



Verification Report for Emission Reductions Relating to J. B. Hunt Trucking
Intermodal Project Including Emission Breakdown by State

Reporting Period: September 1, 2011 – January, 31 2013

Prepared for:
Blue Source, LLC

May 10, 2013

Ruby Canyon Engineering
743 Horizon Ct. Suite 385
Grand Junction, Colorado 81506
(970) 241-9298

Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction and Objective.....	1
1.1	Project Title.....	1
1.2	Date When Project Began.....	1
1.3	Expected Lifetime of the Project	1
1.4	Type of GHG Emission Reduction Project.....	1
1.5	Appropriateness of the Methodology Used	1
1.6	Legal Land Description.....	2
1.7	Roles and Responsibilities	2
2.0	Verification Criteria.....	2
2.1	Scope.....	2
2.2	Level of Assurance	3
	Agreed upon level of assurance: Reasonable level of assurance	3
2.3	Materiality.....	3
3.0	Verification Plan	3
3.1	Verification Records	4
3.2	Facts Discovered After the Verification	5
4.0	Verification Findings	5
4.1	Ownership.....	5
4.2	Sampling Plan	5
4.3	Technologies and processes used in GHG Assertion.....	5
4.4	Assessment of GHG Information and Information System Controls	6
4.4.1	Dispatched Loads.....	6
4.4.2	Miles Traveled	6
4.4.3	Fuel Economies.....	6
4.4.4	Variance Factors	6
4.5	Emission Reductions.....	7
4.6	Finding Overview	8
4.6.1	Deviations to the Protocol.....	8
5.0	Conflict of Interest.....	8
6.0	Verification Principles	8
7.0	Verification Statement	9

1.0 Introduction and Objective

Blue Source, LLC (Blue Source) is an active supplier of emission reduction credits sourced from geologic sequestration, conservation, transportation, and avoidance projects and entities. J.B. Hunt Transport Services, Inc. (J.B. Hunt) is one of the largest truck-load transportation and logistics companies in North America.

In 1989, J.B. Hunt formed a partnership with the former Santa Fe Railroad (now Burlington Northern Santa Fe). Over the next decade new intermodal concepts were developed and tested. In 2000, the J.B. Intermodal (JBI) business segment was formed within J.B. Hunt and over 300 million USD of capital was invested in containers, chassis, tractors and software to support the new JBI.

The goal of intermodal ground transport is to optimize the best of both truck and rail modes. Freight is loaded in containers and picked up at a shipper's location by a JBI tractor or third party dray company for transport to the rail yard. The freight is then transported from highway vehicles to rail cars for what is typically the longest leg of the route. At the destination rail yard, JBI freight is then transferred from the rail car and delivered by JBI or dray carriers to the final destination. This method of transporting freight via intermodal reduces fuel consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. Transporting freight via trains is over three times more efficient than trucks on a ton-mile basis. Thus, using trains to transport freight has the potential to provide significant greenhouse gas emissions reductions.

Ruby Canyon Engineering (RCE) was contracted by Blue Source to perform the verification of the fifth Reporting Period of the *J. B. Hunt's Intermodal Transport Project* (Project) listed with the Canadian Standards Association (CSA) GHG CleanProjects™ Registry. The objective of the verification is to confirm data, controls and processes supporting the emission reduction or removal calculations as presented in the GHG Report and corresponding GHG Assertion according to the procedures set out in ISO 14064-3 and CSA GHG CleanProjects™ Registry guidelines. Additional objectives include confirming that the GHG Report and corresponding GHG Assertion are without material discrepancies.

1.1 Project Title

J. B. Hunt Trucking Intermodal Project

1.2 Date When Project Began

October 1, 2006

1.3 Expected Lifetime of the Project

October 1, 2006 – September 30, 2016

1.4 Type of GHG Emission Reduction Project

Intermodal Transportation Project (Truck-Train)

1.5 Appropriateness of the Methodology Used

This verification is based on data and information obtained from J.B. Hunt and Blue Source, and uses the protocol entitled *Blue Source's Project Description Report – GHG Reduction Protocol for J. B. Hunt's Intermodal Transport Project (December 2008)* that was developed for this project. Additional changes were made to the calculation methodology in RP3 in Blue Source's *GHG Assertion of GHG Emission Reductions from JB Hunt's Intermodal Transport Project (October 2010)*, where the emission reductions are disaggregated into individual States. The protocol was based on established emission estimation techniques, conservative estimates, accurate/reliable data sources, emissions factors, and documented methodologies. RCE confirms the methodology is applicable to the project and the emission reductions

generated by the project are additional to what otherwise would have occurred in the absence of the project.

1.6 Legal Land Description

Continental United States

1.7 Roles and Responsibilities

Verification Team:

Ruby Canyon Engineering	Title	Responsibility	Email
Michael Cote	President	Lead Verifier	mcote@rubycanyoneng.com
Zach Eyler	GHG Project Manager	Senior Reviewer	zeyler@rubycanyoneng.com
Eric Ripley	Sr. Environmental Scientist	Team Member	eripley@rubycanyoneng.com

Project Developer:

Blue Source, LLC	J.B. Hunt Transport, Inc.
Mr. Mahesh Gundappa Vice President, Engineering 1935 East Vine Street; Suite 300 Murray, UT 84121 Phone: (919) 649 8392 E-mail: mgundappa@bluesource.com	Mr. Gary Whicker Senior Vice President – Engineering Services J.B. Hunt Transport, Inc. 615 J.B. Hunt Corporate Drive Lowell, Arkansas 72745 Phone: (479) 820-8143 E-mail: Gary_Whicker@jbhunt.com

2.0 Verification Criteria

The verification criteria are as follows:

- The project is in conformance with the requirements and principles of ISO 14064-2
- The data supporting the GHG calculations have sufficient controls to be considered fair and accurate and without material discrepancy
- The GHG assertion considered to be sufficiently accurate and without material discrepancy
- There are no competing claims to the ownership of the project

2.1 Scope

The scope of the verification includes the following:

Project Boundaries: The project boundary includes truck loads dispatched by J.B. Hunt for their JBT (JB Trucking) and JBI fleets (including the independent contractors and outsourced drays), and the rail intermodal loads contracted through J.B. Hunt, but dispatched through third-party railroad companies within the continental U.S.

- GHG Sources: mobile combustion sources for JBI and JBT fleets, and various intermodal railroads
- GHG Types: CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O (HFC, PFC, & SF₆ not applicable to the project)
- Reporting period: September 1, 2011 – January 31, 2013.
- Project follows the validated project protocol and quantification methods (December, 2008)

2.2 Level of Assurance

Agreed upon level of assurance: Reasonable level of assurance

2.3 Materiality

RCE determined that the GHG assertion was materially accurate within the 5% materiality threshold by verifying the following information:

- Number of loads dispatched by J. B. Hunt
- Documented miles driven by trucks by state
- Estimated miles traveled for trainloads by state
- Fuel economies of both the trucks and trains
- Mileage variance factors for trucks and trains
- BTU/ton-mile variance factors for each railroad
- Intermodal share of freight transportation in U.S.
- Percentage of biodiesel consumed

3.0 Verification Plan

RCE is a leading GHG verification company in the North American voluntary carbon market and maintains a staff of experienced GHG verifiers. RCE staff possesses skills with emissions estimation, establishing project boundaries, and baseline determination, as well as extensive experience with the various calculation methods, mass balance equations, site-specific and default emission factors, and the concepts of materiality. RCE completed the ANSI accreditation program to become an ISO 14065 approved GHG validation and verification (V&V) body on October 9, 2009. RCE has verified projects and inventories for the CSA, CAR, PCT, TCR, VCS, ACR, and ARB GHG registries, including over 200 GHG verifications in the landfill gas, livestock, coal mine methane, oil & gas, renewable energy, ozone depleting substances, nitrous oxide, and transportation sectors. RCE is already ANSI-accredited to perform validations and verifications under Project-Level Scope for Scope 1 (combustion, fuel switching) and Scope 2 (process emissions, N₂O, ODS), Project-Level Scope 5 (agriculture) and Scope 6 (waste gas, landfill and coal mine methane). The J.B. Hunt project falls under Scope 1. RCE understands the requirements of the CSA GHG CleanProjects™ Registry and has completed verifications for the CSA GHG CleanProjects™ Registry in the past.

RCE created a project specific verification plan that included risk assessment and a desktop sample plan. The verification plan also included a detailed facility visit to J.B. Hunt headquarters in Lowell, Arkansas. RCE created the verification plan based on the following criteria:

Table 1 – Verification Assumptions

REPORTING PERIOD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ September 1, 2011 – January 31, 2013
PROTOCOLS AND STANDARDS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CSA GHG CleanProjects™ Registry: Blue Source’s <i>Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Protocol for JB Hunt’s Intermodal Transport Project, December 2008</i> ○ Blue Source’s modification to the protocol: <i>GHG Assertion of GHG Emission Reductions from JB Hunt’s Intermodal Transport Project (October 2010)</i> ○ <i>Blue Source’s Emission Reductions Report from JB Hunt’s Intermodal Transport Project, September 2011 – January 2013 (May 9, 2013)</i> ○ ○ ISO 14064-3 “Greenhouse gases – Part 3: Specification with guidance

	<p>for the validation and verification of greenhouse gas assertions”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CSA GHG CleanProjects™ Registry: Verification Guidance, January 1, 2012
LEVEL OF ASSURANCE & MATERIALITY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reasonable Level of Assurance ○ Materiality (5%)

RCE developed a verification plan that was followed throughout the verification activities. The verification plan consisted of the following activities:

- Prior to completing a verification agreement, RCE’s internal auditor completed its internal COI form to identify any potential conflict of interest with the Project proponent (J.B. Hunt) or Project developer (Blue Source). RCE’s COI policy conforms to ANSI-approved GHG Policies and ISO 14065 requirements. The potential for COI was identified to be Low.
- Blue Source sent preliminary data and information to RCE on March 1, 2013.
- RCE held a teleconference verification kick-off meeting with Mahesh Gundappa on March 1, 2013. During the kick-off meeting RCE reviewed the verification objectives and process, the verification schedule, and requested the verification background documents.
- RCE performed a strategic review and risk assessment of the received data and support documents in order to understand the scope and areas of potential risk in the GHG emissions reductions. RCE assessed risk associated with inherent risk, control risk, and detection risk.
- RCE developed a risk-based desktop sampling plan based upon the strategic review and risk assessment. The verification plan and desktop sampling plan were used throughout the verification and were revised as needed based upon additional risk assessments.
- RCE performed a site visit to J.B. Hunt headquarters on March 5, 2013. RCE interviewed and held detailed discussions with J.B. Hunt logistics engineers responsible for compiling data that was entered into the GHG assertion. In addition, RCE interviewed personnel from JBI and JBT truck dispatch operations, director of intermodal rail operations, fuel manager, data analysts, accounting, and data security.
- RCE performed a risk-based desk-top review of the submitted verification documents. The desk top review included an assessment of the GHG calculation methods and inputs to confirm the appropriateness of the methods used, source data completeness, GHG management and monitoring systems, record retention practices, and project ownership.
- Following a review of the GHG assertion, data and supporting documents, RCE sent Blue Source additional data/information requests via the List of Findings on March 9, & April 24, 2013; and held several conference calls with Blue Source and J.B. Hunt to discuss the required documents in more detail. All items in the List of Findings were closed out on April 25, 2013.
- RCE conducted a senior technical review of the verification plan, sampling plan, report and statement.
- Blue Source provided a final Project Report (that contained the GHG Assertion) to RCE on May 9, 2013 which will be presented for registration.
- RCE developed a final verification report and statement, and listing of findings.
- RCE held an exit meeting with the client on April 29, 2013.

3.1 Verification Records

RCE maintains all verification records according to its ANSI-approved GHG Verification Policies and Procedures and any GHG Program requirements. RCE maintains verification records for seven years following the end of the crediting period.

3.2 Facts Discovered After the Verification

RCE will apprise the project proponent and GHG CleanProjects™ if material discrepancies are discovered after the verification. It may be necessary for an updated GHG Report, GHG Assertion, and Verification Report be prepared and posted once the material discrepancies have been addressed.

4.0 Verification Findings

The following sections define the scope to which the GHG verification activities were limited to.

4.1 Ownership

RCE confirmed that the project is owned and operated by J.B. Hunt, and that the emission reductions generated by the project have been transferred to Blue Source, LLC. RCE reviewed an agreement between J. B. Hunt and Blue Source dated August 1, 2003 and amended on September 6, 2010 that states that Blue Source has clear title to all emission reductions generated by the project.

4.2 Sampling Plan

RCE's risk-based desktop sample plan was based on the following:

- Confirm the project conforms to the validated project protocol
- Review of the GHG report and assertion for errors or misstatements
- Verify use of appropriate variance factors, fuel efficiencies, and mileage software
- Review of GHG information and control systems and GHG management
- Verify that any changes to trucking dispatch, data management, and maintenance operations, have been documented since the previous verification
- Completeness of supporting documentation to confirm baseline scenario (actual loaded miles)
- Calculation methodologies were correctly applied
- Calculations and results were materially correct
- Verify that all the necessary monitoring and metering were in place and maintained
- Verify QA/QC procedures are in place and being followed
- Verify the documentation trail of a sample of customer loads (dispatched ramp pair miles) to accounting (paid bill of lading and invoices)
- Approve any deviations from the project protocol

4.3 Technologies and processes used in GHG Assertion

A fuel-based methodology is used to calculate all CO₂e emissions. Thus, the largest data requirements are truck loads (empty, loaded and deadhead), miles traveled, and fuel economy (which is then converted to fuel consumption). J.B. Hunt engineers provided database queries and resulting spreadsheets containing the annual dispatch, empty and deadhead truck loads, train loads, and miles, load weights, truck fleet fuel economies, and rail miles.

The Project utilizes software systems PC-Miler, PC-Railer, and Rand McNally to calculate baseline truck, rail, and JBI Dray mileage. PC-Miler and PC-Railer are accepted industry wide and complies with U.S. Department of Defense and General Services Administration distances for approved freight rating and billing. Given this certification, RCE has a high level of assurance of the accuracy and use of the software.

J.B. Hunt has integrated Rand McNally mileage into their data management system and can run jobs that calculate mileage and routes for any given ramp pair. The product is used industry wide and also provides a high level of assurance in the accuracy of the mileage provided.

For the state-by-state breakdowns of emission reductions, the baseline truck miles are calculated using PC-Miler by entering the starting and ending ramp pairs to calculate the route and total number of

miles. The project railroad miles are calculated using PC-Railer and entering railroad ramp pairs. The software determines the miles driven in each state based on routes.

4.4 Assessment of GHG Information and Information System Controls

4.4.1 Dispatched Loads

Dispatched loads are entered from J.B. Hunt's facilities and entered into the truck's on-board computer. The load is tracked and the data is transferred to J.B. Hunt's mainframe computer database. Output files are queried for daily reports. J.B. Hunt uses error checking software to match each load order with actual truck data – corrections are usually made within 24 hours.

4.4.2 Miles Traveled

Data for the trucks were collected by the J.B. Hunt on-board truck computers, and communicated via a satellite tracking system to an in-house database system. J.B. Hunt checks the truck's odometer readings with the dispatched miles to record any variances. The variances are tracked and recorded each month, and then applied to the dispatched amounts.

Actual rail miles were determined from data obtained from BNSF and Norfolk Southern (NS) railroads for various ramp pairs used for transporting JB Hunt intermodal loads. For the remaining ramp pairs J.B. Hunt used software PC Railer to estimate the rail miles. Using this approach, approximately 99 percent of the total track miles traveled was determined. These actual rail miles were compared to PC Railer miles in the JBI reporting system and indicated that the actual track miles were about 14 percent greater than miles generated from the software. To account for this difference, the reported rail miles were increased by a variance factor (discussed in Sec. 4.4.4).

4.4.3 Fuel Economies

Fuel economies for each truck were determined using data from the fuel billing system. The driver must enter the truck identification number, and odometer reading before receiving fuel from the fueling station. Fuel economies are recorded each time a driver fills up a truck with diesel. J.B. Hunt accurately calculates and documents truck fuel economies for both the JBI and JBT fleets separately on a monthly basis. The fueling system has safeguards that monitor the time between fuel-ups, mileage, and the truck's identification number to prevent partial fuel-ups that will affect the MPG tracking. If the truck does not meet all of the criteria, the fuel-up will not be authorized without further investigation from J.B. Hunt.

4.4.4 Variance Factors

Trucks - Actual truck miles driven by both the JBI and JBT fleets are greater than the standard PC Miler miles used by the dispatched load orders. In order to reflect actual miles driven, the PC Miler miles are multiplied by two factors. The first, a *loaded mile adjustment factor*, combines the loaded truck, empty truck, and deadhead miles, and compares them to the PC Miler miles. The second factor applied to the Rand McNally miles is called the *variance factor*. This represents the additional miles driven by the truck drivers that are not required for shipment of the dispatched loads. The causes of additional miles may include road construction detours and food stops. RCE verified the monthly variance factors applied to truck miles in the GHG assertion.

Trucks – Beginning in 2011, J.B. Hunt began accounting for biodiesel consumption companywide. Because biofuel is considered carbon neutral, the emissions associated with the actual biofuel portion of the purchased biodiesel are subtracted in the baseline scenario. J.B. Hunt consumed approximately 2.1 percent biogas in 2011 and 6.3 percent in 2012, and RCE confirmed the baseline emissions were adjusted as such.

Trains - Actual train miles driven are more than the standard PC Railer miles used by the dispatched load orders. In order to reflect actual miles driven, the PC Railer miles are multiplied by two factors. The first, a *loaded mile adjustment factor (approximately 14 percent)*, accounts for the actual miles traveled, and compares them to the PC Railer miles. The second factor applied to the PC Railer miles is called the *empty mile variance factor (varying from 6.0-8.3 percent)*. This represents the additional miles driven by the trains that are not required for shipment of the dispatched loads. RCE verified the monthly variance factors applied to train miles in the GHG assertion.

Trains - Information regarding the energy intensities (Btu/revenue-ton-miles) of the railroads was obtained from the American Railroad Association and the two largest carriers for J.B. Hunt, BNSF and NS railroad for 2009 and 2010. In addition, studies from 2001 and 2005 showed the energy intensities of their intermodal locomotives are approximately 21 percent less efficient than their overall fleet average (600 intermodal gross ton-miles/gallon of diesel vs. 762 average gross ton-miles/gallon of diesel). The reasons for the difference are the use of larger locomotive engines for intermodal transport, requiring travel at higher than average speeds (70mph vs. 45mph). In addition to a 21 percent variance factor, an additional 1 percent variance factor is applied to account for rail yard emissions for loading and unloading containers (using overhead cranes and Hostler trucks).

4.5 Emission Reductions

Table 2 outlines the total quantity of CO₂e of baseline emissions, project emissions, and emission reductions from the Project for the reporting period September 1, 2011 to January 31, 2013.

Table 2: Total U.S. GHG Emission Reductions - CO₂e (metric tonnes)

Reporting Period:	September 1- December 31, 2011	January 1 – December 31, 2012	January 1 – 31, 2013	Total
Baseline Emissions	1,347,442	4,201,360	371,089	5,919,891
Project Emissions	688,634	2,182,182	188,078	3,058,894
Total Emission Reductions	658,807	2,019,179	183,011	2,860,997

Table 3 summarizes the total emission reductions by state for the Reporting Period September 1, 2011 to January 31, 2013.

Table 3: GHG Emission Reductions by State – CO₂e (metric tonnes)

State	CO ₂ e	State	CO ₂ e	State	CO ₂ e	State	CO ₂ e
AL	24,013	IA	150,440	NV	120,694	SD	6,327
AZ	215,026	KS	0	NH	0	TN	121,424
AR	117,903	KY	22,105	NJ	0	TX	193,578
CA	134,826	LA	26,267	NM	157,285	UT	186,380
CO	161,773	ME	0	NY	0	VT	0
CT	6,023	MD	13,101	NC	13,446	VA	55,193
DE	0	MA	0	ND	11,543	WA	12
DC	0	MI	0	OH	94,743	WV	11,698
FL	16,643	MN	7,621	OK	184,126	WI	3,209
GA	0	MS	17,517	OR	55,735	WY	151,639
ID	49,916	MO	63,314	PA	68,199		
IL	44,870	MT	39,283	RI	226		
IN	45,813	NE	260,496	SC	8,590	Total	2,860,997

4.6 Finding Overview

Blue Source provided sufficient evidence and adequate documentation of their emission estimates, data collection procedures, monitoring and quality control procedures. The verification process focused on the documented loads dispatched, variance factors applied to reconcile between actual miles traveled and PC-Miler and PC-Railer outputs, and assigned fuel economies for both truck and trains. RCE also investigated the use of J.B. Hunt's data management systems that were used to query data and information from the company's data warehouse. Finally, RCE conducted a detailed review of the GHG assertion spreadsheets that were used to quantify the emission reductions.

There were no material findings during the verification activities. All, non-material findings were corrected and Blue Source provided sufficient evidence for all information requests and clarifications.

4.6.1 Deviations to the Protocol

During the reporting period, J.B. Hunt included two small deviations to the calculation methodology to ensure additional conservativeness and accuracy of the GHG assertion. The first deviation included the consideration of the non-fossil fuel volume of biodiesel that J.B. Hunt consumes in its trucking operations. In 2011, the amount was non-material (2.1 percent), but the volume increased to 6.3% in 2012. By including the biofuel volumes into the calculations, the amount of baseline emissions in the GHG assertion is reduced. RCE approves this deviation.

The second deviation involves a software update - the use of PC-Miler Rail-BatchPro 19 (PCRail) software to determine the state-by-state train miles related to project emissions. The previous calculation method used PCMiler 24 software. While the change in software does not affect the overall emissions reductions, the updated software is considered an improvement and provides a more accurate state-by-state estimate of emissions reductions. RCE approves this deviation.

5.0 Conflict of Interest

RCE's internal auditor completed a COI assessment based on ISO 14065 requirements and RCE's ANSI-approved GHG Verification Policies and Procedures. The results of the COI assessment determined the potential for COI to be low.

6.0 Verification Principles

RCE's verification team remained independent and free of bias throughout the verification activities. The verification team demonstrated ethical conduct, integrity, confidentiality, and discretion throughout the verification process, and exercised due professional care and judgment when performing the verification activities. The verification findings represent truthfully and accurately the verification activities, opinions, and conclusions.

7.0 Verification Statement

Mr. Mahesh Gundappa
Vice President, Engineering
Blue Source, LLC
1935 East Vine Street; Suite 300
Murray, UT 84121

Ruby Canyon Engineering conducted a independent, third-party verification of the J. B. Hunt Trucking Intermodal Emission Reduction Project (Project) GHG assertion and GHG Project Report (dated May 9, 2013) for Blue Source LLC.

The objective of the verification is to confirm data, controls and processes supporting the emission reduction or removal calculations as presented in the GHG Project Report and corresponding GHG Assertion according to the procedures set out in CSA GHG CleanProjects™ Registry guidelines. RCE performed a strategic review of the Project Report, GHG calculations, and Project support data and evidence for the reporting period September 1, 2011 through January 31, 2013.

The criteria against the GHG assertion and supporting evidence were evaluated include the following:

- CSA GHG CleanProjects™ Registry: Blue Source’s Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction Protocol for JB Hunt’s Intermodal Transport Project, December 2008
- ISO 14064 - Part3
- ISO 14065

Based upon the processes and procedures and the evidence collected, RCE concludes to a reasonable level of assurance that the Project emission reduction assertion is free of material errors, omissions or misrepresentations, and are substantiated by sufficient and appropriate evidence, and that the Project Report was prepared in accordance with the relevant criteria.

The GHG assertion includes three GHG: CO₂, CH₄ and N₂O. **Table 4** shows the verified emission reductions by vintage and GHG type. **Table 5** shows the verified emission reductions by vintage and individual U.S. state. The amounts are shown in metric tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalents (t CO₂ e).



Table 4 – Verified GHG Emission Reductions by GHG Type - CO₂e (tonnes)

Reporting Period	CO ₂	CH ₄	N ₂ O	Total
September 1 – December 31, 2011	661,794	(627)	(2,360)	658,807
January 1 – December 31, 2012	2,028,751	(1,998)	(7,574)	2,019,179
January 1 – 31, 2013	183,818	(201)	(607)	183,011

Table 5 - Verified GHG Emission Reductions by State - CO₂e (tonnes)

State	September 1- December 31, 2011	January 1 – December 31, 2012	January 1 – 31, 2013	Total
Alabama	5,131	17,310	1,572	24,013
Arizona	47,796	152,899	14,331	215,026
Arkansas	27,388	83,042	7,473	117,903
California	30,094	95,794	8,938	134,826
Colorado	38,264	113,644	9,864	161,773
Connecticut	1,138	4,487	398	6,023
Florida	3,953	11,550	1,140	16,643
Idaho	12,115	34,803	2,998	49,916
Illinois	10,049	31,790	3,031	44,870
Indiana	9,623	33,265	2,924	45,813
Iowa	35,193	106,057	9,190	150,440
Kentucky	5,165	15,570	1,370	22,105
Louisiana	5,338	19,146	1,783	26,267
Maryland	3,045	9,260	796	13,101
Minnesota	2,595	4,539	487	7,621
Mississippi	3,690	12,600	1,227	17,517
Missouri	14,409	44,623	4,281	63,314
Montana	11,521	25,333	2,429	39,283
Nebraska	61,631	183,082	15,783	260,496
Nevada	28,620	84,568	7,506	120,694
New Mexico	34,479	111,910	10,896	157,285
North Carolina	3,147	9,503	796	13,446
North Dakota	3,740	7,058	745	11,543
Ohio	19,934	68,305	6,504	94,743
Oklahoma	41,860	130,365	11,901	184,126
Oregon	13,182	39,216	3,337	55,735
Pennsylvania	14,616	48,862	4,721	68,199
Rhode Island	18	187	21	226
South Carolina	2,038	6,024	528	8,590
South Dakota	1,669	4,297	361	6,327
Tennessee	28,022	85,741	7,662	121,424
Texas	42,414	138,266	12,898	193,578
Utah	44,121	130,905	11,355	186,380
Virginia	12,126	39,462	3,605	55,193
Washington	12	-	-	12
West Virginia	2,665	8,310	724	11,698
Wisconsin	1,753	1,279	177	3,209
Wyoming	36,254	106,129	9,256	151,639
Total	658,807	2,019,179	183,011	2,860,997

Verification Team Signatures

Lead Verifier – Michael Cote, RCE	Senior Reviewer – Zach Eycler, RCE
	
Date: May 10, 2013	Date: May 10, 2013