



Statement from the Diversey Community Coalition and Alderman Knudsen

On ComEd's Oct. 8 response to Alderman Knudsen | Oct. 14, 2026

Statement from Alderman Knudsen

On October 8, my office received ComEd's response to the joint inquiry submitted alongside fellow elected officials and community partners. The response is appreciated; however, the reply falls short of delivering the robust, data-driven explanations requested, leaving several critical questions unaddressed. Key concerns include, but are not limited to:

- The exact location of the primary connection point remains unidentified;
- ComEd intends to pursue a five-transformer configuration, directly contradicting the three-transformer layout cited in their testimony before the Illinois Commerce Commission (Docket No. 26-0047); and
- No detailed cost breakdowns or engineering studies were provided to substantiate the rejection of the 14 alternative locations proposed by the community.

Our coalition of elected representatives, community organizations, and neighbors remains steadfast in its resolve. Without the transparent, comprehensive data our neighborhood deserves, we will continue our unwavering efforts to relocate this proposal.

Please continue to engage and rally alongside us. Stay tuned for more ways to get involved, and a big thank you to everyone who has submitted a formal comment on the ICC electronic docket system. Public comments are still being received through December and can be filed on the ICC's or the Diversey Community Coalition's websites. For those interested in reading ComEd's full response, please see below.

https://diverseycastle.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/10/ComEd_-AldKnudsen-response_Oct8.pdf

Statement from the Diversey Community Coalition

Alderman Knudsen shared ComEd's response with the DCC. We appreciate ComEd's reply, but ComEd continues to evade direct questions and is not addressing the concerns of the surrounding community. We continue to ask how ComEd is determining the numbers in its response—the costs of alternate locations, the distance to the connection point(s), and how many transformers will actually be built. Show us the math.

ComEd is a regulated public utility. Its rates are set by the state, and customers cannot take their business elsewhere. In exchange, it owes the public its homework: the numbers, the alternatives it weighed and the due diligence behind a decision with hundreds of millions in impact. Two rounds of questions later, we still have not seen it.

What the response letter shows:

Continued Lack of Transparency and Engagement

- **The connection point is still a mystery.** ComEd rejected seven sites for being 1.1 to 2.14 miles from a "connection point" it has never identified. ComEd also says the new station will be fed by underground lines from its existing Diversey and Crosby substations, yet it rejected 1127 N. Halsted, a lot that shares a

property line with the Crosby substation, as too far away. A site next to a source of supply cannot be too far from it. ComEd should name the connection point and show the distances.

- **ComEd cannot put a price on sites it did not price.** ComEd cites \$405.8 million to \$519.4 million for alternative sites, then admits it “did not evaluate all fourteen sites for cost impact.” It cannot claim an alternative costs half a billion dollars when it never ran the numbers. It says engineers ruled some sites out, but no engineering study or financial analysis has been shared.
- **ComEd merged lots for its own site and not for anyone else’s.** ComEd combined two parcels at 1111 W. Diversey to make its own site, but never considered combining neighboring parcels among the alternatives. Two pairs on its own list touch each other (2900-2950 N. Oakley and 2331 W. Nelson; 1668 N. Kingsbury and 1110 W. North Ave), and it rejected a lot beside an existing substation.

Just because you can, doesn’t mean you should

The site ComEd chose sits directly next to schools, businesses and homes.

- **Three to the ICC, five to the community.** ComEd is asking the ICC to approve three transformers. Its letter says a total of five are planned and that “sites were not evaluated for fewer than five transformer installs.” It used that unapproved five-transformer requirement to reject four lots of 0.86 to 1.2 acres as “too small,” while asking regulators to approve only three.
- **The growth does not match the footprint.** ComEd’s own forecast shows load in the area growing about 3.5% over five years, roughly 0.7% a year. ComEd has not shown why that justifies a site sized for five transformers or the threat of outages. The site should be sized to the actual customer need, not to fit a lot ComEd already owns.
- **The community is missing from the criteria.** ComEd judged sites on cost, distance to the load center, size and reuse of its existing equipment. Schools, homes, businesses and the neighborhood did not make the list. The ICC looks at total cost, not just price, and the cost to this community is high, including lost tax revenue for our schools and TIF funding and a permanent loss of housing in a corridor designated for transit-oriented development.
- **Where are the studies?** We asked for completed engineering and environmental studies for 1111 W. Diversey. ComEd named and shared none and described only planned “inspections, test holes, and surveying.” ComEd told the community in March that these studies would be conducted and seven months later nothing has been disclosed.
- **The “savings” are unproven.** ComEd counts the old substation’s existing conduit and cable as a savings, but has shared nothing on their age or condition. The old substation also has a history of fires that damaged the surrounding community.

Buy first, explain later

ComEd is moving ahead before the neighborhood, or the ICC, has had its say.

- **Land held for years is not “used and useful.”** Under Illinois law, customers should pay only for investment that is prudent and “used and useful” in providing service (220 ILCS 5/9-211). ComEd bought this lot years ago and now says it needs room for five transformers, despite only seeking approval from the ICC for three. ComEd has not shown that holding land years ahead of an approved plan meets that test, or that it weighed the best use of the lot for this community, including housing near transit.
- **Spending now, approval later.** ComEd says it will do inspections, test holes and surveying now, calls the costs “prudent,” and did not say whether customers could be charged if the ICC denies the request.
- **Fourteen sites, four weeks.** ComEd took four weeks to reject 14 community-suggested sites, many of which are available and for sale, and did not say whether it contacted any of the owners.

ComEd is asking customers to pay for a conclusion it has already drawn without showing its analysis. It is not being transparent, and it is not weighing the alternatives the statute requires. Our neighbors, the community and all ratepayers will be stuck paying the bill, and we deserve to see the details and the estimates. We continue to believe this is the wrong site, not no site. The DCC is calling on ComEd to publish its site-by-site analysis and to only build what customers actually need. We are asking the Illinois Commerce Commission to hold ComEd to the standard of showing its work, estimates, and analysis before ratepayers are asked to pay the bill.

For more information and to file a comment on the ICC docket, please visit diverseycc.org.

###