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**Priti:** They are all good stories, because we are such a tight community of folks who work together, and because of that you just build relationships over the years. Pretty soon you look at someone and you think, “I’ve known them for 15 years, how’d that happen?”

**Marta:** Well maybe we could start there, because that’s something that I’ve heard from a lot of people. Today is July 31st, 2015, and I’m speaking with Priti Patel with the Midcontinent Independent System Operator (MISO). So Priti, Gordon Pietch was telling me about how the planners share their work with their peers at other utilities, so it was an easy transition to work together on studies that supported CapX, or regional studies for MISO.

**Priti:** I think what Gordy is saying is absolutely true. The utility industry, particularly when CapX was taking place—I can’t speak to the rest of the country—but in the Upper Midwest, a very collegial, collaborative group of folks that work together with systems that connect into one another for decades.

So when the concept of CapX came along, for the most part, you do have some utilities that will own facilities with other, or have agreements to use one another’s facilities, but the concept of joint-ownership, so to speak—or owning something together that was large and often times among folks that may or may not have great business relationships in the past—albeit, we all worked together, so the operations can run very well. But getting folks like an Xcel Energy along with Wisconsin Public Power, or Rochester Utilities….you’ve got different entities with different business models, so there’s always a bit of “...is this going to work?”

But I think what the effort showed is that it does work. Because in the end, you had good intent, and you had folks that wanted to do the right thing for the region, for their customers. ...what was the most cost effective? What could be a great long-term….not just to meet the short term needs...maybe local reliability issues...but the longer term needs of the states, of the region. They got behind these projects, and they said “These are a good idea. We collectively believe that these are a good group of projects to undertake for the future of the Upper Midwest and for the region.” They were able to come together, get through the regulatory processes together, work through landowner issues together. Set the right tone and policies. The right message to folks whose land these lines went on. They were able to ultimately able to put together commercial arrangements that suited everybody. You have different models….some are regulated, some aren’t. Some are IOU’s and have shareholders, some don’t. Some have members. But they were able to get together and create a commercial model that worked for them. It just shows you what the Upper Midwest was able to do, hand in hand. Utilities didn’t create a separate corporation or entity. It was by contract and it was by a huge amount of faith and trust that we can get this done together. And they have.
Marta: One of the things that Will Kaul mentioned was that the group realized right away that there needed to be a lot of regulatory reforms to help support the project….changes in tariffs and cost-allocation. He said that they also worked to have the ability to form a Transco if they wanted to. They never did, of course, but can you speak to how that decision was ultimately made?

Priti: On some level, the faith-based….there was quite a bit of that in the early years, when they were just talking about it. It kept the group of visionaries together. Then you get folks involved who say, “Okay, we need to now put that vision on paper and make sure we can, in stages, implement that vision.” Because we’ve got too many folks involved, and we need to make sure that once you start putting money toward the vision, we know who’s doing what, who’s responsible for what. That’s a natural consequence of the involvement of money.

I think the concept of a Transco….I just don’t think folks were ready for it, at the end of the day. There’s a lot of, for the regulated IOU’s, the concept of a Transco means quite a bit of work with the regulator to help the regulator understand, “What does that Transco mean? What does it mean to the base business of that regulated utility? Who’s going to operate it? Who are the employees? Is this going to take away resources from the base business that you do today with your customers?” There’s a lot to it, and at the time, I surmise that the group thought, “Instead of trying to get the political buy-in to get that going, what if we agree by contract. We all sign an agreement that says, ‘We’re going to vision together.’ So let’s sign a Participation Agreement that says that we are CapX participants by contract. We’ll put dollars in so we can jointly study, jointly vision, jointly create a strategy. And then we’ve got these four projects where there are some natural owners because of the location of the projects or the facilities that the new project might impact. One might be more conducive to have Otter Tail, and it might be good to have Rochester Public Utilities, Xcel, GRE….whoever those owners are. Then let’s figure out how the agreements should be for each of those projects. But let’s keep it all consistent, so if at any point in time in the future owners need to swap, at the end of the day we are one community of owners. And we’re going to get these projects done. So how can we make sure this can happen without getting stuck on a concept that may not have the political buy-in in the timeframe we need, like a TransCo. So, what’s the alternative? Well, the alternative is…it’s going to be a little harder, but it’s going to require us to hold hands and work more together, and use some of our resources. Maybe that’s how we do it? We can do this.” And that’s how they did it. That was the alternative to the Transco.

There are so many legal implications, tax implications, regulatory implications….not just for the regulated IOU’s, but for everybody. A municipality would have to figure out, “How do we get involved in a Transco? Now we’ve got to talk it through in our governance model, with our lender….“ These are not easy things that can happen like that, right? So for many reasons, I think the Transco may be a great idea today, but at that time, to make movement, it was probably
better for them all to work together and to show regulators, legislators, the region that they could get this done without having to take that other step.

**Marta:** It sounds like it would have taken away from trying to move forward on the project, trying to get the political buy-in, and navigating an even more complicated regulatory process.

**Priti:** Could it have been done? It probably could have been done. How long would it have taken, and the stranglehold it would have had? That’s, I guess, the issue, right? You can get stuff done, it’s how much time do you want to spend on that, vs let’s just move.

**Marta:** It also seems like there was a lot of uncertainty. The group didn’t know how to move forward, so they were keeping their options open. It’s more clear to me now why they didn’t go that route. And it helps me understand what was going on internally as the group was trying to figure out how to move forward.

I should have started with this question, but I got sidetracked. Could you tell me about what your role was with the CapX group, and how you got on board with the project?

**Priti:** Sure. When I started at Xcel Energy, I was in their legal department. I was doing regulatory work on the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) side, and on the energy market side, and a little bit on the transmission side. Then Laura McCarten, who was one of the initial folks that was part of CapX, she was looking for a lawyer to help them with a pretty simple MOU (Memorandum of Understanding). So she contacted me and asked if I would help with it, and I said sure. So then I started learning about what they were doing, and I thought, “Well this is really interesting.” But there had been a failed attempt at TransLink, which was kind of similar to what you’re talking about--a Transco kind of concept--and there had been an attempt right before CapX started, where folks did try to get together, and I just think the political climate was just not really ready at the time for the concept.

**Marta:** When you say that do you mean locally?

**Priti:** I think probably more locally. I wasn’t part of any of that, I started right when that ended. So I really only have heard the war stories. Others will probably have a better view of what happened, but so many folks thought, “Now they’re going to start CapX2020...where is that gonna go.” So we had folks that were pretty gun-shy, but because I hadn’t been part of that previous effort, I said, “This sounds great!” I asked our Deputy General Counsel, “I’d like to be the lawyer on this.” And he said, “Go ahead!” And it was the best decision I ever made.

What I started doing was just helping out Terry Grove and Laura McCarten on the legal side. They were trying to prop up how we could get these varied owners together to start figuring out
how to put words to paper. Things like rules and responsibilities, duties and obligations. You think it’s easy, but it’s not. You’ve got all these owners….some who’ve worked well, some that trust each other, some who’ve had horrible business histories. Big players, small players. You had all kinds of stuff like that. All kinds of politics. At the core, what came through was that when something needed to get done, that group got it done. Right? That’s what came out, at the end of the day.

Was everybody different? Yes. Does everybody have a different business model? Yes. Does everybody value the same things? No. Do some have expertise in transmission and others absolutely none? Yes. So, delineating roles, responsibilities, duties, and obligations among that group, was a Herculean effort. And that’s what I started working on with Laura and Terry, was getting outside counsel in, who would be the outside council to deal with this group. How do we proceed? Having a structure set up so that everybody had an equal voice, frankly. Which, for the larger companies is always hard because it’s in terms of dollars. “Well, I’ve got more dollars in this project, how is this equal?” At the end of the day, we created an atmosphere, I believe, we tried very hard to create an atmosphere and an environment of negotiation where it really was equal in terms of the voices that could get heard, and how we put our commercial agreements together.

That’s how I got involved. Then Laura was promoted within NSP to Vice President of NSP which is she’s at now, and so transmission asked me to come outside of legal to transmission, and I did that. And that was, again, another fun move. I didn’t think I’d do something like that, but then I was able to be a part of the visioning group. The job really became overseeing the implementation of all of the four projects. Terry and I were at a point where we would look around and say, “Where is the regulatory process on this? What are the obstacles? Is there a regulatory issues? Is there an owner issues that we have to tamp down?” We had eyes and fingers in everything, just to make sure the whole thing was moving forward.

You know, you have project managers, you have very responsible people in charge, but having that overseeing layer, and making sure that everybody maintained satisfaction throughout the process, and if there were issues, we can manage them. And so that’s really what I ended up doing.

Marta: It sounds like a glorified project management position, once things got rolling.

Priti: Exactly, for the overall initiative. Then we would start visioning, “What’s the next phase? Where do we go after this, in terms of the Upper Midwest, as we define it?” Which is, it’s one of those once-in-a-career moments you have to work on something as fun, frankly, as this. It was really fun.
Marta: It sounds like it!

Priti: It isn’t dull and it isn’t boring. You work at all the levels of what it takes to put a transmission line in the ground, but it’s all of the public policy, the environmental policy, the energy policy… all that you talk through, and you work out that nobody knows when they look at a transmission line, what the conversation was before that steel went into the group. They have no idea. The conversations we have about landowner impacts. Wetland impacts. How it will impact bird or any other species that we need to be aware of. All those conversations, people just have no idea. Except for the nerd conference, which is what we call ourselves. [laughs]

Marta: Does that make me a wanna be? Maybe a little more that that, I hope. [laughs] Well, there are lots of places I want to go, but before we get too far away, you mentioned you worked on some FERC issues before you moved over to CapX. Was this by any chance around the same time that FERC was considering having a national standard market?

Priti: I was not involved on that side of things. So no.

Marta: What I was wondering is, I heard a few stories about how it had been discussed, but no one from the utilities really liked it, and the threat of having a federal regulation to mandate to be more unified was not the main factor, but helped people realize that, “hey, we need to start figuring this out ourselves.”

Priti: Yeah, I haven’t heard that one of the reasons, I’d be interested to hear if anyone else brought that up as a reason.

Marta: I was digging deep. One or two people mentioned it.

Priti: No, I haven’t heard that as a reason. This pre-dated my involvement. A lot of the very early visioning between Will [Kaul] and others very early on…..it also pre-dated the regional transmission planning process at MISO. So, that’s what makes this so interesting and unique, and that human nature of these entities brought themselves together and basically were the regional planners for the Upper Midwest, and did it in a way that was collaborative and thoughtful, and looking out for the greater good, at the end of the day. So, I don’t know if it was as much of, “The feds would get into our business.” I can say, at the time before FERC Order 1000 came about, and FERC was discussing competitive development, that in the Upper Midwest, many of the utilities felt, “Well, we don’t know where it’s not getting built, but it’s certainly not up here. You don’t need to have a law that helps get transmission build, because we’re doing it together collaboratively and voluntarily, already.” I think that was that mentality that ended up having states like North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota pass laws that said, “We do have the right of first refusal in our states. We want out incumbents to have the first right to build, because
that’s our experience in the Upper Midwest.” Now there may be other parts of the country that
didn’t have that same voluntary building of large transmission that FERC felt was needed, which
is why the rule has come out. In terms of federal involvement, or the possibility of federal
involvement, that’s mostly what I’ve known. As well as, federal siting issues that came up, too.

**Marta:** What were some of the challenges or positives about working with federal agencies that
you recall from the project?

**Priti:** Just probably what you have already heard, which is….I used to work for the Department
of Commerce, so I worked for a state agency….actually, I worked for the Attorney General’s
office, my client was the Department of Commerce. But working with them and at the AG’s
office, you’re in their shoes. You realize the good intentions they have, the duty that they feel to
do the work that they have to do, the lack of resources, the lack of resources! And money, and
the influx of work that they can’t keep up with. And so, when we were dealing with federal
agencies, you have some sympathy toward that. You just do. Now, it doesn’t make it easier on
the project side of things…..”When are you going to look at this?”…..but I think at the core of the
CapX project teams, a core foundational belief for us was to establish good working
relationships so that you understand what their pressure points are. And that went for the State
Department of Transportation, all the state agencies, federal agencies. We said, “Let’s establish a
rapport so that we know, and can understand, and don’t get frustrated and upset unnecessarily.”
Build a relationship, stay on top of it, offer up whatever you can, and you just work closely
together. There’s not much else you can do, other than try and understand the shoes that they’re
in, and what they’re facing, so you can strategize on your end how to make sure we’re in line for
the work we need done on the timeline we need. That’s all you can do.

It did help when Lauren Azar who was with the DOE, then came in and said, “I’m trying to help
streamline some of the agency decision-making, and we want to use the Twin Cities to La Crosse
line as part of our pilot program.” We were thrilled to be a part of that, it’s a great undertaking. I
think it was called the Rapid Response Team--RRT--and having a singular point in contact for
all the federal agencies that might need to do work on a project, so that helped us from a
scheduling perspective, help to move a project along, it’s a great concept.

**Marta:** It was a pilot. Do you think it worked out well?

**Priti:** Yes. The project, of course, is still going on. So it would probably be a good idea to talk
with some folks there. At least in the initial stages, the concept and the notion of having a single
point of contact that we could go to, is helpful. It helps manages things on the federal agency
side, and it helps us, because timing is everything. And it’s a domino effect, with time. When
you’re doing these large-scale projects, people do not realize the importance of schedule and
time, and the impact on cost. Every month, that cost goes up. Every day, the cost goes up. It’s all linked. And that’s why we become fanatical about time. Because it’s a cost issue.

Marta: Right, and there are not a lot of things that you can cut out. All of these things need to happen, so you have to resign yourself to realizing that large transmission build-outs are going to take, especially one like CapX, over a decade to complete. I’m wondering if you see any other places that could benefit from a “Rapid Response Team” of their own? I’m particularly interested in multi-state collaboration on things on the Certificate of Need and Permitting side.

Priti: I think, my view is that when it comes to energy policy, I think states not only have a duty to themselves, but they do have a duty to the broader region. What you build in your state, what you’re citizens use, is not just in your state. Energy doesn’t work that way, it just doesn't. These are issues that have a lot of politics around them. They are issues that have business development and economic development around them. These are issues that are long-standing. When you make certain decisions, you make a decision to put a certain type of power plant in, you’re paying for it for 40-50 years. These are big money decisions with a lot of politics, a lot of social politics around them, that I believe, states should have a duty to work with one another. I don’t know what that looks like, but the politics of one state versus the politics of another state starting to create obstacles, in terms of what could be good planning and policy for the region or a broader footprint. It’s easy for me to say, sitting at MISO, it concerns me. I would prefer that states come together and say that, “We are a five-state area, and because we have interconnected facilities, we’re going to define ourselves as a five-state area and we’re going to work things out.” That doesn’t mean that we’re not going to talk to Montana, but the openness and willingness to have open discussions and conversations about what are the right and good paths to take, is a good idea. I think the leadership of those states should think it’s a good idea.

But, I’m not in politics, and I’m not elected, but having some type of brain trust around that, with folks from Governor’s offices would not be bad. But that’s just me, I’m not talking on behalf of MISO, I just believe that. And we did have interstate lines in CapX. We did have to talk and coordinate with Commissions and staffs, and there are a lot of different politics in the Upper Midwest when it comes to energy policy, environmental policy, resource in general policy. Gas pipelines, rail issues with coal. We’ve got all kinds of stuff, and everybody’s got a different take on it, and that can complicate things. But I think people would feel better if they knew there was a consortium or group that was thoughtfully thinking through all these different and distinct characteristics, and then still coming to a consensus or agreement or something.

Marta: Sure. You can make the argument, however, that the Upper Midwest states are already doing that. Look at the Midwestern Governors Association, and UMTDI. But maybe it’s not as coordinated as it could be.
**Priti:** UMTDI was a great example of coming together and saying here are the wind zones we all agree on, here are the projects that could help solve it. That’s a great example, and that’s what was in my mind--those are the sorts of things--that’s great leadership in showing that we can come together and figure this out.

**Marta:** But yet, there are also laws that make them groups work together--like the biannual transmission report, but that’s just within the state of Minnesota. So, in a way there are things on the books that compel utilities to work together.

**Priti:** And that’s where I think RTOs (Regional Transmission Organizations) are useful. We create a neutral space for all of those states to come in, and have the technical debate over what should futures look like as we’re trying to figure out how to plan the system. We can help provide that venue and space to have those discussions without politic involved, without any of that in a resource neutral space, which is what we are.

**Marta:** One of the things that Clair Moeller brought up was how important it was that the states were on board---I should say, I’m thinking about the MVP (Multi-Value Project) lines, sorry--he was telling me about how important it was that the idea of the MVP’s needed to have bipartisan support, and that when the Governor’s office in Michigan changed, he spend 20% of his time for one year working on building back up the relationship to keep them in MISO. Then, going back to CapX, the bipartisan nature of the group was pervasive through the whole project, and helped in its success.

**Priti:** I think a lot of it was, for the most part, the states understood that this type of large-scale transmission was necessary. It has been decades, right? And now they actually had their home utilities that were trying to get together, and build something in North Dakota, in parts of South Dakota, parts of Wisconsin, Minnesota...that would be beneficial, regardless of what the resources were. If you are supportive of lignite coal, you’ve got a wind RPS, whatever it is. These were determined by the engineers to be very beneficial for the movement of the scale of energy that they needed over the next X amount of years, but also made sure that if there were certain states that needed to export, that was possible.

So I think that we were, because of the nature of the projects, and the explanation and the understanding of what needs they could fulfill, there was good support in our states for the projects. But that took a lot of early socialization and education on what those projects could do. And even then, you’d get stymied by landowner issues and all kinds of things, and then you’d have to re-work it, and remind folks what this was for. We’d been here for 7 years talking about it, why these sudden questions? But that was more rare than common. People knew.
And for most regulatory bodies, it’s that they know….this seems overall like this is a good idea. Make sure you show us, with evidence and in the record, that this is a good idea. And that's really our responsibility. We’ve got to show that these are needed projects, as the utilities that were proposing them. And we were able to do that.

I think it was a very…I don’t want to say unique situation, but because there had not been that large-scale build-out, and, as one engineer told me, “You don’t need these 345 kV lines. You can use what we have, and do a lot of band-aids. Is it the most effective and efficient? No. Do these lines really help you create a foundational network and system upon which you can grow into the future? Yes.” And that’s what it was about.

As we look at the CapX lines, and we look at the MVP lines, now when you think of the Clean Power Plan, and the adjustments that need to be made--I’m sure Clair Moeller brought this up too—you could not have planned this better, at the end of the day. That’s, to anybody who questioned sometimes the visioning and the strategy that our transmission planners across the footprint have…it’s very easy to say, “Do we really need this?” But you are creating a robust infrastructure for the future, and all that it holds. And it could not have been planned better, is all I can say.

Marta: 111d and the Clean Power Plan is clearly a big emerging issue. I’m wondering what the next big emerging issue is aside from that.

Priti: For MISO, and I think the footprint and the industry, that is really one of the key things that is on everybody’s mind. This rule is coming out, we’ve seen the proposed rule, it created all kinds of concern for the industry. For MISO, the concern was really around timing. We’re neutral on the rule. If it comes, if it doesn’t….all we care about is what the impact will be from a reliability perspective, and from a market perspective--so that we are prepared to make the changes we need to make, or provide transparency around reliability impacts that our membership and the states should understand so they can move forward with their authority and responsibility over making sure that we are resource adequate. Our concern has always been around timing. We thought that the rule proposed a timeline that could potentially result in inefficient or ineffective infrastructure being proposed to meet a timeline that may not truly be efficient for the long run. So, we were able to weigh in at have talks with the EPA about that concern. Others weighed in on other parts of it, which is their prerogative, and what’s right for their business or not.

But we’re in the process of studying what the impacts would be from a cost-of-compliance perspective. So, looking at the cost of complying with the Clean Power Plan if you factor in the transmission that’s necessary and/or the gas infrastructure that’s necessary, because we don’t really have a good….our states don’t necessarily have a good view of what that could be. So we
are helping our stakeholders in that regard. That’s really one of the key things at our forefront: understanding what that impact is going to be.

**Marta:** As things progress and CapX finishes the buildout and energization of all it’s lines, what future do you think the CapX group could have in the region? Do you think they will continue to work together?

**Priti:** I hope so, I really do.

**Marta:** Do you see them having impacts in places other than transmission? Do they have the buy-in necessary from state agencies, regulators, etc., to tackle another big challenge in their footprint?

**Priti:** Well, that would be a good question to ask some of them. One of the big questions is gas infrastructure as we move forward, and I will not profess to understand the gas industry at all, but what I understand is that it’s a very balkanized industry, and the way that it even plans for its infrastructure is very balkanized. There’s always plays that could be had with folks that want to get together. My view is that, is that if there’s a problem, getting together to figure out the solution to the problem is so much easier than trying to figure out how to just go solve it yourself. Especially if the problem is one that could be common, right? So, I’m wired to think of, “What’s the problem? How common is it? Who else is sharing that common problem? Are we stronger coming together to solve it, than me tackling it by myself….with legislators, and industry, and whatnot.” And so I guess what I would say, is look for those problems that have commonality….whether it’s generation build, or gas infrastructure build, whether it’s a new competitive project that might be coming about. Is it better for 4 or 5 of them to tackle it together….I think there’s plenty out there that folks could get together on.

The other thing is, most of us read the book [Powerline](#) when we started CapX. I don’t know if you are familiar with that book.

**Marta:** I am, but I didn’t know that the group had read it.

**Priti:** Many of us were wired to think, “How do we make sure this goes well?” I don’t profess to have had transmission development experience before my involvement in CapX. And we did have folks that actually had been through different transmission development wars in the past, and one of them was the UPA-CPA 500 kV line. And so, reading that book to understand where the problems were, and where we could make sure that we created a strategy and an education and communication policy that could make this go better. So we didn’t come out of it just coming out of it….but coming out of it with things fairly intact. I don’t know where that fits into anything.
Marta: Oh I think it does.

Priti: It was a mentality.

Marta: It’s what I’ve been trying to figure out, is how other than saying that the group agreed to do this the best way possible, what was actually influencing the behavior. It explains a lot to me.

Priti: It does. In making sure that we had a lot of education at landowner meetings, because this is, I think something that came out of that book that really resonated with me….I’m wired to always support the underdogs. I’m always looking for that perspective, so I can make sure it doesn’t get lost.

Someone in the book said, “It’s like the country was deciding energy policy and forgetting about us.” So when you’re out there, and you’re proposing these large lines, going over god knows what property and community that may have been designated for x, y, or z….you’re thinking about that. It’s always in the back of my mind. How can we make this better? How can we not have this happen? It’s making sure you have people on your project team like Tim Carlsgaard, and folks that are acutely aware of those viewpoints and how can we make sure that we manage that. Can we move the line? Can we create an alternative? What can we do to make it better? It’s doing all of that. You’re going to make everybody 100% happy, but you can tamp down a lot of that unhappiness by managing it person by person. It’s a mindset and a mentality, and I think the project team had it in spades.

Marta: I agree. I’m not an expert, but from my vantage point, the work was put in early on to make sure that everyone that the line touched knew about it well before it even started.

Priti: Its feeling that disengagement or feeling that nobody cares about your view on energy policy that we were trying to prevent.

Marta: It seems like the project did a good job of making people feel like they have gotten their due process.

Priti: That’s all you can do, right? It’s a process. And making it understandable. That’s the other thing. You want to hand someone the tax code and say the answers are in here?

Marta: Right, they aren’t going to go read it.
Priti: Make it understandable. Let’s do the newsletter. Let’s make sure they know. Let’s remind them of when they can come and talk. And let’s not cut the meetings short, let’s get everybody to be able to talk. So it’s all of that.

Marta: Is there anything that I didn’t ask you about that you think is important that I should know?

Priti: I think it’s important to know that we spent so much time on the agreements, figuring out how we would vote on things, and the weight of the voting. And you’d get that conversation between those that felt like, “I’m funding 60% of this project, you’re only funding 2%, how do we have equal votes?” So we had to structure the votes. We spent so much time on that, and at the end of the day, in nearly every project management meeting I was in, it was generally consensus. [laughing] And if it wasn’t, we never had a vote where it wasn’t everybody voting the same way. If we weren’t prepared to take the vote because folks weren’t sure of something, we would wait on the vote. It was so rare that a vote happened where someone voted against something or on the other side of the majority vote. If it did happen, it was because we had a political reason where we had to document it that way. What it showed me, is that at the end of the day, everybody wanted to make sure everyone was happy with everything going on. Know what I mean? I just think that its point I always think about where I would watch and think, “Oh my gosh you guys, we worked on this voting, and you are all just voting the same way.” It’s great. You want to get along, and then it actually happens.

Marta: Were there pressure of time? How easy was it to postpone votes?

Priti: On some issues you could, on others it was a challenge. At the end of the day, everybody had this mentality that the project had its own life, and none of us had the right or prerogative to delay the life of that project. Our duty was to make sure it kept moving. You were not more important than somebody else that you got to stop it. And that was the mentality that carried the day.

Marta: Well I think that’s a great spot to stop in, unless you have anything further to add.

Priti: No, thank you.