of the Public Utilities Act.

4 Today the ICC will initiate a formal
5 investigation into whether Peoples Gas and its
6 parent companies knowingly misrepresented or
7 withheld material facts to the Commission concerning
8 the estimated long-term cost of the Accelerated
9 Replacement Program.

10 While the Commission must refrain from
11 prejudging the case, the allegation first raised by
12 an Illinois Commerce Commission auditor is serious
13 and goes to the fundamental issue of public trust
14 and integrity of companies that provide vital
15 service to Illinois ratepayers.

16 Since 2013, the Commission has worked
17 diligently with the Attorney General, CUB, and
18 others to oversee this necessary public works
19 project, and we welcome their continued interest and
20 participation.

21 I also would like to thank our Staff
22 for their thoughtful and vigilant work over the

1 years. The Commission will ensure that Peoples Gas
2 is forthcoming and that the process is transparent.

3 Today's action will provide all
4 parties the opportunity to seek answers the
5 Commission and public deserve.

6 I move that we approve the Initiating
7 Order.

8 Is there a second?

9 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Seconded.

10 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: I believe we have some
11 discussion. Commissioner del Valle.

12 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
13 I believe the most important question to be answered
14 is whether the Commission was knowingly misled in
15 the merger proceeding. The Initiating Order before
16 us purposefully avoids this question.

17 The Attorney General and CUB petition
18 that was filed last week asks the question whether
19 the Commission was knowingly misled in the 14-0496
20 Merger Docket and the May 20, 2015 Open Meeting.
21 This Initiating Order dismisses that petition.

22 In its place this Initiating Order

1 states: "It is, therefore, ordered that, pursuant
2 to Section 5-202.1 and 10-101 of the Public
3 Utilities Act, a proceeding of a specified scope and
4 duration be initiated to determine whether Peoples
5 Gas, Integrys or WEC or any employee, agent or
6 representative thereof knowingly misled or withheld
7 material information from the Commission at its May
8 20, 2015 Open Meeting." That's it.

9 The Merger Docket has been
10 specifically excluded from the scope. While the
11 Initiating Order directs Peoples and Wisconsin
12 Energy Corporation to provide a broad range of
13 information, if that information is not directly
14 related to the May 20, 2015 Open Meeting, it is
15 immaterial and falls outside the scope of this
16 investigation.

17 By reducing the scope of this
18 investigation to exclude an 11-month proceeding and
19 only include a 30-minute Open Meeting, the
20 Commission is disregarding the most important
21 question and redirecting the focus to whether two
22 individuals made knowing misrepresentations

1 specifically at the May 20, 2015 Open Meeting.

2 Staff's report and the Initiating
3 Order names Wisconsin Energy and its agents as part
4 of the investigation, despite the fact that
5 Wisconsin Energy did not own Peoples Gas at the time
6 of the May 20 meeting and had no legal authority,
7 liability, responsibility over the AMRP program, its
8 costs or representations thereof at that time.

9 Wisconsin Energy and its agents were,
10 however, parties to and witnesses to an ongoing
11 proceeding, and their representations in that
12 proceeding are relevant to the underlying question
13 of whether the Commission was knowingly misled.

14 I'm afraid that by initiating this
15 investigation and dismissing AG/CUB's petition, we
16 are frustrating the purpose of a Section 5-202.1
17 investigation, which is to root out knowing
18 misrepresentations that impedes the Commission's
19 ability to exercise its duties under the Act.

20 The Attorney General and CUB's
21 petition spells out the scope and breadth of such an
22 investigation. This Initiating Order does not.

1 I had proposed a change to this
2 Initiating Order that would have addressed the
3 concerns I have just outlined; however, it was
4 refused by a simple majority. Instead, we have an
5 Initiating Order for a proceeding whose scope is
6 excessively limited, and dismisses the AG/CUB
7 petition which would have allowed the Commission to
8 get at the truth of whether we were misled in the
9 merger docket.

10 I, therefore, cannot vote to accept
11 this Initiating Order and will be voting no.

12 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

13 Commissioner Edwards, I believe you
14 would like to make a comment.

15 COMMISSIONER MAYE EDWARDS: I do. Thank you,
16 Mr. Chairman.

17 I echo the comments and definitely
18 speak to the seriousness of the allegations.

19 I would like to briefly add though
20 that given the history and the ongoing nature of
21 this issue, time is of the essence and I'm confident
22 that the investigation will lead to a fair and

1 expeditious resolution of this important matter.

2 I just want to stress that I do hope
3 we can move forward quickly, efficiently, and to use
4 as little of the resources of our consumers as
5 possible. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you, Commissioner.

7 Commissioner McCabe.

8 COMMISSIONER McCABE: While I share some of
9 Commissioner del Valle's concerns, I support this
10 investigation to determine whether the Commission
11 was misled about the estimated long-term cost of
12 Peoples' Accelerated Main Replacement Program, or
13 AMRP.

14 Staff's report and the proposed Order
15 calls for information to be provided within 14 days
16 and the inquiry to be completed within 180 days.

17 Given the recent notice of a
18 \$8 billion AMRP cost estimate and the findings by
19 Liberty, the larger issues, which will not be
20 resolved in this investigation, are (1) how to
21 handle pre-merger cost overruns and possible
22 mismanagement in future rate case and QIP dockets

1 and (2) how to refocus and restructure the AMRP's
2 goals and timelines to ensure safety and minimize
3 rate impacts on Peoples' customers. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you.

5 Commissioner Rosales.

6 COMMISSIONER ROSALES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
7 It is extremely concerning when we hear allegations
8 that parties before us have made misrepresentations
9 to the Commission.

10 As a regulatory body, we can only make
11 decisions based on the information that is put
12 before us. It is our job to ensure that Illinois
13 utility customers receive adequate, efficient,
14 reliable, environmentally safe, and least cost
15 service, and that job is virtually impossible when
16 the parties involved do not give us all of the
17 information necessary to make a sound decision.

18 I want to be clear, we will not
19 tolerate such behavior from parties before this
20 Commission, and we plan to do a thorough and fair
21 investigation into these allegations.

22 If our investigation reveals that the

1 parties involved made misrepresentations to the
2 Commission, there will be repercussions.

3 During this process, we expect all
4 parties involved to cooperate fully and to be
5 forthcoming with information that we request.

6 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you.

8 Is there any other discussion?

9 (No response.)

10 All those in favor, say aye.

11 Aye.

12 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Aye.

13 COMMISSIONER MAYE EDWARDS: Aye.

14 COMMISSIONER ROSALES: Aye.

15 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Opposed, say nay.

16 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: No.

17 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: The vote is 4 to 1 and the
18 motion is approved.

19 Item T-1 involves a complaint filed
20 against AT&T regarding billing in Oak Park.

21 Commissioner Edwards, I believe
22 you have a question for the ALJ.

1 COMMISSIONER MAYE EDWARDS: I do. Thank you.

2 So in reading this Order, I see the
3 complaint was filed on June 22nd of this year and
4 between that date and October 6th there was quite a
5 bit of motion practice, and between June and October
6 is not necessarily a long time, but my concern was
7 there was, as I said, motion practice after motion
8 practice, then the case was dismissed for want of
9 jurisdiction.

10 So my concern is if you could just
11 walk me through the process of when the complaint
12 was filed and then the Order.

13 JUDGE CARDONI: Sure, Commissioner.

14 As you stated, the complaint was filed
15 by Ms. Pierce on June 22nd of this year, and I sent
16 a notice for a hearing about a month later on June
17 25th. The company filed a Motion to Dismiss on June
18 26th, and so I continued the status until July 28th,
19 a week later, to allow for a response by the
20 complainant and a reply by the company later that
21 month.

22 I was not present on the July 28th

1 hearing. ALJ Jorgenson covered for me. I had my
2 child that day. And at that hearing the complainant
3 represented that she had not received the Motion to
4 to Dismiss, so ALJ Jorgenson gave an additional
5 month for her to respond and then reply.

6 During that time period, Ms. Pierce
7 had some difficulty making her filings to the
8 Clerk's Office and there was a lot of back and forth
9 between her, and the Clerk's Office, and Judge
10 Jorgenson about procedurally how to make those
11 accurate. So by the time the complaint or the
12 responses were completed to that Motion to Dismiss,
13 it was October 2nd.

14 ALJ Jorgenson filed her proposed Order
15 on October 6th, and then there were no exceptions or
16 replies to the exceptions, and then when I returned,
17 I handled the proposed Order at that time.

18 COMMISSIONER MAYE EDWARDS: I want to be clear.
19 I don't have an issue with it so long as it sounds
20 reasonable. My only issue is that for this case to
21 settle and ultimately dismiss for want of
22 jurisdiction, that's not something that could have

1 been determined in June when we received the
2 complaint?

3 MS. CARDONI: When we received the complaint,
4 keep in mind it's a one-page-kind-of form that
5 complainant fills out and they only have the top
6 portion to handwrite usually what that issue is.

7 A lot of times we don't really have a
8 good sense of what that complaint is until we get
9 though the first status hearing. It said
10 in Ms. Pierce's complaint that it was an issue with
11 her 1495 Internet service, and, of course, that does
12 look like it would be something that we don't deal
13 with here at the Commission, but until we have that
14 first status, a lot of times we find out the
15 complainant has an issue with overbilling by a
16 utility, but then we get to hearing and there's a
17 tampering issue or a mixed-meter issue. We don't
18 have full information until we have that first
19 status hearing.

20 So in this case I think it was
21 appropriate to give some time to figure out what the
22 real issue was even though the company did file a

1 Motion to Dismiss right away.

2 COMMISSIONER MAYE EDWARDS: But then when you got
3 to the status hearing, you were able to get more
4 information -- I can't recall if you were at a
5 status hearing or not at that point in time -- then
6 it wasn't enough information to determine you have
7 jurisdiction?

8 MS. CARDONI: Not completely, and certainly we
9 wanted to afford Ms. Pierce due process. She filed
10 a complaint and there was a Motion to Dismiss and
11 she hadn't really responded at all to that Motion to
12 Dismiss, so it seemed reasonable to give her that
13 time to reply, and she did, in fact, file two
14 replies to that Motion to Dismiss.

15 COMMISSIONER MAYE EDWARDS: It just seems to me
16 if they're in the actual commission of due process,
17 you should be able to respond, but if it's a
18 procedural issue that's not in your jurisdiction, I
19 guess I'm not sure, and, again, I have never
20 practiced before the Commission. I'm not an
21 administrative law judge, and it just seemed to
22 me -- I know that over at the Daley Center this

1 would never work. At the time the complaint is
2 filed and there's no jurisdiction, there would not
3 be several briefs, you know, even for a defendant.
4 I mean, she's spent -- I know she was pro se, but
5 she still spent time going back and forth only to
6 determine that we were not the correct venue.

7 JUDGE CARDONI: Ultimately, I agree with you,
8 Commissioner, that there was some back and forth and
9 there was some time spent, but, you know, the
10 company had laid out their issue in the Motion to
11 Dismiss and why there was no jurisdiction for the
12 Commission.

13 We still allow Ms. Pierce to respond
14 to those specific issues that the company brought up
15 and I'm not certain that she would have had the
16 wherewithal to do that at the status hearing. I
17 think more about what her response would be.

18 COMMISSIONER MAYE EDWARDS: So it's the standard
19 procedure of this Commission -- of our
20 Administrative Law Division even if we determined
21 from the start from looking at the complaint that we
22 don't have jurisdiction, that's standard procedure

1 to allow briefing?

2 MS. CARDONI: I'm not sure if it's the standard
3 procedure. I think every complaint is taken as it
4 needs to be. I think there needs to be a lot of
5 leeway. We are dealing with a lot of different
6 kinds of complainants with a lot of different
7 abilities to make responses and appear and
8 participate using our rules.

9 I think we always err on the side as
10 much due process as possible. I think that was done
11 in this case.

12 COMMISSIONER MAYE EDWARDS: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Other questions?

14 Commissioner del Valle.

15 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: I agree totally with
16 Commissioner Edwards, because I had the same kind of
17 questions when I read this, and I have asked this
18 question before. How many individuals that file
19 with us have legal representation? What's the
20 percentage?

21 JUDGE CARDONI: I would think it would be very
22 slim.

1 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Very slim. So most
2 represent themselves?

3 JUDGE CARDONI: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: How are they suppose to
5 figure all this out and know what the different
6 hoops are? I know it's got to be frustrating for
7 many that are up against lawyers, on top of that,
8 too, then at the end of it all say, well, you don't
9 have jurisdiction. After having jumped through all
10 kinds of hoops, I think it just, you know, leads me
11 to thinking there has to be a better way, so I just
12 want to support us looking for a better way.

13 JUDGE KIMBREL: I would just comment that the
14 complainants are not very sophisticated, so we do
15 give them more leeway.

16 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: I appreciate that, I
17 really do, and I guess if we are going to make it
18 better to be one that could eventually benefit the
19 complainant, but when it's just obvious that we
20 don't -- I wish we had jurisdiction, because we
21 would see a ton of those complaints.

22 I know a lot of people talk to me all

1 the time about problems they have with AT&T, and
2 U-verse, and all kinds of things, and so I wish we
3 had jurisdiction. We don't. So we ought to let it
4 be known from the beginning when it's kind of
5 obvious. I'm speaking as a non-lawyer.

6 COMMISSIONER MAYE EDWARDS: I speak as a lawyer.
7 I agree with you.

8 JUDGE KIMBREL: I just think it's -- when a
9 company's engaged in motion practice, the
10 complainants are at a complete disadvantage, and
11 oftentimes we know when we have a reasonable course,
12 but we still try to give them the leeway to file
13 appropriately to have their day in court, but --

14 COMMISSIONER MAYE EDWARDS: I see what you are
15 saying, but to me if it's only to say that you don't
16 have jurisdiction anyway, that just doesn't sit well
17 and maybe it was something we can discuss
18 procedurally somehow. Outside of this, this doesn't
19 make sense.

20 JUDGE KIMBREL: We are certainly willing to
21 follow recommendations.

22 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Are there any comments?

1 (No response.)

2 Are there any objections to approving
3 the proposed Order dismissing the complaint?

4 (No response.)

5 Hearing none, the Order dismissing the
6 complaint is approved.

7 Item T-2 involves the Village of
8 Barrington's Petition for Approval of a Modification
9 to its existing 9-1-1 Emergency Telephone System.

10 Are there any objections to approving
11 the proposed Order?

12 (No response.)

13 Hearing none, the Order is approved.

14 Item W-1 concerns Illinois-American
15 Water's Application seeking Approval to Purchase the
16 Water System Assets of the Village of Ransom and
17 seeking issuance of a Certificate of Public
18 Convenience and Necessity to provide water service
19 to the areas in La Salle County.

20 Are there any objections to approving
21 the Interim Order?

22 (No response.)

1 Hearing none, the Interim Order is
2 approved.

3 We have an item under other business
4 regarding the Approval of the Procurement
5 Administrator's Recommendations on Selection of
6 Winning Bids as set forth in the Procurement
7 Administrator's Confidential Report.

8 Is there a motion to approve the
9 recommendations?

10 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: So moved.

11 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there a second?

12 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Seconded.

13 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Any comments or questions?

14 (No response.)

15 All those in favor of approving the
16 recommendation, say aye.

17 (No response.)

18 Opposed, say nay.

19 (No response.)

20 The vote is 5 to 0 and the
21 recommendations are approved.

22 Judge Kimbrel, do we have any other

1 matters to come before the Commission today?

2 JUDGE KIMBREL: There's nothing further.

3 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Commissioners, do we have any
4 business to discuss?

5 COMMISSIONER MAYE EDWARDS: Mr. Chairman, if I
6 could make a comment, I just would like to put in
7 front of you tomorrow's policy forum. I know we
8 don't like to admit it but winter is coming. The
9 first half of the policy session will be winter
10 readiness and we'll have our RTOs, as well as our
11 gas utilities, represented on that, and the second
12 half of the policy forum will be on resource
13 adequacy which is a very large issue not just in the
14 Midwest but specifically for Illinois. So we look
15 forward to you all here tomorrow for that.

16 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you.

18 Without objection, we are adjourned.

19 (Whereupon, the above matter
20 was adjourned.)

21

22