

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

In Re the Matter of:)
)
ADOPTION OF A LONG-TERM)
EXPERIMENTAL PLAN FOR THE FUTURE)
OPERATION OF GLEN CANYON DAM AND)
OTHER ASSOCIATED MANAGEMENT)
ACTIVITIES)
)
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING)
-----)

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

Phoenix, Arizona
January 4, 2007
6:06 p.m.

PREPARED BY:
DOREEN C. BORGMANN, RMR, CRR
Certified Reporter
Certificate No. 50644

PREPARED FOR:
U. S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation

(Original)



3030 North Central Avenue
Suite 1102
Phoenix, Arizona 85012

T 602.264.2230
888.529.9990
F 602.264.2245

www.griffinreporters.com

1 REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
2 taken in the Public Scoping Meeting regarding the Long
3 Term Experimental Plan for the Operation of Glen Canyon
4 Dam and Other Associated Management Activities, at the
5 Embassy Suites Phoenix Airport, Cholla Room, 1515 North
6 44th Street, Phoenix, Arizona, on the 4th day of
7 January, 2007, commencing at the hour of 6:06 p.m. of
8 the said day. The proceedings were reported by Doreen
9 C. Borgmann, RMR, CRR, and a Certified Reporter in and
10 for the County of Maricopa, State of Arizona.

11

12 APPEARANCES:

13 For the Bureau of Reclamation:
14 RANDALL PETERSON
15 DENNIS KUBLY
 DAVE SABO
 JAYNE KELLEHER

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

P R O C E E D I N G

MR. PETERSON: Good evening. After a short burst of technical difficulties, I think we're ready to start. My name is Randy Peterson. I'm the manager of the Environmental Resources Management Division, Salt Lake Bureau of Reclamation.

Everybody hear okay? A little bit louder. Is that okay? Okay. Great.

Did everybody sign in?

Okay. Appreciate that.

You might have noticed as you signed in that at the table right there there's a number of Federal Register notices, fact sheets, and other information. Make sure you take whatever piece of information you'd like.

And since there's just a few of us here tonight, maybe it makes some sense to introduce ourselves to each other.

Dennis, go ahead and start.

MR. KUBLY: I'm Dennis Kubly. I work with Randy in Salt Lake.

MR. KNOWLES: Glen Knowles, Fish and Wildlife Service.

MS. SCHUSTER: Laura Schuster, National Park Service, Grand Canyon.

1 MS. JALBERT: Linda Jalbert, National Park
2 Service, Grand Canyon.

3 MR. WERNER: Bill Werner, Arizona Department of
4 Water Resources.

5 MR. LOCANDER: Aaron Locander, citizen.

6 MS. BECKMAN: Natalie Beckman, citizen.

7 MR. RICE: Ken Rice, Bureau of Reclamation, Glen
8 Canyon Dam.

9 MR. GOCKEL: Rich Gockel, citizen.

10 MS. BALSOM: Jan Balsom, National Park Service.

11 MR. SPILLER: Sam Spiller, U.S. Fish and Wildlife
12 Service.

13 MS. CHEONG: Holly Cheong, Southern Nevada Water
14 Authority.

15 MR. MELIS: Ted Melis, U. S. Geological Survey.

16 MR. LEHR: Phil Lehr, Colorado River Commission
17 of Nevada.

18 MS. ERLANDSEN: Evelyn Erlandsen, here as a
19 citizen.

20 MR. CHRISTENSEN: Kerry Christensen, Hualapai
21 Tribe.

22 MS. JAMES: Leslie James, Colorado Energy
23 Distributors Association.

24 MS. CARROLL: Stacey Carroll, Bureau of
25 Reclamation.

1 MR. SABO: Dave Sabo, Bureau of Reclamation.

2 MS. KELLEHER: Jayne Kelleher, Bureau of
3 Reclamation.

4 MR. LI: Paul Li, here for Bob Lynch.

5 MR. PETERSON: Jan?

6 MS. BALSOM: I already did.

7 MR. PETERSON: Okay. Great.

8 Well, welcome. We appreciate your coming
9 tonight. The purpose of our discussion tonight and the
10 opportunity for you to have input and comment on a
11 proposed Environmental Impact Statement that Reclamation
12 is going to prepare over the next two years.

13 We'll be describing tonight some of the
14 historic information that the Adaptive Management
15 Program has unpaved, if you will, or discovered,
16 revealed over the last decade and the need for
17 additional experimentation below Glen Canyon Dam.

18 We'll talk about the schedule. We'll talk
19 about how you can be involved. And we'll talk about
20 ways for you to obtain information.

21 We'll spend just a few minutes as we
22 discuss the Adapted Management Program for those of you
23 that might not be familiar with it.

24 And we primarily want to hear from you.
25 And specifically what we want to hear are issues that

1 are important to you and you think should be covered,
2 discussed, and evaluated in the Environmental Impact
3 Statement, ideas for alternatives that should be
4 discussed, and methods or processes of analysis that you
5 would suggest we use. So we are here tonight to listen.

6 Glen Canyon was authorized in 1963 -- 1956,
7 completed in 1963, and is located about 15 miles
8 upstream of Lee's Ferry. The compact point between the
9 upper and lower basins on the Colorado river.

10 It was designed as a water storage unit,
11 the keystone really of the Colorado River Storage
12 Project. And its purpose was to ensure that the
13 requirements of the Colorado River Compact of 1922 could
14 be met. In other words, that the upper basin could
15 deliver no less than 75 million acre feet every ten
16 years to the lower basin states of Nevada, Arizona, and
17 California. And this large storage unit provided the
18 insurance, if you will, that this release could be met
19 during drought periods.

20 And, of course, we've been through a recent
21 drought period of five or six years when the storage of
22 Glen Canyon was called on to make those deliveries. And
23 without it Glenn Canyon would not have been able to help
24 make those deliveries, and uses in the upper basin would
25 have been severely limited, and Lake Mead would be

1 nearly dry as we speak.

2 In 1992, Congress passed and the president
3 signed the Grand Canyon Protection Act. This act
4 required the things that you see on the screen right
5 here. The EIS was completed in the middle of 1995, and
6 the record of decision was signed in 1996.

7 The EIS and the response to the Grand
8 Canyon Protection Act also established the Adaptive
9 Management Program. This was established as a federal
10 advisory committee where this committee makes
11 recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior.

12 The Secretary then responds to these
13 recommendations, and they can cover the gamut from dam
14 operations to specific things like non-native control or
15 temperature warming, specific actions the park service
16 might take, for example, as managers of the National
17 Park in the Grand Canyon.

18 It also required that these actions, these
19 recommendations and actions the Secretary would take to
20 protect the Grand Canyon would be done in accordance
21 with the existing water delivery requirements, and that
22 includes the Mexican Treaty requirements, if any,
23 Colorado River Compact, and various statutes that are in
24 place.

25 In 1997, the Glen Canyon Dam Adaptive

1 Management Program was established, and in the decade
2 since then, there's been a number of experiments
3 conducted to try and better understand the ecological
4 effects of man's actions in the Grand Canyon. Human
5 activity such as, not only dam operations, but also the
6 influence and effect of non-native species, of other
7 management policies such as recreation or visitor use,
8 and the effect of natural processes not related to dam
9 operations.

10 We should spend a minute and talk about
11 beach/habitat-building flows. They're cornerstone to
12 much of the experimentation that has occurred. These
13 are flows that are above power plant capacity, at least
14 40 to 45,000 CFS when the power plant capacity is about
15 30,000 CFS, and their purpose is to stir up the sediment
16 in the main stem and rebuild beaches downstream of the
17 dam. They also help reestablish and rework back water
18 deposits, eddy areas downstream that are key to native
19 fish habitat.

20 In 1996 this was the first test of such an
21 event, and there was quite a bit of skepticism about
22 whether or not it was even going to work at all. And so
23 it was a rather unique experiment.

24 In 2000, we conducted a four-month period
25 of steady low flows out of the dam during the summer.

1 This had the effect of significantly warming the
2 releases as they flowed down from the dam through the
3 Grand Canyon, and the purpose of this experiment was to
4 determine if steady or low flows would have a positive
5 effect on the native fish community out in the stream.

6 The third bullet, the translocation of
7 ambersnail and chub, were related to trying to expand
8 the range of these two endangered species beyond their
9 present habitats. It really was in response to the
10 fourth -- the fifth bullet, actually, and the fourth
11 bullet, an additional test of beach/habitat-building
12 flows and other actions designed to better understand
13 the ecosystem.

14 About this time as well, you may have heard
15 about the removal of non-native trout from the area
16 around the confluence with the Little Colorado River.
17 And so these things were pretty integrally related.
18 That non-native removal continued for four years and has
19 essentially eliminated to a great degree the trout
20 population near that confluence.

21 That confluence is important because it is
22 also the centroid of the location of the humpback chub
23 in the Grand Canyon. Most of the chub in the canyon use
24 the Little Colorado River for much of their life stages.

25 About this time as well the drought had

1 reduced the level of Lake Powell such that the distance
2 between the water surface elevation and the power plant
3 intake penstocks was significantly reduced and the water
4 naturally warmed. Typically, the releases have been 9,
5 10, 11 degrees Centigrade, and they got as high as
6 pretty close to 15 degrees, I think, in 2005. And as
7 the water warmed, as it went downstream, it exceeded the
8 threshold of 16 degrees Centigrade that's required for
9 humpback chub spawning and recruitment. And so we'll be
10 talking a little bit or showing you a little bit of
11 information about that.

12 Now, in connection with all these
13 experimental efforts, Reclamation conducted NEPA
14 compliance and compared environmental assessments on
15 these actions. That website at the bottom of the page
16 is where you can find those. This will be important
17 because this current effort will build upon all these
18 actions. It will build upon the 1996 EIS. It will tier
19 off that. It will tier off these existing or previous
20 environmental assessments. And it will use the
21 knowledge that has been gained through the past decade
22 of scientific investigation under the Adaptive
23 Management Program.

24 This is the Proposed Federal Action. Why
25 don't you take a minute and read that. I want to make

1 sure that it's clear. There's a couple important points
2 here.

3 When we say a Long-Term Experimental Plan,
4 the duration of the proposed action is not stated with
5 certainty. I know the Adaptive Management Program has
6 been talking about ten plus or minus years in length,
7 but it's not fixed. So if you have comments on that, we
8 would appreciate that.

9 The focus is an experiment. There are many
10 things that we don't know or won't be able to predict
11 about the outcome of these actions. And so the
12 Environmental Impact Statement will try and evaluate the
13 proposed alternatives for this experiment. But,
14 frankly, there are going to be some things that we won't
15 know the answer to, and this is the experimental nature
16 of this action.

17 You should note that there's more involved
18 than just dam operations, and we'll get into that in a
19 minute. Modifications to the intake structures. This
20 is along the lines of a temperature control device
21 designed to physically take the water from higher up in
22 the reservoir so that it's warmer.

23 There might be other things included in our
24 alternatives such as the continued non-native removal --
25 non-native fish removal.

1 But there might be other actions, too.
2 That's part of the reason for the public meeting
3 tonight. So if you have ideas of things that we should
4 consider as part of this experiment, we'd like to hear
5 from you.

6 We'll go into a specific Purpose and Need
7 Statement that we crafted. And this is published in our
8 Federal Register notice. There are two key parts for
9 the purpose of this action. One is the scientific
10 understanding, and one is downstream resource
11 protection. We would expect the alternatives to be able
12 to meet the purpose and need must accomplish these two
13 objectives. So rigorous scientific monitoring has been
14 a keystone to the past decade of effort for the Adaptive
15 Management Program.

16 And we would expect that, to meet the
17 purpose and need statement, the alternatives would have
18 to produce answers to key questions about downstream
19 resources and the effect of the previous slide's
20 characteristics of each alternative. So if we're going
21 to evaluate a temperature control device, for example,
22 at the end of our experiment, we should be able to
23 answer the question did this work or not. And you could
24 make the same type of argument or question about each
25 part of the various alternatives.

1 The second half to the paragraph are some
2 ideas on things we have included in the Federal Register
3 notice that could be or should be addressed. Those are
4 primarily dam and other management action related. You
5 can see there are still some unanswered questions about
6 habitat building flows, some question about the effect
7 of non-native removal, temperature warming, and flow
8 releases. And so those are the kind of things that we
9 intend to be able to address through the experimental
10 duration of the program. This is why it's needed.

11 The first half of that paragraph is pretty
12 much a verbatim citation from the Grand Canyon
13 Protection Act related to resource protection. The
14 second half relates to how the Secretary of the Interior
15 makes decisions about what actions to take, not only
16 with respect to dam operations, but also actions within
17 the National Park, for example, or other resource
18 impacts between Lake Powell and Lake Mead such as
19 non-native removal, things like that.

20 So as the result of this experimental
21 program, if the Secretary has a better understanding of
22 how the ecosystem responds to these specific actions,
23 he or she will then be able to make a better decision
24 when addressed with those concerns or questions.

25 Now, as I mentioned before, this current

1 effort will tier off the previous documents. The
2 Adaptive Management Program has already started to
3 address the question of this experimental plan. In
4 fact, it, for the past about a year and a half, I think,
5 has had numerous meetings about how to structure this
6 experiment, what kind of things should be studied.

7 They've just completed some recommendations
8 to the Secretary putting forth three or four different
9 options that primarily relate to differing types of dam
10 releases, but also include the consideration of a
11 temperature control device and non-native removal and
12 other actions. The aspects of those Adaptive Management
13 Group recommendations we posted to our website so you
14 can peruse them with great detail. But we'll be
15 building off those efforts as we go through this EIS.

16 This is what we've done to date. Copies of
17 those Federal Register notices are on the back table.
18 Now, we've had a number of opportunities for interaction
19 with the public, but we will basically have the next two
20 months to offer the public opportunity to comment on
21 this proposed action. We have a copy of this Power
22 Point presentation on the back table. And in that,
23 you'll have this slide here, so you'll be able to get
24 our address and e-mail addresses and things like that by
25 which you can send us comments. And we think we're

1 going to be able to move steadily through this process.

2 Our goal is to have a final record of
3 decision in about two years. Now, to do that, we will
4 conduct Scoping Meetings today and tomorrow in Salt
5 Lake. We expect to be able to publish the Scoping
6 Report by March, have alternatives by May and then take
7 about a year to prepare a draft. We'll have a number of
8 cooperative agencies working with us. And we know this
9 is ambitious, and it also comes at a time when we've got
10 a lot of work to do on the shortage EIS for the lower
11 basin, shortage criteria as well. It's very ambitious,
12 but we believe it's very doable.

13 I think I'd like to stop here and see if
14 you have any questions initially and then open it up for
15 your comments.

16 In making comments, if you could come to
17 the front of the room, that would be helpful and use the
18 mic. That way the court reporter can hear you more
19 clearly. Spell your name, if you would, please. I know
20 you've signed in as wanting to make a comment, and
21 that's great, too.

22 So first of all, any questions at all?

23 Norm.

24 MR. HENDERSON: Randy, in the proposed action,
25 you say that it's. The proposal is to make -- develop

1 and adopt a long-term experimental plan. And is the
2 intention there to include those non-flow actions as
3 part of the experiment, an actual experiment, so that
4 they would actually be tested through some kind of
5 experimental design?

6 MR. PETERSON: Everybody hear the question okay?
7 He's basically asking in this experimental design, would
8 non-flow actions also be rigorously tested through this
9 experimental plan EIS to be able to produce scientific
10 results at the end of that plan. The answer is yes.

11 I think fundamental to addressing a solid
12 science program to this effort is the identification of
13 core or key hypotheses or questions that will focus our
14 efforts on specific resources or specific actions that
15 we might take in response to trying to protect those
16 resources. And at the end of that effort, we would
17 expect to be able to answer those questions.

18 Yes, sir.

19 MR. GOCKEL: Is the purpose of the non-native
20 controls -- at the end of this study, would you have a
21 better way to remove trout upstream from these areas?
22 Is that the goal?

23 MR. PETERSON: Okay. That's a good question. Is
24 the goal to remove trout upstream from Lee's Ferry for
25 one, and is the purpose of the experiment to find a

1 better way to do that? I would say probably no and no
2 is the answer to the question. The non-native removal
3 effort has been downstream of Lee's Ferry. The area
4 upstream of Lee's Ferry has been viewed by the Adaptive
5 Management Program as a blue ribbon trout fishery and
6 pretty much left alone with respect to that. The
7 humpback chub are generally downstream. And it's the
8 interaction between the two that's of concern.

9 So the purpose, if it's part of this
10 experimental plan in the end, might be, for example, to
11 determine the interaction between the native and
12 non-native and answering the question has reducing the
13 trout downstream had a positive effect upon the
14 endangered humpback chub. That might be one question.
15 But frankly, we're here to listen to your views on what
16 those questions should be. That answer the question?
17 Okay.

18 MR. GOCKEL: Yes.

19 MR. PETERSON: Any other questions. Jan. Jan --
20 I'm sorry. Mary Barger.

21 MS. BARGER: Did you decide who the cooperating
22 agencies will be?

23 MR. PETERSON: Yeah. We're in the process right
24 now of sending out letters to the cooperating agencies.
25 That should be coming to you shortly. But generally,

1 there will be quite a few of the members of the Adaptive
2 Management Workgroup, certainly all of the Department of
3 Interior agencies that are part of that, tribes, state
4 governments, local government agencies.

5 That's a good leading question. We intend
6 to use the Adaptive Management Program as the mechanism
7 for interacting with our cooperating agencies. And so
8 part of every Adaptive Management Workgroup meeting will
9 be dedicated to an update on the progress of the EIS.
10 For example, disclosure of alternatives, disclosure of
11 methods of analysis, progress in terms of evaluating the
12 impact and things like that.

13 Other questions? Norm.

14 MR. HENDERSON: With regard to the cooperating
15 agencies, are we going to develop a specific cooperative
16 agreement between us cooperating agencies and the Bureau
17 of Reclamation for completion of the interaction between
18 us and you for the EIS.

19 MR. PETERSON: The question is are we going to
20 have a Memorandum of Agreement between the cooperating
21 agencies and Reclamation. I don't know the answer to
22 that yet. Maybe; maybe not.

23 MR. PETERSON: As you might tell from the
24 presentation, we're just barely getting started in terms
25 of public interaction and, frankly, the development of

1 the core foundation issues to be developed in the EIS.
2 So I think that's why your public comments are very
3 important to us. Jan.

4 MS. BALSOM: Randy, could you speak a little bit
5 more about the relationship with the Settlement
6 Agreement in the Federal Register notice, to kind of put
7 this in context.

8 MR. PETERSON: The question was could I talk a
9 little bit more about this EIS in relationship to the
10 Settlement Agreement.

11 First of all some background. Reclamation
12 was sued -- oh, seems like it's almost a year ago -- for
13 failure to comply with NEPA, ESA, and the Grand Canyon
14 Protection Act in protecting downstream resources. We,
15 of course, don't believe that. And in the discussions
16 that ensued since the plaintiffs filed that lawsuit we
17 reached agreement. It was memorialized in a Settlement
18 Agreement that required Reclamation to take some
19 specific actions. That's the last year of the
20 Settlement Agreement.

21 This process of trying to develop an
22 experimental flow plan has been going on at least a year
23 and a half. We've recognized the importance of becoming
24 very rigorous in trying to answer the scientific
25 questions rather than just a continued monitoring and

1 research without a real specific direction. And I don't
2 mean to sound critical at all. I'm not being critical
3 at all. But I think it's -- everybody recognized the
4 time has come for us to focus on core questions and get
5 them answered and then take the actions that the results
6 would indicate should be taken.

7 So what happened during the potential
8 lawsuit and the Settlement Agreement is that we saw a
9 pretty good marriage between the completion of this
10 effort, for example, and meeting what the plaintiffs
11 wanted to do. And that led to a Settlement Agreement.
12 That required that we publish a Federal Register notice
13 by the end of January, 2007, that we initiate Section 7
14 Consultation, I think by May of 2008. And so our
15 process here marries very well with what was agreed to
16 with the plaintiffs. That answer the question okay?

17 Okay.

18 MR. PETERSON: Well, we'd like to -- right now
19 like to open it up to comments from you if that sounds
20 agreeable. I know at least two people have indicated
21 they'd like to make a comment. And just --

22 Bill, come on up.

23 This is Bill Werner. He's the first
24 commenter.

25 Just a reminder that your written comments,

1 whether it's by e-mail or letter, will carry the same
2 weight as any verbal comments made tonight. In fact, we
3 often prefer the written comments so we can have greater
4 expansion of your thoughts. But we've got a court
5 reporter that will capture your comments verbatim.
6 Remember to spell your name. And take it from there,
7 Bill.

8 MR. BILL WERNER: Where are we going to do this?

9 MR. PETERSON: Here is fine.

10 MR. BILL WERNER: Okay. My name's William E.
11 Werner, Environmental Program Manager, Arizona
12 Department of Water Resources, 3550 North Central
13 Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85012.

14 I'm here today to present scoping comments
15 of the Arizona Department of Water Resources. Arizona
16 is host state to a portion of Lake Powell and Glen
17 Canyon National Recreation Area, Glen Canyon Dam, and
18 Grand Canyon National Park. These are important assets
19 to the State.

20 Water stored and released from Glen Canyon
21 Dam and associated energy production are also important
22 assets to Arizona. Thirty-five percent of Arizona's
23 overall water use is from the Colorado River with a
24 majority of that water released from Glen Canyon Dam.
25 Electrical energy produced at the dam is utilized by

1 municipal, agricultural, tribal, military, and rural
2 customers scattered across Arizona.

3 In developing long-term experimental plan
4 alternatives to, as described in the Federal Register
5 notice, increase understanding of the ecosystem
6 downstream from Glen Canyon dam and to improve and
7 protect important downstream resources, a balance of
8 benefits should be maintained.

9 As recommended by the Glen Canyon Dam
10 Adaptive Management Workgroup on December 6, 2006, the
11 alternatives should maintain the balance of benefits to
12 all resources as described in the Record of Decision for
13 the Glen Canyon Dam EIS while focusing on humpback chub
14 and sediment resources. Insofar as they are consistent
15 with this balance and focus, the elements of the
16 alternatives should include a range of flow events
17 patterns and timing, include non-flow experiments, be
18 based on credible science planning, maximize hydro-power
19 capacity and flexibility to the extent possible and
20 address tribal and cultural resources.

21 We note that Section 1802 of the Grand
22 Canyon Protection Act requires "Consistency in
23 establishment and implementation of long-term monitoring
24 programs and activities by directing that the Secretary
25 shall operate Glen Canyon Dam in accordance with the

1 additional criteria and operating plans specified in
2 Section 1804 and exercise other authorities under
3 existing law in such a manner as to protect, mitigate
4 adverse impacts to, and improve the values for which
5 Grand Canyon National Park and Glen Canyon National
6 Recreation Area were established, including but not
7 limited to natural and cultural resources and visitor
8 use; and that the Secretary shall implement this section
9 in a manner fully consistent with and subject to the
10 Colorado River Compact, the Upper Colorado River Basin
11 Compact, the Water Treaty of 1944 with Mexico, and the
12 decree of the Supreme Court in Arizona vs. California
13 and the provisions of the Colorado River Storage Project
14 of 1956 and the Colorado River Basin Project Act of 1968
15 that governed allocation, appropriation, development,
16 and exportation of waters of the Colorado River Basin."

17 We look forward to working with all
18 involved parties to develop alternatives that provide a
19 balance of benefits consistent with law. Thank you.

20 MR. PETERSON: Thank you, Bill. Okay. I think
21 that's all that have signed in to give comments. Is
22 there anybody else that would like to offer a verbal
23 comment?

24 Welcome, Dave. Dave Wegner from Durango,
25 Colorado, as I recall. Is that right?

1 MR. WEGNER: So far.

2 MR. PETERSON: So far. Nice to have you here.

3 We failed to introduce a couple of people
4 that you heard their names, but they're key to the
5 scientific understanding of the Adaptive Management
6 Program. One is Dennis Kubly. He's our program manager
7 for the Adaptive Management Program, seated with me here
8 at the table. And Dr. Ted Melis in the back row. Ted,
9 raise your hand quickly. Ted's with the Grand Canyon
10 Monitoring Research Center in Flagstaff. Has been
11 around for probably 20 years I think. And great
12 resources. If you've got questions about the scientific
13 studies and things that they've discovered, please chat
14 with Ted or Dennis.

15 We'll be here all evening to take
16 questions, interact with you. At any time if you'd like
17 to offer a comment, our court reporter will be here to
18 take that.

19 And, again, a reminder, pick up a copy of
20 the PowerPoint presentation, our e-mail and street
21 address is on that. And let us know your thoughts.
22 Very good. Thank you.

23 (Whereupon, a recess was taken for informal
24 discussion.)

25 (The proceedings concluded at 7:45 p.m.)

1 STATE OF ARIZONA)
) SS.
 2 COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

3

4 I, DOREEN C. BORGMANN, hereby certify that
 5 the foregoing pages numbered from 3 to 24, inclusive,
 6 constitute a full, true and accurate record of the
 7 proceedings had in the above matter, all done to the
 8 best of my skill and ability.

9 DATED this 26th day of January, 2007.

10

11

12

Doreen C. Borgmann

 DOREEN C. BORGMANN, RMR, CRR
 Certified Reporter
 Arizona Certificate No. 50644

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25