

**CENTER FOR
STRATEGIC AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES (CSIS)
SMART POWER SERIES**

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION:
FRANK VERRASTRO
DIRECTOR AND SENIOR FELLOW OF THE ENERGY AND
NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAM, CSIS**

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2008

*Transcript by
Center for Strategic and International Studies
Washington, D.C.*

Q&A TRANSCRIPT

DR. SAM: What do you think are some of the alternative energy's nuclear courses – controversial – and what are some of the alternative energies, renewables, and otherwise that you think will be used and promoted around the globe?

CHRISTINE WHITMAN: Geothermal, I think holds a great deal of promise. I think obviously, hydrogen is something where there has been a lot of money and attention put into it. I don't see hydrogen as a viable mobile source of power. But it's there already for a stable source of power. I think that's something that can and should be promoted. Wind and solar are great and they're important. But the problem we have in this country and other countries is that - first of all - they are intermittent. They are not base power and they are peak-shaving. And we haven't come up with the high-intensive battery yet that will allow us to store it so that they could become part of the base power structure. And of course if you do that anyway [inaudible] you're going to be using, you're going to have to deal with that at the end of the day. You have a host of other issues. They tend to be in places that aren't next to population sources. You can see it particularly in this country. They have a huge geographic footprint. It requires a lot of windmills to make power of any kind of quantity – a kilowatt of power. And so there are problems with that and with the transmission of getting there. But that doesn't mean we shouldn't continue to try to improve on that. Coal will always be a part of our base power. It will be in this country because it's better than 50% of our power. It's certainly going to be as – we see – as I say China is doing one coal fueled power plant a week, because it's affordable and cheap. We're going to have gas and oil, but what are the really best ways of using that. We see the huge fluctuation in gas prices, and that's been of enormous concern to people. Are we using it the best way? And can we reduce our dependence on that? There are also ways that I haven't even thought of – that nobody's thought of. We actually, my company, is working with a city in South Korea, Yu Sang Do, which is, actually, it's going to be the size of Boston when it's built. And it's going to be a lead in [inaudible] the whole thing. The office, the apartment buildings will be basically – the office buildings will be lead, gold or silver. And then they have one platinum lead. I tried to get them, because, I think, those of us at a certain age remember that the Korean War, one of the big challenges was the In-Chon landing, because of the tides. They have some of the highest tides in the world there, and I thought tidal – why can't we use tidal for our energy? Didn't work. Problem was that when you take that order you have to funnel it in order to get the power and that changes the ecosystem surrounding it. And there was a host of problems. It wasn't feasible. But there are other ones that we haven't even begun to think of that are going to be coming forward. And that is exciting to look at. We should be promoting all of them. Where I worry, in this country, is the government tends to get behind one source. They shouldn't do that. If we're going to have money for research and development for renewables, it should be for renewables – the whole portfolio of renewables, not something like corn-based ethanol. It doesn't work. (laughter)

FRANK VERRASTRO: You get points for that one.

RAGHUBIR GOYAL, *India Globe & Asia Today*: good to see you ...

I have to ask two quick questions. One and two. One, you said that many countries do not like America today, and we had Karen Hughes who tried her best from the State Dept. I understand that those countries hate U.S that U.S. are giving them money. Or France of the US hates the most.

And Second, What do you think about the civil nuclear agreement between U.S. and India, which is still pending in the bureaucracy in Indian Parliament or the Son of the Leftist. Or do you believe, if you have studied that, because of too many conditions or restrictions or why it's still not going through with the Pres. Bush had done his best to bring India clean energy?

CHRISTINE WHITMAN: Well, I can't speak for why India isn't moving forward with it faster, but it's something that we should be promoting. I believe it is the right approach to try to encourage green energy around the world. Again, we need to be doing and putting emphasis on it here – in this country – so we can lead by example and also provide excellent examples. So that's one of those things that is caught up in local politics. And also, there's always this attitude when you're taking money from someone that means your dependent, and it comes with strings, and you resent the strings. And that's natural. That's why I like the MCC approach because it allows the countries to come first to say this is what we want to do and they have to meet certain criteria in order to be eligible for those funds and it requires the involvement of civil society. It allows it to be a much more comprehensive process, and one that is really based on what the countries need, rather than what we think the countries need. There are a couple of mistakes – but who am I to say about mistakes in foreign policy, and no one is perfect, but we ought to be very careful about the way we approach personalizing our international relations. We tend to focus on the individual leaders of a country, and start to make the relationships be about them, and with them. This is particularly true, for instance with Musharraf of Pakistan. That means when anything goes wrong with them, there goes our relationship. And it also hurts sometimes them and their countries and undermines their effectiveness and it doesn't – I don't believe necessarily accrue to our best interest. We need to enter into a much more partnership role. It's perfectly legitimate, I believe, to have standards for the money we're going to give, to have requirements on that money, and that's why the MCC approach allows the country to say, "yes I do want it and I'm willing to participate and this is what I'm going to do" makes a lot of sense to me as a new paradigm, really.

RAY DUBOIS, *CSIS*: Governor, if gasoline, or the reduction of gasoline consumption, which has clear foreign policy, national security policy, economic, domestic policy benefits, what would be your recommendation to the next president with respect to a policy – whether it's investigating advanced technologies, hydrogen, fuel cells, hybrids, or tax credits, tax incentives – what would be your recommendations to the next president in respect to achieving some kind of a program of reduced gasoline consumption?

CHRISTINE WHITMAN: Well, I certainly think raising the café standards is something we have got to continue to push. I'd say happily a tax on gas, but it's not going to happen. I tried that in New Jersey, and in order to raise money to help preserve open

space, and I couldn't even get the legislature to begin to think about it. There is no appetite, I don't believe, on Capital Hill for a tax. So, it would be more incentives. And it should be. If you're going to have incentives again, they've got to be, excuse the pun, clean incentives. You can't say that we will give people a tax break on buying a hybrid car, but only from a manufacturer that hasn't sold more than 300,000 cars. That makes no sense at all. Clearly, I know it makes sense, it's protecting Detroit. But Detroit still isn't there yet. And the only way Detroit is going to get there is – it's going to get there is if the competition is real and not buffered by the federal government in this way. So if we're going to do it, we should open it up. It's the same way, if you look at bio fuels. Corn based ethanol, to my mind, makes no sense. I mean, it doesn't burn effectively, you can't, and you have to mix it in at the pump, because it adheres to water or water adheres to it, and you can't transport it through the pipes. It has a ripple effect, as we are already seeing on the rest of the economy. Because, those of us who grew up in farms, knows that we're using the corn for something, and it wasn't for gas. And when it gets used for gas, it's not going to those other places, and yet we've had a tariff on Brazilian sugar cane based ethanol, which is actually much more efficient. There's switchblade. There are whole hosts of things and by getting behind just one source of power, I think we've made a mistake. We have narrowed the inventive genius, frankly, of the American people and the business community, who can come up with a whole lot of different things, if we open and make the incentives more broad based. So I would think that the next president needs to take it up as a serious issue, and talk about raising the café standards, not reducing them. One candidate, who is no longer in contention, said that in Detroit and he was going to roll back the café standards. We can't afford that kind of talk. And then look at the kinds of incentives we could be set in place that would encourage the behavior that would reduce our dependence.

[Inaudible question]

CHRISTINE WHITMAN: Yes, the hydrogen car may be the car of the future, but the infrastructure is so far, it's going to be 25 years. I mean DOE is already behind on their project, and the challenges are enormous. I've seen the cars. We have them. The cars are there. But, you can only fuel them up here in the district, you got two places, I guess, in the district and you can't fuel it up. You have to let the little man do it, because you might blow yourself up, and that can really do some damage to the enthusiasm for this form of energy. But eventually, it will be there. But, I drive a hybrid, and I love it. There are people who want a fully electric car, and that's great too depending on how you produce the electricity for that. It's just like hydrogen. You have got to produce the hydrogen for something, and take some energy. I think you can do that with nuclear pretty well.

[UNKNOWN SPEAKER]: If I can just follow up on that, the infrastructure in which we had the conversation earlier, a lot of the renewables, the new energy forms required for infrastructure that doesn't exist yet, the IEA projection was 22 billion dollars over the next 25 years. So we have to be smart in our choices, and keep your eye kind of on the end game, but I think we're looking at a period of kind of near term solutions, mid-term

solutions, and long term solutions. And we're going to leave some investments stranded along the way – because we're going to make some mistakes. But [inaudible]

CHRISTINE WHITMAN: I think the hybrid is one of the interims.

[UNKNOWN SPEAKER]: It's a bridge.

JOE DUKERT, CSIS: I'm an independent energy analyst, but also a senior associate here at CSIS. Governor, while you were EPA administrator, you were ex-officio, a member of the North American Commission for Environmental Cooperation. And during the first year of the Bush administration, something called the North American Energy Working Group was established. There was never any cooperation between, and I'm not blaming you, there was never any cooperation between NAEWG and CEC, and as far as I know, there still isn't. You mentioned David Anderson. At the time David Anderson was head of environment Canada, Ralph Goodale, he was – I'm sorry- one was in charge of environment and one was in charge of energy. And they didn't cooperate at all. Do you have any advice for the new administration, Republican or Democrat, on stopping the stove piping within governments and within North America in those efforts, between energy officials and environmental officials?

CHRISTINE WHITMAN: Well, I think the first thing that would make an enormous change is to make EPA a department, and give it cabinet status, because while that didn't affect any of my relationships with my contemporaries or my other –

[Inaudible comment]

CHRISTINE WHITMAN: Yea, Spence was the cabinet secretary there. It didn't affect our relationship and our ability to talk and get together. You get down a little bit into bureaucracies and boy did it make a difference (?) You're only an agency. And everybody has their turf wars and - Spence and I we get together and say, "hey, you take this" and "fine by me," I could care less, as long as we're getting the job done and it makes sense where its done. And the two of us would sit down and we would come up with those things. And you'd start to put them in motion and you'd be amazed at what happened. You get further down the line. So one of the first things that I really do believe is a clean bill - just make it the way it is – a department. So that there's none of this second-class status when you get into the bureaucracy. But it's a psychological thing that shouldn't mean a whole lot and wouldn't change anything anyway. It operated, but just in the relationship. And then there needs to be a strong signal from the President that we got to work on these things. You know, it's whether it's putting someone from the White House staff in charge. I mean, you've got CEQ, which is supposed to coordinate all the environmental policies between all the agencies. But again, out of all the departments, EPA gets the short end of that, because we're only an agency. CEQ maybe needs to be reinvigorated in the sense that the president needs to say, "I want to see coordination here. I want to see cooperation. I want to see less government bureaucracy. I want to see a smarter use of what we have available already." EPA steps on everybody's turf. I mean, EPA is involved whether it's defense department or department of energy or commerce.

EPA gets in there some way, or some how, and nobody likes to see us coming. Because it meant that they were going to have to spend money, because we were going to tell them that they're doing something wrong, or they would have to change behavior. And that's the problem we have as a regulatory agency. But it takes leadership from the top to say, "I'm sorry, this is important, we need to move forward on these things; and you're going to be there." Now, the president always had us at the table. We were – I was treated like a cabinet member. It was when you got down to the working groups that made – things really started to happen in the government – in the working group level that our opinions and our proposals and our suggestions were not given and not treated the same way that our counterparts from the departments were treated. Even though it was an issue that we knew the best.

TOM HICKS, *US Green Building Council*: I've got a question about China. You've mentioned China and mentioned technology transfer opportunities and maybe some ideas for carbon intensity goals. But given here in the states, that we have 18,000 folks at EPA serving the 400 million people here, and they've got 1.2 billion – 1.5 billion. And they've got less than a thousand people, how – what sorts of things can the world community do to help China not repeat some of the mistakes that you refer to in your discussion?

CHRISTINE WHITMAN: Well, as you've seen in the last few five-year plans, the Chinese have made environment a major part. Now, of course the fact that the Premier will stand up and say "We've missed our target," that tells you that they weren't that serious about it. Because when they get serious about something, they can make it happen. There's not a whole lot of question. If they want to get something done, it gets done. So, I don't believe they've actually had that kind of commitment. But they do care what the rest of the world thinks of them. And they do care if there's pressure put on them from the other country saying, "Look, you got to clean this up." Plus, they're seeing it themselves. They have an enormous challenge this summer with the Olympic games. I mean, face is very important in the culture and if they're going to be seen – you've already got all the equestrian events are going to be taking place in Hong Kong, because the air just can't get clean enough for the horses. I don't know how you run a marathon, in or around Beijing, right now. I mean, I don't know why you'd even try it. So they're going to close down on manufacturing. They're going to ban cars; they're going to take some pretty extraordinary steps. They're talking about trying to clean up the air for the games. And that will be just for a finite period of time. Multinational companies now are starting to raise their hands, and say, "Hey, we don't like this." It is a hardship post for the State Department, because of the air quality, as is Delhi – both hardship posts. If we were to enter in with them, and say we will help you; we're not even going to hold you to the same standards, as we, as the developed nations should be held to. But we're going to try to work with you and ensure that you continue with this kind of economic growth. But don't make these same mistakes. It'll be better for you. They have an enormous problem with both air and water, actually. It's not just air. But, the health issues with their population now are so big that maybe they don't notice it quite as much. But those families do. Those villages do. They care. And they are, as you know now, moving the industrial base away. Everybody was moving to the shoreline, along the coast, because that's where all the major cities were developing. Now, they're moving them out of the

country, which just moves the pollution out further out of the country. But you have had some 1800 demonstrations in the last year in China. We don't always hear about them. But the people in those villages and towns on a variety of things – not the least of which – the three gorgeous dam – that was a protest from an environmental perspective. So, we need to look for where we can work in a cooperative way with them in a cooperative way, rather than say – look for the punitive. We're not going to let you into this organization or that organization. We're not going to give you aid here or there, if you don't do something. But rather say – here are ways we can work together to help you clean up your environment. Because they're starting to see the impact domestically from what's going on. And they're starting to feel the pressure from some of the international community – from the private sector as well as the public sector, internationally.

BOB KUPANEY, formerly the department of energy among others:

You did talk about countries around the world that don't like us. I think about Hugo Chavez of Venezuela as a case in point. And we depend fairly significantly it seems on imports of Venezuelan oil. And he's I think, an effective master at what I call – petro politics. Using SITCO oil to subsidize imports and give it to poor people here. What do you think we can do if anything to make Mr. Chavez dislike us less?

CHRISTINE WHITMAN: Oh, I don't know if we can make him dislike us less. It has played pretty well for him. I'm not sure that's – but I will tell you that one of the things that – I don't know, it may be too late now – but you got to talk to people. Even if they don't like you, you got to talk to them. If you don't talk to them, you really have no ability to affect or change. If you're not in some kind of dialogue, it doesn't mean you stroke someone like Hugo Chavez and I'm not sure if he would have embraced us anyway. But we might have been able to reduce some of the collegiate support he's been able to garner over time. Now, the other side of that is, we got to try to figure out ways to reduce our dependence on that kind of foreign oil. We're never going to be energy free. When I hear the candidates say “energy frees society,” I think that is such a sound bite for campaigns and so far from policy potential that it just makes me laugh, because as you all know, energy is really pretty fungible. And it's going all around the world to different places. And we're always going to have to – always going to be importing some, but we can reduce our dependence. So the kinds of – so when he gets out of bed on the wrong side one morning, and decides he's going to turn off the tap, because he's done from time to time, that isn't going to send us into a tailspin. We need to have a better and more stable and more self-sustaining. We're never going to be completely independent, but we can be more self-sustaining.

LEORA FALK, BNA's Daily Environment Report: Going back to the question of China, what – is the concept of having a cap or trying to enforce a cap at all realistic there – of trying to get an international cap when they're building a coal plant a week when punitive responses have not been effective?

CHRISTINE WHITMAN: Well, that's why I don't think we can expect them to engage in the same kind of regulatory framework that we have. I think we ought to have a cap on carbon. What we ought to do is work with China and India, and the other developing

nations to work out intensity caps on carbon, which will allow them to grow – intensity reduction – so that they’re growing in their economy and yes, there will be more carbon. And the environmentalists hate it because it would be more green house gases going into the atmosphere. But that’s going to be the fact of life. And if we can reduce the amount of greenhouse gases going in, we’re making some progress. It’s not going to be perfect. But I don’t think you’ll ever get China, India, or any of the fast developing nations to agree right now to a hard cap on carbon. It’s just not in their interest. And many of them feel that – and that’s why they were not parties to Kyoto. They really felt it was a developed nations’ subterfuge to stop their economic development. What made it so interesting is that we weren’t signing it, because we thought it was the Europeans that were trying to control our economic growth. So, it’s the two extremes – coming up with the same reason for not being partied to it. Although I think Kyoto has its problems. So I never had a problem with the president’s position on that or the country’s position on that. But, having said that – I don’t think we can expect the same regulatory regime in the developing nations. I suspect what we will see more of is regional compacts. You see regional compacts today. You even have it now with states that have entered into compacts with some of the provinces of Canada on reduction. You will start to get trading. The European Union has a cap and trade program now. They’re entering into a new compact. It’ll be more regional that it will eventually have to come together because you’re going to have some continuity in how you price carbon, what you do with your offsets. The standards – it will have to be standardized. But I think it’ll come out at it this way – I don’t think we’ll see – I don’t know – they’re negotiating the next phase of Kyoto now, but I don’t see this country ever signing a Kyoto, and doubt that you will have the developing countries accept a hard cap in the near future.

TAMIO MASUDA, *Tokyo Electric Power Company*: First, I appreciate the governor support technology transfer to developed countries, and the nuclear development of the world [inaudible] In Japan, the government, and companies harbor [inaudible] strong interest in APP and GNEP program. And we worry about policy change in the future so, how do you think the next president – how does – the next president think about these programs – APP and GNEP?

CHRISTINE WHITMAN: Well, it’s going to be hard to know on those specific programs, how the next administration should treat them – depending on how it is. I mean sometimes you get administrations that will throw out everything even if it is good or bad just because the old administration did it. Hopefully, whoever wins this one, is going to be more sophisticated than that and look through them. And I think they’re good programs that are going to be worthy of support. What I will say is, as indicated in my remarks, I don’t think it matters who is elected president as far as the United States moving into a carbon constrained economy. Of the three major candidates, I mean, I don’t know where Mike Huckabee is on this. I haven’t read his statements. But I don’t think he’s going to get the Republican nomination. We’ll ignore that. But of the other three of whom I would consider the likely of the likely nominees, they have all said that global climate change is a major issue. They’ve all talked to the need to move to some kind of a cap on carbon. As we know John McCain has had a bipartisan bill in for some time with a cap and trade program. They’ve all spoken to this issue. So you will see –

they'll be looking for programs like this that will help improve the worldwide footprint on greenhouse gases. And whether they keep the exact same programs, or they just change the name, or they just decide, the heck with it. If it's a good program, I'll admit it's a good program, and will go forward with it. Not everything about this administration is bad. I mean they've got some very good things that they've done, and those should be recognized and we should build on them. So, one way or another, you're going to see much more activity in this whole area, I believe, in the next few years.

MARTIN APPLE, PRESIDENT, *Council of Scientific Society Presidents*: It's a group of a million and half scientists and a 150 research fields. The IPCC Report is an intergovernmental panel that underneath it is the science that took 25 years and 2500 scientists to generate. And that conclusion is that we're at a world crisis that we have never been in before, and to a degree that we've never been in before. And all of the measures that you're proposing, even the ones that our leading candidates are trying to propose, to get us to an improvement are really beginning to fall short of what the world may need. And so I think we should begin to think in terms of really bigger projects, really major changes. If we can use the major source of the sun, to be able to make wind energy and to make solar energy and capture the differences when we don't have it – when the sun's not shining and wind's not blowing through fuel cells or whatever. We can begin to create systems that will work better. We lose more than a half of our energy in this country by transmission lines and other things. So because we have decided that they have to be centralized and send their power lines hundreds of miles. So if we really rethink the system, we can in a period of one generation or less, make enough of a solution to make a huge difference. But if we do it, piecemeal and if we try to raise the café standards or whatever, we're not solving the problem – at least, in my judgment.

CHRISTINE WHITMAN: I don't disagree with you that those are not the full solution. Obviously, we have to be much bolder, and much broader, in our thinking. But we've got the people there to the point where they'll accept that kind of thinking. Because even with a president who might embrace all of this, and want to have the big thinking, and make it like 'man on the moon' kind of thing – we're going to go to outer space – that kind of focus, you got to get the Congress there too. And I want to tell you, there are a lot of people in Congress who still don't even believe there's a real problem. And they are reflecting in many instances, what their constituents feel. We're – This country is so – we've lagged so much in this area of climate change, that as far as educating the public, that we're way behind the rest of the world. I mean, Europe is taking the steps that they're taking because they have the political support to do that – because it's going to cost money. And that's the other part of this whole thing that I love when we hear these discussions in the debate level. When we talk about – we're going to have all this new power and everything – we think, "Guess what gang? It's going to cost us more." And nobody wants to talk about that. And transmission is going to cost more. We're going to have to pay more to get the power that we want to continue the quality of life that we enjoy today, and we like to have. So it needs, it is going to take someone to put it up to a level that says, "This is what we got to start solving today." And I just did a thing this morning, actually with Aspen – if I can mention that here – a health stewardship program talking about how we need to change the way we look at healthcare in this country and

try to look at prevention and healthy lifestyle rather than how do we better treat people who are sick. But one of the things about it is – everything – every decision that is made should be looked at – what is that impact going to be on health? And I can think of no more direct correlation than what we do with the environment, and energy, and its impact on health. And we're going to – at some point, it's going to take a really big thinking to put those things together. And say, "This is all part of one discussion that we need to have." And it's worth making the investment in time, money, and energy to solve these problems, because they're going to have real consequences. But until we can relate what's happening to the environment to the people individually, they don't buy into it. And that's what we – it's an incremental thing that is frustrating. And we're starting behind the curve. So it is really going to take – we got someone – if there were a president who wanted to put this as their big signature issue, they can encompass a lot of things in it. It could be terribly complicated and difficult to do, but it is a kind of challenge that we can meet in this country. We have terrific brains, a lot of ingenuity. I'm convinced that we can solve just about any problem, if we just get out of the way and let it happen.

FRANK VERRASTRO: Let me take this conversation a little bit off topic. Earlier we talked about, in addition to being head of the Republican Leadership Council, Governor Whitman authored a book, "It's my party too" where she talked about crossover, bipartisanship, moderation, get rid of the partisan bickering to form a better country for the American people, and solve some of these issues. Can you talk a little bit about politics since you're in Washington during primary season; you can't get away that easily. It was dangerous when you got on the train.

CHRISTINE WHITMAN: Absolutely, one of the things that has encouraged me is that the candidates that are coming to the fore are candidates who are talking about reaching across party lines and solving problems. And that's where the American people have been from the get-go. That's what I have seen, as I've traveled around the country, forever. The American people are not at the extremes. They really are in the center. And what they want out of their elected officials, are people who will problem-solve. They will not see every issue as being a partisan/political issue that offers them opportunity for gain for the next election cycle. I mean, just look at some of the major issues. Energy being one of them, where we've had an energy proposal, energy bills in, they don't go in anywhere, until the gas at the pump goes up. And all of a sudden we get action. And we don't get a comprehensive plan. The reason they didn't get discussed – because each side wanted to hold them for the next election cycle, so they can beat up the other side about how they hadn't done anything. You don't think you couldn't have had some intelligent solution to the immigration issue, which is number one on everybody's list? Well, now the economy has taken over as number one. There was a bill in the house and a bill in the Senate. They passed. They never conferenced them. That's one of the very few times in the history of our Congress where they hadn't even appointed conference committees. They had no discussion. Why? Because they were coming into an election cycle, and this was a hot-button issue for the base of each party. Because what we've got to do is get beyond that. And one of the things, I think, that makes Barack Obama so appealing to people is because that's his main thing – that's what he's talking about. And whether

people know where he stands on the issues or not, at this point, all they're saying is – “we like the message.” “We like the message that we got to work together.” And the other candidates are just starting to figure this out. And John McCain has always been someone who has reached across the aisle. And has not been afraid to do that. And that's why he's being excoriated by the far right of our party. And some of the things they say about him are really, pretty awful. I thought they said bad things about me, but he's really getting it now. He's really taking it. So it's good to see that happening. I hope that the interest – This is the first time that since 1952 that we haven't had an incumbent running. So this isn't surprising that this election season is so different than any of the ones we've experienced in our life times. And I just hope we can sustain this interest that what we see in the primaries – the voter turnout – will continue in the general elections. Because up until this year, the average voter turnout in the primaries, in this country was 10%. The average voter turnout in congressional elections when they were the top of the ticket was 35%. And we really thought we did a terrific job in presidential when we got to 51%. And that is just inexcusable, frankly. And I'm hoping that what's happening now, people are beginning to see that yes, in fact the only people who can affect and change the system are the people. You know, it's the voting bloc, and that's what democracy is all about. And hopefully, people are going to continue the kind of enthusiasm they have today and that belief that they can make change through until November and continue it after that and start to be really involved.

FRANK VERRASTRO: Well, it's really been a pleasure. I'm glad you came down here. And I'd very much appreciated if you can join me in thanking the governor.