

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
REGULAR OPEN MEETING
(PUBLIC UTILITIES)
December 13, 2017
Chicago, Illinois

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

- PRESENT:
- BRIEN J. SHEAHAN, Chairman
 - SADZI M. OLIVA, Commissioner
 - MIGUEL DEL VALLE, Commissioner
 - JOHN R. ROSALES, Commissioner
-
- SULLIVAN REPORTING COMPANY, by
Devan J. Moore, CSR
License No. 084-004589

1 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Pursuant to the Open
2 Meetings Act, I call the December 13th, 2017 Regular
3 Open Meeting to order. Commissioners del Valle,
4 Rosales, and Oliva are with me in Chicago. We have a
5 quorum.

6 We have one request to speak this
7 morning. As a reminder, you only have 3 minutes.
8 We'll let you know when you have 2 minutes, 1 minute,
9 and when your time has expired.

10 Please be aware that while the
11 Commission affords the public an opportunity to
12 comment, we will not respond directly to your
13 comments. Your comments will be made part of the
14 record but cannot be relied upon to resolve disputed
15 issues of fact in a contested case.

16 Our first and only speaker is Paul
17 Hammond.

18 Welcome back, sir. Make sure the mic
19 is on.

20 MR. PAUL HAMMOND: Paul Hammond, 511 Beverly,
21 Lake Forest.

22 Let me pass over a sketch to the

1 Commissioners that I believe will help clarify the
2 issue today (tendering).

3 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you.

4 MR. PAUL HAMMOND: There are high voltage poles
5 on private property in Lake Forest and other
6 communities. I've been working this issue for 27
7 years. And the reason this issue has been unresolved
8 for so long is that fixing a splice during a storm
9 condition on an overhead high voltage line should be
10 less than \$200, but Commonwealth Edison's solution is
11 to build a new mile-long underground transmission
12 line for more than \$200,000 but may be as much as
13 \$600,000.

14 The problem is, the residents need a
15 splice for about \$200. The Commonwealth Edison
16 solution is a new mile-long transmission line for
17 more than \$200,000. Their solution is a thousand
18 times more than the cost of the initial problem.

19 It is scary to me that the ICC would
20 accept such a solution from ComEd. ComEd is a
21 monopoly, who proposes a solution that is a thousand
22 times greater than the initial problem. It's an

1 unnecessary tax on everyone that uses those monopoly
2 services. I still believe Commonwealth Edison should
3 maintain all overhead residential high voltage --
4 over 600-volt lines, poles, and other related
5 equipment -- from their utility substation to the
6 utility step-down transformer located on the
7 residential properties, because local residential
8 electricians do not have high voltage equipment that
9 is insulated to those high voltages.

10 The sketch I passed out shows Area A
11 with an easement for ComEd and Area B without an
12 easement for ComEd. Area B is similar to the problem
13 on the east side of Beverly that I explained at the
14 last meeting.

15 There are six homes on Cherokee Road,
16 Timber Road, and Forest Hill Road in Lake Forest that
17 have two high voltage poles that ComEd expects those
18 homeowners to maintain. Those residents have not
19 been notified of their new responsibility. It's
20 strange that they were not invited to the
21 Beverly-ComEd meeting that addressed the same issue
22 of being required to maintain high voltage lines.

1 There are hundreds of examples throughout Lake Forest
2 and other communities with the same problem. The
3 residents of Timber, Forest Hill, and Cherokee Roads
4 have been given preferential treatment.

5 Similar to the residents on the east
6 side of Beverly, ComEd must visit the site to open
7 these switches to isolate the fall after a tree
8 branch falls on that high voltage line. The time to
9 fix a line after a branch falls on the line takes
10 less time than to return a second time to close their
11 switch when the work is done.

12 This morning I filed a complaint with
13 the United States District Court Northern District of
14 Illinois - Eastern Division. And based on the
15 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Title 2, commencing
16 the action, all four members of the Illinois Commerce
17 Commission Board are listed as defendants.

18 Thank you very much for your time.

19 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you, sir.

20 Moving into our Public Utilities
21 Agenda, there edits to our November 24th, 2017
22 Regular Open Meeting.

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

3 (No response.)

4 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the minutes
5 are approved.

6 Moving on to our Electricity Agenda,
7 Item E-1 concerns MidAmerican Energy and
8 Mt. Carmel's reconciliation of revenues collected
9 under fuel adjustment charges.

10 Are there any objections to approving
11 the proposed Order commencing the reconciliation
12 proceedings?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the Order is
15 approved.

16 Item E-2 concerns Ameren's
17 Reconciliation of Revenues collected under its
18 Transmission Service Rider.

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

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the Order is

1 approved.

2 Item E-3 concerns a Petition for
3 Interlocutory Appeal.

4 Is there a motion to affirm the ALJ's
5 decision regarding the Petition to Intervene?

6 COMMISSIONER ROSALES: So moved.

7 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there a second?

8 COMMISSIONER OLIVA: Seconded.

9 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Is there any discussion?
10 Commission del Valle?

11 COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: We were asked to
12 reconsider the Administrative Law Judge's decision to
13 deny the Petition to Intervene. In this proceeding
14 ComEd is seeking approval for recovery of its
15 microgrid pilot and its base rates and earn a profit
16 off of it.

17 ComEd's leadership used the widespread
18 deployment of the microgrids as an important part of
19 their platform of the future and have attempted to
20 persuade the General Assembly to authorize the
21 recovery of the cost for their microgrids.

22 Unable to advance their microgrid

1 proposal in the Future Energy Jobs Act negotiations,
2 they have turned to the ICC. Similar to the approval
3 for the recovery of the online marketplace pilot
4 earlier this month, the Commission is being asked to
5 consider narrow questions about a discrete pilot.
6 And, again, it is a pilot with broad and substantial
7 implications for the definition of utility service
8 and what is recoverable.

9 As part of ComEd's microgrid proposal
10 the Company might recover the cost of owning or
11 leasing solar resources and/or storage including
12 fossil fuel generation for the first time in 22
13 years. These utility proposals presented in the
14 innovation research cannot be accepted at face value
15 or approved with minimal analysis.

16 The initial proposal of ComEd's
17 microgrid pilot involves entry into completely new,
18 potentially competitive, services. The Commission's
19 approval of the pilot must ensure proper pilot
20 design, study design, with clearly defined and
21 meaningful metrics.

22 Any party with expertise in

1 distributed energy resource development in markets
2 aids in the Commission's arrival at a correct and
3 proper pilot study design. Whether an intervenor may
4 participate is discretionary by a rule. This
5 discretion should be exercised to ensure that the
6 Commission is able to assemble a complete factual
7 record as a basis for not only a legally sustainable
8 decision but a correct one.

9 Allowing this intervenor to
10 participate does not offend any of the other
11 considerations under the Commission's standard of
12 discretion and, importantly, benefits the
13 Commission's goal to come to a correct decision.

14 The Petition For Interlocutory Review
15 should be granted, and I will be voting No on the
16 motion.

17 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Thank you, sir.

18 All of those in favor of affirming the
19 ALJ's decision say "aye."

20 (Chorus of ayes.)

21 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Opposed say "nay".

22 COMMISSIONER DEL VALLE: Nay.

1 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: The vote is 3 to 1. The
2 "ayes" have it, and the ALJ's decision is affirmed.

3 Item E-4 concerns a consumer complaint
4 against Green Mountain Energy.

5 Are there any objections to approving
6 the Joint Motion to Dismiss?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the Joint
9 Motion is approved.

10 Item E-5 concerns MPower Energy NJ's
11 application to operate as an alternative retail
12 electric supplier.

13 Are there any objections to approving
14 the proposed Order approving the application?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the Order is
17 approved.

18 Items E-6 through E-121 concern
19 Applications for Certifications to Install Energy
20 Efficiency Measure.

21 Are there any objections to
22 considering these items together and approving the

1 proposed Orders?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the Orders are
4 approved.

5 Moving on to our Gas Agenda, Item G-1
6 concerns various utility Reconciliation of Revenues
7 collected under gas adjustment charges.

8 Are there any objections to approving
9 the proposed Order commencing the Reconciliation
10 Proceedings?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the Order is
13 approved.

14 Item G-2 concerns MPower Energy NJ's
15 application to operate as an alternative gas
16 supplier.

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

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the Order is
21 approved.

22 Moving on to our Telecommunication

1 Agenda, Item T-1 concerns Madison Communications
2 application for to provide cable service in Madison
3 County.

4 Are there any objections to approving
5 the application?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the
8 application is approved.

9 Item W-1 under our Water Agenda
10 concerns Aqua Illinois's petition to approve its
11 asset purchase to operate portions in Will County.

12 Are there any objections to approving
13 the interim Order approving contracts with approved
14 appraisers?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the interim
17 Order is approved.

18 Under our Miscellaneous Agenda we have
19 one. M-1 concerns interest rates to be paid on
20 consumer deposits for 2018.

21 Are there any objections to approving
22 the interest rate set in the proposed Order?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the Order is
3 approved.

4 Item M-2 concerns amendments to Code
5 Part 340.

6 Are there any objections to approving
7 the proposed Order adopting the amendments?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the Order is
10 approved.

11 Under Petitions for Rehearing, PR-1
12 concerns a consumer complaint against Peoples Gas.

13 Are there any objections to denying
14 the Petition for Rehearing?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the petition
17 is denied.

18 We have one other item of Other
19 Business; approval of the report on the Energy
20 Infrastructure Modernization Act's Infrastructure
21 Program and Performance-Based Formula Rate.

22 Are there any objections to approving

1 the report?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, the Order is
4 approved.

5 Judge Kimbrel, do you have any other
6 matters to bring before the Commission this morning?

7 JUDGE KIMBREL: No, Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Commissioners, do any of you
9 have any other business that you'd like to discuss?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN SHEAHAN: Hearing none, and without
12 objection, therefore, the meeting stands adjourned
13 thank you.

14

15 (Whereupon, the above-entitled
16 matter was adjourned.)

17

18

19

20

21

22