FUTUREGEN 2.0 PROGRAM

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

IRONHORSE GOLF CLUB

2000 IRON HORSE DRIVE

TUSCOLA, ILLINOIS

JUNE 8, 2011

Representatives:

Mr. Cliff Whyte, Department of Energy
Mr. Jeff Hoffmann, Department of Energy
Mr. Michael Long, Ameren Energy Resources
Mr. Gordon Beeman, FutureGen Alliance

Court Reporter:
Jennifer L. Crowe, CSR
Illinois CSR #084-003786
Midwest Litigation Services
15 S. Old State Capitol Plaza
Springfield, Illinois 62701
217-522-2211
1-800-280-3376

I N D E X

(On the record at 7:06 p.m.)

MR. WHYTE: Let's go on the record. Welcome to the Department of Energy's public scoping meeting for FutureGen 2.0. Let the record show that the meeting began on June 8th, 2011, at 7:05 p.m. at the Ironhorse Golf Club in Tuscola, Illinois. First I'd like to thank the golf club for letting us use the facility and thank all of you for being here this evening.

As part of its compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, DOE has determined that an Environmental Impact Statement, or EIS, should be prepared for this project. The EIS will analyze and describe the potential environmental impact and project alternatives. This scoping meeting is for the FutureGen 2.0 project. FutureGen 2.0 is not the same project as considered under the original FutureGen, although it does share common -- several common concepts such as carbon capture and storage.

In addition, although DOE has or is considering supporting other projects in the area such as the Taylorville Energy Center, these projects are not part of, nor related, to the FutureGen 2.0 program.

One of the first steps in preparing an EIS is to conduct public scoping meetings. A public scoping meeting is basically the opportunity for the public to participate in the evaluation of possible environmental impacts associated with the proposed project. More importantly, it is an opportunity for us at DOE to listen to your concerns about the proposed project. Those concerns may be environmental issues, economic impacts, social matters, health and safety concerns.

Our goal tonight is to determine the major topics that we need to include in the environmental impact statement as we write it.

For your convenience there are comment sheets available back where we signed in, and those can be used to provide written comments. Written comments or comments that are delivered orally this evening or mailed to me or emailed to me or faxed to me are given equal weight in the process. None is considered more important than the others.

Also on that comment sheet you have an opportunity to indicate if you would like to get a copy of the draft Environmental Impact Statement when it is available. You may wish to obtain a hard copy

of that or hard copy summary. Some of these documents tend to be fairly large, so think of your mailman. We also provide you an opportunity to click on a link on the Internet to be able to read it in electronic format and print out sections if you would like.

During the informal session earlier this evening we had a number of experts in the back and a number of different pieces of this project that are laid out in posters, and it is very important that we have that opportunity to spend one-on-one time with the folks who are interested in understanding the project.

It was -- hopefully you found it helpful. I know that I did. It was good to be able to meet all of you. I think I got the opportunity. And after we finish the formal part of the presentation this evening, the formal comments, we will also stay around for awhile if anybody wants to continue to ask some specific questions.

During the formal session this evening we are going to give you just a little bit of history into FutureGen. Also, Ameren Energy Resources and FutureGen Alliance are going to present an overview of their pieces of the project. I'm going to give a

brief presentation about the NEPA process and talk a little bit about the anticipated schedule, and then we are basically going to turn the program over to you. We are going to go through, and any speakers who have signed up will be given the opportunity, and those who decide later this evening to give comments are welcome to do so.

Again, comment sheets are available in the back if you would like to use those, and the comment period for the scoping process closes on June 22nd, 2011, which is a Wednesday. So there is still some time even after this evening for you to if you -- even if you give comments this evening, if you think of something on the way home or over the course of the next several days, please use the contact information on the sheets and submit your thoughts.

Before we proceed with the presentations this evening, I would like to acknowledge the fact that the Mayor of the Village of Arthur joined us this evening, Matt Bernius. Thank you for being here.

Also I'd like to introduce some of my colleagues here. You'll see Tom Sarkus who is our division director at DOE, NETL; Jeff Hoffmann who is a project manager at the Department of Energy; Nelson

Rekos seated over there. He is a project manager with the Department of Energy. Mike Long is the plant manager at Ameren. Steve Whitworth is the manager of environmental services; Mitch White is the plant technical services supervisor; Brian Martin is the environmental scientist.

With FutureGen Alliance we have Mr. Gordon Beeman. We also have Gretchen Hund and Sallie Greenberg here. Gretchen is the stakeholder involvement manager, and Sallie is with the State of Illinois Geological Survey.

I'd also like to thank our friends at PHE, Potomac-Hudson Engineering. They're the contractor that's working for DOE on this project as far as writing the Environmental Impact Statement. We have with us Fred Carey who is the president of PHE, Cynthia Ong who is the assistant project manager, and we also have Andrea Wilkes and Amanda Tyrrell. They have done an outstanding job in keeping us organized and moving forward here this evening.

Now it is time for a few presentations and to have a discussion of DOE's role and a little bit of background. Here is Jeff Hoffmann.

MR. HOFFMANN: Thanks, Cliff. Can

everybody hear me? Good.

I just want to start off, talk a little bit about FutureGen 2.0. I will start by saying that the US Department of Energy has awarded approximately $1.05 billion for the FutureGen 2.0 program.

Contractually the FutureGen 2.0 program is broken into two cooperative agreements; one with a DOE award of approximately 590 million to Ameren, Babcock & Wilcox and American Air Liquide, and the scope of that cooperative agreement is to cover the oxy-combustion testing and technology basically within the plant fence line of the Meredosia power plant. Nelson Rekos, as Cliff introduced, is the project manager of that piece of FutureGen 2.0.

The US Department of Energy has also awarded approximately 460 million to the FutureGen Alliance to develop the transport and geologic storage component of FutureGen 2.0. That represents the pipeline, the geologic storage field and the associated visitor education and training facility. Combined with 100 or $1.05 billion and the private share contribution by the Alliance, Ameren, Babcock & Wilcox, American Air Liquide, the total project value is approximately $1.3 billion.

The FutureGen 2.0 project has several objectives, some of which include the validation of the technical feasibility and economic viability of near-zero emission energy developed, derived from coal. It also intends to verify the effectiveness, safety and permanence of CO2 sequestration in a deep saline formation.

In addition it intends to establish standardized technologies and protocols for CO2 management, verification and accounting, typically referred to as MVA, and also to gain domestic and global acceptance of FutureGen 2 concept with the intention to facilitate broad deployment of oxy-combustion coupled with CCS both for new and re-powering existing coal-based power plants.

I'd also like to take a moment and explain how FutureGen 2.0 fits into the Department of Energy Major Demonstration Program. The DOE has been conducting major demonstrations for at least the past 25 years. Of those technologies that have been demonstrated, many on large scales, 100, 200, 500 megawatts, have made its way from pre-commercial development stage to widespread commercial deployment based on or with the assistance of DOE funding.

FutureGen 2.0 will be fitting in towards the tip of the arrow representing a clean, low carbon, near-zero emission power option for the fleet of tomorrow including the re-powering of the existing fleet of today.

This slide here captures many of the carbon capture and sequestration projects that are currently being funded out of the Department of Energy National Energy Technology Laboratory, which what is important to mention here is of the ten or so projects that are included here, they represent a broad span of technologies as well as sequestration formations. Included here are integrated gasification combined cycle coal plants, or IGCC technology that was originally intended for FutureGen at the Mattoon plant as well as post-combustion capture and with FutureGen 2.0, oxy-combustion technologies, CO2 capture and sequestration.

I'd also like to distinguish of the many technologies, projects that are depicted here, most of them are looking at sequestration in enhanced oil recovery where CO2 can promote the additional extraction of oil from secondary recovery fields.

What is important that I want to point out, of

the ten or so projects here, only three of them are representing sequestration in saline formations. FutureGen 2.0 is one of those.

I'd like to talk a little about carbon sequestration. You saw the video before we started. There is several different ways of capturing and storage of carbon. One of them is terrestrial capture and storage that was mentioned where CO2 is absorbed from the air and stored in trees, grasses and soils.

Another method and what is important and what we are trying to test and evaluate here is point source capture. Point source capture can be from a number of different sources including power plants like we intend to do at the Meredosia power plant as well as ethanol plants, chemical plants, cement, steel, refineries, natural gas processing plants.

I'd also like to mention that the Decatur ADM plant is an ethanol plant that represents an application of carbon capture and storage, and as with geologic storage there is a number of different formations that can be -- that CO2 can be stored in including saline formations that we intend to demonstrate here with FutureGen as well as depleted oil/gas wells, unmineable coal seams and other

formations.

I can't stress the importance of the demonstrating improving permanent, safe sequestration in saline formation.

This slide here represents some findings from what we refer to as the National Atlas of Carbon Capture and Storage or Carbon Storage Opportunities. What I really want to point out here is that of the three major formations, saline formations, oil and gas fields and unmineable coal seams, saline formations represent the single largest potential availability for storage, long-term storage of CO2, more than oil/gas fields and unmineable coal seams combined.

Also important to point out is the broad distribution of saline formation. What we are trying to demonstrate and prove out, FutureGen 2.0 represents the potential solution for the wide various or wide variation of existing power plants as well as other industrial CO2 sources.

Finally I want to close with a little bit of history of the FutureGen program. FutureGen was originally conceived in the early part of the last decade. It officially kicked off in March 2004 with a report to Congress that identified FutureGen 2.0 as an

integrated research initiative with the objective to establish feasibility and viability of producing electricity from coal with near-zero emissions.

As many of you are probably aware, in December 2007 the FutureGen Alliance selected Mattoon, Illinois as the location for IGCC with CCS. Early in 2000 -- well, in late 2007, early 2008 the Department of Energy announced the cancellation of the original FutureGen at Mattoon plant. The Alliance continued on with engineering and development, continuing to evaluate that project. Early in 2009, President Obama, through the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, announced that the original FutureGen plant intended to be located at Mattoon would be -- the project would be restarted, and another locale would be taken to evaluate the economic viability and feasibility of the project.

Due to a number of issues including the escalating cost of facilities similar to the IGCC CCS at the Mattoon plant as well as the fact that at the -- in the close of the last decade, the Department of Energy had several other IGCC CCS programs, projects under way, Secretary Chu announced that FutureGen 2.0 would be an alternative approach to achieve near-zero

emissions.

With that I will pass it to Mike Long, the plant manager, who will further describe the technical details of the Meredosia Plant.

MR. LONG: As Jeff said, I'm Mike Long. I'm the plant manager at the Meredosia power station, and this evening I would like to talk about Ameren Energy Resources, who we are, Meredosia project, an overview of that, and description of the oxy-combustion technology.

Most of you are probably aware of Ameren. It is a company that consists of three separate companies; Ameren Illinois, Ameren Missouri and Ameren Energy Resources. We are a merchant-generating company. That means that the power plants that are within our company do not have rate regulated customers, but we sell our energy directly to the open power market. Most, the majority, if not all, our power plants are in Illinois, and we had 6,250 megawatts of generation, and last year we did generate just shy of 30 terawatts of megawatt hours of energy.

When I say we are a merchant-generating company, we do sell to municipalities and industrial utilities and the like and others that are indicated

up on the slide here. The company that does that for us is a company within AER called Ameren Energy Marketing. They take energy that is generated at Meredosia and sell it on the open market to us, to these customers.

The project team for the power station portion of this project, of course, is Ameren Energy Resources who own and operate the power station. Babcock & Wilcox are responsible for the boiler island and gas quality control systems. Air Liquide is responsible for the air separation unit which is at the front end of the process and the compression and purification unit which is on the back end of the process. URS is a company that was hired by Ameren who are responsible for the balance of the plant and connecting that to the new facilities that will be constructed as part of this power plant.

When I talk about balance of the plant, what I am referring to is the turbine generator set and the systems that support that will remain. Those are current pieces of equipment that will not change as far -- as part of this project.

Here we will talk about Meredosia a little bit more specifically here. The picture that you see on

the screen is a picture of the plant. The left side is a tall stack there. That is associated with units 1 and 2. Their primary fuel is coal. Units 1 and 2 have their operation currently suspended, so they are not operating at this time. In the middle there is a little taller stack on top of the building. That is unit 3. Its primary fuel is also coal, and it is operating at this time.

And then the unit that we are interested in here tonight is unit 4. It has a yellow rectangle drawn around it. Unit 4 was constructed in 1975. This slide says it is currently idle. It is not on today, but it could be put online. Its main fuel, its main fuel is oil, and because of that it is not as readily available to be dispatched on the market that we find ourselves in, so it doesn't run a lot.

That's pretty much been the history of it throughout its life, and for this project that is an advantage because it has very low operating hours on the turbine generator to supporting systems. The size of unit 4 is also advantageous for this project. It is a 200-megawatt plant, so it is the next logical step from the research and development 30-megawatt facility to the first commercial scale size which is

200 megawatts.

Okay. Very briefly, what is oxy-combustion? The air that we breathe is approximately 20% oxygen and 80% nitrogen, and in conventional power plants air is mixed with fuel and combusts with fuel, and the flue gas the results from that contains nitrogen, same amount of nitrogen in CO2. What oxy-combustion simply does is remove the nitrogen and uses the oxygen that's already in the air for the combustion process. As part of that, the CO2 after the process is reconverted, is recirculated back to fill the volume that was left by the nitrogen in the normal combustion process.

If you look at the power station, it is basically made of three parts not including the turbine. So this will be the new portion of the power plant that is being constructed in FG2. There is the boiler island which is a new boiler and environmental control equipment. This equipment, at least the environmental control equipment, is very similar to what is on conventional power plants today. It is a bag house and a scrubber.

So if you look at the process at the start on the front end as the air separation unit where it

comes in, nitrogen is removed, oxygen goes to the boiler for combustion. The flue gas and CO2 from that process goes to the environmental clean-up equipment where ash and water and sulphur are removed. Some of these -- recycled flue gas is recycled back into the oxygen stream as we just discussed on the last slide, and then the highly concentrated stream of CO2 from this process goes to the compression and purification unit where it is compressed and captured to the pipeline to sequestration site.

I'd like to introduce Jeff Gordon from the Alliance. Excuse me, Gordon Beeman.

MR. BEEMAN: My name is Gordon Beeman with FutureGen Alliance. I'm the design and engineering manager. I would like to send regrets from CEO Ken Humphreys who could not be here tonight. I'm sure he would like to be here to meet with you.

I'm going to talk about the alliance portion of the project which is essentially the CO2 pipeline and CO2 storage site.

A little bit about the Alliance. The Alliance is a consortium of coal companies, electrical utilities, equipment manufacturers who have come together to pursue the option of clean coal, near-zero

emissions power plant and carbon storage. They were formed shortly after the act, the report provided to Congress that Jeff talked about and have been pursuing these activities for quite some time.

The project concept is fairly straightforward. As Mike described the Meredosia power plant, our plans are to construct a pipeline underground from Meredosia to the injection site. At the injection site we will then put together the injection wells and monitoring equipment and other equipment required to inject CO2 underground, and then we will inject it deep underground into the Mt. Simon aquifer.

Project goals are really pretty straightforward also. We want to demonstrate an approach for siting, permitting, ensuring and operating a CO2 storage site that is fully integrated with an upstream power plant. Our intentions are to store up to 39 million tons of CO2 over the life of the plant. That is about 1.3 million tons per year.

We want to demonstrate a comprehensive set of monitoring technologies and validation techniques needed to account for the CO2 that's injected into the ground and also to be able to understand and predict where that CO2 is going when it is underground.

We will establish a visitor research and training facility that advances the information and research of carbon sequestration storage technology, and we hope as a first-of-its-kind project to provide a pathway forward to demonstrate to people that this can be done and can be done effectively, it can be done economically, and it clearly can be done safely.

Talk a little bit about CO2 pipeline and wells. The CO2 pipeline is a 12-inch diameter pipeline. It will be buried to a depth of four feet deep. In agricultural areas it will be buried to a minimum of five feet deep. We will stay at least 150 away from residences. Regulations require us to stay 50 feet away. We have made the decision to stay further away than that. We will avoid sensitive environmental features, and the CO2 wells, we will minimize the footprint of these CO2 injection wells and monitoring wells because we realize compatibility with surface use is critical to the success of the project.

So going forward, site selection, the FutureGen Alliance has selected a site in Morgan County near Jacksonville. That is the preferred site for the CO2 storage facility. There are two

alternative sites that we're evaluating; Taylorville, Christian County, Tuscola here in Douglas County. All three sites are being analyzed by DOE, and an EIS will be carried forward.

If you look specifically at what we believe to be the geology that we are looking at here in Douglas County, typically you are finding the well water is in the upper zone. We have three geologic seals made of shale to protect, to capture the CO2, and then we have Mt. Simon Formation that is down about 7,000 feet and about 1500 feet deep here in Douglas County.

From the standpoint of the injection well, there are a significant amount of monitoring activities that are required to be done both from a standpoint of things the Alliance wants to do and things that will be required by our underground injection control permit that will be issued by the Environmental Protection Agency.

There will be -- excuse me. There will be several monitoring wells that are placed down into the formation to measure how the CO2 is migrating and the pressure of the CO2, the pressures from the formation. There will be other wells that will be shallower than that to search for any CO2 that potentially could be

coming out of the formation. There will be seismic arrays placed in there to understand how the plume is moving, and we will do additional 3D profiles, other kinds of work to better understand the geology, better understand the characteristics of the pore space so that we can understand how the CO2 is moving.

So in summary, FutureGen will be the world's first near-zero emissions clean coal power plant. We will have a high efficiency of carbon capture on the order of 90%. There will be near-zero levels of other trace emissions. We will be fully integrated with the power plant, with the pipeline and geologic storage. This will allow the cleaner use of Illinois Basin coal, will create construction and permanent jobs. It will provide additional revenue for those landowners whose deep underground pore space is used for CO2 storage. It will increase county revenue, and we will construct a visitors education training facility to the tune of somewhere between 25 and $50 million in the host community. Thank you.

MR. WHYTE: Okay. We are almost, almost finished with the presentations. I'm going to speak briefly on the National Environmental Policy Act.

The act, or NEPA as it is often referred to,

is more than 40 years old now, and it does apply to all federal agencies. As projects or federal monies are involved in projects, NEPA must be satisfied. It is a national charter for the protection of the environment and promotes the environmental consideration in the decision-making process.

One of the central tenets of NEPA is providing information to the public. It is important that information be of high quality, it is accurate, scientific information and that the expert agencies have an opportunity to weigh in on the project. Those might include folks like the State Historic Preservation Office, US Fish and Wildlife Service among others.

I appreciate the fact that there are a number of state agencies that are represented here this evening. We have turned out to answer any questions that may come up, and, again, we appreciate having them with us this evening.

Finally, most importantly is public involvement to find out what are the concerns and issues of the local folks who could be impacted by the project.

In this particular project, an EIS or

Environmental Impact Statement, determination was made in November of 2010. A Notice of Intent was published in the Federal Register on May 23rd, and that officially began the public scoping period, the comment period which will last 30 days. That comment period, again, will close on June 22nd, which is a Wednesday, of 2011.

The Environmental Impact Statement, although each one is tailored differently, they all contain certain elements. Those include items such as the purpose and need for the agency action, the federal agency action, the proposed agency action and reasonable alternatives, proposed project description and description of project alternatives, description of the affected environment. There is also analysis of the potential environmental consequences, a list of agencies, organizations and persons who were contacted and finally public participation and responses to public input.

As we have discussed with many of you on the posters here this evening, FutureGen 2.0 is very early in the EIS process. We are in the scoping period, and as you will see, there will be eventually a draft Environmental Impact Statement that will be prepared,

and it will go through another series of public meetings and receive public comment on that document before a final EIS and ultimately a Record of Decision would be issued.

To give you an idea of the time frames that we are projecting at this point, the draft Environmental Impact Statement is likely to be published sometime in the spring of 2012. Obviously shortly thereafter the public hearing or hearings would be held and a final EIS is then projected to follow in the fall of 2012.

Again, the purpose of the scoping meeting is to invite comments and solicit input into the process be that issues that you would like to see covered in the EIS, certain data that you believe should be collected, certain analyses that you believe may be important to have performed and also just, in general, stakeholder concerns.

On the comment forms that I referenced earlier this evening, you will find all my contact information which is up here and, again, a reminder that the comment period closes June 22nd, although the DOE will, to the extent we can, consider late comments.

Just a few logistics as we get to the formal comment period. I believe we only have one speaker

signed up in advance, so I don't think that the five-minute time limit is going to be applicable this evening.

A transcript is being made, and although I have the luxury of having your name up here before me, the court reporter does not. So anyone who wants to give comments this evening, I'll bring the microphone to the podium, and I would ask that you begin by spelling your name for the court reporter, please. Also, if you are affiliated with a certain club or issuing comments on behalf of a certain organization, please clearly indicate that organization.

A copy of the transcript of this meeting will be available online on the NETL web site in a few weeks. It will also be a part of the draft Environmental Impact Statement.

Just a reminder that this comment session is not a question and answer session but is an opportunity for you to express your comments, your issues, your concerns on the formal record.

Please also note that we do have a court reporter here this evening, so please try to speak clearly and speak slowly such that we can incapsulate all of your comments, and, again, we appreciate those

who are here this evening.

With that, the speaker that we have this evening is Barbara Brehm.

MS. BREHM: Thank you. I'm a landowner in the five mile, square mile area. My sisters and I own about 1,000 acres in that area. Because I only had two days notice, I don't have a PowerPoint presentation for you, so I will just speak from my notes I made today after I got here.

I thought the notice was very short and somewhat repetitive. Between my sisters and I, we got 18 notices. I don't know if anybody else had that experience that you got quite a few.

We are -- next year, we will be -- one of our farms will be a centennial farm. The farm where I currently live, my family has lived there for 53 years, and the test bore will be in the same section where I live less than half a mile from where my house is.

I have three concerns. Number one is property values. If we sell gas or oil rights, our property loses value. Will we lose value with this carbon sequestration, I don't know. That's open. However, if the pipeline does run through our land, we cannot

build any permanent structure either on the pipeline or for -- I don't know what the easement is on this if the pipeline goes through. It is like 150 feet. Therefore, when you sell a piece of property that has a pipeline going, the pipeline going across it, you have lost value right there.

Number two concern is this is experimental. There is the possibility of leakage to the surface.

I have a couple of quotes. One of them is political. It is from Senator Dick Durbin from an October 5th, 2010 meeting in Meredosia. He says, although there is a possibility of property damage, he told the group that's really a minor concern. It is not a minor concern if you are a farmer.

But then he was a assured by CEO Ken Humphreys that the possibility of -- in that possibility, FutureGen Alliance and its associated insurance companies would cover the cost of the leak, and that the individual landowner would not be held responsible. That's really reassuring.

The other quote that I have is from globalccsinstitute.com, and the question -- this is a question and answer session.

Is it safe to put CO2 underground?

This is coming from the people who are sponsoring it.

A strong body of research in years of industry experience indicate that CO2 can be stored safely and securely for a well-selected, designed and managed geological site.

That's the catch for me. What about air? Nuclear power plants are safe. Wow. Look at what happened in Japan or China. I'm sorry. It is somewhat my concern about public air.

It also says although some leakage occurs upward through the soil -- I'm quoting again from their site -- well-selected stores are likely to remain more than 99% retained, more than 99% of the injected CO2 over a 1,000-year period. So technically it should be okay, but when we factor in human error, I have a concern about it.

The third point is the cost of the pipeline. Initially FutureGen was scrapped because it cost too much. The pipeline, according to one -- and I was not -- I don't have the specific official saying, but one of the persons for FutureGen in Morgan County this past winter said that the pipeline cost 1.5 to $2 million per mile. Now, it is 96 miles further

according to the article here in Douglas County than it is in Morgan County. So that comes out to about 1 and half to 200 million dollars more to bring it to Douglas County. For these reasons, I am against bringing carbon dioxide to Douglas County.

MR. WHYTE: Thank you. That was the only speaker that we had signed up this evening. Is there anyone here that would like to offer comments at this time? You are welcome to come up. Anyone at all?

Normally we ask those that have spoken if they have any additional comments. She just made it back to her seat, so I'm going to guess you don't have any additional comments at this time.

Okay. Well, thank you for your comments and participation this evening, and remember that the public comment period stays open for June 22nd, 2011. We will continue to be around here for a short time period back at the posters like we were before the formal session and, again, attempt to answer your questions and have further discussion.

This concludes the formal session of the public scoping meeting for FutureGen 2.0. Let the record show that this meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Thank you. (Off the record at 7:50 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, JENNIFER L. CROWE, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State of Illinois, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceeding was taken by me to the best of my ability and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this deposition was taken, and further that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties thereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

_____

Notary Public in and for
The State of Illinois