

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

BEFORE THE  
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

PUBLIC UTILITY SPECIAL OPEN MEETING

Chicago, Illinois  
December 9, 2013

Met, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 o'clock a.m.

BEFORE:

- MR. DOUGLAS P. SCOTT, Chairman
- MR. JOHN T. COLGAN, Commissioner
- MS. ANN McCABE, Commissioner
- MR. MIGUEL DEL VALLE, Commissioner
- MS. SHERINA E. MAYE, Commissioner

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES, by  
Kathy J. Szotek  
Certified Shorthand Reporter  
Illinois CSR No. 84-4657

1           CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Pursuant to the provisions of the  
2 Open Meetings Act, I now convene a Special Open Meeting  
3 of the Illinois Commerce Commission. With me in Chicago  
4 are Commissioner Colgan, Commissioner McCabe,  
5 Commissioner Del Valle, and Commissioner Maye. I'm  
6 Chairman Scott. We have a quorum.

7           Before moving into the agenda, according to  
8 Section 1700.10 of Title 2 of the Administrative Code  
9 this is the time we allow members of the public to  
10 address the Commission. Members of the public wishing  
11 to address the Commission must notify the Chief Clerk's  
12 Office at least 24 hours prior to Commission meetings.  
13 According to the Chief Clerk's Office we have one  
14 request to speak at today's Open Meeting. It comes from  
15 Mr. Scott Lackey.

16           Mr. Lackey, you'll have -- are you in  
17 Springfield, sir?

18           JUDGE WALLACE: Yes, he is.

19           MR. LACKEY: Yes, sir.

20           CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Mr. Lackey, you'll have three  
21 minutes to speak. And we won't respond or make comments  
22 or respond to what you say, but I just wanted you to  
23 know that up front. So go ahead whenever you're ready.  
24 You'll have three minutes to speak.

25           MR. LACKEY: Good morning, Chairman Scott,

1 Commissioners Colgan, McCabe, Del Valle, and Maye. I  
2 would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak  
3 this morning. I'll keep my remarks brief to respect  
4 your time for other matters on your agenda this morning.  
5 My name is Scott Lackey. I'm the acting District 5  
6 local roads engineer for the Illinois Department of  
7 Transportation.

8           On behalf of the Department I would  
9 respectfully ask that the Commission make a ruling on  
10 Administrative Article AM-1 at its upcoming  
11 December 18th Bench session. This item has previously  
12 been listed in your transportation agenda at the  
13 November 6th as well as December 4th bench sessions.  
14 This request is in reference to Case No. T11-0134, a  
15 joint petition among the City of Urbana, City of  
16 Champaign, and the City of Champaign -- Champaign  
17 County -- excuse me -- seeking authorization to  
18 construct a bridge to extend existing Olympian Drive  
19 Highway over railroad tracks in Champaign County. The  
20 original petition for this project was filed with the  
21 Commission during October of 2011, more than two years  
22 ago. This bridge project is currently programmed for  
23 funding in the Department's fiscal year 2014 Highway  
24 Improvement Program that includes Illinois Jobs Now  
25 funds as well as Federal Service Transportation funds.

1 Illinois Jobs Now funds was signed into law by  
2 Governor Quinn in 2009 to provide funding for  
3 improvements to bridges, roads, and transportation  
4 networks. The Federal Surface Transportation funds are  
5 provided by the Federal Highway Administration for  
6 designation by the Department for specifically targeted  
7 projects not on the National Highway System or, in other  
8 words, projects for counties and municipalities. The  
9 Olympian Drive project was specifically selected by the  
10 Department in 2010 to receive this funding expecting  
11 that the bridge project would be completed within  
12 five years. Based upon the time that has elapsed  
13 through the ICC hearing process, the Department has  
14 urgent concerns with the lending schedule for this  
15 project. I would like to reiterate the points made by a  
16 previous Department motion from September of this year  
17 and that the ideal lending for this project is the  
18 spring of 2004, which is less than 90 days from now.  
19 The Department has made financial commitments for this  
20 project for fiscal year 2014, including the Illinois  
21 Jobs Now funds, and if the project is not lent before  
22 June of 2014 the Department will not meet its financial  
23 obligations to the State of Illinois or to the Federal  
24 Highway Administration. Also, as this project continues  
25 to be delayed the Department expects to have higher

1 costs for this project which will affect all parties  
2 involved. Therefore, the Illinois Department of  
3 Transportation respectfully requests that the Commission  
4 rule on the pending matters and allow the hearing  
5 process to continue. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you, Mr. Lackey.

7 Moving on to today's agenda, Items 1 through 3  
8 can be taken together. These items are complaints  
9 against ComEd as to billing and/or charges and replacing  
10 underground cable. In each case the parties have  
11 settled their differences and filed a Stipulation and  
12 Joint Motion to Dismiss, which ALJ Benn recommends be  
13 granted.

14 Is there a motion to dismiss the complaints?

15 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: So moved.

16 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?

17 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Second.

18 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Moved by Colgan, seconded by  
19 McCabe. All in favor say "aye."

20 ("Ayes" heard.)

21 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is five to nothing. The  
24 motions are granted and the complaints dismissed. We  
25 will use this five to nothing vote through the remainder

1 of today's agenda unless other noted.

2 Item 4 is Docket No. 13-0311. This is Shirley  
3 Funches's complaint against Peoples Gas as to billing  
4 and/or charges in Chicago. It appears the parties have  
5 settled their differences and filed a Stipulation and  
6 Joint Motion to Dismiss which ALJ Benn recommends we  
7 grant.

8 Is there any discussion?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the motion is  
13 granted and the complaint is dismissed.

14 Items 5 and 6 can be taken together. These  
15 items are complaints against ComEd as to billing and/or  
16 charges. In both cases the complainant failed to appear  
17 at the hearing and in each case ALJ Benn recommends  
18 entry of an Order dismissing the proceeding.

19 Is there any discussion?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders are  
24 entered and the proceedings dismissed.

25 Item 7 is Docket No. 13-0632. This is Source

1 Power & Gas' Motion to Withdraw its application for a  
2 certificate of service authority under Section 16-115 of  
3 the Public Utilities Act. ALJ Sainsot recommends we  
4 grant the Motion to Withdraw and dismiss the docket.

5 Is there any discussion?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Motion to  
10 Withdraw is granted and the proceeding is dismissed.

11 Item 8 is Docket No. 13-0634. This is  
12 MidAmerican's application for an Order authorizing the  
13 issuance and sale of up to \$750 million aggregate  
14 principal amount of long-term debt pursuant to  
15 Section 6-102 of the Public Utilities Act. ALJ Sainsot  
16 recommends entry of an Order granting the requested  
17 relief.

18 Is there any discussion?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is  
23 entered.

24 Item 9 is Docket No. 13-0526. This is Onvoy  
25 Voice Services' Application for a certificate of

1 authority to operate as a reseller and facilities-based  
2 carrier of local exchange and interexchange long  
3 distance telecommunication services throughout the state  
4 of Illinois. ALJ Benn recommends entry of an Order  
5 granting the certificate.

6 Is there any discussion?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is  
11 entered.

12 Item 10 is Docket No. 13-0569. This is  
13 Vodaphone Global Enterprise's Application for a  
14 certificate of interexchange authority to operate as a  
15 reseller of telecommunication services throughout the  
16 state of Illinois. ALJ Benn recommends entry of an  
17 Order granting the certificate.

18 Is there any discussion?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is  
23 entered.

24 Item 11 is Docket No. 12-0212. This is our  
25 motion to establish certification requirements



1 applicable to vendors that install electric vehicle  
2 charging stations. Local Union 51 IBEW, AFL-CIO, the  
3 Illinois Chamber of Commerce, Electrical Contractors  
4 Association of City -- Electrical Contractors  
5 Association of the City of Chicago, and Associated  
6 Builders and Contractors of Illinois filed a joint  
7 petition for Rehearing which ALJ Wallace recommends we  
8 grant.

9 Commissioner Del Valle.

10 COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Mr. Chairman, I move to  
11 deny.

12 COMMISSIONER MAYE: I second.

13 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Moved by Del Valle and seconded by  
14 Maye to deny the petition for rehearing. All in favor  
15 of that motion say "aye."

16 ("Ayes" heard.)

17 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Opposed?

18 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: No.

19 COMMISSIONER McCABE: No.

20 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is three to two, and the  
21 motion to deny the rehearing is approved. The rehearing  
22 is denied.

23 Item 12 is Docket No. 13-0192. This is Ameren  
24 Illinois' filing regarding a proposed general increase  
25 in gas rates. This item will be held for disposition at

1 a future Commission proceeding.

2 Item 13 is Docket No. 13-0301. This is  
3 Ameren's Rate MAP, modernization action plan, pricing,  
4 and/or update filing. ALJs Albers and Yoder recommend  
5 entry of an Order approving the reconciliation and rate  
6 decrease. Several offices have edits that they would  
7 like to propose. So we will move through these as we've  
8 done in the past one office at a time. I will start  
9 moving through the offices individually. Many of the  
10 edits that I'm going to propose were done in  
11 collaboration with the other offices, and I really  
12 appreciate their help and thank them for their input and  
13 hard work on this particular case.

14 The first set of edits appears on page 47 of  
15 the PEPO in the Commission conclusion under  
16 miscellaneous operating revenues. We appreciate the  
17 PEPO's decision to adopt the AG's use of a net  
18 transmission distribution allocator to determine the  
19 percentage of proceeds from the sale of microwave  
20 frequencies and that should be attributed to electric  
21 delivery service operating revenues. The edits here  
22 reflect that it is AIC's burden to provide the  
23 Commission with the relevant information to reduce the  
24 correct allocation of these revenues, which they failed  
25 to do in this case which thus results in the Commission

1 finding in support of the ALJ's allocator. So the  
2 decision does not change. There's just some additional  
3 language to support that decision.

4 The second set appears on pages 60 to 62 of  
5 the PEPO in the Commission's conclusion under purchases,  
6 other account 588, and they're meant more to address the  
7 language regarding that and not changing the substantive  
8 decision involved with that particular matter.

9 The third set of edits appears on page 70 of  
10 the PEPO in the Commission's conclusion under other  
11 credit card expenses. They include edits to further  
12 flush out that the AIC witness was unable to testify as  
13 to the policies of AIC that supervisors use in approving  
14 charges. There's some additional language edits as in  
15 the previous set of edits. And with regard to AIC's  
16 claim that the expenses improve the work experience and  
17 should therefore be recoverable, these edits point out  
18 the recoverable expenses should improve the customers'  
19 experience not the other way around.

20 The fourth set of edits appears on page 79 of  
21 the PEPO in the Commission conclusion under sponsorship  
22 expenses. We stressed to AIC and other utilities that  
23 we have previously asked that they be explicit and  
24 detailed in requesting recovery of just this kind of  
25 expense and once again they failed to provide the

1 parties and the Commission with that kind of  
2 information. Further, the edits conclude that even if  
3 these expenses were recoverable under a different  
4 section, 9-227 for example, AIC has not made a detailed  
5 showing under that provision to allow recovery of the  
6 expenses as well.

7           The fifth set of edits appears on pages 92 to  
8 96 of the PEPO in the Commission conclusion under  
9 advertising and public relations expense. They include  
10 some language edits. Secondly, with regard to expenses  
11 that AIC seeks to recover for the annual report, we  
12 would propose that the Commission disallow the entire  
13 amount. AIC provided the Commission with an arbitrary  
14 60.61 percent and the PEPO chose what admitted was an  
15 arbitrary 25 percent allocation. Again, we believe it  
16 was AIC's burden to provide us with accurate and  
17 detailed information and did not do so. Thus, there  
18 should be no recovery there as well.

19           The next set of edits appears on pages 122 to  
20 123, 131 to 138 of the PEPO and they are meant just to  
21 address the tone and do not change the conclusions  
22 involved therein.

23           And the final set of edits appears on page 143  
24 of the PEPO in the Commission conclusion under balance  
25 and embedded costs to short-term debt including cost of

1 credit facilities. These edits do not change the  
2 conclusion that AIC's affiliation with its generation  
3 affiliate has impacted its risk and cost of capital in  
4 this case but are meant to further flush out the  
5 Commission's opinion that the reports by credit rating  
6 agencies like Moody's and S&P show the utilities  
7 generation affiliate may still impact its risk, credit  
8 rating, or cost of capital.

9 With that I would move for adoption of these  
10 edits. We will separate one of those particular edits  
11 out for the vote, but I would move for the adoption of  
12 all of them at this time.

13 COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner  
15 Del Valle.

16 So for all of those edits -- We have one  
17 additional set of edits that we'll do then afterwards.  
18 So for those particular edits, is there any discussion?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor of those edits vote  
21 "aye."

22 ("Ayes" heard.)

23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Opposed?

24 (No response.)

25 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is five to nothing and

1 the edits are adopted.

2           There is one additional set of edits on  
3 pages 62 and 71 of the PEPO. These edits add Staff's  
4 disallowance of payments for DISH Network and Comcast  
5 for television service category 7 back in and allow AIC  
6 to recover that cost. I believe that the record  
7 provided a fair amount of testimony that discusses that  
8 the cable and satellite services give AIC a better  
9 ability to obtain the most up-to-date information on the  
10 system with regard to local events and weather events  
11 and I agree with that. So I would move that edit as  
12 well. Is there a second?

13           COMMISSIONER MAYE: Second.

14           CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner Maye.

15           Any discussion?

16                           (No response.)

17           CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor of the edits say  
18 "aye."

19                           ("Ayes" heard.)

20           CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Opposed?

21           COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: No.

22           CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is four to one and that  
23 edit is adopted.

24           Moving on, Commissioner Colgan.

25           COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Thank you, Chairman. I

1 propose amendments today to the Commission's conclusion  
2 in the relocation expense, loss on sale, and payroll  
3 uploading account 588 section of the AIC formula rate  
4 case Order. The contested costs at issue are amounts  
5 paid for a loss on sale benefit compensation provided to  
6 eligible new hires or internal transfers if they have to  
7 sell or believe they'll have to sell their residence for  
8 less than the initial purchase price to accept or remain  
9 at the position offered. I do not believe it is  
10 reasonable for ratepayers to cover this benefit.

11 I'm not opposed to the already generous  
12 company relocation policy, which includes moving  
13 expense, hotels, mileage, et cetera. And I understand  
14 that this allowance for the loss of sale provision is  
15 only \$53,000 out of a total of \$550,000 in relocation  
16 expenses, but I believe that employees, especially  
17 employees at a high level of management at AIC, I  
18 believe that they're receiving all these benefits are  
19 more able to bear these expenses than the ratepayers.  
20 It's understandable that a utility would want to hire  
21 and retain experienced and skilled employees; however,  
22 in my opinion AIC did not provide the Commission with  
23 sufficient evidence demonstrating the need for its loss  
24 of sale benefit especially given its already generous  
25 relocation policy. I believe the proposed Order erred

1 in allowing AIC to recover the loss on sale cost and  
2 base rates because I do not believe this benefit should  
3 be funded by AIC ratepayers. Therefore, my edits adopt  
4 Staff's adjustment. And if AIC wants to continue to  
5 provide a premium relocation policy including this loss  
6 of sale issue, I believe it should be done at the  
7 expense of the shareholders, not the ratepayers. So  
8 with that, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I request  
9 your support for these edits and move that they be  
10 approved.

11 CHAIRMAN SMITH: Is there a second?

12 COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner Del  
14 Valle. Is there any further discussion on this  
15 addition?

16 COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: I certainly agree with  
17 Commissioner Colgan. I'm sure there are lots of folks  
18 out there working who apply for jobs and have to make a  
19 decision to relocate and they're not offered a premium  
20 relocation that includes up to a \$25,000 benefits on the  
21 loss of the sale of their home. I agree that if Ameren  
22 wants to offer this they certainly can, but don't pass  
23 it on to the ratepayers. They in addition to that  
24 didn't offer any evidence demonstrating that candidates  
25 would have turned down the positions if this additional



1 perk had not been offered. And so I second and I fully  
2 agree with Commissioner Colgan.

3 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Further discussion?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The only thing I'll say in  
6 response to that, and I understand the position that  
7 both of you gentlemen are adopting and can relate to it  
8 a little bit, but I look at this the same way that I  
9 look at relocation costs and we made a determination in  
10 many, many, many cases over the years that relocation  
11 costs make sense in terms of trying to attract certain  
12 types of talent to the company. I see this as an  
13 extension of that. And again, I understand the  
14 sentiment that's behind it; but I thought that there was  
15 sufficient evidence to talk about why that policy was  
16 important to the company that was in the act and the  
17 fact that what the market had been during the last  
18 five years, which I think we all understand and know  
19 what that's been like. And so if we're committed to  
20 these companies being able to hire the best people that  
21 are available to them and we've decided in a way that  
22 that provides benefits to the ratepayers for being able  
23 to have the right people in the right places at the  
24 companies and that has been the collective decision that  
25 we've had, it makes sense to me that this part of that

1 especially in these times makes sense as an extension of  
2 what -- and I won't disagree with you of what are  
3 already very generous relocation benefits. So I thought  
4 there was enough in the record to justify that expense  
5 and so for that reason I won't be supporting the  
6 proposed edit.

7           COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Well, I want to be really  
8 clear that I'm not opposed to relocation benefits and I  
9 think the company in this case offers a generous  
10 relocation benefit and I think that that's appropriate;  
11 but when you take this situation beyond that issue and  
12 move it out into the greater economy as a whole which  
13 ratepayers have absolutely no ability to affect or  
14 impact and then expect ratepayers to pick up a balance  
15 on the purchase of a home which is an individual private  
16 decision, it's not a corporate decision, it's not an  
17 Ameren decision. It's not got anything to do with the  
18 ratepayers. It's a personal decision. And from time to  
19 time people make bad decisions in purchasing homes.  
20 There have been a lot of those decisions made. And I  
21 don't think ratepayers should have to pick up that  
22 balance for that decision. And maybe it wasn't a bad  
23 decision at the time, but it's a risk and the economy  
24 went a different direction. And likewise, I know that  
25 if an Ameren employee purchased a home for \$250,000

1 10 years ago and wants to relocate to Decatur to take an  
2 Ameren job and they sell their house for \$500,000, what  
3 happens there? I mean, do the ratepayers get the  
4 benefit of the profit on the house, no. The ratepayers  
5 have to pick up the loss, but they don't get the benefit  
6 of the other direction. So I just think it's -- I want  
7 to be clear that I support the relocation policy. I  
8 think this just goes a little bit too far.

9 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Further discussion?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's moved and seconded to approve  
12 the edit as described by Commissioner Colgan. All in  
13 favor say "aye."

14 ("Ayes" heard.)

15 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Opposed?

16 COMMISSIONER MAYE: No.

17 COMMISSIONER McCABE: No.

18 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is two to three and the  
19 edit is not adopted.

20 Commissioner Maye, further edits.

21 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Thank you, Chairman. The final  
22 Order is different in tone and content than the proposed  
23 Order. As a litigator I definitely understand that in  
24 any adversarial proceeding some level of argument will  
25 exist; however, after reviewing the PEPO we did find it

1 necessary to remove much argumentive and extraneous  
2 language. As a Commissioner I believe we should strive  
3 to keep emotion out of our decision making. While we  
4 may disagree strongly with certain parties' positions, I  
5 believe we should nevertheless approach each issue with  
6 only the facts and pertinent law as well as  
7 professionalism in mind. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are you moving the adoption of the  
9 edits then?

10 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Yes. I move the adoption of  
11 the edits.

12 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?

13 COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Seconded by Commissioner  
15 Del Valle.

16 Further discussion on Commissioner Maye's  
17 edits?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor say "aye."

20 ("Ayes" heard.)

21 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is five to nothing and  
24 the edits are adopted.

25 Is there further edits on this matter?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Then we need a motion to enter the  
3 Order as amended.

4 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: So moved.

5 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Second.

6 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Moved by Commissioner Colgan.  
7 Seconded by Commissioner McCabe. Any discussion on the  
8 Order as amended?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor say "aye."

11 ("Ayes" heard.)

12 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is five to nothing and  
15 the Order as amended is entered.

16 And as always, thank you very much to everyone  
17 who was involved in the work on this particular case,  
18 from the judges and all of the interested parties and to  
19 the Commissioners and their offices as well. There was  
20 a lot of work involved with that and I appreciate  
21 everyone's efforts there.

22 Item 14 is Docket No. 13-0318, this is ComEd's  
23 annual formula rate update and revenue requirement  
24 reconciliation under Section 16-108.5 of the Public  
25 Utilities Act. This item will be held for disposition

1 at a future Commission proceeding.

2 Item 15 is Docket No. 13-0387. This is  
3 ComEd's filing regarding revenue-neutral tariff changes  
4 related to rate design. This item will be held for  
5 disposition at a future Commission proceeding, as will  
6 Item 16, which is Docket No. 13-0546, the Illinois Power  
7 Agency's petition for approval of the 2014 IPA  
8 procurement plan pursuant to Section 16-111.5(d)(4) of  
9 the Public Utilities Act. This item again will be held  
10 for disposition at a future Commission proceeding.

11 Judge Wallace, is there any other matters to  
12 come before the Commission today?

13 JUDGE WALLACE: No, Mr. Chairman, that's all.

14 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Thank you. We will see everybody  
15 next week; and pack a lunch, that will be a long one.  
16 Thank you everyone. Have a good day.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS )  
2 COUNTY OF COOK ) SS.

3

4 Kathy J. Szotek, being first duly sworn, on  
5 oath says that she is a Certified Shorthand Reporter and  
6 Notary Public, doing business in the City of Chicago,  
7 County of Cook and the State of Illinois;

8 That she reported in shorthand the proceedings  
9 had at the foregoing Meeting;

10 And that the foregoing is a true and correct  
11 transcript of her shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid  
12 and contains all the proceedings had at the said  
13 Meeting.

14

15

16

\_\_\_\_\_  
KATHY J. SZOTEK, CSR

17

18 CSR No. 084-004657

19

20 SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO  
21 before me this 12th day of  
22 December, A.D., 2013.

21

22

23

\_\_\_\_\_  
NOTARY PUBLIC

24

25