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POWERS: Welcome everybody. Thanks for coming. I'd like to introduce Lynn Rust, he's the Deputy State Director here for the BLM in the Colorado State Office, and he'd like to welcome you to his town.

RUST: Welcome to the new Colorado Convention Center. It's turned into quite an edifice. With completion of the new addition, they've changed some of the entrances around a little bit and I was wandering around lost trying to figure out how to get in here. So, welcome to Colorado is you out-of-state, and certainly, a lot of members of the team are, welcome to the convention center.

I'm one of three deputies, but I'm the Deputy State Director for Energy, Land and Minerals for BLM-Colorado. So, the topic today is certainly of importance to the programs with which I administer for the BLM in Colorado.

It's my pleasure to welcome you to this first public scoping meeting for the West-wide Energy Corridor Environmental Impact Statement. This is required by the Energy Policy Act, which is the comprehensive energy bill passed by Congress, signed by the President on August 8th. It's
certainly one of the most far-reaching pieces of energy legislation the country really has ever seen. There is an awful lot that's being required of federal agencies and those of us who are involved in that are really scrambling quite a bit to start getting done everything that Congress and the administration wants done.

This particular joint effort involving five federal agencies and covering land in eleven states, will be going on for the next couple of years. There will be additional scoping meetings held throughout the west over the next few weeks.

Again, this is the first one and I think -- what? there's eleven total? Is that correct? -- that will go on in various cities.

Please use this opportunity to give your comments and suggestions on this very important project. The agencies will use all comments collected during the scoping period, which ends on November 28th to formulate the draft Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

Once the draft is released, there will be an additional opportunity for public comment -- public review and comment on the various alternatives in the draft, and these comments will be incorporated.
in the final Environmental Impact Statement and the
Record of Decision. Comments will be accepted in a
variety of forms, through your verbal and written
testimony today, in written form through the mail,
on the web and by fax.
I really can't stress the importance of energy
corridors enough. This is a topic that I've been
kind of sounding for a couple of years, now. You
can explore and develop energy minerals all you
want in particular areas, but if you can't get it
to the markets, it doesn't do any good.
Transportation, whether it's by pipeline, rail
line, by wire moving electrons, is critical to the
country's energy needs.
At this time, I'd like to introduce our panel
members for today's meeting. Your moderator for
today's meeting will be Scott Powers with the
Bureau of Land Management. Julia Souder with the
Department of Energy. She is the National Project
Manager for the Environmental Impact Statement.
And Paul Johnson with the Forest Service. All
three work for the Washington office, which I do
not. And so, Scott, please take it away. Thank
you.
POWERS: Thank you, Lynn. Appreciate you
coming by. Nice to see a lot of familiar faces in
the crowd -- people that I personally have been
talking to about corridors for a number of years.
I'm the BLM Project Manager for this project and
we're co-leads with the Department of Energy and
the Forest Service is a cooperating agency for the
Programmatic EIS.
I just wanted to give a little bit more
background, elaborate a little bit more on what
Lynn said about the Energy Policy Act, although I
assume most of the people in here understand what
Section 3.68 directs us to do. It directs the
Secretaries of Energy, Ag, Interior, Commerce and
Defense to designate corridors for oil, gas and
hydrogen pipelines and electricity transmission and
distribution facilities on federal lands in eleven
contiguous western states.
The Act further directs us to incorporate the
designated corridors into the relevant agency
land-use plans. And that's a key point that you
need to keep in mind. The outcome of this project
will ultimately result in the BLM and the Forest
Service making resource allocation decisions
through the land-use planning process.
So, for the purpose of complying with Section
3.68, the Department of Energy, the BLM and the
Forest Service are preparing this West-Wide Energy
Corridor Programmatic Environmental Impact
Statement. And I won't say that anymore. That's a
mouthful. But, we're going to do this jointly and
we're going to try to accomplish it within the
24-month time frame, as directed by the
legislation. So, we're to have a final Record of
Decision issued by each agency in the land-use
plans amended by August 7th of 2007. And if
anybody's ever worked on an large EIS, that's warp
speed. So, we're going to be moving through this
process as quickly as we can.

We really appreciate your interest in this
project, and we really hope that you will help
start to provide us the information we're going to
need to build the alternative to be considered
within this EIS. You know, scoping is the
opportunity for the public to come in and tell us
what they think should be considered in the EIS.
You know, what the scope of the document should be.
It helps us identify issues. And, as I said, most
importantly, we're going to develop alternatives
for this Programmatic EIS once scoping is complete.
At this present time, we haven't started that
process.

Lynn mentioned how comments can be provided.

There's a number of ways, and there's a poster
board outside the door here that tells the four
different ways. We have an active website already
up and running that we think will answer most of
that we can think of. And I encourage you to go to
that website.

We're going to be providing a report that
summarizes all the comments that were provided
during scoping. We're hoping to get that out in
January -- this-coming January.

We've asked people to sign up at the
registration table if they want to speak this
afternoon; some have and we assume that some in the
audience haven't and may still want to speak. We're
going to ask you to come up and give your name, who
you represent, and we'll turn this podium a little
bit so you can address comments to the panel.

We're here to listen to what you have to say today,
and if there's some clarifying questions, we'll try
to answer those, but more importantly, we want to
hear what you have to say.

I hope everybody has turned off their
cellphones or pagers. If you haven't, please do.
Again, when you come up -- I'll call your name, but
if you would repeat your name for the recorder,
that will help.
Did I leave anything out? Okay, with that --
any questions before we get started? Okay. Well,
I'm going to call on an old friend to come up
first. Mr. Lowery? Rick Lowery with EEI.
We'd appreciate it if you'd try to keep your
comments to about five minutes.

LOWERY: Thanks, Scott. I'm Rick Lowery
with the Edison Electric Institute in Washington,
D.C. The Edison Electric Institute, or EEI, thanks
the federal agencies for the opportunity to make
comments on the West-wide Energy Corridor
Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement or, as
I'll say from now on, PEIS, and that's hard enough
to say.
EEI is the association of United States
shareholder-owned electric companies. A number of
EEI's member companies generate, transmit and
deliver electricity in the contiguous eleven
western states covered by the PEIS. EEI applauds
the Departments of Energy, Agriculture and Interior
in proceeding forward to identify endemic corridors
for energy linear facilities across federal land in
the west. We also applaud the Western Utility
Group, Western Governors Association, and other
groups that have been addressing the need for
energy corridors in the west.

Because of the predominance of federal land
ownership in the west and the location of such
lands, the federal land agencies must be a partner
in helping meet the energy infrastructure needs for
the west. At least six of the fastest growing
states are located in the west.

The corridor initiative will provide, at least
from the EEI perspective, a dual benefit. One, it
will allow consideration of the infrastructure
needs on a source-to-market basis. Something that
is very important to EEI and it's member companies.
And, two, it will allow for better or more careful
planning to conserve and protect natural resource
values on federal land while meeting these energy
infrastructure needs.

EEI believes that the corridor designation
process as proposed will enable the public to
better appreciate and evaluate the basis for energy
infrastructure decisions. The context of the
decisions will be more readily apparent. EEI
supports the legislative provisions that are the
basis of this corridor designation effort, Section
3.68 of EPA, and we look forward to working with
the agencies to fulfill Congressional intent.
EEI would like to offer the following six
recommendations in the designation of western
energy corridors.

First, consider a long-term planning horizon.
Federal land-use planning horizons and utility
horizons are not easily reconciled. We encourage
the agencies to take a long view and anticipate
what the transmission needs will be, and designate
corridors accordingly. Utilities and other
participants in the western regional transmission
planning are very willing to assist the agencies.

Second, define now a future process for
designating additional corridors, as needed,
recognizing that it may be impossible to anticipate
what those transmission needs will be ten, fifteen
or even twenty years down the road. EEI strongly
recommends the agencies develop now a process for
designating additional source-to-market corridors
once this process is complete. This may usefully
include a [skip-over] process where the critical
feature is to allow for an integrated,
multi-jurisdictional evaluation and decision
regarding corridor designation.

Third, define now the stream-lined procedures available to electric companies abiding within a designated corridor. EEI strongly urges the agencies to develop sound and effective stream-lined procedures for siting facilities within a designated corridor. The procedures should recognize that much of the environmental analysis and review will have already taken place and, as long as facilities are consistent with the parameters set for a corridor, that work should not have to be repeated. At a minimum, we encourage you to establish a rebuttable presumption that will be a categorical provision for NEPA that will be consistent with Section 3.90 of EPAC for pipelines. Transmission should not be treated differently than pipelines, in our opinion. EEI recommends the agencies to consider an alternative, streamlined consultation process under the Threatened and Endangered Species Act.

Fourth, flexibility should be a consideration of the process. This can be accomplished through careful consideration of what [garbled] set for corridors. This should be based on a technical and engineering requirement, and vegetation management
needs. But, also taking the decision to look at all existing rights-of-way containing 69KB and above transmission lines, and convert the corridors to expanded width and purposes.

This will allow either for the expansion of facilities within the corridor, or upgrading the facility to improve reliability in a band-grid capacity.

Fifth, protect corridors from incompatible uses. ERI urges the agencies to protect designated corridor against the entry of incompatible uses, or the location of incompatible uses near the facilities. In deciding what may or may not be an incompatible use, the agencies should consider how a transmission facility must be managed and operated to meet public safety and reliability requirements and concerns. And what will be needed to reduce fire hazard.

If the management requirements for another use conflict with the requirements for the transmission facilities, that other use should be clearly regarded incompatible.

[inaudible comment].

LOWERY: Okay. And sixth, carefully consider where and how public lands are disposed.
EEI recommends that land disposal or land swaps that would allow lands subject to a corridor designation to be transferred to private ownership generally be construed as an incompatible use.

Should such a transfer be allowed, the transfer should be made subject to the designation, and with stipulations that protect the use of the land as a corridor, assure adequate management authority to meet reliability with respect to any facilities that might be located in a corridor, and does not allow the facility owner or operator to be charged rental fees different from those that would have been charged is the land had remained in federal possession.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to address you today. EEI believes through this process electric facilities operating in the west will be able to provide substantial assistance in identifying transmission needs throughout the region. EEI will submit written comments on or prior to the November 28th deadline specified in the Federal Register notice.

Thank you.

SOUDER: Just a reminder. If you'd like
to [inaudible] now, you're more than free to do
that, if you like.

LEHR: Afternoon. My name is Ron Lehr,
L-E-H- R. I'm the western representative for the
American Wind Energy Association.
I've provided the panel with a copy of a very
preliminary outline of the concerns we'll want to
raise in this process. And I'd like to go through
and explain just briefly what we have in mind.
Wind energy will need transmission corridors
that involve federal lands in the west, but the
exact corridors and the precise timing are not
available right now. We, the Wind Energy
Association, and our colleagues at the West-Wind
Wires, whom you will meet in Portland when you get
there, want to help you identify the information
that is available so that the corridors can be
identified.
We want to add to these preliminary comments
that I'm going to make today, as we get the chance
to work on this some more with you and also some of
the information that I'm going to tell you about
has a chance to mature a little more.
The best information right now about wind
transmission needs is found in work by the various regional planning entities that do transmission planning in the region. And there will probably be some wind developers who will talk about particular projects. But, I will say that some of them also have confidentiality concerns about revealing where and the timing of the projects. So, I don't think the wind developers are going to be a complete source of information for this problem.

The draft wind report for the Western Governors Association's Clean and Diversified Energy Analysis Committee -- so-called CDEAC -- has the best information about the role of wind in the west, about making better use of existing transmission, which seems to me to be a prerequisite to adding, and the needs for new transmission corridors.

We've given you some information here about the projected demand for wind. We think it could play a very large role going forward in the electric sector, particularly as the fossil industry shows that it's unable to deliver stable prices to customers.

We've also cited the utility wind interest group, which is doing the best group of integration
of wind in the electric systems. That's something you need to understand that the costs of integrating this variable resource into the electric system are fairly modest. Not a show-stopper.

The markets that the wind projects in the west will serve -- I've characterized them as being local loads served on distribution levels by distributed community and locally-owned wind projects. I think this is really going to take off. It's taking off in the upper Midwest. Serving the regional population centers -- something that the Rocky Mountain Transmission Study identified -- with lines that will come out of the wind areas and serve what's the most urbanized part of the country. The west is the most urbanized part of the country. More people living here in SMSAs [phonetic] than any place else in the country.

And then, the third market is the west coast, where the loads are, and that will require large-scale lines for export. It's a longer-term phenomenon, in my opinion. It depends on some changes in the transmission grid in operations, which I'll refer to, later.
But, there will be competition and trade-offs among these three niches. If it's too expensive and troublesome to build in the Wyoming wind resource -- which is the best one in North America -- and ship to California, then local California winds of less energetic kinds will be developed, instead. So there's going to be some trade-off among those different markets.

So, we have to keep an eye on that in the scoping for this process, because that will determine how much and what kind of corridors will needs.

The wind resources to be served are enormous in the west. They've been characterized by the National Renewal Energy Lab in a Renewable Energy Atlas in the west; in some scenarios that the Segue [phonetic] Group has put together in a balanced energy plan; and I've given you the websites for all of those.

There's a chicken-and-egg or timing mismatch problems that go along with wind. Wind resources are so large and so well distributed that the wind developers will go wherever the transmission is. So, when I talk to them, they say, "tell me where the transmission's going to be -- we'll build you
some wind right there".

And, wind can be developed in a couple of years. You have to wait around, but can be mobilized quite quickly. Transmission takes a long time. And, I think we'll see in the west states following the lead of Texas and Minnesota in getting state laws that require identification of those resources and transmission needed to serve them. And, I think that'll start to happen in the time frame for this study. So, you'll start to see that development coming up while you're looking at this.

There's some wildlife issues with wind. The National Wind Coordinating Committee has the best information on that, and I've given you a reference to them.

And, back on the transmission policy framework -- that's in transition -- so, how that transition operates between where we are in the market today with bilateral operations among utilities, in a transition towards a more open market for the west for resources like wind to move power around -- that transition is going to really, I think, have a big impact on where the transmission corridors need to be. So, that's something I wanted to flag for
you, because I think it's going to be important.

One final point is that there's some work
underway in Minnesota about compensating private
land owners. I think it will be a rare situation
where a transmission line will be located all in
federal right-of-way. So, the feasibility of a
federal right-of-way may turn on how acceptable a
right-of-way is to private land owners. The
methods that we have of compensating private land
owners are, in my opinion, crude. And more
sophisticated methods are under study now in
Minnesota and may reflect more willingness by
private owners to accept transmission. If that
happens, then it could have impact on federal
corridors, as well.

So, those are preliminary things that we
wanted to identify. We'll keep working. We want
to work with you to perfect some of these and,
probably add some more. I know there's a couple
that I though about that didn't get into this, and
we'll be putting them into the other cities where
you're visiting, and some written comments.

Thanks, very much.

POWER: Thank you, Ron. Evan Hanson with
Williams.
HANSON: My name is Evan Hanson. I'm with the Williams Companies, and we, too, appreciate the opportunity of expressing our opinion and writing our thoughts today.

The Williams Companies is primarily a natural gas company. We operate in the western United States 7,000 miles of transmission lines -- or, 4,000 miles of transmission lines -- 7,000 miles of gathering and processing lines. And we have approximately 7,000 natural gas-producing wells.

We have facilities throughout the west, which use pipelines to conduct our business. And our transmission line to the northwest pipeline system is a primary source of natural gas in the states of Washington, Oregon and Idaho. We service natural gas from New Mexico, Colorado, Wyoming, as well as Canada.

Williams is smaller than we used to be. Five years ago, we had over 65,000 miles of natural gas transmission lines and 26,000 miles of fiberoptic cables that we've put in the ground. Since 1969, when NINFA [phonetic] was put in service, we've had tremendous experience putting pipeline and fiberoptic cable in the ground, and we think we understand the process.
Overall, we support the concept of creating the corridors. However, there are some concerns that we want to express and make sure they are addressed in this process.

We are currently conducting a process to build a new system from Wyoming to Kansas, and in certain areas of this system, we find that we'll be following a pipeline corridor where there are ten existing either pipelines or fiberoptic systems. However, we will be required to once again do the appropriate cultural and biological surveys. We feel certain circumstances of that nature are excepted and we hope that something can be done to address that.

We feel that Programmatic EIS, especially as broadly and regionally as this one is, would not do away with these investigations, but they should be done in the appropriate level. We are in the loop in this process. We do a lot of these facilities.

At the same time that this is being done, we think that there should be corridors built and represent the needs of the industry. For example, we need to exercise caution that when pipelines and power lines are put in the same corridors, that appropriate safeguards are in place that the
[garbled] protection of pipelines are not interfered with.

We think it is appropriate to have circumstances where construction has adequate room, where you can be putting multiple systems that we can operate without interfering with any of the existing facilities or the new facilities to come. We don't want to be locked into these corridors.

Any of these comments that you'll hear now, I'm sure that mine are duplicate -- some you've heard and some you'll hear throughout the rest of the day -- but we feel this is very important. We want to be able to have flexibility to fulfill that potential if new energy sources are developed, you've got to have new corridors to address those and get those to the market.

We want to make sure that there are sufficient locations that are remote from those that can protect the assets that will be put in place, meaning the platforms, power lines and such, that get those to the appropriate market. We feel that there's great disparity in the marketplace right now, and a lot of this is due to the lack of infrastructure.

This will become more and more important as
access for developed energy sources here in the Rocky Mountain states in particular. There are projects that I'm sure you are aware of going from the Rocky Mountains to the eastern corridors. These need to have good access through both public and private grounds. We feel that the need to balance private and public grounds needs to be addressed as part of this process. That where we are traversing both, that no one is damaged and that people are allowed so they can get just compensation for the land used.

Williams will be providing written comments to you formally, before the deadline. We commend you for this efforts. We are looking forward to the opportunity of providing these comments and would be glad to consult in any way that we could as we go forward.

Thank you.

POWERS: [inaudible]. Sandra Johnson from Xcel Energy.

POWERS: [inaudible].

P.JOHNSON: [inaudible].

POWERS: Turn it up a little be more. I guess we'll ask the speakers to get a little closer to it.

P.JOHNSON: [inaudible]. Sure. Thank
you. I'm Sandra Johnson. I work for Xcel Energy.

Xcel Energy has facilities in multiple states and we're here today to speak on behalf of Public Service Company of Colorado.

The demand for electricity continues to grow at a very healthy pace in Colorado. And while we are actively seeking the addition of generation resources within our state to meet our load, we also rely on the existing corridors that bring power into our state from both the north and west, as well as the southwest.

So, what we are hoping to accomplish through this is the identification of those existing corridors for expansion potential, as well as the identification of new corridors.

We are transmission constrained, as I mentioned, and we anticipate that in order to continue to provide low-cost power to our customers, in addition to building generation within our state, we will also need to rely on generation resources outside of our state, whether it be renewable and/or cold. And, so, we want to preserve, I guess, our rights and opportunities to work with the DOE on the development of these corridors going
forward so that we can participate and actively comment [garbled].

POWERS: [inaudible]. Is Pam Inman here? Okay. Landon Gates from Colorado Farm Bureau? No? Well, we'll have our open mike for those that didn't sign up, if they'd like to come up and say something. Those are the only people that pre-registered to speak, so, if there's anybody else? Okay.

[inaudible].

POWERS: Huh?

[inaudible].

POWERS: [inaudible].

MURRAY: My name is Mark Murray and I'm with Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association located here in Denver. We are a generation and transmission cooperative. We serve 44 member electric distribution cooperative throughout a four-state area of western Nebraska, Wyoming, Colorado and New Mexico.

As pointed out by Sandra with Xcel, Tri-State, too, is experiencing a great deal of load growth in our members on the front range, western slopes and throughout the western grid. We would encourage and support the Programmatic EIS that's taking
place. We would also encourage that you would seek
information from the western electric -- WECC --
and a conduit for that could be the Western Utility
Group. Tri-State is an active member in that group
and we provide information to WECC on our
expansions as needed for our electric grid system.

And that's the only comments I have. Thank
you.

POWERS: Thank you, Mark. Is there
anybody else that would like to come up and say
anything? Okay. I want to remind you that we have
the scoping comment form on the registration table.
There's copies of the Notice of Intent to prepare
the Programmatic EIS on the back table.

There's several other -- since this is our
first coping session meeting and we're going to do
this in eleven states in the next eight or nine
days, we've actually got two teams that are going
to be doing this and we all came here to the first
one so that, you know, we could get a sense for
what kind of a response we'd get and so we could
figure out whether we're going to do some of these
things together, as well.

And, I'd like to ask those members of BLM,
Forest Service and DOE to stand up, because we're
going to be around. We'll be available to answer
questions and --. Okay. Thank you, very much.

MALE: [inaudible].

POWERS: Yes, sir. There's another
session from 7:00 to 9:00 right here tonight. Yeah,
Ron?

LEHR: [inaudible].

POWERS: Well, what I've been advising
people is, well, from the industry's perspective
that is going to have a utility -- some time of
linear utility facility -- we need to know where
you need to get from point A to point B and why is
that important to you. I mean, it's basically that
simple. And, so -- we could try to make it more
complicated that that's going to be the gist of the
information, from my perspective. Paul or Julia?
Would you like to add --

SOUDER: I just like to add that
expressing your priorities of why you agree or
disagree, whether there's things you really want
brought to the surface and that you really want to
educate us on. Because, the main point of the
public scoping meeting is to really hear from you
many perspectives -- not just industry but, I mean,
all the different voices that are out there to make
sure that we can consider these comments and really
listen to them so that when we're writing the
report, we've definitely heard from everybody
[inaudible].

And it is the best way with these formats is
to really express your priorities -- to really show
us up-front this is what is most important to us,
and as Scott said, this is why.

P.JOHNSON: And, also, just to add, the
collection of information that we will have at
these meetings will go to help the writers of the
Programmatic EIS in framing the alternatives, and
so forth. So, it's good to give us your comments
and suggestion, so that as we move forward in
developing the Programmatic EIS, we have all the
available information to move forward in this
endeavor.

SOUDER: Whether comments are submitted
via at the annual public scoping meetings, website
or fax, they are treated equally. There's equal
weight granted to each one. There's no ranking
[inaudible]. We're glad to get public scoping
comments. The website again, which is on the
poster and the Notice of Intent, and on various
documents that were handed out is
Powers: Another question?

Pay: Are you -- do you have cooperating agencies that are already signed up [inaudible] regional [inaudible].

Souders: We're in consultation with various groups, but, as of right now, BLM, Forest Service and DOE, that are the agencies right now. After public scoping, we'll be definitely adding more names to that [inaudible].

Pay: [inaudible].

Souders: Right. We'll definitely add to the various groups that make comments [inaudible].

Schaftel: Since we're asking questions -- at the end of these transmission corridors, at least the electric ones, there's some type of generation -- does that exclude some consideration [inaudible] process?

Souders: I don't think we have the answer to that, yet, because the whole point of public scoping is to get a better understanding --

Schaftel: Better understanding. So there could be included in the process of evaluation if you get enough comments --

Souders: Could be.
SCHAFISH: -- in the scoping process
[inaudible].

VARHOL: Well, definitely you want the
crude fields, the oil field and the wind areas
[inaudible].

SOUDER: Would you want to make a public
comment with your name and address? I mean, that'd
be great.

VARHOL: Okay. My name is Thomas Varhol,
I'm with Black & Beach [phonetic] Corporation.

POWERS: [inaudible].

VARHOL: Sure.

SOUDER: Thank you.

VARHOL: I have more questions than
comments, but, I guess -- depending on how you
respond to the questions -- what clearly -- with
corridors in the western states, you want to hit
crude fields and the oil shale area and the prime
wind areas that the gentleman earlier spoke of. How
wide are these corridors going to be? Any thoughts
on that, yet?

POWERS: No. We're directing the
legislation to establish a width, but that's going
to be based on information that we receive in
scoping.
VARHOL: But, are we talking about a line
on a map, or are we talking about something several
hundred feet wide or several miles wide?

SOUDER: That's all depending on what we
receive from the public scoping.

POWERS: The legislation says we have to
define a centerline of the corridor.

SOUDER: Right. I'm going to interrupt
for one second, because we're not really supposed
to be doing Q&A. We need to just check with you on
public scoping and, if you want to continue this
dialog with the panel, we'll be going off the
record, so, I want to make sure that the people who
still want to speak and be on the record, then
let's do that now and we can do a Q&A off the
record.

VARHOL: Okay. One last comment, then.
I hope that you work with the state agencies that
certify the various types of linear facilities and
get their buy-in to whatever corridors you're
talking about. Because, not only do we have to deal
with federal agencies to permit various linear
facilities, we also have to go through the state
certification process. And we need their support on
this, as well.
Thanks.

SOUHER: Does anyone else want to come to the podium and give their name and a comment?
[inaudible comments].

POWERS: Okay. Thank you, very much. I guess we can turn that up and open it up for questions.

[Break taken from 2:40 p.m. to 3:50 p.m.]

POWERS: Can I have your attention, please? Sorry about that. There's been several people that have signed up after we ended the official proceeding and so, I wanted to know if any of those people wanted to make any comments that they'd like to have recorded and whether we need to open the proceedings. So, is there anybody that wishes to do so? Okay. Thanks.

[END OF MEETING]
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