

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I listened to the Senator's very eloquent and well-prepared speech of the problems that occurred prior to 9/11. We all understand and know how bad they were.

EARTH DAY

Mr. JEFFORDS. I rise to speak about an issue that has been with us for a long time and for which we have had responsibility and have done a pretty good job at making sure everything would turn out all right. I want to talk about clean air, the environment, and areas where we have made tremendous progress.

As we mark Earth Day tomorrow, rather than celebrating the environmental legacy, I am afraid we are fighting harder than ever to protect our progress. Since the day he came into office, President Bush has worked to gut more than 34 years of hard work by weakening many of our Nation's standing environmental laws, some of which were signed into law by his father.

Air pollution is causing 70,000 premature deaths a year in the United States. Yet this Bush administration has proposed one of the biggest rollbacks of the Clean Air Act in history. Science tells us more than 600,000 women and children are at risk from mercury contamination. Yet this Bush administration has proposed to violate a legal requirement to reduce mercury emissions from powerplants.

As we approach another summer, 40 percent of the U.S. rivers and lakes remain too polluted for fishing or swimming. In spite of this fact this Bush administration has proposed fewer bodies of water to be protected by the Clean Air Act. Toxic waste sites continue to be added to the Superfund while the Bush administration continues to cut funding for the program and refuses to reauthorize the "polluter pays" law.

The Earth continues to warm and this Bush administration refuses to act to reduce the greenhouse gas emissions. This Bush administration has a growing credibility gap, maybe even a credibility chasm, on environmental policy. The President has lost the trust of the American people when it comes to the environment.

As the ranking member of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee, I believe we have an obligation to maintain and enforce the environmental laws already on the books and also to strengthen them. Unfortunately, our President is moving us backward instead of leading us forward. I hope we can once again celebrate Earth Day by showing more respect for our environment.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am proud to be here with my friend and colleague Senator JEFFORDS, who is the ranking member on the Environment and Public Works Committee on which I serve. His leadership has been ex-

traordinary on a whole range of issues, as has been his dedication to the environment, to protecting people and their environment.

When we hear protection of the environment, some people think of wildlife, which is true, and fisheries, which is true, and forests. It is all about preserving these things—first of all, because they are God's gift to us and that is our moral obligation, but it also protects the people of our country because we know when species get endangered, we know when oceans get polluted, we know when we lose the wetlands, we know when the air is smoggy, it hurts the people we represent—particularly the children, who are the most vulnerable, the people who are ill, and the elderly.

If we take our position seriously, what could be more fundamental than protecting our people? Protecting the environment is protecting our people. It is what we must do. It is the moral thing to do.

I say to my friend Senator JEFFORDS—and I see my colleague Senator REID of Nevada has come to the floor. I serve with both of them on that committee. It is a joy to be on that committee—we have a lot of work to do. We know Earth Day is a time for us to reflect on what our work should be. Gaylord Nelson and Denis Hayes founded Earth Day in 1970 to ensure environmental protection would be a major national issue. It has been. Tomorrow is the 34th anniversary of Earth Day.

One thing I find when I go home is people are so—I don't like to use this word, but it is true—they are disgusted with partisanship. They have had it with partisanship. They want us to work together. On what better issue could we work together than a clean and healthy environment? Whether you are a Democrat or Republican or whatever, you still have to breathe the air; you still have to drink the water; you still want to take your family to the beach or to the park. It is our job to protect the environment so you can do that.

We know this issue has been very much a bipartisan issue. When I think back, what comes to mind is President Nixon founded the EPA. We look at each President and we see progress has been made across party lines. Yet with this Presidency—and I think Senator JEFFORDS has touched on it and it has to be very painful for him to touch on it—we see a reversal of years of bipartisan progress. I want to get into that.

In today's paper there is a big story. The U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy has given its preliminary report on the state of our oceans. Happily, they gave us a blueprint for a new, comprehensive, national ocean policy. This happens to be a Presidentially-appointed commission composed of academics, naval officers, and members of the business community. This group, appointed by our President, is telling us our oceans are in crisis and we need to take action now if we are to reverse de-

clines. The Commission stated we need to start taking an ecosystem-based management approach to protect our oceans and marine species. That means we need to look at the whole environment of the ocean and not take small steps, but make sure we have policies that protect the entire ocean.

We need to improve the governance of our oceans by strengthening and coordinating decisionmaking. The Commission highlighted the need for greater Federal investment in ocean research and exploration for better scientific information.

I am someone who has worked for a long time to stop oil drilling off the coast of California because that is a precious environment we must protect, and it is an economic asset as it is. I am someone who wrote the tuna labeling bill which turned out, happily, to save tens of thousands of dolphins every year. I so welcome this report. I call on the President to embrace the findings of this report. I call on the President to work with us and let us know how he wants to implement this report.

I hope I am wrong in what I am about to say, but given the history of this administration I am very worried we will not hear much from the President about steps he is going to take with us to invest in our environment, to make sure America is the model for the world when it comes to protecting its natural resources.

Half a billion people participate in Earth Day campaigns every year, half a billion people across this world. I urge the President to take a look at this report, to step out on Earth Day and say I embrace this and we are going to work together to protect the oceans. While he is at it, I think Earth Day would be a perfect day for him to say he has seen the light and he is going to reverse all of the environmental rollbacks he is perpetrating on the American people.

I have a scroll I cannot bring into the Senate Chamber because there are rules against bringing the scroll in. When I unroll that scroll—and it goes out 30 feet—we see the more than 350 laws and regulations that have been rolled back unilaterally by this administration. No one has been immune from these attacks: not children with asthma, not communities faced with toxic waste sites, not parents who worry about what comes out of their faucets.

I couldn't possibly go through every rollback. I don't have enough time in the day. But what I want to give a sense of is what these rollbacks look like when they are written down, so I do have a whole series of charts. It is very hard to read, I know. Each one has a date. It starts January 20, 2001.

When the White House Chief of Staff, Andrew Card, issued the memo to all Federal agencies ordering the 60-day suspension of all rules finalized by the Clinton administration, including numerous important regulations to protect the environment and public

health, that is how they started. It was barely a day that they were in office. It started then—unrelenting—the same day the administration held up rules announced by the EPA to minimize raw sewage discharges and to require those discharges be placed in the public record so that the public was notified.

To give you a sense of it, last year alone there were 40,000 discharges of untreated sewage carrying bacteria, viruses, and fecal matter into basements, streets, playgrounds, and waterways across the country.

My God, who would ever want to stop a rule that said you need to notify the public and minimize raw sewage into people's basements?

Earth Day is coming. What are we doing here?

That is just the first two on the list.

On February 12, just a couple weeks after he was inaugurated, the Department of Energy delayed implementation of a new energy-efficient standard for residential and commercial appliances and equipment.

Again, I come from a State that has an electricity crisis. The best way to deal with it is to make sure we conserve as much as we can. Why would anyone think it is in the public interest not to move ahead with those standards?

This goes on. Here I go. I just landed on this one, August 8, 2001: In a reversal of President Bush's Earth Day pledge to preserve wetlands, the Corps of Engineers proposed relaxing a series of rules designed to protect streams and other wetlands. The Forest Service granted authority to review road building and timber sale prices, removing protections for the most pristine and largest roadless national forests.

We have national forests. We protected them. And the administration wants to go and build roads in these most precious areas.

It goes on. December 2001, Interior Secretary Norton reverses her agency's denial of a Canadian company's proposal to locate a major open pit gold mine in an area of the Southern California desert that is of great cultural and religious importance. Former Interior Secretary Babbitt denied it because of the devastating impact it would have had on the resources of this site.

Wasn't that a cyanide mine? They used cyanide on a beautiful precious area that is a religious holy site.

My eyes are just landing on different items here.

December 14, right before Christmas, 2001, the Department of Energy says the Government no longer must prove the Yucca Mountain's underground rock formations would leak radioactive contamination into the environment.

Can you imagine dumping radioactive waste and not making sure that it wouldn't leak into the environment? What are they doing over there? It is shocking, absolutely shocking.

This upcoming Earth Day is a chance for the President to embrace his own

ocean commission's recommendations and then to step to the plate and reverse some of these.

Here are some more: January 2002 through May 2002. President Bush releases the fiscal year 2003 Federal budget that eliminates the EPA's budget for graduate student research in the environmental sciences. Funding for the EPA's Star Grant Program, which provides highly motivated doctoral students with 3 years of funding to do environmental research, amounts to a little more than one-tenth of 1 percent of the EPA's budget.

Here is a program where young people who are dedicated to the environment can continue their education. Oh, no. This is something that is going to be cut from the budget.

May 10, 2002, EPA documents reveal that the Federal Office of Surface Mining is pushing to halt reforms that would ensure coal companies have plans to restore mining development before they can obtain mountain top removal permits.

Here is a coal mine that wants to go on the top of the mountain. And we always said you have to have a plan for how you are going to restore the mountaintop. They say it is OK; go ahead, destroy the mountains; we really do not care.

How could people understand all of this that is going on?

I am just picking a few.

Let us look at another chart. All of this is on the scroll.

The Bush anti-environmental record, May 2002 through August 2002: This is something Senator JEFFORDS talked about.

An Assistant Secretary at the Commerce Department testified that the Bush administration needs between 2 and 5 years to develop a national strategy to minimize global warming, and they will seek volunteer reductions instead of mandatory emission reductions.

The announcement came despite recent civilian employee reports confirming what most scientists have long believed—greenhouse gases generated by human activity are a major cause of climate change.

The Commerce Department says, Well, even though the scientists say this is global warming—and we have had hearings that show that slopes where people go skiing may not be there in the near future—they are just going to take their time about it and they are not going to require companies to clean up their act. They are going to use voluntary methods. This is just one more example. It goes on and on.

Here is August 2002 through December 2002. Can you imagine all of these rollbacks by one administration? It is shocking. Any one of these, I say, deserve days of discussions because of their ramifications.

Here is one, September 7, 2002: An investigation reveals that under the Bush administration the number of

EPA personnel assigned to enforce air quality laws has fallen by 12 percent, the lowest level on record. In addition, the number of EPA civil enforcement employees also has been cut in the past year by 5.7 percent.

What does that mean? It means the people who are enforcing the laws we pass are being laid off or transferred out. The polluters understand it. They are not dumb; they know. If they are not being watched, they are not going to live up to their obligations.

It is a reversal of years of bipartisan progress. That is what hurts so much.

As I listened to my friend, Senator JEFFORDS, who made a very heartfelt decision to become an independent, one of the reasons he decided was the environment and that he was perplexed and discouraged and dismayed at what had happened to his party—his former party. I understand why he is perplexed.

We just looked at some of these. Let us go ahead. This doesn't stop. It goes on and on.

Here is 2002 through July 2003. The administration has reversed a Federal policy that protects public lands while Federal land managers are assessing possible designations of wilderness areas.

Let me explain that. In the past, if someplace is under consideration for wilderness designation, you don't go in there with mining companies and drills. You don't go in there and destroy it while the land is under consideration for wilderness designation. Once you destroy the wilderness, this pristine gift from God, it is gone. Never before have we seen where you go in there and disturb these beautiful areas. But that is what they do.

Here is one, June 6, clean water: The EPA has racked up an abysmal record of enforcing Federal water pollution standards, according to its own study. In the broadest effort to date to document the failure of the EPA and State to enforce the 30-year-old Clean Water Act, the Agency's Office of Enforcement and Compliance found that at one time roughly 25 percent of all large industrial plants and water treatment facilities were in violation of Federal law, and in all but a handful of cases EPA failed to take action against the polluters.

The Clean Water Act is 30 years old, and now we are not enforcing it. The first Clean Water Act was passed under Harry Truman. It has been amended since then.

We have the Clean Water Act and they decided not to enforce it.

Here is one, March 19, 2004: The Federal Government has issued its first-ever warning that certain people should limit their consumption of canned albacore white tuna due to a risk of mercury poisoning. Under new guidelines issued by the U.S. FDA and EPA, pregnant and nursing women and young children should eat no more than 6 ounces of white tuna per week. According to experts on the FDA advisory panel, the recommendations do

not reflect the groups' view that children and pregnant women should completely eliminate albacore tuna from their diets and eat significantly less chunk light tuna than the Government suggests.

Vas Aposhian, a toxicology professor at the University of Arizona, resigned from the panel after the FDA did not heed its warnings.

Mercury is a serious problem, and Senator JEFFORDS has been a leader on that. Even though we know how harmful it is, they have even tried to downplay the impact of mercury on women and children.

This will complete more than 350 rollbacks. This is where we are as we approach this Earth Day.

I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I thank the Senator for illuminating, pointing out all of the problems created by this administration. As we go forward, the challenge we now have is to make sure no more occur.

Many Members on both sides of the aisle are deeply concerned about what is happening to our environment on this Earth Day. We know that all Members have to continue to alert this Nation of what the policies are doing to this Nation.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend for his comments. He is right.

My goodness, at the minimum, we should do no harm. In other words, let's do no harm. We should do a lot more. We should clean up. We should do better. We should set ourselves a standard of achievement on the environment so that areas get cleaner and the water gets purer. At the minimum, we have to stop bad things from happening.

As we look at more than 350 rollbacks made by this administration, going around the Congress, going through the executive branch by Executive order, and rules and interpretations, I tell you who has been protecting the people. The only way the people have been protected from some of these things is the courts. We are winning some of these battles in the courts.

Speaking of the courts, we are still fighting with the Bush-Cheney administration over the Vice President's desire to keep secret who sat in on his meetings as he put together the energy policies for this country which, as my friend knows, very much weigh heavily on the state of the environment, particularly the quality of the air.

I will be calling on the Vice President, and I might as well start now, to cease and desist in these lawsuits and turn over the records of who was in those meetings. Why should the Vice President not want to reveal this? Instead, it has taken years and thousands of hours of attorneys' time that the taxpayers are paying for, to keep all this secret.

I say to my friend, this is an open government, by and for the people. I don't see any reason why the Vice

President needs to keep all of this secret. That is another issue on which we will be working.

I wish to talk about the Superfund. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A minute and fifteen seconds.

Mrs. BOXER. I will conclude, and I assume my friend would like to speak again.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I would like to add that we have both witnessed all this. I don't know how the Senator feels, but I feel perhaps I have not done as much as I could have, as much as I would like to do.

We have to work together to make sure this terrible onslaught of destroying our environmental laws stops. And I know the Senator joins me in that pledge. And that we will do what we can to not get weaker but hopefully get stronger.

Mrs. BOXER. I say to the Senator, those words mean a lot to me. With all the other issues we face, and we face some very harsh issues, not the least of which is that this month alone I have lost 45 people in Iraq who either were from California or based in California—that weighs heavy on my heart—we have to do it all. There are no excuses.

This is only one environment. It is hard to bring it back when you destroy it.

I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would that be 5 minutes for each side?

Mrs. BOXER. Absolutely.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, despite all of our other pressures, we have to become tougher, stronger. We have to do everything we can.

I try to give out the Toxic Trophy Awards every time one of these things happens to try to draw attention to what is going on.

I return to my Earth Day comments and the Superfund Program. One in every four Americans, 70 million people, including 10 million children, lives within 4 miles of a Superfund site as we sit here today.

During its tenure in office, this administration has cut cleanups of those sites from 87 per year to 40 per year while refusing to fully fund the program.

Superfund is experiencing a funding shortfall of up to \$800 million. This President Bush is the first President in history to oppose the "polluter pays" fee. His dad supported it, Ronald Reagan supported it, and Bill Clinton supported it. This was a consensus until now.

What does it mean when you do not have the polluter fee? It means the taxpayers, not the polluters, pay for the cleanup.

I will show how many Superfund sites we have in the United States: 1,239. As this chart shows, the sites are in almost every single State. Maybe a State or two escapes, but not many.

In 1995, polluters contributed 82 percent to the Superfund trust fund. As of October 1, 2003, the trust fund had no money collected from polluters. This means we will never be able to clean up the most hazardous wastesites. Do you know what has happened to this budget. When the keys were handed over in the Oval Office from Bill Clinton to George Bush, he had a surplus as far as the eye could see. It has been reckless over there. We now have deficits as far as the eye can see. It is a very anxious time in our country. Is this the time to now say to polluters, "Don't worry, you don't need to pay a fee. We have enough money in the tax coffers to cover your problems?"

We all love to tell people, "You don't have to pay taxes." That is the greatest thing for any of us to do. But of all the times to tell polluters, "You don't have to clean up your room anymore," this is not the time.

My mother taught me: If you make a mess, you clean it up. I find myself quoting my mother more and more the older I get. She said other things like: Don't go where you're not wanted. She said a lot of smart things to me that I hold close to my heart. One thing is: Clean up your mess. She was talking about me when I was a kid in my room. I am talking about polluters, the messes they have made.

So where are we now? We are in a situation where we have reduced the cleanups. Let's look at it graphically on this chart. Through 2005, we are going to see 40, if we are lucky—and no money. And when Bill Clinton took office, the cleanups increased. But George Bush has radically decreased the pace of cleanup from former administrations, that is for sure. He has not gotten back to this level as shown on the chart.

But look at where we are now. Whether you look at the Superfund sites, whether you look at air pollution, whether you look at safe drinking water, whether you look at mercury, whether you look at global warming, whether you look at deep cuts in enforcement, whether you look at perchlorate, which they refuse to set a standard for, whether you look at the changes of the Sierra Nevada framework, we are hurting the environment and the people of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I yield the floor and hope all of us can work together on this Earth Day to change things around here.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will the Chair notify this Senator as to how

much time is left on both sides for morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the Democratic side, the time has expired. On the Republican side, the time is 5 minutes 45 seconds, and counting.

Mr. REID. I say to the Chair, I will just wait until we get to the motion to proceed. I assume, because I certainly cannot yield back the Republican time. It is my understanding the Presiding Officer wishes to speak at some time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer was going to speak if somebody was going to relieve him.

Mr. REID. I would be happy to relieve the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I appreciate the offer, but I will continue to preside until our time runs out.

Mr. REID. I will just let the time wind down then, and we will get to the bill in 5 minutes.

I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President. I understand the time would run evenly, but if we have no time left, it would just run; is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I withhold that. Probably it would be best to ask unanimous consent that the Republican time be reserved and I be allowed to speak for whatever time I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. If the majority wants more time, consent could be easily obtained.

GASOLINE PRICES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to talk about gasoline prices in the country and in Nevada. This is a terribly difficult situation. It is a story about the wild west, but it is not about Wild Bill Hickock or cowboys or mining or claim jumping. It is about gasoline. Some refer to it as black oil.

This chart illustrates how the gasoline prices in Nevada have skyrocketed. The prices are as of April 5. Prices now are at least 5 cents higher. I was in Nevada last week. Gas prices were approaching \$2.50 a gallon in some locations. This has been a burden on the people of Nevada and visitors who come there. The average price on January 5 of this year in Nevada was \$1.64 a gallon, which was pretty high compared to the rest of the country. But now it is much higher. This chart, as I have indicated, is as of April 5. We have had an increase in the State of Nevada of about 50 cents a gallon. We can't keep up with the increases in the price with our charts.

This is outrageous. Let me put it into perspective. In a truly bipartisan spirit, the Senate passed a \$318 billion highway bill. The bill would create at least 1 million jobs, rebuild and improve our transportation system, and provide a tremendous boost to the economy. In the House of Representa-

tives, Chairman YOUNG proposed a highway bill with a price tag of \$375 billion. The White House opposes Chairman YOUNG's proposal to add 5 cents in taxes to a gallon of gasoline and to index future tax increases to inflation.

Meanwhile, the oil companies have gouged—I use that word purposely—consumers by 10 times the amount of what Chairman YOUNG proposed for an increase in the tax, a half dollar a gallon.

This is ironic. The President doesn't want Americans to pay more at the pump, does he? There is no way the administration can shake the mantle they have assumed of being close to the oil industry. Both the Vice President and the President have been in the oil business. We have been litigating for 3 years whether the Vice President has to disclose who he met with, when he met with them, and what he talked about; that is, the oil companies. He has fought this every step of the way. He has fought it through the court system. It is still going on.

Then there is the fact the President won't call upon Saudi Arabia to increase their supply unless, according to Bob Woodward and his book, the President makes a deal with Prince Bandar to do this in September when it would have more of an impact on the elections. Time will only tell. I would hope if they have made an arrangement with the Saudis, they will start doing it now rather than wait until September.

Nevada gets all of its gasoline from California, so any problem with supply in California is a problem for Nevada. There has been a lot of talk and a lot written about the tight California gasoline market, where prices are typically 20 to 30 cents above the national average. We hear about the lack of refineries. We hear about boutique fuels and reduced inventories contributing to higher prices. I am sure each one of these has some bearing on higher prices. All of these things I have talked about need to be addressed.

I met with the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission. There are reports there are as many as 300 separate boutique fuels. He thinks there are around 100. But there are lots of them, and that could be a problem. We realize the need to reduce the number of specialty fuels.

We also hear about supply and demand. One thing I have been pushing is something the first President Bush did and President Clinton did, and that is to release oil out of our petroleum reserve to bring up the supply to reduce prices. I know the law of supply and demand cost Nevada ratepayers nearly \$1 billion during the western electricity crisis 3 years ago. While Enron was reaping windfall profits—and there must be a better name for that than windfall profits; it was even bigger than windfall profits—it told consumers it was all a matter of supply and demand. But, of course, it turned out Enron was really manipulating the

supply. So it wasn't supply and demand.

Based on this bitter experience which is still being litigated in the courts, I was concerned Nevadans might be getting ripped off again when gasoline prices went through the roof this year. I asked the Federal Trade Commission, along with Senator ENSIGN, to investigate these wild price increases, particularly with an eye toward any possible manipulation in gasoline markets. I needed to assure the citizens of Nevada that gasoline markets were operating fairly and not being manipulated to maximize the profits of oil companies.

It is easy for domestic oil companies to boost their profits by squeezing the supply of gasoline. A combination of refinery capacity reductions and corporate mergers has concentrated control of prices in only a handful of companies. Again, this chart shows how prices have risen steadily in Nevada since the first of the year.

A major spike occurred in February 18, due to a power outage at the Tesoro refinery in northern California that supplies 20 percent of the refined gasoline to that region. In a matter of days, prices in Nevada topped \$2 a gallon. The refinery came back on line only a week later, and the supply was restored. But as the chart shows, prices at the pump didn't recover. They had a power outage that slowed that refinery for a week. Prices skyrocketed. The refinery came back on line. Prices stayed high. Actually, they went higher. Prices at the pump didn't recover. Families were still paying an extra half dollar a gallon every time they filled their tanks.

So in case anyone is worried about the impact of a refinery shutdown at Tesoro, they can rest easy. Refiner margins of profits were 70 cents higher a share this quarter; 60 percent higher than analysts had expected. The stock at Tesoro is at a 52-week high.

Let me show another chart, the price of a gallon of gasoline in Nevada. Here is where we arrived at \$1.64. The bottom number is important: Crude oil price, 77 cents; refiner margin, that is cost plus profits, at a quarter; dealer margin, 10 cents; taxes, 52 cents. That is the way it is. There's ample profit for the oil companies at \$1.64. Anything above that is just additional profit.

In order to understand what drove gasoline prices in Nevada to record highs and why they stayed high even after California refineries temporarily reduced their wholesale price, we need to understand what goes into the price we pay at the pump for a gallon of fuel. As indicated, this chart shows the price of a gallon of gasoline has four main components: cost of crude oil; refiner's margin, which is cost plus profits; the dealer's margin, which is cost plus profit; and fuel taxes, both Federal and State. We must pay attention to the word "profits." It figures big in this discussion.

The chart shows the typical numbers we have come to expect in the Nevada