

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

BEFORE THE
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION
REGULAR OPEN MEETING
(PUBLIC UTILITIES)
Springfield, Illinois
Tuesday, June 17, 2014

Met, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 a.m. at 527 East
Capitol Avenue, Springfield, Illinois.

PRESENT:

- MR. DOUGLAS P. SCOTT, Chairman
- MR. JOHN T. COLGAN, Commissioner
- MS. ANN McCABE, Commissioner
- MS. SHERINA E. MAYE, Commissioner
- MR. MIGUEL del VALLE, Commissioner (by video)

MIDWEST LITIGATION SERVICES, by
Angela C. Turner, Reporter
CSR #084-004122

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is everything ready in
3 Chicago?

4 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: We're all set.

5 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Pursuant to the provisions
6 of the Open Meetings Act, I now convene a Regular
7 Open Meeting of the Illinois Commerce Commission.
8 With us in Chicago is Commissioner del Valle. With
9 me in Springfield are Commissioner Colgan,
10 Commissioner McCabe, and Commissioner Maye. I am
11 Chairman Scott. We have a quorum.

12 Before moving into the agenda, according to
13 Section 1700.10 of Title 2 of the Administrative
14 Code, this is the time we allow members of the public
15 to address the Commission. Members of the public
16 wishing to address the Commission must notify the
17 Chief Clerk's office at least 24 hours prior to
18 Commission meetings. According to the Chief Clerk's
19 office, we have no requests to speak at today's
20 meeting.

21 The first item of business on today's agenda
22 is Docket Number 12-0548. This is our reconciliation
23 of revenues collected under Ameren's power
24 procurement riders with actual costs associated with

1 power procurement expenditures. ALJ Yoder recommends
2 entry of an Order approving the reconciliation.

3 Is there a motion to enter the Order?

4 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: So moved.

5 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there a second?

6 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Moved by Commissioner
8 Colgan; second by Commissioner Maye.

9 Is there any discussion?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: All in favor say aye.

12 (Chorus of ayes.)

13 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any opposed?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The vote is five to
16 nothing, and the Order is entered.

17 We will use this five to nothing vote for
18 the remainder of today's Regular Open Meeting agenda
19 unless otherwise noted.

20 Item 2 is Docket Numbers 13-0501 and 13-0517
21 consolidated. This is the People of the State of
22 Illinois' complaint to suspend tariff changes
23 submitted by Ameren and to investigate Ameren's Rate
24 MAPP pursuant to Sections 9-201, 9-250, and 16-108.5

1 of the Public Utilities Act. ALJs Albers and Yoder
2 recommend we grant AIC's request for oral argument
3 and enter an Order clarifying the formula rate
4 process.

5 The request for oral argument has been
6 granted and the Order clarifying the formula rate
7 process will be held for disposition at a future
8 Commission proceeding. We will set a date for oral
9 argument in the near future.

10 Item 3 is Docket Number 13-0546. This is
11 the Illinois Power Agency's Petition for Approval of
12 the 2014 IPA Procurement Plan pursuant to Section
13 16-111.5(d)(4) of the Public Utilities Act. ALJ
14 Wallace recommends entry of an Order on Rehearing.

15 Is there any discussion?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Are there any objections?

18 COMMISSIONER McCABE: I just note there's a
19 few non-substantive edits.

20 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And those will be forwarded
21 to the ALJ following today's meeting.

22 Any further discussion?

23 JUDGE WALLACE: Mr. Chairman.

24 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes.

1 JUDGE WALLACE: It would be helpful if we
2 would get -- it would be helpful if we, the ALJs,
3 would get the edits before, you know. We do
4 appreciate that you actually include them in your
5 vote. Just to avoid any problems on our -- not
6 problems. But, you know, so we won't be accused of
7 anything.

8 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Even non-substantive?

9 JUDGE WALLACE: Non-substantive.

10 We don't -- you know, I think it's just
11 better form. And I guess this is just as good a
12 place as any to bring it up. We would prefer that
13 you vote on them or at least all five of you know
14 that they're being made.

15 And if we get a non-substantive -- say
16 here's some non-substantive edits, we have no real
17 way of knowing if all five of you are in on it or
18 not. I mean, it's just a slight concern, and my
19 judges would feel better doing it this way that
20 they're all included in the vote.

21 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Just so I understand,
22 Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Commissioner.

24 COMMISSIONER MAYE: So you're saying that we

1 would get you the non-sub edits, let's say, the day
2 before?

3 JUDGE WALLACE: If you want to make them
4 like you do your other ones just so that you all five
5 know.

6 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Oh, on the Bench that we
7 talk about them?

8 JUDGE WALLACE: You don't have to talk about
9 them. If you say there are some non-substantive
10 edits and they're included in the Order that is being
11 voted on.

12 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: We could do this a couple
13 of ways. It's probably easier just -- the deadline
14 on this is not until I believe the 5th, so we have
15 one more meeting.

16 JUDGE WALLACE: I am fine. I would actually
17 prefer you go ahead and vote it out. I just --

18 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Just in the future?

19 JUDGE WALLACE: Huh?

20 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: In the future?

21 JUDGE WALLACE: I mean, you brought up there
22 would be some non-substantive edits that would be
23 coming down. That's fine.

24 COMMISSIONER MAYE: I think you're saying

1 can we vote on it?

2 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Just include those in the
3 vote, you're saying?

4 JUDGE WALLACE: Yeah.

5 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Well, let me ask it
6 this way then. Is there any further discussion then?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Is there any objection to
9 the Order with the non-substantive edits in them?

10 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: No.

11 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order on
12 Rehearing with the non-substantive edits is entered
13 then.

14 Thank you for bringing that to our
15 attention, Judge.

16 Item 4 is Docket Number 14-0146. This is
17 Richard Fowler's complaint against ComEd as to
18 billing and/or charges in Roselle. The Complainant
19 has filed a Motion to Dismiss, which ALJ Riley
20 recommends we grant.

21 Is there any discussion?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

24 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the motion is
2 granted and the complaint dismissed.

3 Item 5 is Docket Number 14-0345. This is
4 IDOT's petition on behalf of the People of the State
5 of Illinois for approval of the taking or damaging of
6 certain properties owned by ComEd in Kendall County
7 by exercising the right of eminent domain. ALJ
8 Hilliard recommends entry of an Order granting the
9 requested relief.

10 Is there any discussion?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is
15 entered.

16 Item 6 is Docket Number 14-0134. This is
17 Trademark Merchant Energy LLC's Petition for
18 Withdrawal of its Alternative Retail Electric
19 Supplier Certificate, which ALJ Kimbrel recommends we
20 grant.

21 Is there any discussion?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

24 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is
2 entered.

3 Items 7 through 10 can be taken together.
4 These items are Petitions for Confidential and/or
5 Proprietary Treatment of petitioners' various
6 reports. In each case, the ALJ recommends entry of
7 an Order granting the requested relief.

8 Is there any discussion?

9 (No response.)

10 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders
13 are entered.

14 Items 11 and 12 can be taken together.
15 These items are Applications for Licensure of Agents,
16 Brokers and Consultants under Section 16-115C of the
17 Public Utilities Act. The ALJ in each case
18 recommends entry of an Order granting the requested
19 certificate.

20 Is there any discussion?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Orders

1 are entered.

2 Item 13 is Docket Number 14-0391. This is
3 Park Power LLC's Application for Certificate of
4 Service Authority under Section 16-115 of the Public
5 Utilities Act. ALJ Sainsot recommends entry of an
6 Order granting the requested certificate.

7 Is there any discussion?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

10 (No response.)

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

13 Item 14 is Docket Number 14-0392. This is
14 Ameren's request pursuant to Section 6-102(d) of the
15 Public Utilities Act to incur indebtedness by
16 undertaking the obligation to pay the principal
17 interest and redemption premium, if any, on up to
18 \$300,000,000 principal amount of Senior Secured Notes
19 for the purpose of refunding, redeeming and/or
20 refinancing outstanding evidences of indebtedness.
21 ALJ Von Qualen recommends entry of an Order granting
22 the requested relief.

23 Is there any discussion?

24 (No response.)

1 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

2 (No response.)

3 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is
4 entered.

5 Item 15 is Docket Number 14-0028. This is
6 Nicor's application pursuant to Section 8-104 of the
7 Public Utilities Act for consent to and approval of
8 revised therm savings goals for its Energy Efficiency
9 Plan. ALJ Sainsot recommends entry of an Order
10 granting the requested relief.

11 Is there any discussion?

12 (No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

14 (No response.)

15 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is
16 entered.

17 Item 16 is Docket Number 14-0167. This is
18 ENCOA's Petition for Confidential and/or Proprietary
19 Treatment of its 2013 Dekatherm Report. ALJ Yoder
20 recommends entry of an Order granting the requested
21 relief.

22 Is there any discussion?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is
3 entered.

4 Item 17 is Docket Number 14-0295. This is
5 Interstate Gas Supply of Illinois' Petition to Cancel
6 its Certificate of Service Authority to operate as an
7 alternative gas supplier under Section 19-110 of the
8 Public Utilities Act. ALJ Riley recommends entry of
9 an Order granting the requested relief.

10 Is there any discussion?

11 (No response.)

12 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is
15 entered.

16 Item 18 is Docket Number 14-0297. This is
17 AT&T and RCLEC, Incorporated's Joint Petition for
18 Approval of an interconnection agreement dated
19 April 4, 2014, pursuant to 47 U.S.C. Section 252.
20 ALJ Riley recommends entry of an Order approving the
21 agreement.

22 Is there any discussion?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

1 (No response.)

2 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the Order is
3 entered.

4 Item 19 is Docket Number 14-0288. This is
5 Legent Communication LLC doing business as Long
6 Distance Service's Petition for a Certificate of
7 Interexchange Authority to operate as a reseller of
8 telecommunications services in Illinois and Legent
9 Communication LLC doing business as Long Distance
10 America's Petition to Cancel its Certificate of
11 Service Authority.

12 This item will be held for disposition at a
13 future Commission proceeding.

14 Items 20 and 21 can be taken together.
15 These items are Petitions for the Confidential and/or
16 Proprietary Treatment of petitioners' various
17 reports. In each case, the ALJ recommends entry of
18 an Order granting the requested relief.

19 Is there any discussion?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections?

22 (No response.)

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

1 Item 22 is Docket Number 14-0330. This is
2 CenturyLink Communications' verified Petition for
3 Waiver of the equal access scripting requirements of
4 83 Illinois Administrative Code Part 773.140(b),
5 which ALJ Albers recommends we grant.

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 23 is Docket Number 06-0703. This item
13 concerns our revision of 83 Illinois Administrative
14 Code Section 280. ALJ Hilliard recommends entry of
15 an Order authorizing the Second Notice Period.

16 This item will be held for disposition at a
17 future Commission proceeding.

18 Item 24 is Docket Number 13-0602. This is
19 Phillips 66 Pipeline's Application for Issuance of a
20 Certificate in Good Standing as a common carrier by
21 pipeline pursuant to the Illinois Common Carrier by
22 Pipeline Law.

23 This item will also held for disposition at
24 a future Commission proceeding.

1 Item 25 is Docket Number 14-0060. This is
2 Maurice Perkins of Inner City Youth Foundation's
3 complaint as to billing and/or charges in Chicago.
4 Complainant has filed a Petition for Rehearing, which
5 ALJ Hilliard recommends we deny.

6 Is there any discussion?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Any objections to denying
9 rehearing?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Hearing none, the request
12 for rehearing is denied.

13 Item 26 is a meeting to address
14 administrative matters before the Commission. Before
15 that, we're going to move to the video conference
16 room on the second floor. And Commissioner del Valle
17 will be moving to the video conference room on the
18 eighth floor in Chicago.

19 So we will not adjourn. We will just recess
20 for a couple of minutes and then we'll reconvene in
21 the video conference room.

22 (Recess taken.)

23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: We will now reconvene.

24 We're in the video conference rooms in Springfield

1 and Chicago. This is the meeting to address
2 administrative matters before the Commission. The FY
3 15 budget, the SB 274 Interfund Borrowing, ICC budget
4 long term, legislation from the Spring Session, and
5 the Illinois Finance Authority short-term sharing of
6 some of our unused Chicago office space.

7 I assume we'll take those in order. And
8 Jane Fields, do you want to start with the budget?
9 You can move up to the table, please.

10 MR. FEIPEL: And I sent around some briefing
11 materials on the budget and some of the legislative
12 stuff on Friday to give you some background. The
13 budget, overall, is kind of a mixed kind of split
14 issue in terms of where we're at. The appropriation
15 authority turned out better than we expected. There
16 was no real push to scale back on a lot of unused
17 appropriation, as the General Assembly and OMB
18 thought about it.

19 Ours stayed the same in all categories that
20 were critical to us. You will note some of these
21 reductions like the reduction for the Wireless
22 Carrier Reimbursement Fund transfer, we had a
23 \$9,000,000 transfer last year. That was eliminated
24 this year. So appropriately, that appropriation

1 level was reduced.

2 So the appropriation levels are fully fine.
3 Our issue continues to be on the public utilities
4 side, the cash shortfall. And without additional
5 transfer this year, it's going to lead us into some
6 issues. We'll come back to that budget fix in a
7 little bit here.

8 But the Public Utilities Fund budget
9 continues to face significant structural deficit.
10 Out of a \$30,000,000 operating budget, we're short,
11 roughly, ten. And transportation budget is
12 approaching that same point where we're now starting
13 to run a little high on cost versus our revenue that
14 we're taking in on an annual basis. So some
15 discussions have moved afoot to fix both looking
16 toward veto session, potential lame duck session end
17 of the year.

18 That's an overall. Head count levels also
19 stayed the same. We're operating well below our
20 authorized head count. So we have got plenty of
21 space. There again, the issue continues to be cash
22 across the board.

23 That's the overall. Any questions or any of
24 the detail?

1 (No response.)

2 MR. FEIPEL: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Jane, did you want to add
4 anything?

5 MS. FIELDS: No. I think he covered it.
6 Cash is our issue.

7 COMMISSIONER MAYE: I have a question, I
8 guess, for Jane. With our C & C budgets for each
9 respective Commissioner's office, do we -- when we're
10 traveling intrastate, we don't have to get approval
11 from GOMB, that's just approval from your office, is
12 that right?

13 MS. FIELDS: Correct.

14 COMMISSIONER MAYE: So technically, what is
15 it that you look for when approving or rejecting
16 requests?

17 MS. FIELDS: Mostly, we look at your
18 allocation that you had for travel. As long as you
19 stay within your allocation, we wouldn't ask any
20 questions, as long as the expenditures are
21 appropriate according to the state travel regs.
22 Those are the two things we look at.

23 COMMISSIONER MAYE: If we're traveling
24 within the state within our realms of responsibility,

1 we should never have a rejection?

2 MS. FIELDS: As long as you're within your
3 allocation for travel.

4 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Right.

5 MS. FIELDS: In your particular job.

6 COMMISSIONER MAYE: If I have \$6,000, and I
7 have a \$1,000 travel expense within the state, that
8 will be fine?

9 MS. FIELDS: Uh-huh.

10 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: But they are checking for
11 appropriateness of, you know, the travel modes, the
12 hotels you stay at, and things like that.

13 MS. FIELDS: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Just to make sure it stays
15 within the state travel guidelines.

16 MS. FIELDS: You have to use the lowest cost
17 method of travel.

18 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: When it goes outside, when
19 it goes to OMB, that's where you get more qualitative
20 type of decisions about whether they think it's
21 worthwhile for us to be doing that.

22 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Okay.

23 MR. FEIPEL: Other questions?

24 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Commissioner del Valle,

1 anything on this?

2 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: No, no questions.

3 MR. FEIPEL: And I think, across the board,
4 if people have followup on any of these points, feel
5 free to give me a call and we can talk more too off
6 line.

7 The second, this is just kind of a note.
8 Senate Bill 274 included the same interfund borrowing
9 authority for the Governor and the Office of
10 Management and Budget. This has been standard
11 practice for the last few years. The one fund, as we
12 talk about cash shortages, this really doesn't impact
13 us much at all. The Grade Crossing Protection Fund,
14 however, is running a significantly high balance,
15 primarily because a lot of the projects, we have
16 obligated almost double of the money that's in the
17 fund. But because of lags in getting the engineering
18 in place or projects commenced and then completed, we
19 have run a bit of a balance.

20 So it's a potential that this one would be
21 noticed by people in other agencies looking to do
22 borrowing. Now, these funds are always paid back,
23 and with interest, so it's less scary and less of a
24 concern than a sweep used to be. At the same time

1 though, we have a really strong argument against
2 borrowing these funds, because they're all fully
3 obligated in the projects. And that's the one real
4 reason that states our borrowing requests in the
5 future. That's something to keep in the back of your
6 mind.

7 Next --

8 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: I have a question.

9 MR. FEIPEL: Please.

10 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: So they can borrow
11 from the fund?

12 MR. FEIPEL: No. There's been no borrowing
13 so far. This is just a kind of a heads up that that
14 authorization has been given again, so it's something
15 that we're paying close attention to.

16 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Should we ever be
18 concerned -- this is not about the interfund, but you
19 mentioned a sweep. Should we ever be concerned about
20 getting our budget swept for having a sufficient
21 amount of surplus at the end of our fiscal year?

22 MR. FEIPEL: That was an issue. And it's
23 partly the reason that we ran into kind of the
24 financial situation we're in, a couple of these funds

1 back even ten years ago at this point. The Public
2 Utilities Fund was raided pretty strongly by sweeps by
3 the prior administration.

4 Sweeps have become kind of a thing of the
5 past. This administration has really shifted policy
6 away from that. That's why we see this borrowing.
7 That's not nearly as problematic as a sweep. It's, I
8 think, some people are significantly less concerned
9 with today.

10 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: There is the one tax though
11 that we -- they just appropriated for their own
12 purposes that was originally supposed to go to us.
13 And that's about \$5,000,000 a year that we haven't
14 gotten for ten years, something like that.

15 MR. FEIPEL: Right.

16 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: So I mean, that's also
17 contributed to the -- but that was one where the
18 General Assembly just said, no, we're going to take
19 that for our own purposes.

20 MR. FEIPEL: And we really, because of the
21 cash shortages, we don't really have a balance that
22 we're really maintaining year over year that looks
23 attractive enough for those kind of purposes.

24 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Oh. Which is good

1 though.

2 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: In that sense, it's good.

3 MR. FEIPEL: Other questions there?

4 (No response.)

5 MR. FEIPEL: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The budget fix.

7 MR. FEIPEL: The budget fix. And this is
8 something we have been looking at now for some time
9 at different options to actually get both the Public
10 Utility Fund and the Transportation Regulatory Fund
11 to a sustainable long-term level.

12 Kind of different options on both sides
13 given the different parameters of the two separate
14 funds. The Public Utilities Fund, been in
15 conversations with all of the entities who would pay
16 that fee, the standard usual suspects. The utilities
17 that we regulate, obviously. But looking to broaden
18 that also to the other entities who cause work here
19 that currently don't pay into our fund. But at the
20 same time, we do lots of work for. Not even
21 necessarily that we regulate, per se, but that drive
22 work for the Commission Staff and the administrative
23 budget.

24 The overall concept would be to do this as

1 kind of like a formula ratemaking process, right. So
2 we would estimate at the beginning of each year what
3 our needed operating expenses are in the public
4 utilities side for the upcoming fiscal year. That
5 amount would then be assessed to different parties
6 based on a formula allocation that we set out in law,
7 potentially in administrative rules so it could be
8 updated. And then work through that year over year
9 with a reconciliation at the end, where if we've
10 over- or under-collected, that money is credited or
11 moved back and forth as need be.

12 The concept has seen, overall, some very
13 positive response by folks in the General Assembly
14 still working through it with, obviously, the parties
15 we'd be assessing this too. And back to timing.
16 Really looking strongly at veto session or a
17 potential lame duck session at the end of this year.
18 So in essence, trying to get this locked in the next
19 six months, because that would allow us to, next
20 fiscal year, shift on to the new funding source
21 completely, which would alleviate the significant
22 stress that the Public Utility Fund is under.

23 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Could you give an
24 example of what some cost drivers would be that

1 aren't paying into the Public Utility Fund?

2 MR. FEIPEL: You think of a lot of the ABCs
3 are a perfect example. Some of the gas supplier --
4 gas marketers, we do quite a bit of work certifying,
5 complaints, rules --

6 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Filing fee or
7 something?

8 MR. FEIPEL: Right. And obviously, the way
9 we would set up the formula would be the more work
10 you drive, the more you pay. The less -- and trying
11 to do it on a proportionate scale.

12 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And in your discussions, do
13 you think that there's pretty good recognition from
14 the General Assembly, A, that this needs to be done;
15 and B, that they will take care of it either in veto
16 or in lame duck in January?

17 MR. FEIPEL: Right. And not only that too,
18 but also the entities that we work with on a regular
19 basis, utilities and the others, have all said across
20 the board, we understand that you have a significant
21 problem and we're going to try to help you fix it.
22 Whether they, right now, fully embrace the proposal
23 we put forward, we're still in discussions and
24 working through that. But not one has said, oh,

1 look, you can just cut your way out of this. They
2 all understand that there's no voicemail on the
3 Springfield phones. There's nothing left to cut.
4 There is a broad recognition of that.

5 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Really, the only opposition
6 to that would come from people who haven't been
7 paying before and are going to be paying now?

8 MR. FEIPEL: Right. Right.

9 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: So is our whole
10 case based on having proportional responsibility? Or
11 what other arguments are we making besides the
12 structural problems with the budget and the need for
13 proportion?

14 MR. FEIPEL: The primary is, look, we need
15 to fix this. It's been a problem for some time now
16 and we have been relying on -- we have been the
17 beneficiary of sweeps and transfers the last few
18 years just as much as we were the detriment of sweeps
19 and transfers ten years ago.

20 We have been living off of other transfers
21 from other funds. That's, obviously, not ideal for
22 either us or the other funds that were being
23 transferred. Getting us on to a long-term
24 sustainable plan so we don't have to keep going back

1 and begging for things year over year, which is
2 obviously not the efficient way to do things.

3 Also, looking at this in terms of a bigger,
4 broader pool of different folks who would pay the fee
5 as opposed to now, those really haven't been updated
6 in years. They don't really track kind of the
7 different entities that we deal with now that some of
8 them didn't even exist last time these were updated.

9 So broadening the base. Looking at that
10 proportion of who drives the work is another strong
11 argument. Also including getting away from -- right
12 now, there's the three main fees that support our
13 budget. There are a variety of others that we
14 collect. There's a real simplicity and
15 administrative efficiency argument to be made to say,
16 look, this is going to be one number. We'll let you
17 know before the fiscal year, and that's how you
18 submit the payment. As opposed to now, a lot of
19 these entities have to track multiple different fees,
20 it's multiple different checks. And obviously, that
21 increases administrative costs for those paying under
22 the current fee structure.

23 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: So all those
24 arguments make a lot of sense.

1 MR. FEIPEL: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Why have we had
3 such a hard time accomplishing this?

4 MR. FEIPEL: I think two reasons. One,
5 given the atmosphere in the General Assembly last
6 year, there was really no one interested in talking
7 to us about working out our budget issue. Now that's
8 corrected.

9 But again, I think you've look at the
10 overall politics of what was going on this past
11 session, and there wasn't a lot of interest in
12 readdressing our utility structure -- fee structure
13 in this past session. It seems to be that we're
14 going forward now. You get past both of those and
15 now we have got a much better chance of getting it
16 done.

17 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And two, Commissioner del
18 Valle, I think there's two reasons. Jonathan is
19 being a little kinder. But you and I both know the
20 value of doing something in veto session or in lame
21 duck as opposed to doing it in the General Session
22 that ends in June before November. So we both
23 understand that.

24 And the second part of it is that now

1 they've back themselves into a corner. Now they have
2 sort of taken away, you know, through other
3 legislation that they have done, the ability to just
4 keep going back to the same source for sweep for
5 internal sweeps. It was all within the ICC. But
6 they have now eliminated that as a possibility for us
7 to keep going back to year after year. So they've
8 sort of backed themselves into a corner and
9 understand now, if I have got that right, now they
10 have actually got to do something. And veto or lame
11 duck makes the most sense from a timing standpoint.

12 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Sure.

14 MR. FEIPEL: Other questions?

15 On the transportation side, we're exploring
16 other options to get that structure reestablished
17 into a way that gets us some more security on the
18 transportation fund. Again, that structural deficit
19 is much smaller on the transportation side. So at
20 this point, we don't need on overall -- like an
21 overhaul of how we do the transportation fee
22 assessments.

23 And those are spread out across a wider
24 array of industries. It's not as tied together as

1 the public utility side. So looking at some
2 different options there, again, with the potential
3 look toward a veto session or a lame duck in order to
4 readjust that side too. So more on that as we kind
5 of coalesce around some options there.

6 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Okay. Legislation.

7 MR. FEIPEL: The spring legislation, there
8 were two different things we sent around. The key
9 one is the one that -- there's the chart and then the
10 one that looks more like a narrative with paragraphs.
11 The narrative page, the two-pager, goes through all
12 of the key initiatives that were passed and either
13 sent to the Governor or now some signed. The chart
14 is back up that let's you know all of the different
15 legislation that we followed and had discussions and
16 negotiations in, most of which you'll see didn't
17 pass.

18 The key kind of focus areas, we talked about
19 the budget. We were successful in passing our
20 initiative for getting us compliant with the Supreme
21 Court rules on how out-of-state attorneys are handled
22 here in front of the Commission. So we got that
23 taken care of.

24 The big two, I would say, pieces of

1 legislation that passed, the first that's already
2 signed is the 911 funding rewrite. It's on the
3 second page. That one, for the most part, was really
4 a measure to readjust how 911 funding is dispersed.
5 We have handled the disbursements from the Wireless
6 Carrier Reimbursement Fund for a number of years now.
7 The formula for how those are given out to the 911
8 systems has changed substantially, including, and
9 potentially most importantly, an absolute adder for
10 small systems in counties of 100,000 people and less.

11 So from there, there were also, we take on
12 more authority to review the financials of the 911
13 systems to have them report better and more realistic
14 data to us. We have also got authority now to
15 develop a universal system of accounts for the 911
16 systems, so we have better financial data. The main
17 kind of focus is this is a one year only change,
18 because it appears that a permanent, more long-term
19 change to those 911 funding structure overall will be
20 rolled into the telecom rewrite that takes place next
21 year. So this is a short-term kind of fix to getting
22 911 systems better in place to then next year we take
23 a look at the whole broad funding for 911 as an
24 entire state. So that takes place next year. So

1 that was the 911 side.

2 The second, probably, you know, we have got
3 this supplemental procurement for the IPA, the power
4 agency, to go out and procure a one time using
5 \$30,000,000 from the ARES alternative compliance
6 payment money to go out and buy solar, both new and
7 current from existing systems. It puts in place a
8 set of procedures that we'll actually be looking at
9 those once those plans are fully developed by the
10 IPA, they get filed here and we take a look at them
11 through a standard process. But it's kind of on the
12 side from the standard procurement processes.

13 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: What is the timeline
14 on the filing of that and our internal process?

15 MR. FEIPEL: In essence, the whole thing
16 takes about a year to complete. We should see
17 something in a matter of months. The IPA has to go
18 through a series of workshops and discussions on the
19 front end first. It should fairly closely coincide
20 with the standard IPA process.

21 And the last is of the big, most important
22 ones, is the Supplier Diversity Bill that adds
23 some --

24 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Can I go back to

1 the supplemental procurement? The language in that
2 bill regarding the installers --

3 MR. FEIPEL: Right.

4 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: That IBEW is able
5 to get included in that bill does not align with our
6 current rules.

7 MR. FEIPEL: Right.

8 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: What is the
9 discussion around that issue?

10 MR. FEIPEL: I think it seems to be that in
11 the General Assembly, there is a real desire. That's
12 the way they see the world working in terms of what
13 installers for distributed generation, as well as
14 electric vehicles, they see that the language that
15 they have included here for the IPA, that's really
16 the way they want to see the world work.

17 So I think that was kind of the overall
18 impetus here was to say, okay, look, all of the solar
19 panels that are installed pursuant to the IPA
20 procurement will use the standards and criteria that
21 they pretty much want to see across the board for
22 installation of distributed generation.

23 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: It applies only to
24 the activity around these \$30,000,000?

1 MR. FEIPEL: Right.

2 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Not beyond that?

3 MR. FEIPEL: Right.

4 COMMISSIONER MAYE: With that, Director
5 Feipel, that was kind of last minute, because I know
6 we kind of found out about it. Right?

7 MR. FEIPEL: Right.

8 COMMISSIONER MAYE: That was kind of sneaky.

9 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: The whole solar thing,
10 well, much of the discussion during the spring was
11 about the whole renewable portfolio standard fix.
12 That's the way it had been talked about. And that
13 came about kind of at the last minute as a substitute
14 for it. Not necessarily the greatest substitute for
15 it, but as a substitute for it. And the folks that
16 were pushing the RPS fix wanted to get at least
17 something out of that. And so that was what they
18 settled on and knew that they could get passed, so
19 they did that.

20 MR. FEIPEL: That whole process for getting
21 the IPA supplemental procurement language put
22 together was all done in like the last week or two of
23 session. So a lot of those -- I think a lot of those
24 kind of changes and pushes took place at the last

1 minute just by merit of how the whole thing came
2 together.

3 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Some of the discussion,
4 really, was -- and I think we can share this, because
5 we were saying it down the street. Is that didn't
6 necessarily think they needed this to be able to --
7 that the IPA necessarily needed. In fact, in our
8 last Order to them, we sort of suggested that they do
9 this anyway.

10 So I mean, having that legislative obviously
11 cements that. But that's what I am saying. I am not
12 sure as a substitute for the other bill it really is
13 much, because I am of the opinion that they could
14 have done this anyway. But having it in law
15 obviously solidifies that.

16 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Right.

17 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Does this \$30,000,000
18 have a dedicated revenue stream to fund it?

19 MR. FEIPEL: Yes. And remember, because the
20 -- this all goes back to the crux of dealing with
21 this in the IPA cases, which we're in a much better
22 place now than we were then.

23 Because the IPA has made the argument that
24 in conjunction with language, they say that they

1 spend the ACP money in conjunction with the
2 procurement on the utility side of their portfolio.
3 And because they haven't bought renewables on the
4 utility side, IPA has made the argument that they
5 can't spend the ACP side of the funding. So that
6 fund balance has grown dramatically in the last
7 several of years.

8 So the dollars are there and just kind of
9 sitting. That's what one of the main points of
10 issue, especially with the environmental community,
11 has been, look, we have got tens of millions of
12 dollars just sitting around in a fund at a time when
13 state resources are next to nothing. And this is
14 ludicrous that we can't spend it because the RPS is
15 just broken, it's not working, because it won't let
16 the IPA spend this money.

17 So the dollars are all there. It was
18 supposed to be part of the overall RPS fix that was
19 negotiated and was supposed to be passed last veto.
20 That got hung up and delayed. And so this was kind
21 of a "We need to do something to help the cause
22 along. We'll do this." But everybody fully
23 recognized the RPS still has to be fixed. And that's
24 coming back, presumably, next session.

1 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Along with lots of other
2 generation-type legislation.

3 MR. FEIPEL: Right.

4 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And then you were saying
5 that Representative Davis's bill that we talked about
6 in Policy Session passed.

7 MR. FEIPEL: Right. The Supplier Diversity
8 Bill passed both Houses. And it's got, of course, a
9 significant expansion of what, you know, kind of
10 criteria and direction for the entities for filing
11 reports, what they need to follow. As well as now
12 including some of the water companies. So that was a
13 good, solid expansion. And that's passed too.

14 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Good.

15 Want to talk about the resolution --

16 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Just that it also
17 quantifies the role of the Commission.

18 MR. FEIPEL: Right.

19 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: In terms of
21 requiring the annual process for repaying the
22 reports, conducting reports.

23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Right. Yeah.

24 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: This is an inadequate

1 report. Here's what you need.

2 MR. FEIPEL: Right. It's a really good step
3 in the right direction, yes.

4 And I think I should back up and say on the
5 911 Bill, the Governor signed that two Fridays ago.
6 And we have already started working on implementing
7 all of the reporting and the reviews and the
8 accounting side of it, as well as reaching out to the
9 911 systems to start getting their feedback on what
10 that will like look.

11 We've also started reaching out to the
12 utility side in terms of what those new minority
13 diversity -- supplier diversity requirements will
14 look like. The Governor hasn't signed it. We're not
15 prejudging his decision. But keeping in mind too
16 that there are some things to put in place to get
17 ready for.

18 The resolution is that it's House Resolution
19 1146. Actually, there were two resolutions, and
20 they're tied together, so we can talk about both
21 quickly. One is to talk about and requires some
22 reports by four different state agencies in looking
23 at the potential closure of nuclear plants in the
24 state of Illinois. There's a series of factual

1 whereas clauses. And it gets to requiring ICC to
2 look at reliability and some rate impact issues. EPA
3 would look at the impact on climate issues and
4 societal impacts. IPA is looking at the reliability
5 from the standpoint of their portfolio as they kind
6 of do every year with their procurement process
7 anyway.

8 And the last piece is DCEO is required --
9 it's a resolution, but suggested that DCEO go look at
10 the economic impacts of nuclear plant closures in the
11 state. With that, we have been in talks with the
12 other agencies involved, the other agency directors,
13 to figure out how best to respond to this, because
14 this is one that kind of we're not on our own. We're
15 going to need to coordinate with the other three
16 agencies.

17 It sounds like, at this point, things we
18 like the idea of is responding with one report as
19 opposed to four separate. Obviously, it talks about
20 some modeling issues. That each agency is asked to
21 do different things and with different agencies have
22 different resources. So we're talking through what
23 makes the most sense there.

24 The report really has a due date that points

1 toward November 15th. So for something that could be
2 pretty intense, it's not a lot of time. And
3 certainly, cuts us out of anything that would look
4 like a procurement -- we don't have money for it
5 anyway. But a procurement for some kind of contract
6 to do the work for us. It just would take way too
7 long past the November 15th.

8 So that's the overall. The other, the tie
9 in is this companion, I would say, coal resolution
10 that passed that was also looking at similar --
11 different approach, but it says, hey, look, you know,
12 the shutdown of coal plants as a result of the new
13 USEPA rules is going to be problematic from a number
14 of different standpoints and urges folks to take a
15 look at ways to not just shut down the coal plants of
16 Illinois.

17 So there is obviously a linkage here where
18 one is saying we like nuclear power and we need to
19 take a look at it. And the other says we like coal
20 and need to take a look at it too. So there's an
21 interplay.

22 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: But the coal one doesn't
23 require us to do anything.

24 MR. FEIPEL: Right. Right. Only the

1 nuclear one does.

2 Again, it's not a requirement. But clearly,
3 it was an initiative of the Speaker and Leader
4 Durkin. It passed unanimously, if I can remember
5 properly. So there would be no reason not to respond
6 and put the report together.

7 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And honestly, given what is
8 happening with the USEPA regs and the response that
9 us and EPA and DCEO and IPA and others are going to
10 have to make to that, doing this work probably makes
11 sense anyway. That we can use it as we're doing that
12 at the same time.

13 MR. FEIPEL: Right. EPA is already looking
14 at a lot of those issues. Nuclear is embedded in the
15 USEPA 111D rules anyway. So a lot of this work's
16 already been done.

17 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Or will need to be, one of
18 the two.

19 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: We're not required
20 to do a formal report on the coal.

21 MR. FEIPEL: Right. The coal resolution is
22 broader.

23 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: So what are we
24 going to do exactly to address the coal issue raised

1 by the resolution? How are we going to do that?

2 MR. FEIPEL: We have got some options there.

3 And again, as we continue to talk with the other
4 agencies and see how broadly we want to take this.

5 The nuclear resolution talks specifically about the
6 agencies putting together some findings with specific
7 recommendations on, quote, market-based solutions
8 that would, you know, help the industry in Illinois.

9 So we could look at that as a very narrow issue and
10 what is a market-based solution that works for
11 nuclear.

12 Nuclear only, it seems to be looking at the
13 USEPA back to the 111D rules. It contemplates a much
14 broader energy solution for the state. So it would
15 make quite a bit of sense to say, here's a
16 market-based solution that works for nuclear coal,
17 wind, solar, and gets us to where we need to be by
18 2030, when we would have to comply with the rules as
19 proposed.

20 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: So the market-based
21 solution, does that include some kind of cost of
22 carbon?

23 MR. FEIPEL: There are a number of different
24 ways from carbon tax to cap and trade to like a clean

1 energy standard like the renewable portfolio
2 standard. I think by market-based, they mean like
3 not a direct substantive bailout, by finding some way
4 with competitive forces.

5 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And I think this is an
6 issue just kind of larger than the resolution calls
7 for. And you know, we'll join with the other
8 agencies and do that, that work that was being asked
9 of us.

10 But I think this is a good area for us to
11 start talking in terms of policy meetings, because
12 it's a huge issue that affects everything we do on
13 the power side. And so -- and will be an issue for
14 us for the next at least two plus years while we're
15 trying to figure out, as a state, what plan we submit
16 to comply with the EPA regs.

17 So I'll come around and talk individually to
18 you, but I am going to suggest, I think, that we do
19 this from a policy committee standpoint and really
20 delve into these issues fairly deeply.

21 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: It could be a
22 multi-state initiative.

23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It could be a multi-state
24 initiative as well, right. And there is some work

1 going on in that as well. I think it's probably the
2 right time to do that. And we'll try to -- finding
3 dates is always fun, but we'll try to find some
4 dates, if people agree with that, and kind of move
5 forward on that. Because it really does affect.

6 We can't be talking about nuclear and
7 whether or not they're clearing an auction and what
8 the market base solution for that would be without
9 tying it into renewable portfolio standard and what
10 happens on the 111D compliance. They're all
11 interrelated. I think we have got to start talking
12 about all of those, even though we don't do
13 generation.

14 MR. FEIPEL: Right.

15 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Agree to do resource
16 --

17 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Which we could do, even
18 though we don't do generation. That may be a good
19 legislative issue at some point.

20 I'll come around and talk individually to
21 everybody about this and see, A, if that makes sense
22 to you; and B, if it does have a structure.

23 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: I think that's an
24 excellent major argument, isn't it, that they don't

1 get credit for the benefit, the lack of carbon?

2 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: It's kind of weird. When
3 you read that, the nuclear piece we thought was
4 really confusing. And then in talking to some other
5 folks, it turns out that it was only confusing
6 because it was actually fairly simple. And in that
7 rule, there really isn't much length in it.

8 The EPA takes -- there are 23 states that
9 have nuclear capacity. And they made a judgment of
10 how much of that was quote/unquote, at risk, by their
11 own definition of what "at risk" means. It could be
12 age of the plant. It could be economic drivers, like
13 the plant in Wisconsin or what we're seeing here in
14 Illinois with the not clearing. So it could be for a
15 lot of reasons.

16 They assign that as a rate of just about six
17 percent. And so what they did is, on the front end,
18 they took six percent away from us in terms of
19 compliance. So that's six percent we would have to
20 get in terms of reductions. But if we keep the coal
21 plant -- or the nuclear plants open, we get that six
22 percent back on the back end. So it ends up being a
23 wash.

24 So yes, there is incentive to keep them open

1 the way that that rule is written right now. Again,
2 it's just a draft rule. So there is incentive to
3 keep that open. And then if you were to do something
4 that would open new nuclear plants -- nobody is
5 talking about that here, but in the states where they
6 are talking about that, then there is credit that
7 could come for that.

8 You sort of do get credit, because they're
9 looking at your emissions rate as of 2012. And so if
10 that's part of your fuel mix in 2012, you sort of do
11 get credit for having nuclear be part of your fuel
12 mix in 2012. It's there, but it's probably not there
13 to the extent that the Exelons and Southernns and
14 other big nuclear folks may want it to be.

15 Sorry. That was longer-winded than it
16 needed to be.

17 MR. FEIPEL: Other questions?

18 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Another question on
19 the resolution in the report. The due date on the
20 nuclear plant report is November 15th.

21 MR. FEIPEL: Right.

22 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Veto starts
23 November 16th, right?

24 MR. FEIPEL: Right.

1 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Any connection
2 there?

3 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: What do you think?

4 MR. FEIPEL: You might very well think that.

5 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: You don't believe in
6 coincidences, Commissioner?

7 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: The other shoe will
8 drop.

9 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: And actually, I think that
10 going back to doing some policy things, and not only
11 doing the report, I think that it is a further good
12 reason to be doing that, because you can guess that
13 there may be some discussions about these issues. So
14 the more work we have done, maybe the better.

15 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: And I am glad you
16 stated that, Mr. Chairman. That's one of the reasons
17 I ask the question. Is if we anticipate that there
18 may be some action, then we need to get these policy
19 sessions in.

20 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Absolutely.

21 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: So that we're
22 prepared to deal with it.

23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Agreed.

24 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: In whatever way we

1 have to.

2 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Right. Absolutely.

3 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: So I think I agree
4 that we need to do these sessions and we need to move
5 on them quickly.

6 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Appreciate that. Thanks.

7 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Who will be preparing
8 the report, Director Feipel?

9 MR. FEIPEL: Because we have got the four
10 agencies, it will be agency staff with the four
11 agencies, and then folks here.

12 COMMISSIONER MAYE: So here, who will do it
13 here, or you don't know?

14 MR. FEIPEL: Still working through that.
15 There's two issues, because we've got to look at rate
16 issues. And it makes sense to help support the
17 reliability issues in conjunction with IPA. So
18 that's between engineering, FAD, and policy, it's
19 Public Utilities Bureau kind of stuff.

20 COMMISSIONER MAYE: I got you. Okay. Thank
21 you.

22 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Anything else on the
23 legislation?

24 COMMISSIONER McCABE: Randy did such a good

1 job sharing the 911 task force. Does he get to do
2 the telecom rewrite too?

3 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: He's not raising his hand.

4 MR. FEIPEL: I will say it's a good time to
5 congratulate Randy. He's going to continue his
6 excellent service as the head of the 911 services.

7 MR. NEHRT: Thank you.

8 MR. FEIPEL: You're most welcome.

9 Anything else on legislation?

10 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: What about, did you
11 mention the Poison Control Center?

12 MR. FEIPEL: That's a really good point.
13 That was not passed specifically as part of the
14 911 -- this 911 rewrite that was done for this year.
15 It's my understanding that was taken care of in
16 another part of the budget with some, I believe,
17 hospital funds that came down to. The Hospital
18 Assessment Fund. So they took some money from there
19 for this year. And again --

20 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: That was changed.
21 It was amended at the end, right?

22 MR. FEIPEL: Right.

23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: That was a last week or
24 last two-week kind of thing too.

1 MR. FEIPEL: Yes.

2 The bill that originally passed out of the
3 Senate, that Senator Harmon had been the lead
4 negotiator on, included redistribution of some of
5 those Wireless Carrier Reimbursement Funds for Poison
6 Control. When it got over to the house, the house
7 shifted the way that was done and they found this
8 other pot of money to take care of Poison Control.

9 That's a good question.

10 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: Thank you.

11 MR. FEIPEL: Other things there? Or are we
12 good?

13 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: IFA.

14 MR. FEIPEL: This is doing a favor for one
15 of our sister agencies. We have quite a bit of
16 unused office space in the Chicago offices.

17 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Where?

18 MR. FEIPEL: Eighth and ninth floor
19 combined. And if you look at a lot of that cubed
20 space that's up. And then some of the offices along
21 the sides there. IFA was going to, basically, be
22 homeless for about three months because of some --
23 the way that their leases were working. They're
24 going to be moving from their current space into

1 space that's actually there in the Bilandic Building.
2 So they needed someplace to share for about three
3 months.

4 So from September 1st to about the end of
5 the year, they will be cohabitating with us for a
6 little bit. It will be easy to find. Chris Meister,
7 whose the executive director, will be in my office
8 for those three months. So easy to find and locate.

9 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Will anyone be in
10 Commissioner Colgan's office?

11 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: I will be.

12 MR. FEIPEL: We're working on, obviously,
13 lots of interagency agreements for how we're going to
14 share space and do stuff.

15 COMMISSIONER del VALLE: You can tell Chris
16 Meister I am willing to put a little desk in the
17 corner of my office.

18 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: One of those short ones,
19 right, like in grade school?

20 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Are we sure -- is there
21 a contractual end date or we're just saying we think
22 it will be three months?

23 MR. FEIPEL: Well, part of it is dealing
24 with CMS and getting things in place.

1 COMMISSIONER MAYE: So nine months then?

2 MR. FEIPEL: Or five years, it could be.

3 I am thinking it's more like the three,
4 four months that they need. They have another agency
5 that's got to move out of the space that they're
6 moving into, and things just kind of stacked up, out
7 of whack.

8 Even if we were able to do some hiring in
9 some key spots, we've still got plenty of office
10 space to do that hiring.

11 COMMISSIONER MAYE: I need a tour. I just
12 don't know where these empty offices are.

13 MR. FEIPEL: Right. And I am working on
14 floor plans that will show IFA where they're going.
15 Once we get that locked in, we can circulate that
16 too.

17 COMMISSIONER MAYE: Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Anything else on the admin
19 side?

20 MR. FEIPEL: I think I am good.

21 Other questions?

22 (No response.)

23 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Anything else to come
24 before the body today?

1 COMMISSIONER MAYE: No. Just thanking
2 Director Feipel for his leadership and the Staff.
3 That definitely is the backbone of what we do. So
4 thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: Absolutely.

6 And thank you, Commissioner Colgan, for
7 pinch hitting for me last week. I was listening
8 intently from our Washington D.C. office.

9 COMMISSIONER COLGAN: Not a problem.

10 CHAIRMAN SCOTT: There's nothing else to
11 come before the body. The meeting stands adjourned.
12 Thank you, everyone.

13 REGULAR OPEN MEETING ADJOURNED.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

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

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, Angela C. Turner, a Certified Shorthand Reporter within and for the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the meeting aforementioned was held on the time and in the place previously described.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal.

Angela C. Turner
IL CSR #084-004122