

43481_DOE_Grid_Deployment_Office_CITAP Webinar Video_v01_RELEASE

WHITNEY BELL: Hello, and welcome to the Coordination of Federal Authorizations for Electric Transmission Facilities webinar and public meeting. I'm Whitney Bell with ICF, and I'll be your host today. First, I have a few housekeeping items for today's webinar. This Webex meeting is being recorded and may be used by the US Department of Energy. If you do not wish to have your voice recorded, please do not speak during the call. If you do not wish to have your image recorded, please turn off your camera or participate by phone. If you speak during the call or use a video connection, you are presumed consent to recording and use of your voice or image. All participants are in listen-only mode. If you have any technical issues or questions, you may type them in the chat box and select Send to Host in the dropdown.

We are not taking questions today, but we will have an opportunity for public comment. Attendees who indicated they would like to comment in their registration will be given priority. Given the volume of people who requested to speak, we are unable to provide additional commenting slots. Those who wish to provide comment but did not request a speaking opportunity can provide comment through the mechanisms in the NOPR. There should be information that will be dropped here in the chat.

Also, if you need to view live captioning, please refer to the link that will appear in the chat now as well. We will post a recording and copy of today's presentation on the Coordinated Interagency Transmission Authorization and Permits Webinar web page in about two weeks.

Finally, we would like to notify you that none of the information presented herein is legally binding. The content included in this presentation is intended for informational purposes only relating to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking-- DOE-HQ-2023-0050 Coordination of Federal Authorization of Electric Transmission Facilities. Any content within this presentation that appears discrepant from the NOPR language is superseded by the NOPR language.

Now that I've got all the housekeeping all the way, let's go ahead and get started. First, we'll hear from Maria Robinson, the Director of the Grid Deployment Office for her opening remarks. Maria, I'll go ahead and turn this over to you.

MARIA ROBINSON: Thank you so much, and welcome, everyone. Good afternoon or morning, depending on which time zone you're in. As previously mentioned, my name's Maria Robinson, and I'm the Director for the Grid Deployment Office here at the Department of Energy. And just wanted to welcome all of you to today's public meeting for the coordination of federal authorizations for electric transmission facilities. While I think that that rolls off the tongue, we've narrowed that down to an acronym called CITAP and the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that was published on the Federal Register on August 16 of this year and which is open for comment until Monday, October 2, this year, 2023. So this NOPR introduces this CITAP program, which my colleagues will later explain in greater detail. Certainly, this effort to improve the coordination of permitting of transmission infrastructure builds on the incredible financial investments in electric infrastructure under this administration. The bipartisan infrastructure law makes the largest long-term investment in our nation's infrastructure in nearly a century.

And, of course, the Inflation Reduction Act is breathing life into our clean energy economy by incentivizing the deployment of clean technologies and lowering energy costs.

Our Office, the Grid Deployment Office, also known as GDO, is one of the new offices established to implement the bipartisan infrastructure law and Inflation Reduction Act funding and with new authorities in pursuit of clean, affordable electricity for all. And, through these laws, GDO has about \$26 billion in funding available to support investment in critical generation facilities, the development of inter-regional transmission lines, and upgrades to our existing distribution and transmission system to support grid modernization efforts.

So, in addition to the work that we are going to talk about today, our Generation Credits Division runs over \$750 million in hydroelectric incentives and a \$6 billion civil nuclear credits program. We're also responsible for overseeing about \$14 billion in grid modernization funding through both competitive grants and federal financial assistance as well as formula grants for states, Tribal Nations, and territories. Lastly, as I'm sure many folks on this call are aware, GDO administers several transmission financing and facilitation programs available through the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law and Inflation Reduction Act, including about \$4.5 billion in revolving fund and loan programs. We are in the process of standing up the Transmission Siting and Economic Development Grant program, which is a \$760 million investment, in order to support states and local communities in the siting and permitting of both interstate and offshore electricity transmission lines. If you're here today for this webinar and you're interested in learning more about any of these programs, please go to the GDO's website to learn more. And I encourage you, in particular, to check out our Grid and Transmission Programs Conductor website that includes more detailed information on the various grid and transmission financing opportunities available through GDO and, of course, the Department of Energy at large.

All of this investment, of course, makes it imperative to be able to build new transmission infrastructure to move power from where it is generated to where it's most needed. Here at GDO, we believe that the NOPR released in August and the CITAP program that we are proposing here is an important tool to achieve that goal. So, through this meeting today, and over the next six weeks, we are very much in listening mode. We want to hear from all of you as to what you have to say about our proposal, and we look forward to receiving that feedback. So thank you for being here today as an important part of that process. I'll turn it back over to Whitney.

WHITNEY BELL: Thank you, Maria. Before we move on to our next speaker, let's dive into our agenda. First, we'll learn about the MOU and the 216(h) background before discussing the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and the Standard Schedule. We'll conclude today's webinar with an opportunity for public comments. With that said, let's now welcome Samuel Walsh, General Counsel with the US Department of Energy.

SAMUEL WALSH: Good afternoon, everyone. Thanks for joining. We are very much looking forward to your questions today and your feedback on our proposed rule. That's how we're going to end up with the best possible product. So this is a really important issue for the Department, for the administration, and the CITAP program is a major priority addressing an issue that I think that probably everyone who's tuned in today understands to be a very significant issue for reliability, for affordable electricity, and for meeting the administration's goals.

The background to the rulemaking that we're going to talk about today is an MOU that DOE, as one of nine agencies, entered in May of this year, an MOU intended to expedite the siting, permitting, and

construction of electric transmission lines. The MOU does so by empowering DOE to use its authority under Section 216(h) of the Federal Power Act. That provision was enacted in EPAct 2005. You might say that Section 216(h) was a bit ahead of its time in the sense that it was enacted. The potential that lay in that section has remained latent for a long time, but we're proposing to use that authority now in a way that we described in the NOPR and that we'll describe in greater detail today.

Before handing it over, I just want to say a big thank you to our fellow agencies that we have worked with so collaboratively in this process, from the MOU process to the development of the proposed rule, really, great colleagues at Department of Interior, USDA, Department of Defense, Commerce, EPA, CEQ, FPISC, OMB, and on and on. So if any of you are listening today, thank you. And, without further ado, I'll turn it over to our Transmission team to walk us through the program.

WHITNEY BELL: Thank you, Sam. Next, we'll hear from Jeffery Dennis. He's the Deputy Director for Transmission Development with the Grid Deployment Office. Jeff, welcome.

JEFFERY DENNIS: Thank you, Whitney, and good afternoon or good morning, again, depending on where you are. My name is Jeff Dennis. I'm Deputy Director for GDO's Transmission Division. I'll be providing a walk-through of the purpose of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking we're going to talk about today and the proposed CITAP program. I'll also explain a little bit about how this all fits into other transmission authorities that the Department has under Section 216(h) of the Federal Power Act.

The NOPR that we're talking about today proposes to implement the memorandum of understanding among our nine fellow agencies that Sam mentioned on the previous slide, and it does so by establishing the Coordinated Interagency Authorizations and Permits, or CITAP, program. The program is intended to do a number of things. As a reminder, what this program is focused on is improving the efficiency of the federal permitting and environmental review process. We do this by enhancing communication and coordination and reducing duplication of work among federal agencies, providing more certainty to transmission project developers through a standard and transparent process, ensuring that communities are engaged in the process from early on in the process. Every successful siting experience involves early and often community engagement, and that is a big part of this program as well.

In addition, the program requires that developers, project proponents, have heightened readiness to begin environmental reviews. This reduces the potential for later delays. And, again, the point here is that projects are ready to go. They've been fully analyzed and are ready to enter into the permitting and review process. This NOPR is also consistent with Congress's recent action in the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2003, which requires the designation of a National Environmental Policy Act lead agency to perform a coordinating and schedule-setting function.

Here, are some key components of the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking that we will talk today. Again, these are key components of the CITAP program. This is not a comprehensive list. You can find, obviously, comprehensive details in the NOPR itself, and the rest of this webinar will give us some additional key components as well. But the NOPR implements two key commitments in the MOU-- one, that environmental reviews and authorizations, federal environmental reviews and authorizations for transmission projects, will be completed within two years and that we set a two-year schedule for completion of those reviews. So the NOPR implements DOE's obligation to set those schedules and prepare a single environmental impact statement.

In addition, the NOPR improves the pre-application process that DOE has in its current regulations. This pre-application process is critical to completing environmental reviews and authorizations within two

years. It is an iterative process, by which agencies will work together and with applicants to develop all of the information that's needed in order to conduct environmental reviews and authorization reviews. In addition, alongside the NOPR, the Department has also issued a standard template schedule. You'll hear more about that standard template schedule later, but what that does is really provide an indication of how we expect transmission projects to proceed to approval within that two-year timeframe. In addition, the NOPR requires project proponents to submit resource reports to assist in developing information needed to efficiently conduct permitting and environmental reviews. Those resource reports cover a range of topics-- you will hear more about them in a minute-- but they are key to ensuring that projects are ready to efficiently proceed through the permitting and environmental review process. And they will be subject to that iteration that I talked about among all of the relevant federal agencies involved in this process as well as any state agencies who choose to voluntarily participate in this program as well. And, finally, as I mentioned earlier, the NOPR will require project's proponents to submit a Project Participation Plan to summarize their past and planned stakeholder and community and outreach and public engagement.

I do want to mention one more thing about those resource reports. I mentioned that they will be developed during the IIP process and worked on iteratively with all of the federal agencies, but I do want to emphasize that these resource reports are intended to help inform federal decision-making but not supplant any necessary inherently federal decisions that each of the participating agencies must make. The point, here, is to use these resource reports and the preparation of a single environmental impact statement to support all of those various federal decisions that need to be made, to reduce duplication, and increase efficiency in the process.

This slide is intended to show you the different authorities that we have under FPA Section 216 and to understand what we are talking about today. So you see there, to the right of the dark line, is the program we are talking about today under Section 216(h) of the Federal Power Act. This program is focused solely on federal authorizations and DOE's program to coordinate those federal authorizations and environmental reviews, establish binding schedules for those federal reviews, and prepare a single environmental review document to support federal decision-making.

On the left, there, you see two other important authorities that the Department has but that are not the subject of the rulemaking we will talk about today. First, under Section 216(a) of the Federal Power Act, the Department has the obligation to prepare a National Transmission Needs Study, which is a collection of data on regions most in need of increased transmission capacity. And then, based on the results of that needs study, the Department has the ability to designate a National Interest Electric Transmission Corridor. Those National Electric Transmission Corridors can unlock additional funding opportunity for transmission projects.

And they can also, under FPA section 216(b), allow the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, in certain limited circumstances, to issue permits for the construction of a transmission project. And those circumstances, in particular, are where state authorities may lack authority to site the project, may have not acted on an application to site the project for more than one year, or have denied an application. Projects in NIETCs that are not seeking a permit from FERC would still be eligible for the federal coordination functions under FPA Section 216(h). If a project seeks a permit from FERC, applies to FERC and its limited backstop role, then those projects would proceed under FERC's processes for coordination

of federal authorizations and would not proceed under the Department of Energy's coordination procedures.

With that, I will turn it over to the real experts from our team to dive into the details of the NOPR, and I look forward to hearing your comments. Thank you.

WHITNEY BELL: Thank you so much, Jeff. We now welcome Liza Reed, Senior Policy Advisor with the Grid Deployment Office, for a presentation on the CITAP program. Liza, I'll turn this over to you.

LIZA REED: Thank you. It's great to be here today with all of you. Thank you all for coming.

I'm going to review the key parts of the NOPR, which is not the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in its entirety. So I encourage everyone to read the full text. And, again, of course, we look forward to your comments.

Section 900.1 addresses the Purpose and Scope of the proposed CITAP program. Jeff just provided that for us, so I'm going to start my review with sections 900.2 and 900.3 and particularly focusing on how DOE proposes to define a qualifying project for the program. Then I'll overview the Integrated Interagency Pre-application process, which I'll just call the IIP process for the remainder of this overview. DOE proposes that the participation in the IIP process is a required component for the CITAP program.

There's a number of sections that cover this process. 900.4 presents the purpose. 900.5, 900.8, and 900.9 describe the three required meetings in the IIP, each of which essentially serves as a milestone-- the initiation meeting, the review meeting, and the close-out meeting.

900.10 addresses the consolidated administrative docket, which is part of record keeping for CITAP.

There are also components that are developed during the IIP process. The resource reports that the project proponent must prepare are detailed in 900.6, and the project-specific schedule is addressed in 900.7. In sections 900.11 and 900.12, DOE proposes the process to establish and coordinate the review under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, and the selection of a co-lead agency for that review. Finally, 900.13 addresses the proposed severability of these parts.

So, diving into definitions, 900.2 provides a variety of definitions for terms used throughout the rule. And, here, I'm just highlighting one, the proposed definition for a qualifying project. In the NOPR, a qualifying project means a high-voltage electric transmission line, specified here as 230 kilovolts or above, or other regionally or nationally significant line that is used in interstate or international commerce and is expected to require an Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS. There's additionally a provision that a facility could be approved by the Director of GDO that doesn't meet those requirements that I just stated. I'll cover that on the next slide. A few items to note that are explicitly excluded in this proposed definition are projects that are authorized on the Outer Continental Shelf alongside a specific generation project, projects seeking a construction permit from FERC under 216(b), which Jeff addressed in his remarks, and projects wholly located in the Electric Reliability Council of Texas, or ERCOT.

Section 900.3 addresses the applicability of other projects, and it proposes mechanisms through which a project may be accepted into the CITAP program by the GDO Director, even if it does not meet the other aspects of a qualifying project definition.

Next, I'll move into the IIP process. 900.4 addresses the purpose of the IIP. This process is proposed to ensure early interaction between project proponents, federal entities, and non-federal entities. Non-federal entities will be invited to participate throughout. The purpose is to enhance early understanding among these entities of the project details and the review requirements. It's intended for projects who are

fairly well along their development and planning. For example, they've identified potential study corridors and have proposed locations for substations and other facilities for the qualifying project.

As previously noted, the IIP is a prerequisite for coordination in the CITAP program. It includes iterative aspects and procedures that are intended to allow federal entities to evaluate the completeness and suitability of the materials developed to assist in their decision-making. But I want to emphasize here that federal entities are making their own determinations and still doing their own analysis. This is an information-gathering process, and it is expected that the information gathered in the IIP will be useful for the federal entities, but it does not supplant any work or additional review that those entities will undertake.

The next five sections of the rule detail out the IIP process, and we're showing them here in two buckets. On the left-hand side, you'll see there are three sections that define the milestones of the process, those meetings that I mentioned. On the right-hand side are the two sections that explain various components that will be created during the IIP process. We've put them in this visual order so that you can see how you will find them in the NOPR.

Note the milestones in the left column are project proponent-driven. The proponent will request these meetings when they believe that they are ready. The NOPR itself proposes the requirements and the timelines within which DOE will then respond.

Section 900.5 details the initiation of the IIP process. It starts with an initiation request in which the project requests to be accepted into the IIP process and, therefore, the CITAP program. There are a few elements that must be submitted as part of that request, including a summary of the project, including various maps, a project participation plan, and a statement about the status of the project under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation Act, or FAST-41.

If accepted, during that initial meeting, DOE and the relevant agencies will review the project and provide guidance on various permitting and review topic areas which are detailed in the NOPR. Want to take a minute here to talk about the project participation plan. This is described in more detail in 900.5(d). This plan would include the project's history of interactions with stakeholders and Communities of Interest and includes a public engagement plan to describe the future planned efforts. The public engagement plan must then be updated throughout the IIP process.

The definition of Communities of Interest is proposed in section 900.2, and the term is referenced throughout the proposed rule. Communities of Interest are those communities that could be affected by the qualifying project, including communities that are disadvantaged, fossil energy, rural, Tribal, Indigenous, geographically proximate, or communities with environmental justice concerns.

900.6 is one of the component sections. Project proponent resource reports are developed throughout the IIP process. Here and after, I'll just call them resource reports. There are 13 resource reports proposed and described in the NOPR. The purpose of these reports is to ensure project proponents are sufficiently aware of and prepared for various required federal reviews and to assist federal agencies in decision-making. However, as I previously noted, these reports in no way replace or supplant the analysis and decision-making responsibilities of those federal agencies.

These 13 reports share similarities with resource reports required by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for some of their permitting processes. I'll draw your attention to a few of these reports. Research Report 8 addresses land use, recreation, and the aesthetics of a proposed transmission project. Research Report 9 addresses considerations and concerns of Communities of Interest, as I've

previously defined. Report 12 addresses reliability, resilience, and safety. DOE recognizes that resilience is an important component of what our electric transmission infrastructure can provide and should consider and address in design and implementation.

Finally, Resource Report 13 provides specific focus on Tribal interests. This report is in addition to any cultural and historic interests that may be addressed in Resource Report 4. I encourage you to review section 900.6 of the rulemaking for further details.

900.7 is the second component section, and this addresses the standard and project-specific schedule.

The standard schedule is a document Jeff previously overviewed and RJ will detail shortly. It identifies the steps that are generally needed to complete decisions in environmental reviews of transmission projects.

The project-specific schedule will be established within each IIP process and is unique to the project under consideration. DOE will prepare that project-specific schedule during the IIP process.

In section 900.8, we get back to the procedures, and we start with the review meeting. Those resource reports described in 900.6 must be submitted prior to the review meeting request. DOE will have 60 days for a completion check to review the review meeting request and the contents of these resource reports. If the reports are deemed sufficiently complete, then the review meeting will be convened.

At this meeting, DOE and relevant federal entities along with the project proponent will establish the project description details and the baseline resource information for the NEPA review that will eventually proceed. The federal agencies will also discuss statutory and regulatory standards and expectations with the project proponent. Again, this is about ensuring coordination and mutual understanding among all of the permitting and authorizing entities and the project proponent DOE we will also present the draft project-specific schedule at this meeting.

Finally, the close-out meeting. The project proponent submits a request for the close-out meeting. And, prior to this request, the resource reports must be updated as determined in the review meeting. Here, again, DOE reserves a 60-day period for a completeness check on these final materials. And, at the close-out meeting, DOE will present the final project-specific schedule.

Section 900.10, DOE proposes to maintain a consolidated administrative docket. This docket will include the materials distributed or received during the IIP process and the information assembled and used by entities as the basis of federal authorizations and related reviews following the IIP. This docket will be made available to non-DOE entities, including the NEPA co-lead agency and any other entities responsible for issuing authorizations on the project. It will also be available to any parties consulting under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

In sections 900.11 and 900.12, DOE describes the components of the environmental review under NEPA. You can find more details in the NOPR for both of these sections. 900.11 proposes the role of the lead agency and the selection of a co-lead agency. That co-lead agency will be a federal entity with the most significant interest in the management of federal lands and waters that would be traversed or affected by the qualifying project. In 900.12, DOE proposes the procedures for the environmental review.

After the IIP process concludes, the project proponent submits a relevant application on the timeline established in the project-specific schedule. Then DOE we and the NEPA co-lead agency will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement if it has been determined that that is what is necessary for NEPA review. The intention is that such an EIS will be designed to serve the needs of all the relevant federal entities and support each entity's required decision-making. This is one of the key goals of the IIP process and the CITAP program, to ensure that this EIS development is possible.

Finally, in section 900.13, DOE addresses severability. DOE proposes that the provisions of this part are separate and severable from one another. Should any of the provisions be stayed or invalid, we propose that would not affect any other provisions of this part.

That concludes my review of key components of the NOPR. We encourage everyone to read the notice in full, and I turn it back over to ICF. Thank you.

WHITNEY BELL: Thank you so much, Liza. We'll now hear from RJ Boyle, CITAP Program staff with the Grid Deployment Office. RJ?

RJ BOYLE: Hi. Yes. Thank you so much, everyone, and thanks for joining us again today. As ICF mentioned, I'll be covering some more detail on the standard schedule that is described in Section 900.7. So, when the nine federal agencies signed the MOU for this rulemaking in May 2023, the agencies agreed that DOE needs to establish a standard schedule within 60 days of the agency signing the 2023 MOU. The standard schedule was informed by agency input and the Federal Permitting Improvement Steering Council, or FPISC's, recommended performance schedules known as RPSes. As Liza noted, the standard schedule is a template for project-specific schedules. In other words, general milestones identified here are obviously subject to the needs of each project, as appropriate.

Critically, the MOU agrees to a 24-month NEPA review period from the publication of a Notice of Intent, or NOI, to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS, to the release of a Record of Decision, or ROD, which is informed by the analysis contained in the EIS. The 24-month period also includes timelines for the various federal authorizations that may be needed to complete the qualifying project and inform the basis of the ROD. The schedule does not include details or milestones around the IIP process that Liza just described. Instead, the IIP process is represented in a negative-month period to indicate that IIP process activities are expected to occur prior to publication of the NOI to prepare an EIS. In other words, the drafting of the resource reports and coordination with DOE and the relevant federal entities, the holding and scheduling of various review meetings, and the selection of a co-lead agency all occur prior to the NOI in order to ensure that any following milestones for the NEPA process are completed within the timeline identified in a standard schedule.

We will point out that our proposed standard schedule includes deviations from the FPISC RPSes. Namely, DOE shifts in its standard schedule various authorization and review timelines to start at earlier dates. This is because DOE anticipates robust information gathering during the IIP process such that these timelines can begin when an NOI is published. For example, the NOPR proposes a mechanism through which Section 106 consultation may be authorized prior to publication of the NOI such that, at the time the EIS is underway, consultation efforts may be occurring.

I will reemphasize that the standard schedule allows for project-specific flexibility and timeline uncertainty. Changes in phasing or in duration of any task in the schedule, based on project need, is welcome and encouraged. The rulemaking and the 2023 MOU propose how the agencies can adjust the schedule during project implementation.

On the screen, now, is a visualization of the various pieces that fit into this 24-month timeline agreed to in the MOU and described previously. You will also be able to see, at the top of the screen, the negative-month period I noted at the beginning, in which IIP process activities are set to occur. While the visual captures some of the common major authorizations or reviews that we anticipate for a NEPA effort for a qualifying project, it is, of course, not comprehensive of any project needs or federal authorizations required to complete a qualifying project.

Critically, this proposed standard schedule is still in draft form and will be informed by input on the NOPR. The visualization will, of course, be then updated to a formal graphic following the comment period, and any timelines will be adjusted appropriately in response to comments. The full document, as Liza mentioned, has substantially more information on each aspect of the schedule and the IIP process and what can be depicted here in this visualization. So I, again, with all the others, emphasize you all to review the document and provide feedback.

That concludes my discussion of the standard schedule, and I will actually shift to the start of our Comment Collection Period during this webinar today. I will do so by pointing out some specific elements that DOE seeks comment on during this comment period. While DOE requests input on all topics in the NOPR, the NOPR preamble highlights some topics on which DOE is particularly seeking input. These are listed on the slide here, and I will read now.

DOE is looking for input on whether the use of lead and co-lead agencies, consistent with the terminology used in the 2023 MOU, is appropriate. DOE believes these terms to be substantially equivalent to the Fiscal Responsibility Act's use of lead and joint lead agencies. We're also looking for information on estimated burden and costs associated with the requirements contained in the proposed rule; estimated time and expense saved by the proposed CITAP program; Indian Tribal Government estimates of the cost and effects of the NOPR that could potentially impact Tribal communities; and, related to the project proponent resource reports, whether any other distances listed in the regulations are appropriate, whether the page limits identified in the regulations are appropriate, whether the duplicative aspects of the resource reports should be rectified, and whether future revisions are needed to a proposed list in section 900.6 and 900.8. It is a long list of various special designations that should be considered as a part of the resource reports. That requires resolution with input from everyone, given that it is based on a number of other federal authorizations.

Specifically, related to the proposed distances that we have highlighted in our rulemaking, paragraph 4 of our preamble also highlights the use of 0.25 miles as a buffer zone for a number of resources that you can see listed out on the slide here. DOE seeks specific input on whether these distances are appropriate for these resources. This slide will be available after this webinar, and this text is in the preamble for review as well. So we encourage review and input on those points.

Today, we are also taking input on any topics that folks wish to bring to us now. DOE is in listening mode today, as mentioned before. We encourage any input provided to be submitted in the form of a comment to the rulemaking via [regulations.gov](https://www.regulations.gov) or any of the other methods specified in the NOPR. The comment period closes on October 2.

We are going to turn things over, now, to ICF to facilitate the comment process for the webinar today. And I thank you all for listening and for participating now and in the future. Thanks.

WHITNEY BELL: Thank you, RJ. Thank you so much to everyone for all of your comments today. That wraps up today's webinar. A copy of today's slides and the recording will be available on this Webinars landing page in about two weeks. We will send you an email when it is available. You can find the link in the chat, now, to that landing page.

Thank you to Maria, Samuel, Jeff, Liza, and RJ for joining us today, and thank you to all of our attendees for participating today and for providing your comments. Take care, everyone, and we will see you next time. Thank you, all.