

DISCLAIMER

The transcripts of the City of Los Angeles' four public hearings -- held January 4 at Van Nuys City Hall, January 7 at the Council District 11 Field office in Westchester, January 11 at the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power's office downtown, and January 12 at the Witherbee Auditorium -- are now available for viewing on the City's website: www.lacity-irp.org . The transcripts were prepared by certified court reporters and have been accepted by the City as reasonably accurate records of the public hearings. The City is not soliciting comments on the transcripts. The City is making the transcripts available through its website in the spirit of sharing information with those who have a common interest in the Integrated Resources Plan and its Draft Environmental Impact Report.

NEXT STEPS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROCESS

The public comment period will close on March 31, 2006 and the City's environmental documentation team will begin the process of preparing the Final Environmental Impact Report. All comments -- written in letters and emails, or voiced at one of the four public hearings -- will be carefully reviewed and considered. The comments and responses to the comments will be published as a part of the Final EIR. The public will be notified as soon as the Final EIR is available.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES

BUREAU OF SANITATION

INTEGRATED RESOURCES PLAN (IRP)

PUBLIC HEARING OF THE DRAFT EIR

HEARING OFFICER - JIM DOTY

Commencing : 11:00 A.M.
Location : 7166 West Manchester Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90045
Day, Date : Saturday, January 7, 2006
Reported by : TRULY A. VOSBERG, C.S.R. NO. 12656

Pages 1 - 23

JOB NO. 97564

APPEARANCES:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ALSO PRESENT:

JAWAHAR P. SHAH
ADEL H. HAGEKHALIL
NICK DEMOS
LOUIS UTSUMI
BILL VAN WAGONER
REBECCA BARRANTES
HEATHER VANMETER
JOE GEEVER
FRANCES SPIVY-WEBER
ROSSANA RAVELLI, SPANISH INTERPRETER

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, SATURDAY, JANUARY 7, 2006

2 11:00 A.M.

3 -oOo-

4
5 MR. DOTY: Okay. I think we can get started now
6 if you would like to take a seat.

7 Good morning, and thank you for coming. My name
8 is Jim Doty; I'm an environmental supervisor for the city's
9 Department of Public Works Bureau of Engineering, and I'll be
10 the hearing officer today.

11 Thank you for attending. This is the second of
12 four public hearings for the Integrated Resources Plan
13 Environment Impact Report, otherwise known as IRP/EIR.

14 Simultaneous translation in Spanish is
15 available, so if you would like to hear these remarks in
16 Spanish, you can arrange it.

17 THE INTERPRETER: (Speaking in Spanish.)

18 MR. DOTY: Thank you. Gracias.

19 I hope you signed in on one of the sheets near
20 the door so we can keep you informed of future developments.
21 Also, I hope you picked up an agenda.

22 After this brief introduction there will be a
23 presentation of an overview of the IRP and the EIR. After
24 that, it will be your turn to speak and our job to listen.
25 Speaker cards are available in the back. If you would like

1 to speak, fill out a card and place it in the box or hand it
2 to an IRP team member.

3 IRP team members, would you please stand and
4 introduce yourselves. I'd like to start with Mr. Utsumi
5 here.

6 MR. UTSUMI: My name is Louis Utsumi, and I'm
7 involved in the Environmental Impact Report.

8 MR. DEMOS: My name is Nick Demos.

9 MS. VANMETER: Heather VanMeter.

10 MR. SHAH: Jawahar P. Shah.

11 MR. HAGEKHALIL: Adel Hagekhalil.

12 MR. VAN WAGONER: Bill Van Wagoner.

13 MS. BARRANTES: Rebecca Barrantes.

14 MR. DOTY: Thank you. Forms for submitting
15 written comments are also available on the back table. The
16 City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works and the
17 Department of Water and Power have worked for quite a while
18 with leaders from many organizations and agencies in
19 developing alternatives setting priorities for the City's
20 Integrated Resources Plan. This has given us the opportunity
21 to interact closely with stakeholders at many informal public
22 meetings and workshops.

23 Today's public hearing is different; this is a
24 formal process. Everything said today is being recorded by
25 our court reporter and will be part of a formal record for

1 the preparation of the final Environmental Impact Report.

2 The public participation is essential to the
3 CEQA process. The purposes of review of the EIRs include:
4 Sharing expertise; disclosing agency analyses; checking for
5 accuracy; detecting omissions; discovering public concerns;
6 and soliciting counterproposals.

7 We hope you will focus on whether the EIR
8 sufficiently identifies and analyzes the IRP's possible
9 environmental impacts and ways in which the significant
10 effects of the project might be avoided or mitigated.

11 Comments are most helpful when they suggest additional
12 specific alternatives or mitigation measures that would
13 provide better ways to avoid or mitigate the significant
14 environmental effects.

15 At the same time keep in mind that the adequacy
16 of the EIR is determined in terms of what is reasonably
17 feasible in light of factors such as the magnitude of the
18 project, the severity of its likely environmental impacts,
19 and the geographic scope of the project. CEQA does not
20 require a lead agency to conduct every test or perform all
21 research, study and experimentation recommended or demanded
22 by commenters.

23 Commenters should explain the basis for their
24 comments and should submit data or references offering facts,
25 reasonable assumptions based on facts, or expert opinions

1 supported by facts. An effect will not be considered
2 significant in the absence of substantial evidence.
3 Reviewing organizations should include with their comments
4 the name of a contact person who would be available for later
5 consultation, if necessary.

6 This public hearing is your opportunity to tell
7 us what you think. Our job is to listen. Today we will
8 receive your oral comments on the draft EIR and move on to
9 the next speakers. We will not respond to your comments
10 today but will respond in writing in the final EIR. We
11 greatly appreciate the time and thought you are putting into
12 this effort.

13 And now I would like to introduce Louis Utsumi,
14 who will provide a technical overview.

15 MR. UTSUMI: Thank you. Hello. Thank you, Jim.

16 MR. DOTY: You got it on.

17 MR. UTSUMI: That's better. Thank you.

18 My name is Louis Utsumi, and as I mentioned
19 before, I was involved in the preparation of the
20 Environmental Impact Report. I'd like to provide a brief
21 overview of the alternatives as well as a summary of the
22 impacts that are discussed in the Environmental Impact
23 Report.

24 The Integrated Resources Plan is a facilities
25 planning process that's unique in that it is a

1 stakeholder-driven -- it utilizes a stakeholder-driven
2 alternative planning process. Various members of the
3 community were basically involved in a steering group that
4 played an integral role in the development of the
5 alternatives from the development of preliminary alternatives
6 to the screening and evaluation of those alternatives to the
7 selection of the alternatives that are carried in this
8 Environmental Impact Report.

9 The city is expected to grow over the next 20
10 years by an increase in population on the order of up to
11 800,000 persons, and this poses some substantial challenges
12 from a waste water management standpoint as well as from a
13 water provision standpoint. In addition, urban runoff is
14 increasingly becoming regulated, and all of the alternatives
15 that the state board has developed meet both the future needs
16 of the city as well as meet the regulatory requirements.

17 The IRP alternatives would involve or result in
18 long-term benefits, mainly cleaner rivers and oceans, cleaner
19 beaches, and that translates into improved public health and
20 safety. The alternative also increased the cycled water
21 usage and beneficially managed urban runoff, which would
22 result in increased sustainability over time.

23 The IRP alternatives are all very complex
24 alternatives and involve multiple components or elements.
25 Each alternative is comprised of a different mix of waste

1 water elements, recycled water and runoff elements. The
2 waste water elements are basically capacity increases at one
3 or more of the city's treatment plants and these sewers to
4 meet future needs and prevent overflow. And, again, with the
5 increase in population, there's a need to safely and
6 adequately manage waste water.

7 The recycled water elements would increase the
8 recycled water that's used to offset the need to import water
9 from outside of the city. We're looking right now about 85
10 percent of the city's water is imported from outside of the
11 city of Los Angeles. And then the runoff elements would
12 capture and beneficially reuse runoff to reduce pollution and
13 provide additional water resources.

14 A half-inch rainstorm within the city of L.A.
15 basically generates a little over two and a half billion
16 gallons of water, and the IRP alternatives would take a
17 portion of that and manage it.

18 The EIR includes five alternatives that are
19 analyzed. Four of the alternatives are build alternatives
20 that were developed by the Steering Group and the
21 stakeholders: Alternative 1, which is based on the expansion
22 of the Hyperion Treatment Plant; alternative 2 is based on
23 expansion of the Tillman Water Reclamation Plant and the Los
24 Angeles Glendale Water Reclamation Plant; and alternatives 3
25 and 4 are both based on the expansion of the Tillman Plant;

1 alternative 5 in the EIR is a no-project alternative, which
2 is required by the California Environmental Quality Act.

3 Okay. The features that are common to all of
4 the alternatives are some sort of capacity expansions at one
5 or more of the treatment plants. They all include three new
6 sewers; waste water storage at the Tillman Plant; increased
7 recycled water use; as well as dry weather and wet weather
8 runoff management features.

9 And of the waste water elements, again, I want
10 to just point out the three new sewers that extend from the
11 Eagle Rock area up to the Tillman Plant. It's this area in
12 yellow right here; this is the Eagle Rock area (indicating).

13 The first sewer is Northeast Interceptor Sewer,
14 Phase II, which extends from Eagle Rock to pass by Glendale,
15 L.A.-Glendale plant, up to the L.A. Zoo right about there
16 (indicating). The Glendale-Burbank Interceptor Sewer, or
17 GBIS, extends from the Los Angeles Zoo area over to the
18 Toluca Lake area; and then the Valley Spring Lane Interceptor
19 Sewer, or VSLIS, extends from Toluca Lake over to the Tillman
20 Water Reclamation Plant.

21 What are the differences between the
22 alternatives? Alternative 1 focuses its capacity expansion
23 at the Hyperion Treatment Plant, which is the lowest point in
24 the waste water system. That's this plant right here
25 (indicating).

1 Alternative 1 also manages a moderate level of
2 recycled water on the order of up to 42,000 acre feet per
3 year. Excuse me, that was alternative 1.

4 Alternative 2 focuses the treatment capacity
5 expansions at the Tillman and L.A.-Glendale plant higher up
6 in the system in the Sepulveda flood control basin and
7 Northeast Los Angeles, and it manages a higher level or uses
8 a higher level of recycled water at approximately or up to
9 52,000 acre feet.

10 Alternative 3 and 4 focus the expansion at the
11 Tillman water reclamation plant, only with alternative 3
12 using a moderate level of recycled water -- 43,000 acre feet
13 per year -- and managing a lower level of runoff. The dry
14 weather runoff mentioned in alternative 3 is approximately
15 20, 26 percent of the dry weather runoff generated in the
16 city, whereas the rest of the alternatives, 1, 2, and 4,
17 manage 42 percent of the dry weather runoff, and then
18 alternative 3 manages 39 percent of the wet weather runoff in
19 the city, and the other alternatives manage 47.

20 Alternative 4, again, focuses its capacity at
21 Tillman, and it manages a higher level of recycled water at
22 56,000 acre feet per year.

23 That's a summary of the alternatives that are in
24 the EIR. There's a lot more details contained in section 2
25 of the EIR, and you'll be able to get a much more thorough

1 understanding of the alternatives.

2 Okay. Moving on to the Environmental Impact
3 Report. The California Environmental Quality Act is the
4 governing law which the city must comply with. And this law
5 requires that decisionmakers and in this case, it's the city
6 council -- consider the environmental consequences of a
7 project before they approve that project.

8 CEQA also requires that if a project has a
9 potential to result in significant impact, that Environmental
10 Impact Reports be prepared. So for the Integrated Resources
11 Plan we have prepared an Environmental Impact Report. And
12 that report identifies the environmental impacts that the
13 city council will consider in their decisionmaking process.

14 These are the environmental issue areas that are
15 included in the EIR: Ranges from aesthetics; air quality;
16 geology; noise; recreation; and cumulative impacts. And all
17 of these resource areas are discussed in the EIR in
18 Section 3.

19 The EIR identifies several significant impacts
20 after the incorporation of mitigation measures. From an air
21 quality standpoint, there will be significant instruction in
22 operational impacts related to emissions that are generated
23 during the construction and operation of phases. And they're
24 significant because they exceed the Air Quality Management
25 District's significant thresholds. The IRP alternatives will

1 also result or have the potential to result in potential odor
2 impacts at the Hyperion treatment plant as well as at the air
3 treatment facilities for the NEIS, GBIS and VSLIS sewers.

4 Cultural resources: The EIR identifies impacts
5 related to the potential damage to archeology or paleontology
6 resources. These are varied resources, and unless
7 instructed, if they are encountered during construction, they
8 could be damaged, and that's considered to be significant.

9 There's a potential for significant geology and
10 soils related impacts. Southern California has numerous
11 faults in the area, and one of the faults is the
12 Hollywood-Raymond fault in the northeast Los Angeles area.
13 The NEIS sewer is going to cross that fault. And although
14 engineering mitigation will be incorporated into the sewer,
15 there still is a potential if a substantial earthquake occurs
16 for NEIS II to be damaged. And that's considered to be a
17 significant impact.

18 There's always potential for new sewers to cause
19 surface settlement during construction as the tunnelling
20 machine progresses underground. From a recreational
21 standpoint, there is a potential to affect recreational
22 facilities both from construction sites for the new sewers
23 that are placed at the recreational facilities, as well as
24 permanent facilities such as air treatment facilities placed
25 at recreational resources. Because those, both construction

1 and permanent facilities, could reduce the level of area
2 that's from the recreational areas, that's considered to be a
3 significant impact.

4 Okay. There's a significant impact related to a
5 potential shaft site at the Los Angeles Zoo parking lot for
6 both the NEIS II and the GBIS sewers. It's an optional shot
7 site, and if that shaft site is used, it would result in a
8 loss of up to 225 parking spaces at the zoo, which is
9 considered to be significant.

10 And lastly from a water quality standpoint,
11 because Southern California is prone to earthquakes and
12 earthquakes are unpredictable, there is a remote possibility
13 that a new sewer could suffer a break. And if that occurs,
14 waste water within the sewers could get into the ground
15 water. That's considered to be a significant impact.

16 Section 3, again, of the EIR has a far more
17 detailed discussion of these impacts as well as the impacts
18 of the other resource areas.

19 Next steps, two additional public hearings are
20 going to be held, one in downtown Los Angeles, this
21 Wednesday, January 11th, at the Department of Water and Power
22 Auditorium, and the next at the Los Angeles Zoo in the
23 Witherbee Auditorium on Thursday, January 12th. Comments on
24 the draft EIR are due on February 27th, close of business.
25 And all of the comments that are received will be responded

1 to within the final EIR, which is expected in spring of 2006.
2 And then staff, city staff will make a recommendation for
3 final certification -- certification of the final EIR and
4 project approval for one of the IRP alternatives, and that's
5 expected to occur in summer of 2006.

6 Okay. And then again, comments are due on the
7 EIR February 27th. And you can send them in writing to
8 Jawahar Shah at the above address, or you can send them by
9 e-mail at the address at the bottom of the slide.

10 Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. DOTY: Okay. Thank you, Louis.

12 Now it is your turn to speak, and our time to
13 listen. First, a few ground rules. We will go through the
14 speaker cards. If you have not submitted a card, you may do
15 so at any time prior to the close of the hearing. When you
16 are called upon to speak, please begin by stating your name,
17 and I think our court reporter would appreciate it if you
18 would spell your last name. And if you are representing an
19 agency or group, please tell us the name of the group.
20 Please speak clearly so that your concerns can be recorded
21 accurately, and please limit your comments to around three
22 minutes.

23 Speakers can return, time permitting, after all
24 of the other speakers have been accommodated. If you are a
25 first-timer here at this facility, I'll just point out that

1 rest rooms and a drinking fountain are available through this
2 door to my left. If you are headed to a rest room, you will
3 need a key, which is hanging on the coat rack. The women's
4 room key has lost its tag, but it is hanging there without a
5 tag.

6 Okay. Joe Geever. Would you like to come up?
7 We've provided a chair here that you can come up and speak.

8 MR. GEEVER: My name is Joe Geever,
9 G-e-e-v-like-Victor-e-r, and I'm the Southern California
10 regional manager for the SurfRider Foundation. SurfRider is
11 an environmental organization of over 50,000 members, all
12 dedicated to the restoration and protection of our coast and
13 ocean.

14 First, I want to thank you guys for holding
15 these hearings. This is a massive plan and deserves the
16 heightened outreach and public input you're allowing here
17 today.

18 On a general note, we want to support the goals
19 of this IRP. The idea of treating water as a life sustaining
20 resource rather than a nuisance is long since overdue. Your
21 recognition of the intersection between managing flood
22 control to addressing water pollution problems and supplying
23 the region with sustainable water supplies is commendable.
24 We want to point out that given the right choices, this IRP
25 can also meet the tangential goals of restoring coastal

1 habitat and providing public benefits of expanded
2 recreational and educational opportunities.

3 Excuse me.

4 Orange County's treatment wetland system of
5 watershed-wide network of constructed wetlands is a great
6 model for this concept and is gaining national recognition as
7 a truly integrated management approach, not to mention
8 federal, state and local funding support.

9 While this draft EIR appears to recognize these
10 important benefits in some regards, we hope decisionmakers
11 will give this some heightened attention.

12 I only have a couple specific comments that we
13 hope to better flush out in the coming weeks.

14 First is that we're always concerned when
15 agencies intermingle project specific analysis into a
16 programmatic EIR. Mixing these two processes complicates
17 public participation at best, and at worse it precludes an
18 open analysis of alternatives at the program level.

19 As I said, we'll be reviewing the draft more
20 thoroughly, but we just wanted to bring this general concern
21 to your attention. We hope that the project's specific
22 components of this EIR are thorough and that there is no
23 disagreement that these components are critical parts of
24 achieving the program goals.

25 We have a more specific concern that is

1 appropriate for this meeting because it has to do with a
2 proposal for a treatment wetland in the lower Ballona
3 watershed. Your draft indicates that you've received
4 recommendations to consider treatment wetlands in area D of
5 the Ballona wetlands.

6 Oddly, the language in the EIR seems to indicate
7 that this is a potentially feasible consideration and could
8 help meet the requirements of the existing Ballona watershed
9 TMDLs, but then goes on to postpone further consideration of
10 this component.

11 I'll add here that we're actually in the process
12 of trying to get a feasibility study done on that proposal,
13 and we'd be glad to forward that feasibility study to you if
14 we are successful in getting funded and getting that project
15 completed.

16 So this possibly highlights our concern about
17 combining projects specific final analysis with programmatic
18 EIRs. Arguably, the inclusion of this specific project and
19 others like it will have an impact on the need for diversions
20 of polluted runoff to the treatment infrastructure and,
21 consequently, the degree to which those facilities will need
22 improvements and expansion.

23 In other words, we're concerned about approving
24 project components of the EIR before the programmatic EIR has
25 been fully vetted. Like I said earlier, we still need to

1 examine the draft more thoroughly before drawing any
2 conclusions.

3 Once again, thank you for holding these meetings
4 and coming out to visit us in the coastal communities that
5 are arguably most impacted by this program. We look forward
6 to communicating with you more in the future.

7 If I got a second, maybe I'll add a couple other
8 things that we're working on.

9 MR. DOTY: I think we have time.

10 MR. GEEVER: We are working on a new program
11 we're calling Ocean Friendly Gardens, which is our effort to
12 bring public attention and public support to water
13 conservation through irrigation and landscaping practices.
14 We'd love to share that concept with you and see how we can
15 integrate that into your water conservation plans.

16 And our idea of focusing some public attention
17 on that and waste water reclamation and other programs that
18 you have in this EIR is making the link between these efforts
19 and ocean water quality something that we don't think the
20 public fully gets and taking the public's concern for ocean
21 water quality and putting it into programs that can improve
22 that and simultaneously save water.

23 So I'd love to answer any questions, talk to you
24 more about the treatment wetlands down in Ballona or anything
25 else I might have said that raises some interest with you.

1 Thanks again.

2 MR. DOTY: Thank you Mr. Geever.

3 Next is Frances Spivy-Weber.

4 MS. SPIVY-WEBER: I'm Frances Spivy,
5 S-p-i-v-as-in-Victor-y, hyphen, Weber, with one B. I
6 represent the Mono Lake Committee, and I, too, am pleased to
7 be here.

8 I have three main points to make. One is to
9 thank you for having done Phase I prior to Phase II because
10 it has, I think, made this Phase II presentation of -- of
11 programs and projects much stronger. I don't think we would
12 have had near the storm water -- integration of storm water
13 and dry winter runoff without Phase I. So thank you.

14 Secondly, I want to urge you to consider not
15 just one alternative, but to look at the comments that are
16 made on the various elements of the various alternatives so
17 that at the end of the day when you're making a presentation
18 to the city council, you're presenting the best of the best,
19 which may mean taking from alternative 2 and alternative 4
20 and so on.

21 Finally, I think when -- I'm aiming these
22 comments, although I'm going to have more detailed comments
23 in the future -- when you're making the presentation to the
24 city council, I hope that you present more than is required
25 in an EIR.

1 For example, the projects that are being
2 proposed could and should have very significant impacts on
3 increase in water supply -- in local supplies of water, which
4 will have cost dividends to the Department of Water and
5 Power. You would be getting with conservation, in particular
6 lower cost water with recycled water, and -- and infiltration
7 of storm water and reuse of storm water. You could get both
8 lower cost water as well as more reliable water, avoiding
9 some of the risks associated with imported water.

10 Another place to look for -- or another place to
11 add emphasis to your presentation to the city council is to
12 look at the jobs enhancement impact of these projects. Not
13 only the -- the construction, which certainly there will be
14 some jobs associated with that -- but the both short-term and
15 long-term maintenance of landscape, which is a major
16 component of your addressing dry weather runoff. These jobs
17 are often available to low income community organizations as
18 well as non -- as well as for-profit companies, and there is
19 a tremendous opportunity to enhance this whole section of job
20 opportunities in Los Angeles.

21 And not just with replacing sprinklers which was
22 in the summary I read, but there are a number of landscape
23 opportunities both in replacing turf in hard-to-water areas
24 with -- with artificial turf or other mechanisms where you
25 aren't using turf. Also, there are low water use brooms that

1 recycle water rather than using hoses for taking care of --
2 of dry weather cleanup. So there -- again, there are a
3 number of alternatives beyond which were mentioned in the
4 summary. I will look in the main sections. There may be
5 more there. But all of these could be job creating, and I'm
6 assuming that there are other job creating activities,
7 drawing on what Joe Geever just said, in enhancing the
8 recreational opportunities of a cleaner ocean and beach area.

9 Finally, I think that funding opportunities, if
10 we are working within the region, not just within the city,
11 will be greater. That's why I am particularly interested in
12 the expansion of the Glendale -- the L.A.-Glendale plant and
13 the enhancement of that plant to be able to do RO. The
14 limited state and federal funds are increasingly being
15 targeted for integrated resources planning at the regional
16 level, not just at the city level.

17 So I urge you to consider looking at the funding
18 possibilities and whether those would be enhanced by certain
19 choices, like the Glendale project over other choices. And
20 as I say, I will have more comments for the future, but those
21 are some of my initial thoughts.

22 MR. DOTY: Very good. Thank you.

23 That was the last speaker card I have before me.
24 Is there anybody who would like to speak?

25 Okay. I see no one rushing to the microphone.

1 So that concludes the public comment portion of the hearing.

2 Thanks again to everyone for coming.

3 The public comment period will remain open until
4 5:00 P.M. on Monday, February 27th, and until then you may
5 submit written comments to the address on the overhead slide
6 or on-line or via e-mail.

7 Please remember to include the following
8 information: Your full name; complete address, including zip
9 code; telephone number, including area code; and the name of
10 the organization, if you are representing an organization.

11 This is the second of four public hearings. You
12 do not have to attend the next two, but you are invited to do
13 so and encourage others to do so, too. The location of the
14 other public hearings are given in the Notice of
15 Availability, copies of which are available to the rear of
16 the room.

17 Thank you very much for coming. This hearing is
18 now closed.

19
20 (The hearing proceedings
21 were concluded at 11:32 A.M.)

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

1
2
3 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
4) ss
5 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

6 I, TRULY A. VOSBERG, C.S.R. NO. 12656, Certified
7 Shorthand Reporter for the State of California, do hereby
8 certify:

9 That said proceedings were taken before me at
10 the time and place therein stated and was thereafter
11 transcribed into print under my direction and supervision.
12 And I hereby further certify that the foregoing transcript is
13 a full, true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so
14 taken.

15 I further certify that I am not of counsel nor
16 attorney for any of the parties hereto or in any way
17 interested in the event of this case and that I am not
18 related to any of the parties hereto.

19 WITNESS my hand this 14th day of February, 2006.

20
21 _____
22 TRULY A. VOSBERG
23 C.S.R. NO. 12656
24
25

1 CERTIFIED COPY CERTIFICATE

2
3 I, TRULY A. VOSBERG, Certified Shorthand
4 Reporter, No. 12656, do hereby certify that the attached
5 transcript is a correct and certified copy of the proceedings
6 taken before me on January 7, 2006, as thereon stated.

7 I declare under penalty of perjury that the
8 foregoing is true and correct.

9
10 Executed at Covina, California, this 14th day
11 of February, 2006.

12
13
14 _____
15 TRULY A. VOSBERG
16 C.S.R. NO. 12656
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25