

WILLIAMS COMPANIES INC

Form PRE 14A

March 18, 2010

Table of Contents

**UNITED STATES
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20549**

SCHEDULE 14A

Proxy Statement Pursuant to Section 14(a) of the Securities
Exchange Act of 1934 (Amendment No.)

Filed by the Registrant
Filed by a Party other than the Registrant

Check the appropriate box:

- Preliminary Proxy Statement
- Confidential, for Use of the Commission Only (as permitted by Rule 14a-6(e)(2))**
- Definitive Proxy Statement
- Definitive Additional Materials
- Soliciting Material Pursuant to §240.14a-12

The Williams Companies, Inc.

(Name of Registrant as Specified In Its Charter)

(Name of Person(s) Filing Proxy Statement, if other than the Registrant)

Payment of Filing Fee (Check the appropriate box):

- No fee required.
- Fee computed on table below per Exchange Act Rules 14a-6(i)(1) and 0-11.

1) Title of each class of securities to which transaction applies:

2) Aggregate number of securities to which transaction applies:

3) Per unit price or other underlying value of transaction computed pursuant to Exchange Act Rule 0-11 (set forth the amount on which the filing fee is calculated and state how it was determined):

4) Proposed maximum aggregate value of transaction:

5) Total fee paid:

- Fee paid previously with preliminary materials.
-

Edgar Filing: WILLIAMS COMPANIES INC - Form PRE 14A

o Check box if any part of the fee is offset as provided by Exchange Act Rule 0-11(a)(2) and identify the filing for which the offsetting fee was paid previously. Identify the previous filing by registration statement number, or the Form or Schedule and the date of its filing.

1) Amount Previously Paid:

2) Form, Schedule or Registration Statement No.:

3) Filing Party:

4) Date Filed:

Table of Contents

STEVEN J. MALCOLM
CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

Dear Williams Stockholders:

You are cordially invited to attend the 2010 annual meeting of stockholders of The Williams Companies, Inc. The meeting will be held on Thursday, May 20, 2010, in the Williams Resource Center Theater, One Williams Center, Tulsa, Oklahoma, at 11:00 a.m., Central time. We look forward to greeting personally as many of our stockholders as possible at the annual meeting.

The notice of the annual meeting and proxy statement accompanying this letter provide information concerning matters to be considered and acted upon at the annual meeting. Also at the annual meeting we will provide a report on our operations, followed by a question-and-answer and discussion period.

For security reasons, briefcases, backpacks, and other large bags are not permitted in the theater. All such items can be checked with security upon arrival at the theater.

I know that most of our stockholders are unable to attend the annual meeting in person. However, it is important that your shares be represented and voted at the meeting. Whether or not you plan to attend, you can be sure your shares are represented by promptly voting and submitting your proxy by phone, by Internet, or by completing, signing, dating, and returning your proxy card in the enclosed postage-paid envelope.

Thank you for your continued interest in our Company.

Very truly yours,

Steven J. Malcolm

Enclosures
April 8, 2010

Table of Contents**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<u>NOTICE OF ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKHOLDERS</u>	
<u>PROXY STATEMENT</u>	1
<u>QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE ANNUAL MEETING AND VOTING</u>	1
<u>CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND BOARD MATTERS</u>	5
<u>Corporate Governance</u>	5
<u>Board and Committee Structure and Meetings</u>	8
<u>PROPOSAL 1 ELECTION OF DIRECTORS</u>	13
<u>SECURITY OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN BENEFICIAL OWNERS AND MANAGEMENT</u>	21
<u>SECTION 16(a) BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP REPORTING COMPLIANCE</u>	23
<u>NAMED EXECUTIVE OFFICER PROFILES</u>	24
<u>COMPENSATION DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS</u>	29
<u>Objective of Our Compensation Programs</u>	29
<u>Our Pay Philosophy</u>	29
<u>2009 Compensation Summary</u>	29
<u>2009 Pay Decisions</u>	29
<u>2009 Plan Design Changes</u>	30
<u>Mitigating Risk</u>	31
<u>Compensation Recommendations and Decisions</u>	32
<u>Role of Management</u>	32
<u>Role of the CEO</u>	32
<u>Role of the Other NEOs</u>	32
<u>Role of the Compensation Committee</u>	32
<u>Role of the Independent Compensation Consultant</u>	32
<u>2009 Comparator Group</u>	33
<u>How We Use Our Comparator Group</u>	33
<u>Composition of the Comparator Group</u>	33
<u>Characteristics of our Comparator Group</u>	34
<u>The Pay Setting Process</u>	34
<u>How We Determine the Amount for Each Type of Pay</u>	36
<u>Long-Term Incentives</u>	36
<u>Annual Cash Incentives</u>	39
<u>Annual Cash Incentives Target</u>	39
<u>Annual Cash Incentives Actual</u>	39
<u>How We Set the EVA[®] Goals</u>	40
<u>Base Pay</u>	41
<u>Benefits</u>	42
<u>Additional Components of our Executive Compensation Program</u>	43
<u>Recoupment Policy</u>	43
<u>Stock Ownership Guidelines</u>	43
<u>Derivative Transactions</u>	43
<u>Accounting and Tax Treatment</u>	43
<u>Employment Agreements</u>	44
<u>Termination and Severance Arrangements</u>	44
<u>Rationale for Change in Control Agreements</u>	44
<u>COMPENSATION COMMITTEE REPORT ON EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION</u>	46
<u>EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION AND OTHER INFORMATION</u>	47

<u>2009 Summary Compensation Table</u>	47
<u>Grants of Plan Based Awards</u>	49
<u>Outstanding Equity Awards</u>	50
<u>Option Exercises and Stock Vested</u>	51
<u>Retirement Plans</u>	51
<u>Pension Benefits</u>	52
<u>Nonqualified Deferred Compensation</u>	53
<u>Change in Control Agreements</u>	53
<u>Termination Scenarios</u>	56
<u>COMPENSATION OF DIRECTORS</u>	57
<u>Director Compensation for Fiscal Year 2009</u>	58

Table of Contents

<u>EQUITY COMPENSATION STOCK PLANS</u>	59
<u>REPORT OF THE AUDIT COMMITTEE</u>	60
<u>PROPOSAL 2 APPROVAL OF THE AMENDMENT TO OUR RESTATED CERTIFICATE OF INCORPORATION TO PROVIDE FOR THE ANNUAL ELECTION OF ALL DIRECTORS</u>	61
<u>PROPOSAL 3 APPROVAL OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE WILLIAMS COMPANIES, INC. 2007 INCENTIVE PLAN</u>	62
<u>PROPOSAL 4 RATIFICATION OF APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT AUDITORS</u>	70
<u>PROPOSAL 5 STOCKHOLDER PROPOSAL</u>	71
<u>PROPOSAL 6 STOCKHOLDER PROPOSAL</u>	73
<u>INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE</u>	77
<u>WEBSITE ACCESS TO REPORTS AND OTHER INFORMATION</u>	77
APPENDIX A THE WILLIAMS COMPANIES, INC. ARTICLES OF INCORPORATION	A-1
APPENDIX B THE WILLIAMS COMPANIES, INC. 2007 INCENTIVE PLAN	B-1

Table of Contents

**THE WILLIAMS COMPANIES, INC.
One Williams Center
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74172**

**NOTICE OF ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKHOLDERS
May 20, 2010**

Details for the annual meeting of stockholders of The Williams Companies, Inc. are below:

TIME	11:00 a.m., Central time, on Thursday, May 20, 2010
PLACE	Williams Resource Center Theater, One Williams Center, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74172
ITEMS OF BUSINESS	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. To elect three directors;2. To approve the amendment to our Restated Certificate of Incorporation to provide for the annual election of all directors;3. To approve the amendment to The Williams Companies, Inc. 2007 Incentive Plan;4. To ratify the appointment of Ernst & Young LLP as our independent auditors for 2010;5. To consider a stockholder proposal requesting a report regarding the environmental impact of certain fracturing operations of the Company's Exploration and Production business unit, if properly presented;6. To consider a stockholder proposal requesting an advisory vote related to compensation, if properly presented; and7. To transact such other business as may properly come before the annual meeting or any adjournment of the meeting.
RECORD DATE	You can vote and attend the annual meeting if you were a stockholder of record at the close of business on March 29, 2010.
ANNUAL REPORT	Our 2009 annual report, which includes a copy of our annual report on Form 10-K, accompanies this proxy statement.
VOTING	Even if you intend to be present at the annual meeting, please promptly vote in one of the following ways so that your shares of common stock may be represented and voted at the annual meeting: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Call the toll-free telephone number shown on the proxy card;2. Vote via the Internet on the website shown on the proxy card; or

3. Mark, sign, date, and return the enclosed proxy card in the postage-paid envelope.

Important Notice Regarding The Availability Of Proxy Materials For The Stockholder Meeting To Be Held On May 20, 2010:

The annual report and proxy statement are available at www.edocumentview.com/wmb.

By order of the Board of Directors,

La Fleur C. Browne
Corporate Secretary

Tulsa, Oklahoma
April 8, 2010

Table of Contents

**THE WILLIAMS COMPANIES, INC.
One Williams Center
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74172**

PROXY STATEMENT

GENERAL

We are providing this proxy statement as part of a solicitation by the Board of Directors (the Board) of The Williams Companies, Inc. for use at our 2010 annual meeting of stockholders and at any adjournment or postponement thereof. We will hold the meeting in the Williams Resource Center Theater, One Williams Center, Tulsa, Oklahoma, on Thursday, May 20, 2010, at 11:00 a.m., Central time.

As permitted by the rules of the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), we have elected to send you this full set of proxy materials, including a proxy card, and additionally to notify you of the availability of these proxy materials on the Internet. This proxy statement and our 2009 Annual Report are available at www.edocumentview.com/wmb, which does not have cookies that identify visitors to the site.

We expect to mail this proxy statement and accompanying proxy card to stockholders beginning on April 8, 2010.

Unless the context otherwise requires, all references in this proxy statement to Williams, the Company, we, us, and our refer to The Williams Companies, Inc. and its consolidated subsidiaries.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ABOUT THE ANNUAL MEETING AND VOTING

Q: Why am I receiving these materials?

A: You are receiving these materials because, at the close of business on March 29, 2010 (the Record Date), you owned shares of Williams common stock. All stockholders of record on the Record Date are entitled to attend and vote at the annual meeting. Each stockholder will have one vote on each matter for every share of common stock owned on the Record Date. On the Record Date, we had [_____] shares of common stock outstanding. (The shares held in our treasury are not considered outstanding and will not be voted or considered present at the meeting.)

Q: What information is contained in this proxy statement?

A: This proxy statement includes information about the nominees for director and other matters to be voted on at the annual meeting. It also explains the voting process and requirements, describes the compensation of the principal executive officer, the principal financial officer and the three other most highly compensated officers (collectively referred to as our Named Executive Officers or NEOs), describes the compensation of our directors,

and provides certain other information required under SEC rules.

Q: What matters can I vote on?

A: You can vote on the following matters:

election of three of our directors;

approval of the amendment to our Restated Certificate of Incorporation to provide for the annual election of all directors;

approval of the amendment to The Williams Companies, Inc. 2007 Incentive Plan;

ratification of the appointment of Ernst & Young LLP as our independent auditors for 2010;

a stockholder proposal requesting a report regarding the environmental impact of certain fracturing operations of the Company's Exploration and Production business unit, if properly presented;

a stockholder proposal requesting an advisory vote related to compensation, if properly presented; and

any other business properly coming before the annual meeting.

In the election of directors, you may vote **FOR** or **AGAINST** each individual nominee or indicate that you wish to **ABSTAIN** from voting on one or more nominee. For the other matters, you may vote **FOR** or **AGAINST** the matter, or you may indicate that you wish to **ABSTAIN** from voting on the matter.

Table of Contents

We are not aware of any matter to be presented at the annual meeting that is not included in this proxy statement. However, your proxy authorizes the persons named on the proxy card to take action on additional matters that may properly arise. These individuals will exercise their best judgment to vote on any other matter, including a question of adjourning the annual meeting.

All votes are confidential unless disclosure is legally necessary.

Q: How does the Board recommend that I vote on each of the matters?

A: **FOR ITEMS 1-4:** The Board recommends that you vote **FOR** each of the director nominees, **FOR** the amendment to our Restated Certificate of Incorporation to provide for the annual election of all directors, **FOR** the amendment to The Williams Companies, Inc. 2007 Incentive Plan, and **FOR** the ratification of Ernst & Young LLP as our independent auditors for 2010.

AGAINST ITEMS 5 and 6: The Board recommends that you vote **AGAINST** both of the stockholder proposals.

Q: What is the difference between a stockholder of record and a stockholder who holds stock in street name?

A. If your shares are registered in your name with our transfer agent, Computershare Investor Services, LLC (Computershare), you are a stockholder of record, and the Company's proxy materials, including a proxy card, were sent to you directly by Computershare.

If you hold your shares with a broker or in an account at a bank, then you are a beneficial owner of shares held in street name. The Company's proxy materials were forwarded to you by your broker or bank, who is considered the stockholder of record for purposes of voting at the annual meeting. Your broker or bank should also have provided you with instructions for directing the broker or bank how to vote your shares.

Q: How do I vote if I am a stockholder of record?

A: As a stockholder of record, you may vote your shares in any one of the following ways:

Call the toll-free number shown on the proxy card;

Vote on the Internet on the website shown on the proxy card;

Mark, sign, date, and return the enclosed proxy card in the postage-paid envelope; or

Vote in person at the annual meeting.

Q: How do I vote if I am a beneficial owner?

A: As the beneficial owner, you have the right to direct your broker or bank how to vote your shares by following the instructions sent to you by your broker or bank. You will receive proxy materials and voting instructions for each account you have with a broker or bank. As a beneficial owner, if you wish to change the directions you have provided your broker or bank, you should follow the instructions sent to you by your broker or bank.

As a beneficial owner, you are also invited to attend the annual meeting. However, since you are not the stockholder of record, you may not vote your shares in person at the meeting unless you obtain a signed legal proxy from your broker or bank giving you the right to vote the shares.

Q. Will my shares held in street name be voted if I do not tell my broker how I want them voted?

A. Under the current rules of the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE), if you are a beneficial owner, your broker or bank only has discretion to vote on certain routine matters without your voting instructions. The proposal to ratify Ernst & Young LLP as our independent auditors is considered a routine matter. However, the election of directors, the amendment to our Restated Certificate of Incorporation, the amendment to The Williams Companies, Inc. 2007 Incentive Plan and the stockholder proposals are not considered routine matters. Accordingly, your bank or broker will not be permitted to vote your shares on such matters unless you provide proper voting instructions.

Q. How do I vote if I participate in The Williams Investment Plus Plan?

A. If you hold shares in The Williams Investment Plus Plan, Computershare sent you the Company s proxy materials directly. You may direct the trustee of the plan how to vote your plan shares by calling the toll-free number shown on the proxy card, voting on the Internet on the website shown on the proxy card, or completing and returning the enclosed proxy card in the postage-paid envelope. Please note, in order to permit the trustee to

Table of Contents

tally and vote all shares of Williams common stock held in The Williams Investment Plus Plan, your instructions, whether by Internet, by telephone, or by proxy card, must be completed **prior to 1:00 a.m. Central time on Monday, May 17, 2010**. You may not change your vote related to such plan shares after this deadline.

If you do not instruct the trustee how to vote, your plan shares will be voted by the trustee in the same proportion that it votes shares in other plan accounts for which it did receive timely voting instructions. The proportional voting policy is detailed under the terms of the plan and the trust agreement.

Q: What if I return my proxy card or vote by Internet or phone but do not specify how I want to vote?

A. If you are a stockholder of record and sign and return your proxy card or complete the Internet or telephone voting procedures, but do not specify how you want to vote your shares, we will vote them as follows:

FOR the election of each of the director nominees.

FOR the amendment of our Restated Certificate of Incorporation to provide for the annual election of all directors.

FOR the amendment to The Williams Companies, Inc. 2007 Incentive Plan.

FOR the approval ratifying the appointment of Ernst & Young LLP as our independent auditors for the fiscal year ending December 31, 2010.

AGAINST the stockholder proposals.

Q: Can I change my vote or revoke my proxy?

A: If you are a stockholder of record, you can change your vote within the regular voting deadlines by voting again by telephone or on the Internet, executing and returning a later dated proxy, or attending the annual meeting and voting in person. If you are a stockholder of record, you can revoke your proxy by delivering a written notice of your revocation to our corporate secretary at One Williams Center, MD 47, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74172.

Q: What shares are included on my proxy card?

A. You will receive one proxy card for all the shares of common stock you hold in certificate form, in book-entry form, and in The Williams Investment Plus Plan.

If you hold your shares in street name, you will receive voting instructions for each account you have with a broker or bank.

Q: What is the quorum requirement for the meeting?

A: There must be quorum to take action at the meeting (other than adjournment or postponement of the meeting). A quorum will exist at the meeting if stockholders holding a majority of the shares entitled to vote at the annual meeting are present in person or by proxy. Stockholders of record who return a proxy or vote in person at the meeting will be considered part of the quorum. Abstentions are counted as present for determining a quorum. Uninstructed broker votes, also called broker non-votes, are also counted as present for determining a quorum so long as there is at least one matter that a broker may vote on without specific instructions from a beneficial owner. See *Will my shares held in street name be voted if I do not tell my broker how I want them voted?*

Q: What is the voting requirement to approve each of the matters?

A: Items 1-6 may be approved by a majority of the votes cast. Other matters that may properly come before the annual meeting may require more than a majority vote under our bylaws, our Restated Certificate of Incorporation, the laws of Delaware, or other applicable laws.

Q: How will the votes be counted?

A: Abstentions from voting on the election of a director nominee will not be considered a vote cast with respect to that director's election and therefore will not be counted in determining whether the director received a majority of the votes cast. Abstentions from voting on any other proposal will have the same effect as a vote against that proposal.

Broker non-votes (i.e., shares held by brokers or nominees that cannot be voted because the beneficial owner did not provide specific voting instructions) will be treated as not present and not entitled to vote.

Q: Who will count the votes?

A: A representative of Computershare will act as the inspector of elections and count the votes.

Table of Contents

Q: Where can I find the voting results of the meeting?

A: We will announce the voting results at the meeting. We also will disclose the voting results in a Form 8-K within four business days after the annual meeting.

Q: May I propose actions for consideration at the 2011 meeting of stockholders?

A: Yes. For your proposal to be considered for inclusion in our proxy statement for the 2011 meeting, we must receive your written proposal no later than December 23, 2010. If we change the date of the 2011 meeting by more than 30 days from the anniversary of the date of this year's meeting, then the deadline to submit proposals will be a reasonable time before we begin to print and mail our proxy materials. Your proposal, including the manner in which you submit it, must comply with SEC regulations regarding stockholder proposals.

If you wish to raise a proposal (including a director nomination) from the floor during our 2011 annual meeting of stockholders, we must receive a written notice of the proposal between January 21, 2011 and February 20, 2011. Your submission must contain the additional information required by our bylaws. Proposals should be addressed to our corporate secretary at One Williams Center, MD 47, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74172.

Q: Who is paying for this proxy solicitation?

A: Your proxy is solicited by the Board. We expect to solicit proxies in person, by telephone, or by other electronic means. We have retained MacKenzie Partners, Inc. to assist in this solicitation. We expect to pay MacKenzie Partners, Inc. an estimated \$17,500 in fees, plus expenses and disbursements.

We also will pay the expenses of this proxy solicitation including the cost of preparing and mailing the proxy statement and accompanying proxy card. Such expenses may include the charges and expenses of banks, brokerage firms and other custodians, nominees, or fiduciaries for forwarding proxy materials to beneficial owners of our common stock.

Q. Are you householding for stockholders sharing the same address?

A. The SEC's rules permit us to deliver a single copy of this proxy statement and our 2009 Annual Report to an address shared by two or more stockholders. This method of delivery is referred to as "householding" and can significantly reduce our printing and mailing costs. It also reduces the volume of mail you receive. We will deliver only one proxy statement and 2009 Annual Report to multiple registered stockholders sharing an address, unless we receive instructions to the contrary from one or more of the stockholders. We will still send each stockholder an individual proxy card.

If you would like to receive more than one copy of this proxy statement and our 2009 Annual Report, we will promptly send you additional copies upon request directed to our transfer agent, Computershare. You can call Computershare toll free at 1-800-884-4225. You can call the same phone number to notify us that you wish to receive a separate annual report or proxy statement in the future, or to request delivery of a single copy of any materials if you are receiving multiple copies now.

Table of Contents

CORPORATE GOVERNANCE AND BOARD MATTERS

Corporate Governance

General

Our Board believes that strong corporate governance is critical to achieving our performance goals and to maintaining the trust and confidence of investors, employees, suppliers, business partners, regulatory agencies, and other stockholders.

Corporate Governance Guidelines

Our Corporate Governance Guidelines provide a framework for the governance of Williams as a whole and also address the operation, structure, and practice of the Board and its committees. The Nominating and Governance Committee reviews these guidelines at least annually.

Strategic Planning

During the year, the Board meets with management to discuss and approve strategic plans, financial goals, capital spending, and other factors critical to successful performance. The Board also conducts a mid-year review of progress on objectives and strategies. During Board meetings, directors review key issues and financial performance. The Board meets privately with the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) six times per year and meets in executive session at each regular Board meeting and additionally as required. Further, the CEO communicates regularly with the Board on important business opportunities and developments. In 2009, the Board held one of its regularly scheduled meetings at one of our field locations to further educate the directors about our operations.

Board/Committee/Director Evaluations

The Board and each of its committees conduct annual self-assessments. In addition, the Nominating and Governance Committee evaluates each individual director annually.

Chief Executive Officer Evaluation and Management Succession

The Board and the CEO annually discuss and collaborate to set the CEO s performance goals and objectives. The Board meets annually in executive session to assess the CEO s performance. The Board maintains a process for planning orderly succession for the CEO and other executive officer positions and oversees executive officer development.

Board Leadership Structure

The Board believes that the Company and its stockholders are best served at this time by a leadership structure in which a single leader serves as chairman and CEO and the Board has an independent lead director.

Combining the roles of chairman and CEO makes clear that the person serving in these roles has primary responsibility for managing the Company s business, subject to the oversight and review of the Board. Under this structure, the chairman and CEO chairs Board meetings, where the Board discusses strategic and business issues. The Board believes that this approach is preferable because the CEO is the individual with primary responsibility for

implementing the Company's strategy, directing the work of other officers and leading implementation of the Company's strategic plans as approved by the Board. This structure creates a single leader who is directly accountable to the Board and, through the Board, to stockholders, and enables the CEO to act as the key link between the Board and other members of management. In addition, Mr. Malcolm personally brings to the combined role of chairman and CEO a strong history with Williams. Since joining the Company in 1984, Mr. Malcolm performed roles of increasing responsibility related to business development, gas management and supply, and gathering and processing, before ultimately assuming the chief executive officer position in 2002.

Because the Board also believes that strong, independent Board leadership is a critical aspect of effective corporate governance, the Board has established the position of Lead Director. The Lead Director, who must be

Table of Contents

independent, is elected annually by the independent directors. The Lead Director presides over executive sessions of the independent directors, consults with the chairman of the Board and our corporate secretary to establish an agenda for each Board meeting, oversees the flow of information to the Board, and acts as liaison between the non-employee directors and management. Mr. W. R. Howell currently serves as the Lead Director.

The Board believes that having a single leader serving as Chairman and CEO, together with an experienced and engaged Lead Director, is the most appropriate leadership structure for the Board at this time. However, the Board maintains the flexibility to amend the Corporate Governance Guidelines should it determine in the future that the two roles should be separated based upon the Board's assessment of the Company's needs and leadership from time to time. The Board periodically reviews the Board structure and leadership as well as director succession planning.

Board oversight of Williams' risk assurance process

We employ an annual risk assurance process that is designed to provide positive assurance to management and the Board that risks are effectively managed to enable achievement of strategic and operating objectives. The risk process is governed by the committees of the Board, our executive officers, and our risk subject matter experts. We utilize the Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) framework to identify the top risks to the Company considering our internal and external environments and objectives and to measure the likelihood of occurrence and potential impact of each risk. The Audit Committee annually reviews and provides feedback about the list of the top risks so identified. Such top risks are then further reviewed by the most appropriate Board committee. For example, the risk of financial reporting and disclosure is reviewed by the Audit Committee, the risk of capital availability is reviewed by the Finance Committee, and the risk of ethics and compliance program is reviewed by the Nominating and Governance Committee. Each Board committee annually considers a summary for each of its risks, including the definition, likelihood, and potential impact of each risk, the planned response to the risk, management's assessment of the effectiveness of mitigation efforts, and a status report of any action required. For so long as any action is required for the planned response to a risk, such risk is reviewed at each committee meeting until management assesses the risk's mitigation efforts as effective. Each committee provides feedback to management about the risk assurance process.

Executive Sessions of Non-Employee Directors

Non-employee directors meet without management present at each regularly scheduled Board meeting. Additional meetings may be called by the Lead Director in his discretion or at the request of the Board.

Director Independence

The Board has adopted director independence standards, as an attachment to our Corporate Governance Guidelines.

The Board has affirmatively determined that each of Mr. Cleveland, Dr. Cooper, Mr. Engelhardt, Mr. Granberry, Mr. Green, Ms. Hinshaw, Mr. Howell, Mr. Lorch, Mr. Lowrie, Mr. MacInnis, and Ms. Stoney is an independent director. In addition, the Board affirmatively determined that Charles M. Lillis, who resigned effective March 18, 2009, was an independent director. In so doing, the Board determined that each of these individuals met the bright line independence standards of the NYSE and our own director independence standards. In addition, the Board considered transactions and relationships between each director and any member of his or her immediate family on one hand, and Williams and its affiliates on the other, to confirm that those transactions and relationships do not vitiate the affected director's independence. We discuss these relationships below.

Ms. Hinshaw is a director of Insituform Technologies, Inc., a company whose subsidiaries, Bayou Coating LLC, Bayou Companies LLC, and Insituform Technologies Inc. dba United Pipeline Systems provide services to Williams. In determining that the relationship was not material, the Board considered these facts: the relationship arises only

because Ms. Hinshaw is a director of Insituform, that she has no material interest in any transactions between the subsidiaries and Williams, and that she had no role in any such transactions.

Mr. Howell is a director of Deutsche Bank Trust Corporation and Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas and a member of the America Advisory Board of Deutsche Bank AG. Deutsche Bank AG and Deutsche Bank

Table of Contents

Securities Inc. provide services to Williams. In determining that this relationship was not material, the Board considered these facts: the relationship arises only because Mr. Howell is a director of Deutsche Bank entities, that he has no material interest in any transaction between Deutsche Bank and Williams, and that he had no role in any such transactions.

Mr. Lorch is a director of HSBC Finance Corporation and HSBC North America Holding Co. HSBC Bank (USA) and HSBC Business Solutions provide services to Williams. In determining that the relationship was not material, the Board considered these facts: the relationship arises only because Mr. Lorch is a director of HSBC, that he has no material interest in any transactions between HSBC and Williams, and that he had no role in any such transactions.

Mr. MacInnis is a director of ITT, whose subsidiary Gould Pumps Inc. provides services to Williams. In determining that the relationship was not material, the Board considered these facts: the relationship arises only because Mr. MacInnis is a director of ITT, that he has no material interest in any transactions between the ITT subsidiary and Williams, and that he had no role in any such transactions.

Mr. MacInnis also serves as chairman of the board and chief executive officer of EMCOR Group Inc., a company whose subsidiaries Integrated Solutions Group, Ohmstede Industrial Services Inc., Ohmstede Ltd, Ohmstede United Industrial Services, and Wasatch Electric provide services to Williams. In determining that the relationship was not material, the Board considered the fact that payments made by Williams to EMCOR subsidiaries did not exceed the greater of \$1 million or 2% of either company's consolidated gross revenues.

No member of our Board serves as an executive officer of any non-profit organization that has received contributions from Williams exceeding the greater of \$1 million or 2% of such organization's consolidated gross revenues in any single fiscal year of the preceding three years. Further, in accordance with our director independence standards, the Board determined that there were no discretionary contributions to a non-profit organization with which a director, or a director's spouse, has a relationship that affects the director's independence.

The Board determined that Mr. Malcolm is not independent because he is an executive officer of the Company.

Transactions with Related Persons

The Board has adopted policies and procedures with respect to related person transactions as part of the Audit Committee charter. Any proposed related person transaction involving a member of the Board must be reviewed and approved by the full Board. Otherwise, the Audit Committee reviews proposed transactions with related persons, promoters, and certain control persons that are required to be disclosed in our filings with the SEC. If it is impractical to convene an Audit Committee meeting before a related person transaction occurs, the chairman of the committee may review the transaction alone. The Audit Committee or its chairman, in good faith, may approve only those related person transactions that are in, or not inconsistent with, Williams' best interests and the best interests of our stockholders. No director may participate in any review, consideration or approval of any related person transaction with respect to which such director or any of his or her immediate family members is the related person. During 2009, there were no transactions that required review or approval by the Audit Committee or the full Board.

Majority Vote Standard

Our Board has adopted a majority vote standard for the election of directors in uncontested elections. Each of our directors has executed an irrevocable resignation that will become effective if he or she fails to receive a majority of the votes cast in an uncontested election and the Board accepts such resignation. If a director fails to receive the required votes for election, the Nominating and Governance Committee will act on an expedited basis to determine whether to accept the resignation. The Nominating and Governance Committee will then submit its recommendation

for consideration by the Board. The Board will act on the recommendation and publicly disclose its decision within 90 days from the date of the certification of the election results. The Board expects the director whose tendered resignation is under consideration to abstain from participating in any decision regarding that resignation. The Nominating and Governance Committee and the Board may consider any factors they deem relevant in deciding whether to accept a director's tendered resignation. If the Board accepts a director's resignation, the

Table of Contents

Nominating and Governance Committee will recommend to the Board whether to fill such vacancy or reduce the size of the Board.

Director Attendance at Annual Meeting of Stockholders

We have a policy that all Board members are expected to attend our annual meeting of stockholders. All of the then-current Board members attended the 2009 annual meeting of stockholders.

Communications with Directors

Any stockholder or other interested party may communicate with our directors, individually or as a group, by contacting our corporate secretary or the Lead Director. The contact information is maintained on the Investor page of our website at www.williams.com.

The current contact information is as follows:

The Williams Companies, Inc.
One Williams Center, MD 47
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74172
Attn: Lead Director

The Williams Companies, Inc.
One Williams Center, MD 47
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74172
Attn: Corporate Secretary
Email: lafleur.browne@williams.com

Communications will be forwarded to the relevant director(s) except for solicitations or other matters not related to the Company.

Code of Ethics

We have adopted a code of ethics specific to the CEO, Chief Financial Officer, and Chief Accounting Officer, which was filed with the SEC as Exhibit 14 to our annual report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2003. In addition, we have adopted a code of business conduct that is applicable to all employees and directors.

How to Obtain Copies of our Governance-Related Materials

The following documents are available on our website at www.williams.com from the Corporate Responsibility/Corporate Governance tab.

Corporate Governance Guidelines,

Code of Ethics for Senior Officers,

the Williams Code of Business Conduct, and

the charters for the Audit Committee, the Compensation Committee, the Finance Committee, and the Nominating and Governance Committee.

If you want to receive these documents in print, please send a written request to our corporate secretary at The Williams Companies, Inc., One Williams Center, MD 47, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74172.

Board and Committee Structure and Meetings

Board Meetings

Board members actively participate in Board and committee meetings. Generally, materials are distributed one week in advance of each regular Board meeting so that members can be prepared for the discussion.

Table of Contents

The full Board met 9 times in 2009. Further, the non-employee directors met 6 times without the chairman of the Board and CEO present. Each director attended at least 75% of the aggregate of the Board and applicable committee meetings held in 2009.

Board Committees

The Board has four standing committees – Audit, Compensation, Finance, and Nominating and Governance – as well as an ad hoc Litigation Committee. Each standing committee has a charter adopted by the Board. The standing committees report to the full Board at each regular Board meeting.

The Board elects each committee’s members and chairman annually. The chart below shows the composition of the standing committees and the number of committee meetings in 2009.

	Audit Committee	Compensation Committee	Finance Committee	Nominating and Governance Committee
Joseph R. Cleveland	ü		ü	
Kathleen B. Cooper		ü	ü	
Irl F. Engelhardt	ü		ü	
William R. Granberry		ü	ü	
William E. Green	ü			ü
Juanita H. Hinshaw	ü			
W. R. Howell				ü
George A. Lorch		ü		ü
William G. Lowrie				ü
Frank T. MacInnis		ü		
Steven J. Malcolm				
Janice D. Stoney		ü		ü
Number of Meetings in 2009	11	8	6	6

= Chairperson

ü = Committee Member

Audit Committee

Williams has a separately designated standing Audit Committee established in accordance with Section 3(a)(58)(A) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (Exchange Act). The Audit Committee:

appoints, evaluates, and determines the compensation of Ernst & Young LLP, our independent registered public accounting firm;

assists the Board in fulfilling its responsibilities for generally overseeing Williams financial reporting processes and the audit of Williams financial statements, including the integrity of Williams financial statements, Williams compliance with legal and regulatory requirements, and risk assessment and risk management;

reviews the qualifications and independence of the independent registered public accounting firm;

reviews the performance of Williams internal audit function and the independent registered public accounting firm;

reviews Williams earnings releases;

reviews transactions between Williams and related persons that are required to be disclosed in our filings with the SEC;

oversees investigations into complaints concerning financial matters;

annually reviews its charter and performance; and

Table of Contents

prepares the Audit Committee report for inclusion in the annual proxy statement.

The Board has determined that all members of the Audit Committee are financially literate as defined by the NYSE rules and that Ms. Juanita H. Hinshaw and Mr. Irl F. Engelhardt qualify as audit committee financial experts as defined by the rules of the SEC. No Audit Committee member serves on more than three public company audit committees.

Compensation Committee

The Compensation Committee oversees the design and implementation of strategic compensation programs for our executive officers that align the interests of our executive officers with those of our stockholders. The Compensation Committee's key responsibilities include:

- approving executive compensation philosophy, policies, and programs;
- recommending to the Board equity-based compensation plans;
- recommending to the Board cash-based incentive compensation plans for the NEOs and other executives;
- setting corporate goals and objectives for compensation;
- evaluating the NEOs and certain other executives' performance in light of those goals and objectives;
- approving the NEOs and certain other executives' compensation, including salary, incentive compensation, equity-based compensation, and any other remuneration;
- approving, amending, modifying, or terminating, in its settlor (non-fiduciary) capacity, the terms of any benefit plan that does not require stockholder approval;
- reviewing and revising (if necessary) annual succession and development plans for the positions of CEO and certain other executives;
- reviewing and approving the Compensation Discussion and Analysis required by the SEC for inclusion in the annual proxy statement;
- monitoring the executive officers' compliance with Williams' stock ownership policies; and
- reviewing annually its charter and performance.

The Compensation Committee has authority under its charter to retain, approve fees for, and terminate advisors, consultants, and agents as it deems necessary to assist in the fulfillment of its responsibilities. The Compensation Committee reviews the total fees paid to its outside advisors to ensure that the advisors maintain objectivity and independence when rendering advice to the Committee. The Compensation Committee has selected and retained Frederic W. Cook & Co., an independent executive compensation consulting firm, to:

- provide competitive market data and advice related to the CEO's compensation level and incentive design;

review and evaluate management-developed market data and recommendations on compensation levels, incentive mix, and incentive design for NEOs and certain other executives (excluding the CEO);

develop the criteria used to identify comparator companies for executive compensation and performance comparisons; and

provide information on executive compensation trends and their implications to Williams.

The independent compensation consultant reports to the chairman of the Compensation Committee. Frederic W. Cook & Co. also provides competitive market data and advice to the Nominating and Governance Committee on non-employee director compensation. Frederic W. Cook & Co. does not provide any additional services to Williams.

The Compensation Committee chairman works with the Senior Vice President, Strategic Services and Administration, and Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) to determine the agenda for committee meetings. The CEO and the CAO are invited to attend the Compensation Committee meetings, though they leave the room during discussions of compensation actions that could affect them personally. Williams Human Resources department

Table of Contents

supports the Compensation Committee in its duties and, along with the CEO, may perform certain functions regarding compensation programs. For more information on the Compensation Committee, please see the Compensation Discussion and Analysis in this proxy statement.

Finance Committee

The Finance Committee oversees Williams' finances. Among other tasks, this committee:

- reviews and recommends to the Board Williams' capital spending;
- oversees Williams' financial strategies, plans, and policies;
- reviews and approves any amendments to Williams' financing agreements; and
- reviews annually its charter and performance.

Nominating and Governance Committee

The Nominating and Governance Committee:

- develops and recommends to the Board director qualifications;
- identifies and recommends to the Board director candidates;
- reviews candidates recommended by stockholders;
- recommends to the Board the individual, or individuals, to be the chairman of the Board and the CEO;
- reviews the CEO's recommendations for individuals to be officers;
- monitors significant developments in the regulation and practice of corporate governance;
- reviews the size and composition of the Board and its committees and recommends to the Board any changes;
- conducts a preliminary review of director independence and the financial literacy and expertise of the Audit Committee members;
- recommends assignments to the Board committees;
- oversees and assists the Board in the review of the Board's performance and reviews its own performance;
- annually reviews each committee charter, the Corporate Governance Guidelines, the Code of Ethics for Senior Officers, and the Williams Code of Business Conduct;
- oversees Williams' compliance programs;
- reviews stockholder proposals and recommends responses to the Board;
- develops and monitors stock ownership guidelines for directors; and

reviews and recommends to the Board compensation of non-employee directors.

Consideration of nominees. The process for selecting a director nominee starts with a preliminary assessment of each candidate based upon his/her resume and other biographical and background information, and his/her willingness to serve. The Committee considers prior Williams Board performance and contributions for any director nominee who is a current or former Board member. A candidate's qualifications are then evaluated against the criteria set forth in Proposal 1 Election of Directors, as well as the specific needs of Williams at the time. Qualified candidates are interviewed by the chairman of the Board and at least one member of the Nominating and Governance Committee. Candidates may then meet with other members of the Board and senior management. At the conclusion of this process, if the Board and senior management determine that the candidate will be a good fit, the Nominating and Governance Committee recommends the candidate to the Board for election at the next annual meeting.

Table of Contents

The Nominating and Governance Committee uses the same process to evaluate all candidates regardless of the source of the nomination. The Committee has in the past and may in the future engage third party consultants to identify and evaluate potential director nominees, as it deems appropriate.

Stockholder nominations. The Nominating and Governance Committee will consider written recommendations from stockholders for director nominations. If you wish to nominate a candidate, please forward the candidate's name and a detailed description of the candidate's qualifications, a document indicating the candidate's willingness to serve, and evidence that you own Williams' stock to: Corporate Secretary, One Williams Center, MD 47, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74172. A stockholder wishing to nominate a candidate must also comply with the notice and other requirements described above under the question *May I propose actions for consideration at the 2011 meeting of stockholders?*

Table of Contents

PROPOSAL 1 ELECTION OF DIRECTORS

Our current restated certificate of incorporation provides for three classes of directors with each class of as nearly equal size as possible. The restated certificate of incorporation also provides that the Board must consist of between five and 17 members, with the actual number of directors at any time to be determined by the Board. The term of each class of directors is ordinarily three years, and the term of one class expires each year in rotation.

The 2010 nominees for the office of director Dr. Cooper, Mr. Granberry, and Mr. Lowrie were elected by Williams stockholders to a three-year term that expires this year. Unless otherwise instructed, the individuals designated by the Board as proxies intend to vote to elect Dr. Cooper, Mr. Granberry, and Mr. Lowrie. Should any of these nominees become unable for any reason to stand for election as a director, the designated proxies will vote to elect another nominee recommended by the Nominating and Governance Committee. Alternatively, the Board may choose to reduce its size.

Director and Nominee Experience and Qualifications. At each of its regularly scheduled meetings, in satisfaction of our Corporate Governance Guidelines, the Nominating and Governance Committee evaluates the composition of the Board to assess the skills and experience that are currently represented on the Board, as well as the skills and experience that the Board will find valuable in the future, given the Company's current situation and strategic plans. The Nominating and Governance Committee seeks a variety of occupational and personal backgrounds on the Board in order to obtain a range of viewpoints and perspectives and to enhance the diversity of the Board in such areas as geography, race, gender, ethnicity, and age. This assessment enables the Board to update (if necessary) the skills and experience it seeks in the Board as a whole, and in individual directors, as the Company's needs evolve and change over time. For Board membership, the Nominating and Governance Committee considers the appropriate balance of experience, skills, and characteristics that best suits the needs of the Company and our stockholders. The Committee develops long-term Board succession plans to ensure that the appropriate balance is maintained.

The minimum qualifications and attributes that the Nominating and Governance Committee believes a director nominee must possess include:

- an understanding of business and financial affairs and the complexities of a business organization.
- genuine interest in Williams and in representing all of its stockholders.
- a willingness and ability to spend the time required to function effectively as a director.
- an open-minded approach and the resolve to make independent decisions on matters presented for consideration.
- a reputation for honesty and integrity beyond question.

In evaluating the director nominees and in reviewing the qualifications and experience of the directors continuing in office, the Nominating and Governance Committee considered a variety of factors. These include each nominee's independence, financial literacy, personal and professional accomplishments, and experience in light of the needs of the Company. For incumbent directors, the factors also include past performance on the Board. Among other things, the Board has determined that it is important to have individuals with the following skills and experiences on the Board:

- Industry Experience* in the natural gas business.

Financial Experience with which to evaluate our financial statements and capital investments.

Corporate Governance Experience to support our goals of greater transparency, accountability for management and the Board, and protection of stockholders interests.

Legal Experience is valuable to the Board oversight of the Company's legal and regulatory compliance.

Public Policy and Government Experience is relevant to the Company as it operates in a highly regulated industry.

Operating Experience which is relevant to the understanding of the Company's operating plan and strategy.

Compensation Experience to help us attract, motivate and retain world class talent.

Table of Contents

Technology Experience which is relevant to understand the operations of the Company's networking technology, data requirements, and security.

We have included below certain information about the nominees for election as directors as well as the directors who will continue in office after the annual meeting.

Nominees for Director Whose Terms Will Expire at the Annual Meeting in 2013

Kathleen B. Cooper, Age 65, Class III

Member Compensation Committee

Member Finance Committee

Director since 2006. Dr. Cooper has served as Senior Fellow of the Tower Center for Political Studies at Southern Methodist University since August 2007. From 2005 to 2007, she was the Dean of the College of Business Administration at the University of North Texas. From 2001 to 2005, she was the Under Secretary for Economic Affairs at the U.S. Department of Commerce. Dr. Cooper was at Exxon Mobil Corporation (an international oil and gas company) from 1990 to 2001, serving as Chief Economist the entire time and adding the position of Manager, Economics & Energy Division, Corporate Planning in 1999. Dr. Cooper also acted as Chief Economist for Security Pacific Bank (1981 to 1990) and United Banks of Colorado (1971 to 1981). Dr. Cooper served as a founding director of Texas Security Bank from 2008 through January 2010. She has participated in numerous professional and community service organizations, including Harvard University's Higher Education Leadership Forum, the Oxford Energy Forum, and the International Women's Forum.

As Senior Fellow of the Tower Center for Political Studies at Southern Methodist University, former Under Secretary for Economic Affairs at the U.S. Department of Commerce, and former executive of a Fortune 500 energy company, Dr. Cooper's qualifications include industry, financial, and public policy and government experience.

William R. Granberry, Age 67, Class III

Member Compensation Committee

Member Finance Committee

Director since 2005. Mr. Granberry has been a member of Compass Operating Company LLC (a small, private oil and gas exploration, development, and producing company) since October 2004. From 1999 to 2004, as an independent consultant, he managed investments and consulted with oil and gas companies. From 1996 to 1999, Mr. Granberry was President and Chief Operating Officer of Tom Brown, Inc. (a public oil and gas company with exploration, development, acquisition, and production activities throughout the central United States). He has worked in the oil and gas industry in various capacities for 44 years, including as a manager of engineering at Amoco (a global energy company) and in executive positions for smaller independent energy companies. Mr. Granberry has served on committees and boards of industry organizations, including the Society of Petroleum Engineers, the American Petroleum Institute, and the Independent Producers Association of America. A start up Internet company, Just4Biz.com, where he served on the

Table of Contents

board of directors and as interim chief executive officer for periods in 2000 and 2001, filed for bankruptcy in May 2001. He is a director of Legacy Reserves GP, LLC (an independent acquirer and developer of oil and natural gas properties) and Manor Park, Inc. (a Midland, Texas not-for-profit organization).

As a member of Compass Operating Company LLC, former President and Chief Operating Officer of Tom Brown, Inc., and with his varied experiences as an executive in the oil and gas industry, Mr. Granberry's qualifications include industry, public policy and government, and operating experience.

William G. Lowrie, Age 66, Class III

Chairman Audit Committee

Member Nominating and Governance Committee

Director since 2003. In 1999 Mr. Lowrie retired as Deputy Chief Executive Officer and director of BP Amoco PLC (a global energy company), where he spent his entire 33-year career. At Amoco, Mr. Lowrie held various positions of increasing responsibility, developing expertise in drilling, reservoir engineering, financial analysis of projects, and other skills related to the oil and natural gas exploration, production, and processing businesses. At various times in his Amoco tenure, Mr. Lowrie managed natural gas and natural gas liquids pipeline operations, hedging and other hydrocarbon price risk mitigation functions, international contract negotiations, petroleum product refining and marketing operations, environmental health and safety program design, and the development and execution of a process for managing capital investment projects. Mr. Lowrie also worked closely with all financial functions, internal and external auditors, and industry organizations such as the American Petroleum Institute. From 1995 to 1999, Mr. Lowrie served on the board of Bank One Corporation (now JP Morgan Chase), including on such board's audit committee. He has attended the Executive Program at the University of Virginia. Mr. Lowrie is a director of The Ohio State University Foundation and a trustee of the South Carolina chapter of The Nature Conservancy.

As the former Deputy Chief Executive Officer of BP Amoco PLC, Mr. Lowrie's qualifications include industry, financial, corporate governance, operating, and compensation experience.

Board of Directors Recommendation: THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS UNANIMOUSLY RECOMMENDS A VOTE FOR THE ELECTION OF THE DIRECTORS NAMED IN PROPOSAL 1.

Directors Continuing in Office

Directors Whose Terms Expire at the Annual Meeting in 2011

Joseph R. Cleveland, Age 65, Class I

Member Audit Committee

Member Finance Committee

Director since 2008. Mr. Cleveland was the Chief Information Officer of Lockheed Martin Corporation (an advanced technology company) from 2001 to 2008. Mr. Cleveland was responsible for Lockheed Martin's information technology vision, consolidating its resources, implementing e-commerce initiatives, leveraging

Table of Contents

economies of scale, and supporting its businesses. He was also President of Lockheed Martin Enterprise Information Systems from 1995 to 2008. From 2001 to 2008, Mr. Cleveland served as a director of Exostar (a joint venture formed to support the supply chain and security requirements of the aerospace and defense industry). Prior to the merger of Lockheed and Martin Marietta in 1995, Mr. Cleveland was Vice President and General Manager of Martin Marietta Internal Information Systems. From 1982 to 1986, Mr. Cleveland held an international assignment as Managing Director of GE Medical Systems Operations in Radlett, England. Mr. Cleveland began his career in 1970 as a member of General Electric Medical Systems engineering department. Mr. Cleveland is a member of the board of Aerospace Industries Association, the Florida High Tech Corridor Committee, and the Metro Orlando Economic Development Commission, among other civic and charitable organizations.

As the former Chief Information Officer of Lockheed Martin Corporation, a former Vice President of Martin Marietta, and multiple Executive operating positions with G.E., Mr. Cleveland's qualifications include business operations and technology experience.

Juanita H. Hinshaw, Age 65, Class I

Member Audit Committee

Chairman Finance Committee

Director since 2004. Ms. Hinshaw is President and Chief Executive Officer of H&H Advisors (a financial consulting firm she founded in 2005). From 2000 to 2005 she was Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of Graybar Electric Company (a distributor of electrical and communications products and provider of related supply chain management and logistics services), where she was responsible for the treasury, tax, auditing, and accounting areas. Ms. Hinshaw was a director of Graybar from 2000 to 2005. Prior to joining Graybar, she was with Monsanto Company (an agricultural company) for fifteen years, retiring as Monsanto's Vice President and Treasurer in 1999. Ms. Hinshaw was a director of IPSCO (a supplier of steel products, tubular products, and coil processing services and products) from 2001 until the company was sold in 2007. Ms. Hinshaw is a director of Insituform Technologies Inc. (a provider of technologies and services for the rehabilitation of pipeline systems) and Synergetics USA, Inc. (which designs, manufactures, and markets instruments used for eye and neurosurgery).

As the President and Chief Executive Officer of a consulting firm, the former Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer of Graybar Electric Company, and the former Vice President and Treasurer of Monsanto Company, Ms. Hinshaw's qualifications include financial and operating experience.

Frank T. MacInnis, Age 63, Class I

Member Compensation Committee

Chairman Nominating and Governance Committee

Director since 1998. Mr. MacInnis has been Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of EMCOR Group Inc. (an electrical and mechanical construction company and energy infrastructure service provider) since 1994, after he managed the reorganization and emergence from bankruptcy of its predecessor. Mr. MacInnis also is

Table of Contents

Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of ComNet Communications, LLC (a provider of turnkey voice, data, and video infrastructure support). From 1981 to 1984, Mr. MacInnis served as Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of H.C. Price Construction (a builder of large diameter oil and gas pipelines). He has managed construction and operations all over the world, including in Tehran, Baghdad, Bangkok, the United Arab Emirates, London, the United States, and Canada. Mr. MacInnis has a law degree, having graduated from the University of Alberta Law School in 1971. He is a director of ITT Corporation (a high-technology engineering and manufacturing company) and the Greater New York Chapter of the March of Dimes.

As the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of EMCOR Group Inc. and ComNet Communications, LLC, Mr. MacInnis qualifications include industry, financial, corporate governance, legal, operating, and compensation experience.

Steven J. Malcolm, Age 61, Class I

Chairman of the Board
Chief Executive Officer

Director since 2001. Mr. Malcolm has served Williams in many capacities. He became Chairman of the Board in May 2002, Chief Executive Officer in January 2002, and President in September 2001. He was Chief Operating Officer from September 2001 to January 2002 and an Executive Vice President from May 2001 to September 2001. Mr. Malcolm was President and Chief Executive Officer of Williams Energy Services, LLC, a subsidiary of Williams, from 1998 to 2001, and Senior Vice President and General Manager of Williams Field Services Company, a subsidiary of Williams, from 1994 to 1998. Since joining Williams in 1984, he has performed roles of increasing responsibility related to business development, gas management and supply, and gathering and processing, before ultimately assuming the Chief Executive Officer position. Mr. Malcolm began his career at Cities Service Company in refining, marketing, and transportation services in 1970. Mr. Malcolm is also a director of several entities: Williams Partners GP LLC, the general partner of Williams Partners L.P.; Williams Pipeline GP LLC, the general partner of Williams Pipeline Partners L.P.; BOK Financial Corporation; and Bank of Oklahoma N.A. Mr. Malcolm serves on the boards of the YMCA of Greater Tulsa, St. John Medical Center, University of Tulsa Board of Trustees, Tulsa Metro Chamber of Commerce, and Tulsa Educare, and is a member of the American Petroleum Institute (Executive Committee), The Business Roundtable, the Oklahoma Business Roundtable, the National Petroleum Council, America's Natural Gas Alliance (ANGA), the American Exploration & Production Council, and the 25 Year Club of the Petroleum Industry.

As Chairman, President and Chief Executive Officer of Williams, Mr. Malcolm's qualifications include industry, financial, corporate governance, public policy and government, operating, and compensation experience.

Table of Contents

Janice D. Stoney, Age 69, Class I

Member Compensation Committee

Member Nominating and Governance Committee

Director since 1999. Ms. Stoney served as Executive Vice President of US West Communications Group, Inc. from March 1991 until retiring in January 1993 after a 33-year career. Previously she served as the President, Consumer Division, of US West (the Denver-based parent company of Northwestern Bell Telephone Company, Mountain States Telephone & Telegraph Company, and Pacific Northwest Bell Telephone Company) from 1989 to 1991. Beginning in 1980, Ms. Stoney held officer positions at Northwestern Bell, including as its Chief Operating Officer and ultimately its President and Chief Executive Officer. Ms. Stoney was the 1994 Nebraska Republican nominee for the U.S. Senate. She served as a national vice-chair finance and the Nebraska chair finance for the Dole for President campaign in 1995 to 1996, and as a delegate to the 2000 and 2004 national Republican conventions. Ms. Stoney was a director of Gordmans (a chain of mid-western discount department stores) from 1998 to 2008, Bridges Investment Fund (a venture capital fund) from 1999 to 2006, and Swanson Corporation (a vending and food service corporation) from 1999 to 2006. Ms. Stoney has been a director of Whirlpool Corporation (a manufacturer of home appliances) since 1987. Through 22 years as a director in manufacturing, consumer products, retailing, and investment funds industries, Ms. Stoney has board experience with director searches, CEO and management succession, management development, executive compensation, and strategic planning. She has chaired compensation and audit committees for other entities. She has served on the Federal Reserve Bank, Tenth District, Omaha Branch and the Omaha Community Foundation.

As a former Executive Vice President of US West Communications Group, Inc., Chief Executive Officer of Northwestern Bell, and through her engagement in the political process, Ms. Stoney's qualifications include corporate governance, public policy and government, operating, and compensation experience.

Directors Whose Terms Expire at the Annual Meeting in 2012

Irl F. Engelhardt, Age 63, Class II

Member Audit Committee

Member Finance Committee

Director since 2005. Mr. Engelhardt has served as chairman of Patriot Coal Corporation (a producer and marketer of coal in the eastern United States) since November 2007. He was chairman of Peabody Energy Corporation (a private-sector coal company) or its predecessor companies from 1993 to 2007, and chief executive officer from 1990 through 2005. He was also co-CEO of The Energy Group (comprising Eastern Electricity in the United Kingdom, Peabody in the United States and Australia, and Citizens Power in the United States) from 1997 to 1998 and chairman of Citizens Power (a power marketer, formerly a subsidiary of Peabody) from 1998 to 2000. Mr. Engelhardt is a director of Patriot Coal and Valero Energy Corporation (an independent petroleum refiner and marketer) and the former chairman of The Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

Table of Contents

As Chairman of Patriot Coal Corporation, and former Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Peabody Energy Corporation, Mr. Engelhardt's qualifications include industry, financial, corporate governance, operating, and compensation experience.

William E. Green, Age 73, Class II

Member Audit Committee

Member Nominating and Governance Committee

Director since 1998. Mr. Green is the founder of William Green & Associates, a Palo Alto, California law firm, and has been with the firm since 1974. He is also the Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary of AIM Broadcasting, LLC. From 1971 to 1974, Mr. Green was Assistant General Counsel for Boise Cascade Corporation (which manufactures paper, corrugated containers, and wood products and distributes office products and building materials). From 1963 through 1971, Mr. Green was a member of the legal staff of Sybron Corporation (an equipment manufacturer for the brewing, chemical, food processing and dental equipment markets), serving as Associate Patent Counsel and Associate General Counsel. Mr. Green was employed by the Applied Research Laboratories of United States Steel Corporation as a chemist from 1957 to 1961 and as a patent coordinator from 1961 to 1963. He is a former trustee of Rochester Savings Bank. Mr. Green was Chairman of the City Planning Commission for Rochester, New York from 1966 to 1971 and a candidate for the New York State Assembly in 1968. Mr. Green is a director of Philanthropic Ventures, Inc. (a charitable foundation), Ramsell Holding Corporation (four healthcare companies, primarily performing pharmacy benefit management), Flowers Heritage Foundation (a nonprofit foundation), and Shiloh Energy Group Corporation (a developer of renewable energy systems).

As a member of the law firm Williams Green & Associates; Vice President, General Counsel and Secretary of AIM Broadcasting, LLC; and former Associate General Counsel for each of Boise Cascade Corporation and Sybron Corporation, Mr. Green's qualifications include corporate governance and legal experience.

W.R. Howell, Age 74, Class II

Lead Director

Chairman Compensation Committee

Member Nominating and Governance Committee

Director since 1997. Mr. Howell is Chairman Emeritus of J.C. Penney Company, Inc. (a major merchandise and services retailer). Mr. Howell started with J.C. Penney in 1958 as a management trainee, advancing through store management positions in Oklahoma, Texas and California before transferring in 1979 to J.C. Penney's headquarters in New York, where he oversaw merchandising, marketing, and catalog operations. Ultimately he was Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of J.C. Penney from 1983 to 1995, when he relinquished the position of chief executive officer but continued to serve as chairman until January 1997. J.C. Penney's sales rose from \$12 billion to \$21 billion during Mr. Howell's chairmanship. Mr. Howell also managed J.C. Penney's 1987 decision to move the company's headquarters from New York to Dallas, Texas. Mr. Howell served as a director of ExxonMobil Corporation (an international oil and gas company) from 1982 to 2008. He also served on the boards of Pfizer Inc. (a research-based pharmaceutical company) from 2000 to 2009, Halliburton Company (a provider of oilfield

Table of Contents

technologies and services) from 1991 to 2008, and American Electric Power (a electricity service provider, formerly Central & South West Corp.) from 1997 to 2008. Since 1986 he has served as a director of Deutsche Bank Trust Corporation (formerly known as Bankers Trust Corporation) and Deutsche Bank Trust Company Americas, non-public wholly-owned subsidiaries of Deutsche Bank AG (a financial service provider). Mr. Howell has also served on the Americas Advisory Board at Deutsche Bank AG since November 2008.

As the former Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of J.C. Penney, Mr. Howell's qualifications include financial, corporate governance, operating, and compensation experience.

George A. Lorch, Age 68, Class II

Member Compensation Committee

Member Nominating and Governance Committee

Director since 2001. Mr. Lorch is Chairman Emeritus of Armstrong Holdings, Inc., the holding company for Armstrong World Industries, Inc. (a manufacturer and marketer of floors, ceilings, and cabinets). He was the Chief Executive Officer and President of Armstrong World Industries, Inc. from 1993 to 1994 and Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer from 1994 to 2000. From May 2000 to August 2000 he was Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Armstrong Holdings, Inc. In December 2002, Armstrong World Industries, Inc. filed for voluntary reorganization under Chapter 11 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code. Mr. Lorch has 20 years of sales and marketing experience at Armstrong, including 17 years experience as a head of operations, with responsibility for profit and loss statements, balance sheets, and stockholder relations. During his 21 years as a director in varied industries, Mr. Lorch has participated in CEO searches, succession planning, strategy development, takeover defense and offense, and director recruitment, and he has served on dozens of board committees. Mr. Lorch is a director of Pfizer, Inc. (a research-based pharmaceutical company); Autoliv, Inc. (a developer, manufacturer, and supplier of automotive safety systems); HSBC Finance and HSBC North America Holding Co., non-public, wholly-owned subsidiaries of HSBC LLC (a banking and financial services provider); and Masonite (a door manufacturer). Mr. Lorch also serves as an advisor to the Carlyle Group (a private equity firm).

As the former Chief Executive Officer and President of Armstrong World Industries, Inc., Mr. Lorch's qualifications include financial, corporate governance, operating, and compensation experience.

Table of Contents**SECURITY OWNERSHIP OF CERTAIN BENEFICIAL OWNERS AND MANAGEMENT**

The following table sets forth information as of December 31, 2009, concerning beneficial ownership by holders of five percent or more of our common stock. Unless otherwise indicated, the persons named have sole voting and investment power with respect to the shares listed.

Name and Address	Number of Share of Common Stock	Percent of Class
BlackRock, Inc.(1) 40 East 52 nd Street New York, NY 10022	44,690,166	7.66%

(1) Reflects shares beneficially owned by Blackrock, Inc. according to its Schedule 13G filed with the SEC on January 29, 2010. The Schedule indicates that Blackrock, Inc., a parent holding company or control person in accordance with Rule 13d-1(b)(1)(ii)(G) of the Exchange Act, owns 44,690,166 shares of our common stock.

The following table sets forth, as of February 28, 2010, the number of shares of our common stock beneficially owned by each of our directors and nominees for directors, by the NEOs, and by all directors and executive officers as a group.

Name of Individual or Group	Shares of Common Stock		Shares Underlying Options Exercisable	Total	Percent of Class(4)
	Owned Directly or Indirectly(1)(2)	Within 60 Days(3)			
Alan Armstrong	293,705	258,976		552,681	*
Donald R. Chappel	431,729	466,051		897,780	*
Joseph R. Cleveland	11,957			11,957	*
Kathleen B. Cooper	17,715	4,500		22,215	*
Irl F. Engelhardt	47,706	12,000		59,706	*
William R. Granberry	19,975	9,000		28,975	*
William E. Green	48,508	30,714		79,222	*
Ralph A. Hill	273,657	216,874		490,531	*
Juanita H. Hinshaw	23,666	15,000		38,666	*
W. R. Howell	73,098	48,714		121,812	*
George A. Lorch	62,785	43,631		106,416	*
William G. Lowrie	69,050			69,050	*
Frank T. MacInnis	66,787	48,714		115,501	*
Steven J. Malcolm	1,223,012	2,204,650		3,427,662	*
Janice D. Stoney	54,201	48,714		102,915	*

Edgar Filing: WILLIAMS COMPANIES INC - Form PRE 14A

Phillip D. Wright	420,010	395,552	815,562	*
All directors and executive officers as a group (19 persons)	3,591,754	4,094,329	7,686,083	1.32

* Less than 1%.

- (1) Includes shares held under the terms of incentive and investment plans as follows: Mr. Armstrong, 212,579 restricted stock units and 15 shares in The Williams Investment Plus Plan; Mr. Chappel, 276,269 restricted stock units; Mr. Hill, 231,208 restricted stock units and 27,954 shares in The Williams Investment Plus Plan; Mr. Malcolm, 511,085 restricted stock units and 47,998 shares in The Williams Investment Plus Plan; and Mr. Wright, 212,579 restricted stock units and 15,857 shares in The Williams Investment Plus Plan. Restricted stock units include both time-based and performance-based units and do not have voting or investment power. Shares held in The Williams Investment Plus Plan have voting and investment power.
- (2) Includes restricted stock units over which directors have no voting or investment power held under the terms of compensation plans as follows: Mr. Cleveland, 11,026; Dr. Cooper, 14,026; Mr. Engelhardt, 14,026; Mr. Granberry, 14,026; Mr. Green, 14,026; Ms. Hinshaw, 14,026; Mr. Howell, 22,578; Mr. Lorch, 53,322; Mr. Lowrie, 14,026; Mr. MacInnis, 14,026; and Ms. Stoney, 36,943.
- (3) The SEC deems a person to have beneficial ownership of all shares that the person has the right to acquire within 60 days. The shares indicated represent stock options granted under our current or previous stock option

Table of Contents

plans that are currently exercisable or will become exercisable within 60 days of February 28, 2010. Shares subject to options cannot be voted.

- (4) Ownership percentage is reported based on 583,603,353 shares of common stock outstanding on February 28, 2010, plus, as to the holder thereof only and no other person, the number of shares (if any) that the person has the right to acquire as of February 28, 2010, or within 60 days from that date, through the exercise of all options and other rights.

The following table sets forth, as of February 28, 2010, the number of shares of common units of Williams Partners L.P. beneficially owned by each of our directors and nominees for directors, by the NEOs, and by all directors and executive officers as a group.

Name of Individual or Group	Shares of		Total	Percent of Class(2)
	Common Units Owned Directly or Indirectly	Shares Underlying Options Exercisable Within 60 Days(1)		
Alan Armstrong(3)	20,000	0	20,000	*
Donald R. Chappel	10,000	0	10,000	*
Joseph R. Cleveland	0	0	0	*
Kathleen B. Cooper	0	0	0	*
Irl F. Engelhardt	0	0	0	*
William R. Granberry	0	0	0	*
William E. Green	1,180	0	1,180	*
Ralph A. Hill	500	0	500	*
Juanita H. Hinshaw	1,000	0	1,000	*
W. R. Howell	5,000	0	5,000	*
George A. Lorch	5,000	0	5,000	*
William G. Lowrie	2,320	0	2,320	*
Frank T. MacInnis	5,000	0	5,000	*
Steven J. Malcolm(4)	25,100	0	25,100	*
Janice D. Stoney	5,000	0	5,000	*
Phillip D. Wright	4,425	0	4,425	*
All directors and executive officers as a group (19 persons)	94,825	0	94,825	*

* Less than 1%.

- (1) The SEC deems a person to have beneficial ownership of all shares that the person has the right to acquire within 60 days.

- (2) Ownership percentage is reported based on 52,777,452 shares of common units outstanding on February 28, 2010.

- (3) Represents 10,000 units held by the Shelly Stone Armstrong Trust dated August 10, 2004.
- (4) Represents units beneficially owned by Mr. Malcolm that are held by The Steven J. Malcolm Revocable Trust dated January 19, 2000.

Table of Contents

The following table sets forth, as of February 28, 2010, the number of common units of Williams Pipeline Partners LP, owned by each of our directors and nominees for directors, by the NEOs and by all directors and executive officers as a group.

Name of Individual or Group	Shares of		Total	Percent of Class(2)
	Common Units Owned Directly or Indirectly	Shares Underlying Options Exercisable Within 60 Days(1)		
Alan Armstrong	0	0	0	*
Donald R. Chappel	10,000	0	10,000	*
Joseph R. Cleveland	0	0	0	*
Kathleen B. Cooper	0	0	0	*
Irl F. Engelhardt	0	0	0	*
William R. Granberry	0	0	0	*
William E. Green	0	0	0	*
Ralph A. Hill	5,000	0	5,000	*
Juanita H. Hinshaw	1,000	0	1,000	*
W. R. Howell	10,000	0	10,000	*
George A. Lorch	5,000	0	5,000	*
William G. Lowrie	6,990	0	6,990	*
Frank T. MacInnis	5,000	0	5,000	*
Steven J. Malcolm(3)	10,000	0	10,000	*
Janice D. Stoney	5,000	0	5,000	*
Phillip D. Wright	10,100	0	10,100	*
All directors and executive officers as a group (19 persons)	78,590	0	78,590	*

* Less than 1%.

- (1) The SEC deems a person to have beneficial ownership of all shares that the person has the right to acquire within 60 days.
- (2) Ownership percentage is reported based on 22,607,430 shares of common units outstanding on February 28, 2010.
- (3) Represents units beneficially owned by Mr. Malcolm that are held by The Steven J. Malcolm Revocable Trust dated January 19, 2000.

SECTION 16(a) BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP REPORTING COMPLIANCE

Section 16(a) of the Exchange Act requires the Company's directors and certain of its officers to file reports of their ownership of Williams common stock and of changes in such ownership with the SEC and the NYSE. Regulations

also require Williams to identify in this proxy statement any person subject to this requirement who failed to file any such report on a timely basis. Based solely on a review of the copies of such reports furnished to the Company and written representations from certain reporting persons, we believe that all of our officers, directors, and greater than 10% stockholders complied with all Section 16(a) filing requirements applicable to them during the fiscal year ended December 31, 2009.

Table of Contents**NAMED EXECUTIVE OFFICER PROFILES**

The following individual executive profiles provide biographical information and summarize total targeted compensation for 2009 to our NEOs. These profiles are provided in addition to the detailed compensation tables required by the SEC.

Steven J. Malcolm
Chairman of the Board, Chief Executive Officer and President
 Position held since September 2001.
 Age: 61

Mr. Malcolm became Chairman of the Board in May 2002, Chief Executive Officer in January 2002, and President in September 2001.

For further information about Mr. Malcolm, please see his biography within the section titled Directors Continuing in Office.

2009 Target Compensation¹

Long-Term Incentives (LTI)	
Performance-Based RSUs	\$ 2,760,000
Stock Options	\$ 2,760,000
Time-Based RSUs	\$ 0
Annual Incentive Plan (AIP) at Target	\$ 1,100,000
Base Pay	\$ 1,100,000
Retirement Benefits	
Pension (year over year change)	\$ 163,541
Restoration Plan (year over year change)	\$ 1,236,255
401(k) Company Match	\$ 14,700

**Payment Upon Termination
(As of December 31, 2009)**

Voluntary Termination	\$ 0
Termination with Cause	\$ 0
Involuntary Termination without Cause	\$ 5,102,568
Retirement	\$ 10,297,261
Death or Disability	\$ 10,297,261
Change in Control	\$ 32,053,003

Stock Ownership Requirements

Mr. Malcolm's ownership in our common stock exceeds the required ownership threshold of five times base salary.

¹ Please note that 2009 Compensation reflects target pay and consists of annual base pay, AIP at target, and the targeted long-term incentive grant. These amounts will differ from the Summary Compensation Table. The retirement benefits are valued in the same manner shown in the Summary Compensation Table.

2009 Target Compensation Chart

Table of Contents**Donald R. Chappel**
Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer

Position held since April 2003.

Age: 58

Prior to joining Williams, Mr. Chappel held various financial, administrative, and operational leadership positions. Mr. Chappel is included in Institutional Investor magazine's Best CFOs listing for 2010, 2008, 2007, and 2006. Mr. Chappel serves as Chief Financial Officer and a director of Williams Partners GP LLC, the general partner of Williams Partners L.P., and as Chief Financial Officer and a director of Williams Pipeline GP LLC, the general partner of Williams Pipeline Partners L.P.

2009 Target Compensation¹

Long-Term Incentives (LTI)	
Performance-Based RSUs	\$ 700,000
Stock Options	\$ 600,000
Time-Based RSUs	\$ 700,000
Annual Incentive Plan (AIP) at Target	\$ 450,000
Base Pay	\$ 600,000
Retirement Benefits	
Pension (year over year change)	\$ 60,381
Restoration Plan (year over year change)	\$ 322,999
401(k) Company Match	\$ 14,700

Payment Upon Termination
(As of December 31, 2009)

Voluntary Termination	\$ 0
Termination with Cause	\$ 0
Involuntary Termination without Cause	\$ 3,752,377
Retirement	\$ 3,984,481
Death or Disability	\$ 5,283,631
Change in Control	\$ 13,561,666

Stock Ownership Requirements

Mr. Chappel's ownership in our common stock exceeds the required ownership threshold of three times base salary.

¹ Please note that 2009 Compensation reflects target pay and consists of annual base pay, AIP at target, and the targeted long-term incentive grant. These amounts will differ from the Summary Compensation Table. The retirement benefits are valued in the same manner shown in the Summary Compensation Table.

2009 Target Compensation Chart

Table of Contents**Ralph A. Hill****Senior Vice President, Exploration and Production**

Position held since December 1998.

Age: 50

Mr. Hill acts as President of our Exploration and Production business unit. He was Vice President and General Manager of the Exploration & Production business from 1993 to 1998, as well as Senior Vice President and General Manager of Petroleum Services from 1998 to 2003. Mr. Hill serves as the Chairman of Apco Oil and Gas International Inc. He also serves as a member of the board of directors of the Tulsa, Oklahoma division of the American Heart Association and has been a board member of numerous other nonprofit Boards. He joined Williams in June 1981 as a member of a management training program and has worked in numerous capacities within the Williams organization.

2009 Target Compensation¹

Long-Term Incentives (LTI)	
Performance-Based RSUs	\$ 595,000
Stock Options	\$ 510,000
Time-Based RSUs	\$ 595,000
Annual Incentive Plan (AIP) at Target	\$ 315,250
Base Pay	\$ 485,000
Retirement Benefits	
Pension (year over year change)	\$ 121,556
Restoration Plan (year over year change)	\$ 306,311
401(k) Company Match	\$ 14,700

**Payment Upon Termination
(As of December 31, 2009)**

Voluntary Termination	\$ 0
Termination with Cause	\$ 0
Involuntary Termination without Cause	\$ 3,176,318
Retirement	\$ 3,407,289
Death or Disability	\$ 4,497,986
Change in Control	\$ 8,742,999

Stock Ownership Requirements

Mr. Hill's ownership in our common stock exceeds the required ownership threshold of three times base salary.

¹ Please note that 2009 Compensation reflects target pay and consists of annual base pay, AIP at target, and the targeted long-term incentive grant. These amounts will differ from the Summary Compensation Table. The retirement benefits are valued in the same manner shown in the Summary Compensation Table.

2009 Target Compensation Chart

Table of Contents**Phillip D. Wright**
Senior Vice President, Gas Pipelines

Position held since January 2005.

Age: 54

Mr. Wright acts as President of our Gas Pipeline business unit. From October 2002 to January 2005, he served as Chief Restructuring Officer. From September 2001 to October 2002, Mr. Wright served as President and Chief Executive Officer of our subsidiary Williams Energy Services. From 1996 until September 2001, he was Senior Vice President, Enterprise Development and Planning for our energy services group. Mr. Wright serves as a director, Senior Vice President, and Chief Operating Officer of Williams Pipeline GP LLC, the general partner of Williams Pipeline Partners L.P., and a director and Senior Vice President, Gas Pipeline, of Williams Partners GP LLC, the general partner of Williams Partners L.P. Mr. Wright is former Chairman of the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America and former Chairman of the Association of Oil Pipelines of America.

2009 Target Compensation¹

Long-Term Incentives (LTI)	
Performance-Based RSUs	\$ 560,000
Stock Options	\$ 480,000
Time-Based RSUs	\$ 560,000
Annual Incentive Plan (AIP) at Target	\$ 325,000
Base Pay	\$ 500,000
Retirement Benefits	
Pension (year over year change)	\$ 108,798
Restoration Plan (year over year change)	\$ 311,117
401(k) Company Match	\$ 9,800

Payment Upon Termination
(As of December 31, 2009)

Voluntary Termination	\$ 0
Termination with Cause	\$ 0
Involuntary Termination without Cause	\$ 2,762,219
Retirement	\$ 2,942,607
Death or Disability	\$ 3,947,044
Change in Control	\$ 8,210,669

Stock Ownership Requirements

Mr. Wright's ownership in our common stock exceeds the required ownership threshold of three times base salary.

¹ Please note that 2009 Compensation reflects target pay and consists of annual base pay, AIP at target, and the targeted long-term incentive grant. These amounts will differ from the Summary Compensation Table. The retirement benefits are valued in the same manner shown in the Summary Compensation Table.

2009 Target Compensation Chart

Table of Contents**Alan S. Armstrong**
Senior Vice President, Midstream

Position held since February 2002.

Age: 47

Mr. Armstrong acts as President of our Midstream business unit. From 1999 to February 2002, Mr. Armstrong was Vice President, Gathering and Processing for Midstream. From 1998 to 1999 he was Vice President, Commercial Development for Midstream.

Mr. Armstrong serves as a director and Senior Vice President, Midstream, of Williams Partners GP LLC, the general partner of Williams Partners L.P. He also serves as chairman of the board of directors of Junior Achievement of Oklahoma, Inc., President of the Gas Processors Association, and a member of the Board for the Natural Gas Supply Association.

2009 Target Compensation¹

Long-Term Incentives (LTI)		
Performance-Based RSUs	\$	560,000
Stock Options	\$	480,000
Time-Based RSUs	\$	560,000
Annual Incentive Plan (AIP) at Target	\$	315,250
Base Pay	\$	485,000
Retirement Benefits		
Pension (year over year change)	\$	84,470
Restoration Plan (year over year change)	\$	209,325
401(k) Company Match	\$	14,700

Payment Upon Termination
(As of December 31, 2009)

Voluntary Termination	\$	0
Termination with Cause	\$	0
Involuntary Termination without Cause	\$	2,779,221
Retirement	\$	2,959,608
Death or Disability	\$	3,964,046
Change in Control	\$	8,000,330

Stock Ownership Requirements

Mr. Armstrong's ownership in our common stock exceeds the required ownership threshold of three times base salary.

¹ Please note that 2009 Compensation reflects target pay and consists of annual base pay, AIP at target, and the targeted long-term incentive grant. These amounts will differ from the Summary Compensation Table. The retirement benefits are valued in the same manner shown in the Summary Compensation Table.

2009 Target Compensation Chart

Table of Contents**COMPENSATION DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS****Objective of Our Compensation Programs**

The role of compensation is to attract and retain the talent needed to drive stockholder value and to help each of our businesses meet or exceed financial and operational performance targets. Our compensation program objective is to reward our NEOs and employees for successfully implementing our strategy to grow our business and create long-term stockholder value. To that end, we use relative and absolute Total Shareholder Return (TSR) to measure long-term performance, and Economic Value Added (EVA®)¹ to measure annual performance. We believe linking TSR and EVA® to how we incent and pay NEOs helps ensure that the business decisions that are made are aligned with the long-term interests of our stockholders.

Our Pay Philosophy

Our Pay Philosophy throughout the entire organization is to pay for performance, be competitive in the marketplace, and consider the value a job provides to the Company. Our compensation programs reward NEOs not just for accomplishing our goals, but also for how those goals are pursued. We strive to reward the right results and the right behaviors while fostering a culture of collaboration and teamwork.

The principles of our pay philosophy influence the design and administration of our pay programs. Decisions about how we pay NEOs are based on these principles. The Compensation Committee uses several different types of pay that are linked to both our short-term and long-term performance in the executive compensation program. Included are long-term incentives, annual cash incentives, base pay and benefits. The chart below illustrates the linkage between the types of pay we use and our pay principles.

Pay Principles	Long-term Incentives	Annual Cash Incentives	Base Pay	Benefits
Pay should reinforce business objectives and values	ü	ü	ü	
A significant portion of an NEO's total pay should be variable based on performance	ü	ü		
Incentive pay should balance short-term, intermediate, and long-term performance	ü	ü		
Incentives should align interest of NEOs with stockholders	ü	ü		
Pay opportunity should be competitive	ü	ü	ü	ü
A portion of pay should be provided to compensate for the core activities required for performing in the role			ü	ü
Pay should foster a culture of collaboration with shared focus and commitment to our Company	ü	ü		

2009 Compensation Summary

For 2009, we continued to focus on creating stockholder value by delivering solid financial and operational performance despite the economic downturn. Like most energy businesses, we have felt the effects of reduced energy

demand resulting in excess energy supply that has contributed to lower commodity prices. We responded quickly to the changing landscape and made plans to cut spending despite the very adverse conditions. We also took several actions, described below, to ensure that our executive pay program remains affordable and competitive in the current market and after market conditions improve.

2009 Pay Decisions

As indicated above, significant consideration was given to the need to balance our pay philosophy and practices with affordability and sustainability. In order to maintain the balance, we continued to grant long-term incentives in the form of performance-based restricted stock units (RSUs), stock options, and time-based RSUs in 2009; however, the value granted to the NEOs was lower in 2009 than in 2008.

¹ Economic Value Added[®] (EVA[®]) is a registered trademark of Stern, Stewart & Co.

Table of Contents

Consistent with our commitment to provide a meaningful connection between pay and performance, we have granted performance-based RSUs to our NEOs since 2004. Performance-based RSUs granted in 2007 for the 2007-2009 performance period did not meet threshold targets set at the beginning of the period as a result of the global economic crisis. Therefore, in accordance with the design of the plan, these awards did not distribute to the NEOs. This resulted in each NEO losing a significant portion of pay that was targeted for 2007.

Each year, we set performance targets for our Annual Incentive Plan (AIP) during the first quarter. In early 2009, the economy and energy demand continued to decline while plan expectations and targets were being set. During midyear, energy prices stabilized and business conditions improved leading to financial performance which exceeded our expectations. To reward this performance that exceeded established targets, the AIP paid at 155% of target.

Considering the very difficult economic environment and the competitive position of our base pay, the NEOs and other Company officers did not receive base pay increases in 2009.

2009 Plan Design Changes

The Compensation Committee regularly reviews our existing pay programs to ensure we are able to attract and retain the talent needed to deliver the strong financial and operating performance necessary to create stockholder value. As part of this process, in 2009 we conducted extensive reviews of our long-term and annual incentive plans.

Our long-term incentive plan has been adjusted in two respects. First, we reviewed the performance metric used with our performance-based RSU awards. In prior years, the metric was EVA[®] measured over three years. However, establishing a target level of performance for this metric at the beginning of 2009 would have been very difficult due to a declining economy and extraordinary uncertainties related to the commodity price environment. After this thorough review, we elected to use absolute and relative TSR as the metrics for the three-year performance-based RSUs. NEOs will earn their targeted performance-based RSUs for the 2009 to 2011 period only if we deliver real absolute TSR and also achieve solid TSR in relation to our comparator group of companies.

Second, in order to motivate and incent officers to increase stockholder value and restore some retention that had been lost due to the economic conditions, we changed the allocation of stock awards in our long-term incentive plan for our NEOs, excluding the CEO. Still, we continue to deliver a significant portion of equity in performance-based awards and stock options because these awards have the strongest alignment to stockholders. Shown below is the long-term incentive mix for 2009.

	CEO	Executive Officers (excluding CEO)
Performance-Based RSUs	50%	35%
Stock Options	50%	30%
Time-Based RSUs	0%	35%

As to our annual incentive plan, we completed an analysis of the performance metric utilized in our Annual Incentive Plan (AIP). The purpose of this review was to determine if EVA[®], as described later, continues to be the most appropriate performance metric for our Company. The review consisted of:

a market update on annual incentive plans;

the Compensation Committee's and the CEO's perspective on annual incentive plan design;

- a review of the Company's historical performance in relation to certain financial metrics;
- an analysis of the correlation of these metrics to EVA[®] and the Company's stock price performance; and
- an overview of metrics commonly used in annual incentive plans.

As a result of the review, we confirmed a strong correlation between EVA[®], stock price performance, and other financial metrics. The review supported the continued use of EVA[®] improvement as the performance metric in our AIP.

Table of Contents

We also reviewed other design elements of the AIP, specifically the maximum amount payable under the plan and the reserve feature that allowed AIP awards above a certain level to be placed in reserve with payout contingent on future performance. We reviewed the prevalence among our comparator group and determined that the AIP's maximum annual incentive pool funding for NEOs would be adjusted down to 250% of target and the incentive reserve be eliminated, beginning in 2009. Any existing reserve balance for NEOs will continue to be at risk and will be paid or reduced in accordance with previous plan provisions.

The economic and commodity price environment during the first part of 2009 made establishing a target level of performance very challenging. Recognizing these challenges and uncertainties, the AIP performance necessary to move from threshold to target was doubled in 2009. Likewise, the performance required to move from target to stretch was doubled. This design change attempts to keep the AIP as a meaningful performance incentive throughout the year but better ensures a payout significantly above target only occurs if we significantly exceed established performance targets.

As shown, we were very active in 2009 working to ensure that our pay programs continued to be aligned with our compensation philosophy, would continue to be affordable and competitive, would drive and motivate performance, and would align management with our stockholders during these uncertain times.

Mitigating Risk

Although no compensation-related risk was identified as a top risk for 2009, the approach to determine if there were adverse compensation risk was similar to the process detailed in the Corporate Governance and Board Matters Corporate Governance Board oversight of Williams risk assurance process section of this proxy statement. After this thorough review and analysis, it was determined that we do not have material adverse compensation-related risks. Our compensation plans are effectively designed and functioning to reward positive performance and motivate NEOs and employees to behave in a manner consistent with our stockholder interests, business strategies and objectives, ethical standards and prudent business practices along with our Core Values & Beliefs that are the foundation on which we conduct business. Our Core Values & Beliefs can be found on our website at www.williams.com from the Who We Are tab. In fact, many elements of our executive pay program serve to mitigate excessive risk taking. For example:

Mix of Pay: The mix of pay weighted to long-term incentives, annual cash incentives and base pay is consistent with comparator company practices and avoids placing too much value on any one element of compensation, particularly the annual cash incentive. The mix of our pay program is intended to motivate NEOs to consider the impact of decisions on stockholders in the short, intermediate, and long terms.

Annual Cash Incentive: Our annual cash incentive plan does not allow for unlimited payouts. Cash incentive payments cannot exceed 250% of target levels.

Performance-based Awards:

To strengthen the relationship between pay and performance, our annual cash incentive and long-term incentive plans include performance-based awards. The entire annual cash incentive award is measured against performance targets, while a significant portion of the long-term equity awards provided to NEOs is in the form of performance-based restricted stock units and stock options. Performance-based restricted stock units have no value unless we achieve pre-determined three-year performance targets. Stock options will have no value unless the stock price increases from the date of grant.

To drive a long-term perspective, all restricted stock unit awards vest at the end of three years rather than vesting ratably on an annual basis.

NEOs incentive compensation performance is measured at the enterprise level rather than on a business unit level to ensure a focus on the overall success of the Company.

Stock Ownership Guidelines As discussed later in this Compensation Discussion and Analysis, all NEOs, consistent with their responsibilities to stockholders, must hold an equity interest in the Company equal to a stated percentage of their base pay.

Table of Contents

Recoupment Policy In the event we are required to restate our financial statements due to fraud or misconduct, we have a recoupment policy that enables us to recover incentive-based compensation from NEOs.

Our pay program is intended to motivate NEOs to achieve business objectives that generate stockholder returns while acting in ways that are consistent with our values.

Compensation Recommendations and Decisions

Role of Management

In order to make pay recommendations, management provides the CEO with data from the annual proxy statements of companies in our comparator group along with pay information compiled from nationally recognized executive and industry related salary surveys. The survey data is used to confirm that pay practices among companies in the comparator group are aligned with the market as a whole.

Role of the CEO

Before recommending base pay adjustments and long-term incentive awards to the Compensation Committee, our CEO reviews the competitive market information related to each of our other NEOs while also considering internal equity and individual performance.

For our annual cash incentive plan, the CEO's recommendation is based on EVA[®] attainment with a potential adjustment for individual performance. Individual performance includes business unit EVA[®] results for the business unit leaders, achievement of business goals, and demonstrated key leadership competencies (for more on leadership competencies, see the section entitled "Base Pay" in this Compensation Discussion and Analysis). The modifications made are fairly modest. For 2009 the adjustments made to the NEOs annual cash incentive awards were on average less than 2%.

Role of the Other NEOs

Our other NEOs have no role in setting compensation for any of the NEOs.

Role of the Compensation Committee

For all NEOs, except the CEO, the Compensation Committee reviews the CEO's recommendations, supporting market data, and individual performance assessments. In addition, the Compensation Committee's independent compensation consultant, Frederic W. Cook & Co., Inc., reviews all of the data and advises on the reasonableness of the CEO's pay recommendations.

For the CEO, the Board meets in executive session without management present to review the CEO's performance. In this session, the Board reviews:

Evaluations of the CEO completed by each board member other than the CEO;

The CEO's written assessment of his own performance compared with the stated goals;

Evaluations of the CEO completed by each of the NEOs and other executive officers; and

EVA[®] performance of the Company relative to established targets as well as the financial metrics presented as a supplement to EVA[®] performance.

The Compensation Committee uses these evaluations and competitive market information provided by its independent compensation consultant to determine the CEO's base pay, annual cash incentive target, long-term incentive amounts and any performance adjustments to be made to the CEO's annual cash incentive payment.

Role of the Independent Compensation Consultant

Frederic W. Cook & Co., Inc., assists the Compensation Committee in determining or approving the compensation for our NEOs. Please refer to the section Corporate Governance and Board Matters Board and

Table of Contents

Committee Structure and Meetings Compensation Committee of this proxy statement for a discussion of the independent compensation consultant.

To assist the Compensation Committee in discussions and decisions about compensation for our CEO, the Committee's independent compensation consultant presents competitive market data that includes proxy data from the approved comparator group and published compensation data, using the same surveys and methodology used for our other NEOs (described in the Role of Management section in this Compensation Discussion and Analysis). Our comparator group is developed by the Committee's independent compensation consultant, with input from management, and is approved by the Compensation Committee.

2009 Comparator Group

How We Use Our Comparator Group

We refer to publicly available data showing how much our comparator group pays, as well as how that pay is divided among base pay, annual incentive, equity, and other forms of compensation. This allows the Compensation Committee to ensure competitiveness and appropriateness of proposed compensation packages. When setting pay, the Compensation Committee uses market median information of our comparator group, as opposed to market averages, to ensure that the impact of any unusual events that may occur at one or two companies during any particular year is diminished from the analysis. If an event is particularly unusual and surrounds unique circumstances, the data is completely removed from the assessment.

Composition of the Comparator Group

Each year the Compensation Committee reviews the prior year's comparator group to ensure that it is still appropriate. We made some changes for 2009. The 2008 group consisted of companies in the broader energy industry. In contrast, for 2009 we focused more on companies that work in the same industry segment and reflect where we compete for business and talent. The new comparator group is smaller than our prior group in terms of revenue, assets, and market capitalization.

Table of Contents

The comparator group established for 2009 includes the following 20 companies, which comprise a mix of both direct competitors and companies whose primary business was similar to at least one of our business segments. We typically aim for a comparator group of 15 to 25 companies so our comparisons will be valid.

Company Name	Ticker	2008 Business Lines			2008 Revenue	2008 Total Assets	2008 Market Cap
		E&P	Midstream	Pipeline			
(Dollars in millions)							
Anadarko Petroleum Corp	APC	X	X		\$ 14,640	\$ 48,923	\$ 17,728
Apache Corp	APA	X			12,390	29,186	24,949
Centerpoint Energy Inc	CNP		X	X	11,322	19,676	4,384
Chesapeake Energy Corp	CHK	X	X		11,629	38,444	10,098
Devon Energy Corp	DVN	X	X		15,211	31,908	29,162
Dominion Resources Inc	D	X		X	16,290	42,265	20,912
El Paso Corp	EP	X		X	5,363	23,668	5,470
EOG Resources Inc	EOG	X			7,127	15,951	16,624
EQT Corporation	EQT	X	X		1,576	5,330	4,390
Hess Corp	HES	X			41,094	28,908	17,494
Murphy Oil Corp	MUR	X			27,441	11,149	8,459
NiSource Inc	NI			X	8,874	20,032	3,009
Noble Energy Inc	NBL	X			3,901	12,384	8,511
Oneok Inc	OKE		X	X	16,157	13,126	3,065
Plains All-American Pipeline	PAA		X	X	30,061	10,032	4,264
Questar Corp	STR	X	X	X	3,465	8,631	5,675
Sempra Energy	SRE			X	10,758	26,400	10,377
Southern Union Co	SUG		X	X	3,070	7,998	1,618
Spectra Energy Corp	SE		X	X	5,074	21,924	10,126
XTO Energy Inc.	XTO	X	X		7,695	38,254	20,446
Company Count:	20	13	11	10			
				<i>25th Percentile</i>	<i>5,291</i>	<i>12,075</i>	<i>4,389</i>
				<i>Median</i>	<i>11,040</i>	<i>20,978</i>	<i>9,305</i>
				<i>75th Percentile</i>	<i>15,448</i>	<i>29,867</i>	<i>17,553</i>
Williams Companies	WMB	X	X	X	11,890	26,006	8,387
				<i>Percent Rank</i>	<i>59.7%</i>	<i>62.3%</i>	<i>41.9%</i>

Characteristics of our Comparator Group

Companies in our comparator group have a range of revenues, assets, and market capitalization. Business consolidation and unique operating models today create some challenges in identifying comparator companies. Accordingly, we take a broader view of comparability to include organizations that are similar to us in some, but not all, respects. This results in compensation that is appropriately scaled and reflects comparable complexities in business operations.

The Pay Setting Process

Setting pay is an annual process that occurs during the first quarter of the year. A review is done to ensure that we are paying competitively, equitably and in a way that encourages and rewards performance that exceeded expectations.

The compensation data of our comparator group is the primary market data we use when benchmarking the competitive pay of our NEOs. Aggregate market data obtained from recognized third party executive compensation survey companies (e.g. Towers Watson, Mercer, Hewitt) is used to supplement and validate comparator group market data. Typically, the Compensation Committee is presented with a range of annual revenues of the companies whose data is included in the aggregate analysis provided by the third party survey, but does not know the identities of the specific companies included.

Although the Compensation Committee reviews relevant data as it designs compensation packages, setting pay is not an exact science. Since market data alone does not reflect the strategic competitive value of various roles within

Table of Contents

the Company, internal pay equity is also considered when making pay decisions. Because we take on an enterprise-wide perspective to promote collaboration and ensure our overall success, paying the NEOs equitably is important. Other considerations when making pay decisions for the NEOs include historical pay and tally sheets that include annual pay and benefit amounts, wealth accumulated over the past five years, and the total aggregate value of the NEOs' equity awards and holdings.

Company and individual goals also influence the amount of compensation that is awarded to the NEOs. Individual goals are established for the NEOs that align directly to the Company's purpose and direction, including our 3Ps to Prosperity strategy. After successfully accomplishing the goals set out in the Game Plan for Growth, we focused our priorities on how to grow our business and create stockholder value. During these times of weakness in the economy and energy markets, our strong performance in the following areas is key to our success:

Protect our ability to execute our core business strategies

- i Operate in a safety first manner that respects the environment
- i Ensure our operations are effective, efficient and reliable

Preserve our financial strength and our reputation

- i Control our cost and manage our cash in a manner that adapts to changing economic demands
- i Remain disciplined in our approach to capital investments
- i Build on our compliance track record in a way that demonstrates integrity and continuously improves our reputation

Position ourselves to reap strategic, value-creating growth opportunities when conditions improve

- i Maintain the diverse knowledge and core capabilities of our organization so that we leverage the valuable experiences of our workforce
- i Sustain the key competitive positions our businesses hold while making opportunistic, foothold moves into new areas and new basins
- i Effectively engage with our customers, communities, key vendors and other stakeholders important to our success

Our success in executing the 3Ps to Prosperity strategy led to the improvement of EVA[®] and contributed to the following accomplishments in 2009:

We continued to invest in our natural gas businesses in key growth areas, as well as expand into new areas.

We made an entry into the prolific Marcellus Shale in Pennsylvania with two strategic joint ventures:

- i Williams and Atlas Pipeline Partners L.P. formed a midstream joint venture that owns a gathering system that includes 1,800 miles of intrastate natural gas gathering lines in the Marcellus Shale. Williams owns 51 percent of the joint venture and operates the gathering system.

- i Our Exploration & Production business unit also entered into the Marcellus Shale via an agreement to develop natural gas wells with Rex Energy Corporation. Under the agreement, Williams will acquire a right to earn a 50-percent interest in approximately 44,000 net acres for natural gas development.

We made strides on two key gas pipeline expansion projects in the Northeast:

- i Phase II of the Sentinel expansion was placed into service, increasing firm transportation capacity into the northeastern United States by 102,000 dekatherms per day.
- i Completion of a successful binding open season for the Northeast Supply Project, which is designed to provide East Coast markets with additional access to the natural gas supplies provided by the Transco pipeline, including the Marcellus Shale.

We continued to build upon our large-scale presence in western Colorado's Piceance Basin, with a number of accomplishments:

- i A new 450-million-cubic-feet-per-day (MMcfd) Willow Creek natural gas processing plant was completed and achieved full processing operations. At peak production, the Willow Creek plant will

Table of Contents

boost the volume of NGLs recovered by Williams in the basin by more than five times the previous levels.

- i We added to our substantial natural gas reserves in the Piceance Basin with a \$258 million acquisition of 21,800 net acres for natural gas production. The new acreage could represent an estimated 795 billion cubic feet equivalent (Bcfe) of net reserves. Of the estimated reserves, approximately 150 Bcfe are proved.
- i We completed the Colorado Hub Connection, a 26.4-mile pipeline and related facilities that connect a regional hub in the Piceance Basin to the Northwest Pipeline mainline system.

In addition to continuing to expand our natural gas businesses and drive stockholder value, we were recognized for our efforts to make the Company a great place to work for our employees:

- i The Houston Business Journal named Williams as the #1 Best Place to Work in Houston among companies not based in Houston. This was the second year in a row Williams was recognized on the Best Place to Work in Houston list, and the first time it won the top spot.
- i Utah Business magazine named Williams as a finalist in its Best Companies to Work for program, where the Company was recognized as one of the four best medium-sized companies in Utah.
- i OKCBiz magazine recognized Williams on its Best Places to Work in Oklahoma list for the second year in a row.

We made significant advancements in our environmental, social and governance practices:

- i We adopted an Indigenous People Policy, reflecting our commitment to operate in a way that respects the culture and values of indigenous people.
- i We were recognized with two awards for Operational Excellence by the Colorado Oil and Gas Conservation Commission: reclamation for mitigating the visibility of operations and for reducing noxious weeds.
- i Our exploration & production and gas pipeline business units received Continuing Excellence Awards for five and 15 years, respectively, of participation in the U.S. EPA Natural Gas STAR program.
- i We adopted the model code of conduct on corporate political spending and accountability developed by the Center for Political Accountability.

When setting pay, we determine a target pay mix (distribution of pay among base pay, annual incentive, equity, and other forms of compensation) for the NEOs. The target pay mix for all NEOs can be found in the Named Executive Officer Profile section included in this proxy statement. Consistent with our pay-for-performance philosophy, the actual amounts paid, excluding benefits, are determined based on individual and Company performance. Because performance is a factor, the target and actual pay mix will vary specifically as it relates to the annual cash incentives.

How We Determine the Amount for Each Type of Pay

Long-term incentives, annual cash incentives, base pay, and benefits accomplish different objectives.

Long-Term Incentives

We award long-term incentives to reward performance and align NEOs with long-term stockholder interests by providing NEOs an ownership stake in the Company, encouraging sustained long-term performance, and providing an important retention element to their compensation program. Long-term incentives are provided in the form of equity and may include performance based restricted stock units, stock options, and time-based restricted stock units. Unlike the majority of our comparator companies, we award a significant portion of the annual long-term award in the form of performance-based restricted stock units. We believe this better aligns our NEOs interests with long-term stockholders by requiring that stated targets are met prior to earning these awards.

To determine the value for long-term incentives granted to an NEO each year, we consider the following factors:

the proportion of long-term incentives relative to base pay;

Table of Contents

the NEO's impact on Company performance and ability to create value;

long-term business objectives;

awards made to executives in similar positions within our comparator group of companies;

the market demand for the NEO's particular skills and experience;

the amount granted to other NEO's in comparable positions at the Company;

the NEO's demonstrated performance over the past few years; and

the NEO's leadership performance.

The allocation of our long-term incentive program for 2009 is shown below. The long-term incentive mix for the CEO differs from the mix for the other NEOs. Since the CEO has more opportunity to influence our financial results, the Compensation Committee considers it appropriate that 100% of his long-term incentives are directly tied to the performance of the Company's stock price.

	CEO	Other NEOs
Performance-Based Restricted Stock Units	50%	35%
Stock Options	50%	30%
Time-Based Restricted Stock Units	0%	35%

The primary objectives for each type of equity awarded are shown below. The size of the circles in the chart indicates how closely each equity type aligns with each objective.

2009 Performance-Based Restricted Stock Units

Performance-based restricted stock unit awards further strengthen the relationship between pay and performance and over time will more closely link the long-term pay of our NEOs to the experience of our long-term stockholders. The performance-based restricted stock units awarded in 2009 will be earned only if we attain specific TSR targets.

We believe it is important to measure TSR on both an absolute and a relative basis. In absolute terms, we want to ensure we are delivering a suitable return to stockholders. Additionally, we believe awards should be influenced by how our TSR compares to the TSR of companies in our comparator group. The majority of our comparator companies do not have performance-based equity grants, but we believe this approach allows us to emphasize the importance of delivering value to the stockholder while also performing well against our comparator group of companies. It also ensures that our NEOs will only have the opportunity to earn an award that significantly exceeds targeted levels when we produce strong absolute and relative TSR results. Shown in the chart below are the absolute

Table of Contents

and relative TSR targets for the performance-based restricted stock unit awards for the 2009 to 2011 performance period and the continuum that will determine the resulting potential payout level:

2007 Performance-Based Restricted Stock Units

Since the performance cycle for our 2007 performance-based RSUs ended in 2009, the following is a chart of the threshold, target, and stretch goals that were established in early 2007.

EVA® (In millions)	Payout Level as a % of Target (Attainment %)
\$123	Threshold (where incentives start to be earned)
\$231	100%
\$339	200%

As discussed earlier in the Compensation Discussion and Analysis, we did not attain threshold performance during the three-year period as a result of the global economic crisis. No performance-based RSU awards that were granted in 2007 will be paid out under this plan. This resulted in each NEO losing a significant portion of pay that was targeted for 2007. The performance goals for this award were set during a less volatile time based on market guidance and expectations for our Company's performance.

Stock Option Awards

For recipients, stock options have value only to the extent the price of our common stock is higher on the date the options are exercised than it was on the date the options were granted. Most of the companies in our comparator group grant stock options to their NEOs.

Time-Based Restricted Stock Units

We introduced time-based restricted stock unit grants in 2002, primarily to encourage NEOs to stay with the Company during a period of uncertainty and instability in our executive population. We continue to use this type of equity to retain executives due to continued volatility in the industry and the general economy. Time-based restricted stock units also facilitate stock ownership. The use of time-based restricted stock units is also consistent with the practices of our comparator group of companies. Most of the companies in our comparator group grant time-based RSUs to their NEOs.

Table of Contents

Grant Practices

The Compensation Committee typically approves our annual equity grant in February or early March of each year shortly after the annual earnings release. The grant date for awards is on or after the date of such approval to ensure the market has time to absorb material information disclosed in the earnings release and reflect that information in the stock price. Our grant practices in 2009 were consistent with prior years.

The grant date for off-cycle grants for individuals who are not NEOs, for reasons such as retention or new hires, is the first business day of the month following the approval of the grant. By using this consistent approach, we remove grant timing from the influence of the release of material information.

Annual Cash Incentives

We pay annual cash incentives to encourage and reward our NEOs for making decisions that improve our performance as measured by EVA[®]. EVA[®] measures the value created by a company. Simply stated, it is the financial return in a given period less the capital charge for that period. The calculation we use is as follows:

$$\text{EVA}^{\text{®}} = \text{Net Operating Profits after Taxes (NOPAT)} \quad \text{Less} \quad \text{Capital Charge (the amount of capital invested by Williams multiplied by the cost of capital)}$$

Generating profits in excess of both operating and capital costs (debt and equity) creates EVA[®]. If EVA[®] improves, value has been created. The objectives of our EVA[®]-based incentive program are to:

Motivate and incent management to choose strategies and investments that maximize long-term stockholder value;

Offer sufficient incentive compensation to motivate management to put forth extra effort, take prudent risks and make tough decisions to maximize stockholder value;

Provide sufficient total compensation to retain management; and

Limit the cost of compensation to levels that will maximize the wealth of current stockholders without compromising the other objectives.

Annual Cash Incentives Target

The starting point to determine annual cash incentive targets (expressed as a percent of base pay) is competitive market information, which gives us an idea of what other companies target to pay in annual cash incentives for similar jobs. We also consider the internal value of each job - i.e., how important the job is to executing our strategy compared to other jobs in the Company- before the target is set for the year. The annual cash incentive targets as a percentage of base pay for the NEOs in 2009 are as follows:

CEO	100%
CFO	75%
Other NEOs	65%

Annual Cash Incentives Actual

For NEOs, the annual cash incentive plan is funded when we attain an established level of EVA[®] performance. Applying EVA[®] measurement to this annual cash incentive process encourages management to make business decisions that help drive long-term stockholder value. To determine the funding of the annual cash incentive, we use the following calculation for each NEO:

Base Pay received in 2009 X Incentive Target % X EVA Goal Attainment %

Actual payments may be adjusted upwards to recognize individual performance that exceeded expectations, such as success toward our 3Ps to Prosperity and individual goals and successful demonstration of the leadership competencies discussed below. Payments may also be adjusted downwards if performance warrants.

Table of Contents*How We Set the EVA[®] Goals*

Setting the EVA[®] goals for the annual cash incentive plan begins with internal budgeting and planning. This rigorous process includes an evaluation of the challenges and opportunities for the Company and each of our business units. The key steps are as follows:

Business and financial plans are submitted by the business units and consolidated by the corporate planning department.

The business and financial plans are reviewed and analyzed by the CEO, CFO and other NEOs.

Using the plan guidance, Management establishes the EVA[®] goal and recommends it to the Compensation Committee.

The Compensation Committee reviews, discusses and makes adjustments as necessary to management's recommendations and sets the goal at the beginning of each fiscal year.

Thereafter, progress toward the goal is regularly monitored and reported to the Compensation Committee throughout the year.

2009 EVA[®] Goal for the Annual Cash Incentive Plan

The attainment percentage of EVA[®] goals results in payment of annual cash incentives along a continuum between threshold and stretch levels, which corresponds to 0% through 250% of the NEO's annual cash incentive target. The chart below shows the EVA[®] improvement goals for the 2009 annual cash incentive and the resulting payout level. It is important to note that setting the EVA[®] goal for 2009 was more challenging than in previous years. 2008 was a record year with strong Company performance including EVA[®] improvement. When the global financial crisis hit, our profitability was cut and the cost of capital increased. This was reflected in both our lower EVA[®] and stock price.

EVA[®] (In millions)	Payout Level as a % of Target (Attainment %)
(\$1,172)	Threshold (where incentives start to be earned)
(\$956)	100%
(\$740)	200%

As noted, EVA considers both financial earnings and a cost of capital in measuring performance. The two main components of EVA are NOPAT and a charge for the cost of capital. EVA, like other performance metrics, has been impacted by the economic environment. A decline in NOPAT caused by lower energy commodity prices and a considerable increase in the cost of capital impacted EVA[®] in 2009. However, our NOPAT performance exceeded expectations, which were set in early 2009, and led to an AIP payout level that exceeded target performance.

Based on EVA[®] performance relative to the established goals, the Compensation Committee certified performance results of (\$825) million in EVA[®] and approved payment of the annual cash incentive plan at 155% of target.

The EVA[®] Calculation

EVA[®] is first calculated as previously discussed, NOPAT less Capital Charge. Our incentive program allows for the Compensation Committee to make adjustments to EVA[®] calculations to reflect certain business events. After studying companies that utilize EVA[®] as an incentive measure, we determined that it is standard practice to make adjustments to EVA[®] calculations to create better alignment with stockholders.

When determining which adjustments are appropriate, we are guided by the principle that incentive payments should not result in unearned windfalls or impose undue penalties. In other words, we make adjustments to ensure NEOs are not rewarded for positive results they did not facilitate nor are they penalized for certain unusual circumstances outside their control. We believe the adjustments improve the alignment of incentives with

Table of Contents

stockholder value creation and ensure EVA[®] is an incentive measure that effectively encourages NEOs to take actions to create value for stockholders. The categories of potential adjustments to our EVA[®] calculation are:

Gains, losses and impairments;

Mark-to-market, commodity price collar, and construction work-in-progress; and

Other unusual items that could result in unearned windfalls or undue penalties to NEOs such as certain litigation matters and natural disasters.

Management regularly reviews with the Compensation Committee a supplemental scorecard reflecting the Company's segment profit, earnings per share, cash flow from operations, and safety to provide updates regarding the Company's performance as well as to ensure alignment between these measures and EVA[®]. This scorecard provides the Committee with additional data to assist in determining final AIP awards. As discussed above, there is strong correlation between our EVA performance and other metrics included on the supplemental scorecard.

The Compensation Committee's outside independent compensation consultant annually compares our relative performance on various measures, including total stockholder return, earnings per share and cash flow, with our comparator group to ensure we are consistently delivering stockholder value. The Compensation Committee also uses this analysis to validate our EVA[®] results.

Base Pay

Base pay compensates the NEOs for carrying out the duties of their jobs, and serves as the foundation of our pay program. Most other major components of pay are set based on a relationship to base pay, including annual and long-term incentives, and retirement benefits.

Base pay for the NEOs, including the CEO, is set considering the market median, with potential individual variation from the median due to experience, skills, and sustained performance of the individual as part of our pay-for-performance philosophy. Performance is measured in two ways; through the Right Results obtained in the Right Way. Right Results considers the NEOs' success in attaining their annual goals as they relate to the 3Ps to Prosperity, business unit strategies, and personal development plans. Right Way reflects the NEOs' behavior as exhibited through our leadership competencies. The following table contains these competencies grouped within our five leadership areas.

MODEL THE WAY	INSPIRE A SHARED VISION	CHAMPION INNOVATION	LEVERAGE TALENT	OPTIMIZE BUSINESS PERFORMANCE
Caring About People	Enterprise Perspective	Change Leadership	Building Effective Teams	Business Acumen
Integrity	Vision and Strategic Perspective	Entrepreneurial Spirit	Communication	Customer and Market Focus
Loyalty and Commitment				Decision Making

Promoting Diversity and Creativity	Developing People Resources	
Willingness to Take Risks	Empowering Others	Drive for Results
	Managerial Courage	Functional/Technical Skills
	Motivating and Inspiring Others	

Table of Contents

For 2009, no base pay increases were made to any NEO or other officers of the Company. The ratio of 2008 base pay to the market median remained appropriate when we considered the current environment and the experience, skills, and sustained performance of the NEOs. The following chart includes the 2009 market ratio for the NEOs.

Executive Officer	Position	% Increase from 2008	2009 Base Pay as a % of Market Median
Steven J. Malcolm	CEO	0%	106%
Donald R. Chappel	CFO	0%	108%
Alan S. Armstrong	Senior Vice President, Midstream	0%	102%
Ralph A. Hill	Senior Vice President, Exploration & Production	0%	102%
Phillip D. Wright	Senior Vice President, Gas Pipelines	0%	105%

Benefits

Consistent with our philosophy to emphasize pay for performance, our NEOs receive very few perquisites (perks) or supplemental benefits. They are as follows:

Retirement Restoration Benefits: NEOs participate in our qualified retirement program on the same terms as our other employees. We offer a retirement restoration plan to our NEOs to maintain a proportional level of pension benefits to our NEOs as provided to other employees. The Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended (the Internal Revenue Code), limits qualified pension benefits based on an annual compensation limit. For 2009, the limit was \$245,000. Any reduction in an NEO's pension benefit in the tax-qualified pension plan due to this limit is made up for (subject to a cap) in the unfunded restoration retirement plan. Benefits for NEOs are calculated using the same benefit formula as that used to calculate benefits for all employees in the qualified pension plan. The value of pay in the form of stock option or other equity is not used in the formula to calculate benefits under the pension plan or restoration plan for NEOs, which is consistent with the treatment for all employees. Additionally, we do not provide a nonqualified benefit related to our qualified 401(k) defined contribution retirement plan.

Financial Planning Allowance: We offer financial planning to provide expertise on current tax laws to assist NEOs with personal financial planning and preparations for contingencies such as death and disability. In addition, by working with a financial planner, NEOs gain a better understanding of and appreciation for the programs the Company provides, which helps to maximize the retention and engagement aspects of the dollars the Company spends on these programs.

Home security: We pay home security system and monitoring for our CEO to ensure personal safety.

Personal Use of Company Aircraft: We provide limited personal use of the Company aircraft at the CEO's discretion. As shown in the footnotes to the 2009 Summary Compensation Table, the incremental cost associated with aircraft usage for personal reasons in 2009 was limited to Messrs. Malcolm, Hill, and Wright. The incremental cost to the Company of all trips was approximately \$50,722. The CEO is required to use the Company aircraft for all air travel. Our policy for all other executive officers is to discourage personal use of the aircraft, but the CEO retains discretion to permit its use when he deems appropriate, such as when the destination is not well served by commercial airlines, personal emergencies, and the aircraft is not being used for business purposes.

Event Center: We have a suite and club seats at an event center that were purchased for business purposes. If it is not being used for business purposes, we make them available to our employees, including our NEOs, as a form of reward and recognition.

Executive Physicals: The Compensation Committee approved mandated physicals for the NEOs beginning in 2009. NEO physicals align with our wellness initiative as well as assist in mitigating risk. Mandated NEO physicals reduce vacancy succession risk because they help to identify and prevent issues that would leave a NEO role vacated unexpectedly.

Table of Contents**Additional Components of our Executive Compensation Program**

In addition to establishing the pay elements described above, we have adopted a number of policies to further the goals of the executive compensation program, particularly with respect to strengthening the alignment of our NEOs interests with stockholder long-term interests.

Recoupment Policy

In 2008, the Compensation Committee approved a recoupment policy to allow the Company to recover incentive-based compensation from NEOs in the event we are required to restate our financial statements due to fraud or intentional misconduct. The policy provides the Board discretion to determine situations where recovery of incentive pay is appropriate.

Stock Ownership Guidelines

All NEOs must hold an equity interest in the Company. The chart below shows the NEO stock ownership guidelines, which have been in effect since 2005.

Position	Holding Requirement as a % of Base Pay	Time Frame for Compliance
CEO	5 times	5 Years
NEO	3 times	5 Years

Annually the Compensation Committee reviews the guidelines for competitiveness and alignment with best practice and monitors the NEOs progress toward compliance. Shares owned outright, unvested performance-based and time-based restricted stock units count as owned for purposes of the program. Stock options are not included. The Compensation Committee maintains discretion to modify the guidelines in special circumstances of financial hardship such as illness of the NEO or a family member.

Derivative Transactions

Our insider trading policy applies to transactions in positions or interests whose value is based on the performance or price of our common stock. Because of the inherent potential for abuse, Williams discourages employees and directors from entering into short sales or use of equivalent derivative securities. In addition, our insider trading policy requires that officers, directors, and certain key employees seeking to enter into such a transaction obtain pre-clearance. There were no derivative transactions for 2009.

Accounting and Tax Treatment

We consider the impact of accounting and tax treatment when designing all aspects of pay, but the primary driver of our program design is to support our business objectives. Stock options and performance-based restricted stock units are intended to satisfy the requirements for performance-based compensation as defined in Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code and are therefore considered a tax deductible expense. Time-based restricted stock units do not qualify as performance-based and may not be fully deductible.

The annual cash incentive plan satisfies the requirements for performance-based compensation as defined in Section 162(m) of the Internal Revenue Code and is therefore a tax deductible expense. For payments under our annual cash incentive plan to be considered performance-based compensation under Section 162(m), the Compensation Committee can only exercise negative discretion relative to actual performance when determining the amount to be paid. In order to ensure compliance with Section 162(m), the Compensation Committee has established a target in excess of the maximum individual payout allowed to NEOs under our annual cash incentive plan. Reductions are made each year and are not a reflection of the performance of the NEOs but rather ensure flexibility with respect to paying based upon performance.

Table of Contents

Employment Agreements

We do not enter into employment agreements with our NEOs. We can remove a NEO when it is in the best interest of the Company.

Termination and Severance Arrangements

The NEOs are not covered under a severance plan. However the Compensation Committee exercises judgment and considers the circumstances surrounding each departure and may decide a severance package is appropriate. In designing a severance package, the Compensation Committee takes into consideration the NEO's term of employment, past accomplishments, reasons for separation from the Company, and competitive market practice. The only pay or benefits an employee has a right to receive upon termination of employment are those that have already vested or which vest under the terms in place when equity was granted.

Rationale for Change in Control Agreements

Our change in control program provides severance benefits for our NEOs. Our program includes a double trigger for benefits and equity vesting; there must be a change in control and the NEO's employment must terminate. While a double trigger for equity is not the competitive norm of our comparator group, this practice creates security for the NEOs but does not provide an incentive for the NEO to leave the Company. Our program is designed to encourage the NEOs to focus on the best interests of stockholders by alleviating their concerns about a possible detrimental impact to their compensation and benefits under a potential change in control, not to provide compensation advantages to NEOs for executing a transaction.

Our Compensation Committee reviews our change in control benefits annually to ensure they are consistent with competitive practice and aligned with our compensation philosophy. As part of the review, calculations are performed to determine the overall program costs to the Company if a change in control event were to occur and all covered NEOs were terminated as a result. An assessment of competitive norms including the reasonableness of the elements of compensation received is used to validate benefit levels for a change in control. In reviews of the change in control program to date, the Compensation Committee has concluded that the current benefits provided are appropriate and critical to attracting and retaining executive talent.

Table of Contents

The following chart details the benefits received if an NEO were to be terminated following a change in control as well as an analysis of those benefits as it relates to the Company, stockholders, and the NEO. Please also see the Change in Control Agreements section in this proxy statement for further discussion of our change in control program.

Change in Control Benefit	What does the benefit provide to the Company and stockholders?	What does the benefit provide to the NEO?
Multiple of 3x base pay plus annual cash incentive at target	Encourages NEOs to remain engaged and stay focused on successfully closing the deal.	Financial security for the NEO equivalent to three years of continued employment.
Accelerated vesting of stock awards	An incentive to stay during and after a change in control. If there is risk of forfeiture, NEOs may be less inclined to stay or to support the transaction.	The NEOs are kept whole, if they have a separation from service following a change in control.
Up to 18 months of medical or health coverage through COBRA	This is a minimal cost to the Company that creates a competitive benefit.	Access to health coverage.
3x the previous years retirement restoration allocation	This is a minimal cost to the Company that creates a competitive benefit.	May allow those NEOs who are nearing retirement to receive a cash payment to make up for lost allocations due to a change in control.
Reimbursement of legal fees to enforce benefit	Keeps NEOs focused on the Company and not concerned about whether the acquiring company will honor commitments after a change in control.	Security during a non-stable period of time.
Outplacement assistance	Keeps NEOs focused on supporting the transaction and less concerned about trying to secure another position.	Assists NEOs in finding a comparable executive position.
Gross up on excise and income tax	Ensures that the change in control benefits discussed above are delivered.	Eliminates the risk of paying the excise tax on a payment NEOs cannot control. The gross up helps to ensure the full intended benefit is delivered to the NEO.

Table of Contents

COMPENSATION COMMITTEE REPORT ON EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION

We have reviewed and discussed the foregoing Compensation Discussion and Analysis with management. Based on our review and discussions with management, we recommend to the Board of Directors that the Compensation Discussion and Analysis be included in this proxy statement and in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year ended December 31, 2009.

By the members of the Compensation Committee of the Board of Directors:

W. R. Howell, Chairman
Kathleen B. Cooper
William R. Granberry
George A. Lorch
Frank T. MacInnis
Janice D. Stoney

Table of Contents**EXECUTIVE COMPENSATION AND OTHER INFORMATION****2009 Summary Compensation Table**

The following table sets forth certain information with respect to the compensation of the NEOs earned during fiscal years 2009, 2008 and 2007.

Officer and Principal	Year	Salary(1)	Bonus	Stock Awards(2)	Option Awards(3)	Non-Equity Incentive Plan Compensation(4)	Change in Pension Value and Nonqualified Deferred Compensation(5)	All Other Compensation(6)	Total Compensation
J. Malcolm man, President & Executive Officer	2009	\$ 1,142,308	\$	\$ 2,116,863	\$ 2,846,407	\$ 1,903,360	\$ 1,399,796	\$ 71,100	\$ 9,47
	2008	1,094,231		2,906,309	2,789,127	2,000,000	1,201,514	56,215	10,04
	2007	1,050,000		2,731,000	1,818,000	2,373,086	369,208	46,484	8,38
R. Chappel Vice President, Financial Officer	2009	623,077		1,242,734	618,783	\$ 765,047	\$ 383,380	\$ 17,822	\$ 3,65
	2008	597,115		2,114,349	651,405	780,008	330,531	14,772	4,48
	2007	572,115		1,565,783	440,411	925,752	126,797	14,459	3,64
A. Hill Vice President, Production & Operation	2009	503,654		1,056,319	525,969	\$ 566,473	\$ 427,867	\$ 37,001	\$ 3,11
	2008	480,962		1,606,867	495,071	579,633	363,151	29,586	3,55
	2007	446,538		1,409,199	396,369	662,532	26,578	58,284	2,99
D. Wright Vice President, Operations	2009	519,231		994,187	495,029	\$ 561,642	\$ 419,915	\$ 21,510	\$ 3,01
	2008	497,692		1,268,581	390,840	557,418	381,705	10,010	3,10
	2007	477,692		1,096,059	308,287	669,676	68,048	9,801	2,62
Armstrong Vice President, Team	2009	503,654		994,187	495,029	\$ 567,308	\$ 293,795	\$ 23,434	\$ 2,87
	2008	480,962		1,268,581	390,840	580,884	273,091	14,586	3,00
	2007	446,538		1,096,059	308,287	664,410	32,110	16,615	2,56

(1) **Salary.** No salary increases were provided to NEOs in 2009. The increase in salary is due to a payroll timing issue resulting in a twenty-seventh bi-weekly pay period in 2009.

(2) **Stock Awards.** Awards were granted under the terms of the 2002 Incentive Plan and the 2007 Incentive Plan and include time-based and performance-based RSUs with the exception of the CEO, who receives only performance-based RSUs. Amounts shown are the grant date fair value of awards computed in accordance with FASB ASC Topic 718. The assumptions used to value the stock awards can be found in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year-ended December 31, 2009.

The potential maximum values of the performance-based RSUs, subject to changes in performance outcomes, are as follows:

	2009 Performance-Based RSU Maximum potential
Steven J. Malcolm	\$ 4,233,727
Donald R. Chappel	1,073,769
Ralph A. Hill	912,700
Phillip D. Wright	859,015
Alan S. Armstrong	859,015

- (3) **Option Awards.** Awards are granted under the terms of the 2002 Incentive Plan and the 2007 Incentive Plan and include non-qualified stock options. Amounts shown are the grant date fair value of awards computed in accordance with FASB ASC Topic 718. The assumptions used to value the option awards can be found in our Annual Report on Form 10-K for the year-ended December 31, 2009.
- (4) **Non-Equity Incentive Plan.** As stated in the Compensation Discussion and Analysis in this proxy statement, the maximum annual incentive pool funding for NEOs was adjusted to 250% of target and the incentive reserve has been eliminated, beginning in 2009. Any existing reserve balance for NEOs will continue to be at risk and one-third will be paid if the threshold performance target is met or the balance will be reduced if threshold is not met in accordance with previous plan provisions. Threshold performance was met in 2009 and one-third of the respective reserve balance was paid to each NEO.

Table of Contents

The annual cash incentive and reserve amounts paid in 2010 as it relates to 2009 performance are as follows:

	Reserve Balance	AIP for 2009	Amount of Reserve Paid in 2010	Total AIP plus Reserve for 2009
Steven J. Malcolm	\$ 364,115	\$ 1,782,000	\$ 121,360	\$ 1,903,360
Donald R. Chappel	90,151	735,000	30,047	765,047
Ralph A. Hill	109,431	530,000	36,473	566,473
Phillip D. Wright	94,934	530,000	31,642	561,642
Alan S. Armstrong	111,936	530,000	37,308	567,308

- (5) **Change in Pension Value and Nonqualified Deferred Compensation Earnings.** The amount shown is the aggregate change from December 31, 2008 to December 31, 2009 in the actuarial present value of the accrued benefit under the qualified pension and supplemental plan. Please refer to the Pension Benefits table for further details of the present value of the accrued benefit. The primary reason for the increase in present value in 2008 and 2009 is due to the use of a reduced discount rate. The lower discount rate results in a larger present value amount. Likewise, the amounts shown for 2007 reflect the use of an increased discount rate which decreases the present value at the end of that year.
- (6) **All Other Compensation.** Amounts shown represent payments made on behalf of the NEOs and includes life insurance premium, a 401(k) matching contribution, and perquisites (if applicable). Perquisites include financial planning services, mandated annual physical exam, home security monitoring system for the CEO and personal use of the Company aircraft. The incremental cost method was used to calculate the personal use of the Company aircraft. The incremental cost calculation includes such items as fuel, maintenance, weather and airport services, pilot meals, pilot overnight expenses, aircraft telephone and catering. The amount of perquisites for Mr. Malcolm, Mr. Hill, and Mr. Wright is included because the aggregate amount exceeds \$10,000.

	Financial Planning	Annual Physical Exam	Home Security	Company Aircraft Personal Usage
Steven J. Malcolm(A)	\$ 15,000	\$	\$ 427	\$ 39,353
Ralph A. Hill	15,000	3,541		2,974
Phillip D. Wright		2,505		8,395

(A) The Company did not incur any additional charges for Mr. Malcolm's mandatory physical exam, other than what was covered by the regular benefit plan, as is available to all employees.

Notable Items

The Compensation Committee considers the compensation of CEOs from similarly-sized comparator companies when setting Mr. Malcolm's pay. It is the competitive norm for CEOs to be paid more than other NEOs. In addition, the Compensation Committee believes the difference in pay between the CEO and other NEOs is consistent with our compensation philosophy (summarized in the Compensation Discussion and Analysis), which considers the external (market) and internal value of each job to the Company along with the incumbent's experience and performance of the

job in setting pay. The CEO's job is different from the other NEOs because the CEO has ultimate responsibility for performance results and is accountable to the Board and stockholders. Consequently, the Compensation Committee believes it is appropriate for the CEO's pay to be higher.

Mr. Chappel's base pay, annual cash incentive target and long-term incentive amounts for 2009 are higher than other NEOs (other than the CEO) because of the impact of his role and market data. Because Mr. Chappel directly interfaces with stockholders and has greater accountability to stockholders, his pay is greater than that of the other NEOs, excluding the CEO.

Table of Contents**Grants of Plan Based Awards**

The following table sets forth certain information with respect to the grant of stock options, restricted stock units and awards payable under the Company's annual cash incentive plan during the last fiscal year to the NEOs.

Grant Date	Estimated Future Payouts Under Non-Equity Incentive Plan Awards(1)			Estimated Future Payouts Under Equity Incentive Plan Awards			All Other Stock Awards: Number of Shares of Stock or Units(3)	All Other Option Awards: Number of Underlying Options(4)	Exercise or Base Price of Option Awards	Grant Fair Value
	Threshold	Target	Maximum	Threshold	Target(2)	Maximum				
2/23/2009	\$ 121,360	\$ 1,263,668	\$ 2,977,130					508,287	\$ 10.86	\$ 2
2/23/2009				288,401		576,802				2
2/23/2009	30,047	497,355	1,198,316					110,497	10.86	
2/23/2009					73,145	146,290				
2/23/2009							73,145			
2/23/2009	36,473	363,848	854,911					93,923	10.86	
2/23/2009					62,173	124,346				
2/23/2009							62,173			
2/23/2009	31,642	369,142	875,392					88,398	10.86	
2/23/2009					58,516	117,032				
2/23/2009							58,516			
2/23/2009	37,308	364,683	855,746					88,398	10.86	
2/23/2009					58,516	117,032				
2/23/2009							58,516			

(1) Non-Equity Incentive Awards. Awards from the 2009 AIP are shown.

Threshold: Because one-third of the AIP reserve balance from prior years is payable in 2010 upon meeting threshold performance, one-third of the NEO's reserve balance is shown.

Target: The amount shown is based upon an EVA[®] attainment of 100%, plus one-third of the existing AIP reserve balance.

Maximum: The maximum amount the NEOs can receive is 250% of their AIP target, plus one-third of the AIP reserve balance.

- (2) Represents performance-based RSUs granted under the 2007 Incentive Plan. Performance-based RSUs can be earned over a three-year period only if the established performance target is met and the NEO is employed on the certification date, subject to certain exceptions such as the executive's death or disability. These shares will be distributed no earlier than the third anniversary of the grant other than due to a termination upon a change in control. If performance plan goals are exceeded, the NEO can receive up to 200% of target. If plan goals are not met, the NEO can receive as little as 0% of target.
- (3) Represents time-based RSUs granted under the 2007 Incentive Plan. Time-based units vest three years from the grant date of 2/23/2009 on 2/23/2012.
- (4) Represents stock options granted under the 2007 Incentive Plan. Stock options granted in 2009 become exercisable in three equal annual installments beginning one year after the grant date. One-third of the options vested on 2/23/2010. Another one-third will vest on 2/23/2011, with the final one-third vesting on 2/23/2012. Once vested, stock options are exercisable for a period of 10 years from the grant date.

Table of Contents

Outstanding Equity Awards

The following table sets forth certain information with respect to the outstanding equity awards held by the NEOs at the end of 2009.

	Option Awards					Stock Awards				
	Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Options (#)	Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Options (#)	Equity Incentive Plan Awards: Number of Securities Underlying Unexercised Options (#)	Exercise Price	Expiration Date	Grant Date	Market Value of Shares or Units That Have Not Vested	Market Value of Shares or Units That Have Not Vested	Equity Incentive Plan Awards: Number of Shares, Units of Stock or Other Rights That Have Not Vested	Equity Incentive Plan Awards: Market Value of Unearned Shares or Other Rights That Have Not Vested
J. m	2/23/2009	508,287		\$ 10.86	2/23/2019	2/23/2009(3)			288,401	\$ 6,079
	2/25/2008	72,463	144,928	36.50	2/25/2018	2/25/2008(3)			82,192	1,732
	2/26/2007	133,333	66,667	28.30	2/26/2017	2/26/2007(3)			100,000	2,108
	3/3/2006	250,000		21.67	3/3/2016					
	2/25/2005	225,000		19.29	2/25/2015					
	2/5/2004	300,000		9.93	2/5/2014					
	11/27/2002	475,000		2.58	11/27/2012					
	2/11/2002	200,000		15.86	2/11/2012					
	9/19/2001	33,333		26.79	9/19/2011					
	4/2/2001	27,232		39.98	4/2/2011					
	1/18/2001	114,373		34.77	1/18/2011					
	3/16/2000	65,356		42.29	3/16/2010					
R. el	2/23/2009		110,497	10.86	2/23/2019	2/23/2009(2)			73,145	1,541
	2/25/2008	16,924	33,848	36.50	2/25/2018	2/23/2009(3)			73,145	1,541
	2/26/2007	32,300	16,150	28.30	2/26/2017	2/25/2008(2)			19,911	419

Edgar Filing: WILLIAMS COMPANIES INC - Form PRE 14A

3/3/2006	41,921		21.67	3/3/2016	2/25/2008(3)	39,822	839
2/25/2005	55,000		19.29	2/25/2015	2/26/2007(2)	19,069	401
2/5/2004	75,000		9.93	2/5/2014	2/26/2007(3)	38,139	803
4/16/2003	175,000		5.10	4/16/2013			

A.

2/23/2009		93,923	10.86	2/23/2019	2/23/2009(2)	62,173	1,310
2/25/2008	12,862	25,725	36.50	2/25/2018	2/23/2009(3)	62,173	1,310
2/26/2007	29,070	14,535	28.30	2/26/2017	2/25/2008(2)	15,132	318
3/3/2006	30,488		21.67	3/3/2016	2/25/2008(3)	30,264	637
2/25/2005	40,000		19.29	2/25/2015	2/26/2007(2)	17,162	361
1/18/2001	22,875		34.77	1/18/2011	2/26/2007(3)	34,325	723
3/16/2000	22,875		42.29	3/16/2010			

D.

t

2/23/2009		88,398	10.86	2/23/2019	2/23/2009(2)	58,516	1,233
2/25/2008	10,154	20,309	36.50	2/25/2018	2/23/2009(3)	58,516	1,233
2/26/2007	22,610	11,305	28.30	2/26/2017	2/25/2008(2)	11,946	251
3/3/2006	24,136		21.67	3/3/2016	2/25/2008(3)	23,893	503
2/25/2005	40,000		19.29	2/25/2015	2/26/2007(2)	13,349	281
2/5/2004	55,000		9.93	2/5/2014	2/26/2007(3)	26,697	562
11/27/2002	75,000		2.58	11/27/2012			
2/11/2002	70,000		15.86	2/11/2012			
9/19/2001	17,500		26.79	9/19/2011			
1/18/2001	9,803		34.77	1/18/2011			
3/16/2000	20,424		42.29	3/16/2010			

S.

rong

2/23/2009		88,398	10.86	2/23/2019	2/23/2009(2)	58,516	1,233
2/25/2008	10,154	20,309	36.50	2/25/2018	2/23/2009(3)	58,516	1,233
2/26/2007	22,610	11,305	28.30	2/26/2017	2/25/2008(2)	11,946	251
3/3/2006	24,136		21.67	3/3/2016	2/25/2008(3)	23,893	503
2/25/2005	40,000		19.29	2/25/2015	2/26/2007(2)	13,349	281
2/5/2004	55,000		9.93	2/5/2014	2/26/2007(3)	26,697	562
11/27/2002	10,000		2.58	11/27/2012			
5/16/2002	7,917		15.71	5/16/2012			
2/11/2002	12,500		15.86	2/11/2012			
1/18/2001	14,297		34.77	1/18/2011			
3/16/2000	11,437		42.29	3/16/2010			

Stock Options

(1) The following table reflects the vesting schedules for associated stock option grant dates for awards that had not been 100% vested as of December 31, 2009:

Grant Date	Vesting Schedule	Vesting Dates
------------	------------------	---------------

2/23/2009	One-third vests each year for three years	2/23/2010, 2/23/2011, 2/23/2012
2/25/2008	One-third vests each year for three years	2/25/2009, 2/25/2010, 2/25/2011
2/26/2007	One-third vests each year for three years	2/26/2008, 2/26/2009, 2/26/2010

Table of Contents**Stock Awards**

(2) The following table reflects the vesting dates for associated time-based restricted stock unit award grant dates:

Grant Date	Vesting Schedule	Vesting Dates
2/23/2009	100% vests in three years	2/23/2012
2/25/2008	100% vests in three years	2/25/2011
2/26/2007	100% vests in three years	2/26/2010

(3) All performance-based RSUs are subject to attainment of performance targets established by the Compensation Committee. These awards will vest no earlier than the end of the performance period and therefore do not have a specific vesting date. The awards included on the table are outstanding as of December 31, 2009.

(4) Values are based on a closing stock price of \$21.08 on December 31, 2009.

Option Exercises and Stock Vested

The following table sets forth certain information with respect to options exercised by the NEO and stock that vested during fiscal year 2009:

Name	Option Awards		Stock Awards	
	Number of Shares	Value Realized	Number of Shares	Value Realized
	Acquired on Exercise	on Exercise	Acquired on Vesting	Value Realized on Vesting
Steven J. Malcolm			215,000	\$ 2,408,900
Donald R. Chappel			97,656	1,105,419
Ralph A. Hill			72,840	831,170
Phillip D. Wright			61,832	720,430
Alan S. Armstrong			61,832	720,430

The Compensation Committee determines pay based on a target total compensation amount. While the Compensation Committee reviews tally sheet and wealth accumulation information on each NEO, thus far amounts realized from previous equity grants have not been a material factor when the Committee determines pay. How much compensation the NEOs actually receive is significantly impacted by the stock market performance of the Company's shares.

Retirement Plan

The retirement plan for the Company's executives consists of two programs: the pension plan and the retirement restoration plan as described below. Together these plans provide the same level of benefits to our executives as the pension plan provides to all other employees of the Company. The retirement restoration plan was implemented to address the annual compensation limit of the Internal Revenue Code.

Pension Plan

Our executives who have completed one year of service participate in our pension plan on the same terms as our other employees. Our pension plan is a noncontributory, tax qualified defined benefit plan (with a cash balance design) subject to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended.

Each year, participants earn compensation credits that are posted to their cash balance account. The annual compensation credits are equal to the sum of a percentage of eligible pay (base pay and certain bonuses) and a

Table of Contents

percentage of eligible pay greater than the social security wage base. The percentage credited is based upon the participant's age as shown in the following table:

Age	Percentage of Eligible Pay	+	Percent of Eligible Pay Greater than the Social Security Wage Base
Less than 30	4.5%	+	from 1% to 1.2%
30-39	6%	+	2%
40-49	8%	+	3%
50 or over	10%	+	5%

For participants who were active employees and participants under the plan on March 31, 1998, and April 1, 1998, the percentage of eligible pay is increased by 0.3% multiplied by the participant's total years of benefit service earned as of March 31, 1998.

In addition, interest is credited to account balances quarterly at a rate determined annually in accordance with the terms of the plan.

The monthly annuity available to those who take normal retirement is based on the participant's account balance as of the date of retirement. Normal retirement age is 65. Early retirement eligibility begins at 55. At retirement, participants may choose to receive a single-life annuity (for single participants) or a qualified joint and survivor annuity (for married participants) or they may choose one of several other forms of payment having an actuarial value equal to that of the relevant annuity.

Retirement Restoration Plan

The Internal Revenue Code limits pension benefits based on the annual compensation limit that can be accrued in tax-qualified defined benefit plans, such as our pension plan. Any reduction in an executive's pension benefit accrual due to these limits will be compensated, subject to a cap, under an unfunded top hat plan — our retirement restoration plan.

The elements of compensation that are included in applying the payment and benefit formula for the retirement restoration plan are the same elements that are used, except for application of a cap, in the base pension plan for all employees. The elements of pay included in that definition are total base pay, including any overtime, base pay-reduction amounts, and cash bonus awards, if paid (unless specifically excluded under a written bonus or incentive-pay arrangement). Specifically excluded from the definition are severance pay, cost-of-living pay, housing pay, relocation pay (including mortgage interest differential), taxable and non-taxable fringe benefits, and all other extraordinary pay, including any amounts received from equity compensation awards.

With respect to bonuses, annual cash incentives are considered in determining eligible pay under the pension plan. Long-term equity compensation incentives are not considered.

Pension Benefits

The following table sets forth certain information with respect to the actuarial present value of the accrued benefit under the qualified pension and retirement restoration plan:

Name	Plan Name	Number of Years Credited Services	Present Value of Accrued Benefit(1)	Payments During Last Fiscal Year
Steven J. Malcolm(2)(3)	Pension Plan	26	\$ 798,191	
	Retirement Restoration Plan	26	4,784,547	
Donald R. Chappel(3)	Pension Plan	7	215,326	
	Retirement Restoration Plan	7	1,124,235	
Ralph A. Hill	Pension Plan	26	521,773	
	Retirement Restoration Plan	26	1,070,483	
Phillip D. Wright	Pension Plan	21	475,517	
	Retirement Restoration Plan	21	1,185,269	
Alan S. Armstrong	Pension Plan	24	356,171	
	Retirement Restoration Plan	24	716,608	

Table of Contents

- (1) The primary actuarial assumptions used to determine the present values include an annual interest credit to normal retirement age equal to 5% and a discount rate equal to 5.9%.
- (2) If Mr. Malcolm were to retire from active service prior to age 65, he would be eligible to receive an enhanced retirement based on his Rule of 55 eligibility. The Rule of 55 is a transition benefit that was provided to all employees meeting the eligibility criteria at the time the Company's pension plan was converted from a final average pay formula to a cash balance formula. To be eligible for the Rule of 55 enhancement an employee's age and years of service at the time of the cash balance conversion in 1998 must have totaled 55.
- (3) Mr. Malcolm and Mr. Chappel are the only NEOs eligible to retire as of 12/31/2009.

Nonqualified Deferred Compensation

We do not provide nonqualified deferred compensation for any of our NEOs or other employees.

Change In Control Agreements

We have entered into change in control agreements with each of our NEOs to facilitate continuity of management if there is a change in control of the Company. The provisions of such agreements are described below. The definitions of words in quotations are also provided below.

If during the term of a change in control agreement, a change in control occurs and (i) the employment of any NEO is terminated other than for cause, disability, death or a disqualification disaggregation or (ii) an NEO resigns for good reason, such NEO is entitled to the following:

Within 10 business days after the termination date:

Accrued but unpaid base salary, accrued earned but unpaid cash incentive, accrued but unpaid paid time off, and any other amounts or benefits due but not paid (lump sum payment);

On the first business day following six months after the termination date:

Prorated annual bonus for the year of separation through the termination date (lump sum payment);

A severance amount equal to three times his base salary as of the termination date plus an annual bonus amount equal to his target percentage multiplied by his base salary in effect at the termination date as if performance goals were achieved at 100% (lump sum payment);

An amount equal to three times the total allocations made by Williams for the NEO in the preceding calendar year under our retirement restoration plan (lump sum payment);

An amount equal to the sum of the value of the unvested portion of the NEO's accounts or accrued benefits under the Company's 401K plan that would have otherwise been forfeited (lump sum payment);

Continued participation in the Company's medical benefit plans for so long as the NEO elects coverage or 18 months from the termination, whichever is less, in the same manner and at the same cost as similarly situated active employees;

All restrictions on stock options held by the NEO will lapse, and the options will vest and become immediately exercisable;

All restricted stock will vest and will be paid out only in accordance with the terms of the respective award agreements;

Continued participation in the Company's directors' and officers' liability insurance for six years or any longer known applicable statute of limitations period;

Indemnification as set forth under the Company's bylaws; and

Outplacement benefits for six months at a cost not exceeding \$25,000.

Table of Contents

In addition, each NEO is generally entitled to receive a gross-up payment in an amount sufficient to make him whole for any federal excise tax on excess parachute payments imposed under Section 280G and 4999 of the Internal Revenue Code or any similar tax under any state, local, foreign or other law (other than Section 409A of the Internal Revenue Code).

If an NEO's employment is terminated for cause during the period beginning upon a change of control and continuing for two years or until the termination of the agreement, whichever happens first, the NEO is entitled to accrued but unpaid base salary, accrued earned but unpaid cash incentive, accrued but unpaid paid time off, and any other amounts or benefits due but not paid (lump sum payment).

The agreements with our NEOs use the following definitions:

Cause means an NEO's

conviction of or a plea of nolo contendere to a felony or a crime involving fraud, dishonesty or moral turpitude;

willful or reckless material misconduct in the performance of his duties that has an adverse effect on Williams or any of its subsidiaries or affiliates;

willful or reckless violation or disregard of the code of business conduct of Williams or the policies of Williams or its subsidiaries; or

habitual or gross neglect of his duties.

Cause generally does not include bad judgment or negligence (other than habitual neglect or gross negligence); acts or omissions made in good faith after reasonable investigation by the NEO or acts or omissions with respect to which the Board could determine that the NEO had satisfied the standards of conduct for indemnification or reimbursement under the Company's bylaws, indemnification agreement, or applicable law; or failure (despite good faith efforts) to meet performance goals, objectives, or measures for a period beginning upon a change of control and continuing for two years or until the termination of the agreement, whichever happens first. An NEO's act or failure to act (except as relates to a conviction or plea of nolo contendere described above), when done in good faith and with a reasonable belief after reasonable investigation that such action or non-action was in the best interest of Williams or its affiliate or required by law shall not be Cause if the NEO cures the action or non-action within 10 days of notice. Furthermore, no act or failure to act will be Cause if the NEO acted under the advice of Williams' counsel or required by the legal process.

Change in control means:

Any person or group (other than an affiliate of Williams or an employee benefit plan sponsored by Williams or its affiliates) becomes a beneficial owner, as such term is defined under the Exchange Act, of 20% or more of the Company's common stock or 20% or more of the combined voting power of all securities entitled to vote generally in the election of directors (Voting Securities), unless such person owned both more than 75% of common stock and Voting Securities, directly or indirectly, in substantially the same proportion immediately before such acquisition;

The Williams directors as of a date of the agreement (Existing Directors) and directors approved after that date by at least two-thirds of the Existing Directors cease to constitute a majority of the directors of Williams;

Consummation of any merger, reorganization, recapitalization consolidation, or similar transaction (Reorganization Transaction), other than a Reorganization Transaction that results in the person who was the direct or indirect owner of outstanding common stock and Voting Securities of the Company prior to the transaction becoming, immediately after the transaction, the owner of at least 65% of the then outstanding common stock and Voting Securities representing 65% of the combined voting power of the then outstanding Voting Securities of the surviving corporation in substantially the same respective proportion as that person's ownership immediately before such Reorganization Transaction; or

approval by the stockholders of Williams of the sale or other disposition of all or substantially all of the consolidated assets of Williams or the complete liquidation of Williams other than a transaction that would

Table of Contents

result in (i) a related party owning more than 50% of the assets that were owned by Williams immediately prior to the transaction or (ii) the persons who were the direct or indirect owners of outstanding Williams common stock and Voting Securities prior to the transaction continuing to own, directly or indirectly, 50% or more of the assets that were owned by Williams immediately prior to the transaction.

A change in control will not occur if:

the NEO agrees in writing prior to an event that such an event will not be a change in control; or

the Board determines that a liquidation, sale or other disposition approved by the stockholders, as described in the fourth bullet above, will not occur, except to the extent termination occurred prior to such determination.

Disability means a physical or mental infirmity that impairs the NEO's ability to substantially perform his duties for twelve months or more and for which he is receiving income replacement benefits from a Company plan for not less than three months.

Disqualification disaggregation means:

the termination of an NEO from Williams or an affiliate's employment before a change in control for any reason; or

the termination of an NEO's employment by a successor (during the period beginning upon a change of control and continuing for two years or until the termination of the agreement, whichever happens first), if the NEO is employed in substantially the same position and the successor has assumed the Williams change in control agreement.

Good reason means, generally, a material adverse change in the NEO's title, position, or responsibilities, a reduction in the NEO's base salary, a reduction in the NEO's annual bonus, required relocation, a material reduction in the level of aggregate compensation or benefits not applicable to Company peers, a successor company's failure to honor the agreement, or the failure of the Board to provide written notice of the act or omission constituting cause.

Table of Contents**Termination Scenarios**

The following table sets forth circumstances that provide for payments to the NEOs following or in connection with a change in control of the Company or an NEO's termination of employment for cause, upon retirement, upon death and disability, or not for cause. NEOs are generally eligible to retire at the earlier of age 55 and completion of 3 years of service or age 65.

All values are based on a hypothetical termination date of December 31, 2009 and a closing stock price of \$21.08 on such date. The values shown are intended to provide reasonable estimates of the potential benefits the NEOs would receive upon termination. The values are based on various assumptions and may not represent the actual amount an NEO would receive. In addition to the amounts disclosed in the following table, a departing NEO would retain the amounts he has earned over the course of his employment prior to the termination event, including accrued retirement benefits and previously vested stock options and restricted stock units.

Name	Payment	For Cause(1)	Retirement(2)	Death & Disability(3)	Not for Cause(4)	CIC(5)
Malcolm, Steven J	AIP Reserve		\$364,115	\$364,115	\$364,115	\$364,115
	Stock options		5,194,693	5,194,693		5,194,693
	Stock awards		4,738,453	4,738,453	4,738,453	9,920,100
	Cash Severance					6,600,000
	Outplacement					25,000
	Health & Welfare					16,403
	Retirement Restoration					
	Plan Enhancement					2,263,258
	Tax Gross Up					7,669,434
	Total			\$10,297,261	\$10,297,261	\$5,102,568
Chappel, Donald R	AIP Reserve		90,151	90,151	90,151	90,151
	Stock options		1,129,279	1,129,279		1,129,279
	Stock awards		2,765,051	4,064,201	4,064,201	5,548,909
	Cash Severance					3,150,000