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Public Meeting on the Draft EIR for the
Southern California Edison
Valley-Ivyglen Subtransmission Project and
Alberhill System Project

KRISTI BLACK: Thanks, everyone, for coming. This
is the public meeting on the Draft EIR for Southern
California Edison project for Valley-Ivyglen
Subtransmission Project and the Alberhill System Project.

Please make sure that you signed in at the
front desk. If you didn't, you can do that at the end of
the meeting. If you'd like to make a verbal remark,
please do fill out a speaker card. You can do that. If
20 minutes from now you decide you want to, you can sign
up later. And if you'd like to submit a written comment	onight, we do have forms that you can fill out, but you
can also submit written comments after the meeting.
We'll talk about how to do that later in the
presentation.

If you could please turn off your cell phones
or put them to silent mode, that would be very much
appreciated.

Emergency exit locations, through the front
door and also through the back door.

Restrooms are through this door back here.
Here's the agenda for the presentation today.

1. We're going to do some introductions, talk about why we're here. We're going to talk about how to submit a comment on the draft EIR, talk about the CEQA Review process, and then we'll get into talking about the proposed projects, what they involve. We'll talk about the environmental impacts of the proposed projects and talk about the alternatives. After we go through the presentation we'll have an informal Q and A session, and that will be followed by a formal comment period where you can make verbal remarks.

2. INTRODUCTIONS

3. KRISTI BLACK: From the California Public Utilities Commission we have Jensen Uchida. He's in the front row here.

4. And I am from Ecology and Environment. My name is Kristi Black. We are the CPUC's consultants and we prepared the EIR for the project. Some of my colleagues are also here.

5. We have Sylvia Yanez, Caitlin Barns and Jessica Midbust. And they're available to answer questions about the Draft EIR and the projects.

6. Also, she wasn't able to make it tonight, but
going forward, Rachel James is going to be the project manager for Ecology and Environment, just so you know the name.

PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING

KRISTI BLACK: So what's the purpose of this meeting? This is the California Public Utilities Commission's meeting. Southern California Edison has submitted two applications to the CPUC, one through the Valley-Ivyglen Project and the other is for the Alberhill System Project.

The CPUC is the CEQA Lead Agency for both projects. CPUC prepared and released a Draft EIR that covers both of the projects, and this meeting is to share information about the Draft EIR, and also to get input from the public on what to include in the Final EIR.

HOW TO COMMENT ON THE DRAFT EIR

KRISTI BLACK: Here are the ways that you can comment on the content of the Draft EIR. As I stated before, you can make a verbal comment tonight, fill out a speaker card.

The public comment period for the Draft EIR
extends all the way until May 31st, which is the day after the holiday. So you can either fill out or return a comment form this evening, and we have those at the front table here. But you can also e-mail a letter or mail a letter or fax a letter anytime up until that May 31st date.

CEQA AND CPUC REVIEW PROCESSES

KRISTI BLACK: So Jensen is here tonight, but I'm going to give what he would normally give for his presentation, and that's talking about the CEQA and CPUC review process for projects.

The California Public Utilities Commission regulates public utilities in California, and that includes energy, telecommunications, natural gas, water and certain types of transportation companies. The purpose of CPUC's regulation is to make sure these services are provided to the public in a safe and reliable manner and at a reasonable price. So when a utility proposes to build or expand its facilities in California, the utility has to file an application with the CPUC.

Depending on the type of the facility the utility intends to build and the level of power the
facility will disseminate, the applicant must submit an application for either a certificate of public necessity and convenience or a permit to construct. In this case SCE filed a CPCN for the Alberhill System Project and a PTC for the Valley-Ivyglen project. And along with the application, the project proponent submits a proponents environmental assessment based on a checklist that CPUC has adopted.

The PEA is supposed to be based on the CPUC's information and criteria list in order to determine whether the application for the projects is complete. The applicant has to submit this information before an application can be determined to be complete. The filing of that application is what starts two concurrent review processes and those are shown on this slide over here.

The first process -- they're concurrent.

One process is the CEQA review process, and that's on the left, and there's also the CPUC economic review which is on the right, and it's known as the General Proceeding.

The General Proceeding is conducted much like the legal proceeding in court. The proceeding looks at the effect of a proposed project on customer rates, market competition, market structure, and whether the proposed project will meet the needs of the people in
California.

The assigned commissioner, along with the assigned Administrative Law Judge, will jointly oversee this General Proceeding process.

The environmental review process, which the EIR is part of, is conducted in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA. To review the PEA and draft the environmental document, the CPUC hires an environmental consultant. In this case it was Ecology and Environment. Under the oversight of the CPUC, the environmental consultant reviews the applicant's PEA, performs the environmental review, and then drafts the environmental document.

The purpose of this review is to make the public aware of the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. The document also includes potential mitigation measures that will reduce significant impacts of the proposed project and also a reasonable range of alternatives to the project that will reduce impacts. When it's determined the PEA and application contains sufficient information, this environmental review process begins.

The first major step in this process is a scoping meeting where the project team asks for information from the public to determine the range of
issues and the project alternatives that should be considered in the project's environmental document. Then we use various information, information gathered from the scoping meetings, from surveys in the field, and from research to draft the CEQA document. In this case it was an EIR.

The document identifies potential environmental impacts of the project and also identifies a project alternative that has the least environmental impacts based on the studies conducted during the environmental review. This is called the environmentally superior alternative. Upon publication, the draft environmental document is circulated to the public for a 45-day public review period, and we're in that right now. During this period, comments are collected from the public. Once this review period has completed, all comments submitted on the Draft EIR are considered and we'll prepare responses to these comments in a Final EIR.

The Final EIR will then be given to the assigned Administrative Law Judge at the CPUC who incorporates major findings of the General Proceeding and the environmental document into a proposed decision. All five commissioners then vote on the decision at a commission meeting, and the CPUC will seek a decision about the project that starts the balance on power.
production, land use, and environmental stewardship.

In the Q and A session that follows this, you're welcome to ask questions about that process. I know that's a lot to listen to. There's also more information online at the CPUC's website about this other parallel process that goes on. There's some information here, and we can provide that to you at the front desk if you're interested.

We're at this public meeting and it actually covers two projects. The CPUC determined it was in the public's best interest to consolidate the environmental reviews of both projects into one EIR for a few reasons, they're really close in proximity and sometimes the Alberhill project transmission lines are located on lines proposed for Valley-Ivyglen. There's overlapping impacts, particularly due to the close proximity, and there's similar construction timing.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

KRISTI BLACK: Now we're going to talk about the Valley-Ivyglen Project.

The Valley-Ivyglen Project mainly consists of a new single circuit of 115 kilovolt subtransmission line. There was a project that was approved by CPUC in
2010, and the project we're looking at right now follows mostly the same route as that project. There's some slight deviations. The subtransmission line that SCE is currently proposing would be about 27 miles long within about 23 miles of new right-of-way.

There will also be a telecommunications component.

There will be new fiber optic line installed overhead on the transmission structures underground and some new and some existing underground conduit.

Here's a map of the project. It's also available online at the project website to take a closer look, and we also have some map books up on the front table that have a more detailed look at the route.

OBJECTIONS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

KRISTI BLACK: The objectives of the project -- there's three of them that have been defined -- is to serve projected demand in the Electrical Needs Area, increase electrical reliability, and also improve operational and maintenance flexibility.

The Draft EIR is concluding that the Valley-Ivyglen Project would have unavoidable and significant impacts on air quality during construction,
and also noise generation during construction.

There are some other significant impacts of the Valley-Ivyglen Project, but the Draft EIR concludes that there's mitigation that could be implemented to reduce those impacts to less than significant, and that's for the following resources on this slide. So aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, and several others.

There's also some cumulatively considerable impacts from the Valley-Ivyglen Project. That's where Valley-Ivyglen in and of itself is one piece of a lot of other impacts from other projects in the area, and we found that for air quality and noise the Valley-Ivyglen would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact.

So we have an alternative screening report for the Valley-Ivyglen Project. In that report we looked at 14 alternatives. Five of them were carried forward in the EIR in addition to the No Project Alternative. The No Project Alternative is what would happen if the CPUC denied the permit and the project wasn't implemented.

The Draft EIR identifies the Environmentally Superior Alternative as Alternative C, which involves an underground of 115-kV Segment VIG6 along Temescal Canyon Road and Horsethief Canyon Road. That's instead of
overhead alignment south of I-15 in the same area. And we do have maps of this at the front table.

Now onto the Alberhill Project.

The Alberhill Project involves constructing the Alberhill Substation. That's one of the objectives of the project. Another objective is to construct 500-kV transmission lines to connect it to an existing 500-kV transmission line, and it's also to construct new 115-kV transmission lines to modify how some existing substations operate in the grid, and also to install some telecommunication improvements.

Here's a map of the Alberhill Project, an overview map of where it is. You can see the substation is up in the upper left-hand portion of the map as are the 500-kV lines.

So the objectives of the projects are to relieve projected electrical demand; constructing a substation within the Electrical Needs Area; and also maintain system ties between a new 115-kV System and an existing 115-kV System.

The Alberhill System Project would have several significant and unavoidable impacts on the environment, and these are identified in the Draft EIR. There would be significant and unavoidable aesthetic impacts during operation and maintenance, mostly centered
in the substation area. There would also be significant unavoidable impacts on air quality and noise during construction of the proposed project.

Just as for Valley-Ivyglen, there is also several impacts where the Draft EIR has concluded that mitigation could be implemented to reduce those impacts to less than significant, and those are listed here.

Just like Valley-Ivyglen, Alberhill would also contribute to what's been identified as a significant cumulative impact when looking at the project with other projects going on in the area, and that would be for aesthetics, air quality and noise. For Alberhill we have an alternative screening report that looks at 34 alternatives. Two of them were carried forward to the EIR, including the No Project Alternative.

The Draft EIR identifies Alternative DD as the environmentally superior alternative and that's an alternative substation location. It would be a few miles north of SCE's proposed substation location.

So for more information, both projects have their own project website, and you can also find these pretty easily by Googling CPUC Alberhill, CPUC Valley-Ivyglen. They're usually the first result that comes up.

Right now we can do an informal Q and A if
anyone has questions about the proposed project or the impacts or the Draft EIR, and then we can take a short break, and then after that we'll take formal comments. So if you have a comment, don't raise it now. This isn't the comment period. But if you have questions or anything like that, this would be the time to do it.

QUESTION AND ANSWER

KRISTI BLACK: Yes.

MS. RIDENOUR: My name is Linda Ridenour. I have a question. It's a significant hardship for me to try to download something like that on my computer, and I feel that you are perhaps discriminating against some of us elders who are not computer literate. So how do you plan to rectify that?

KRISTI BLACK: Well, we could provide you with a DVD that has the file. As far as paper copies, they've also been distributed to several libraries in the area. There's a list of the libraries on the notice of availability.

MS. RIDENOUR: How do we check those out so we can underline significant environmental problems?

KRISTI BLACK: Jensen, do you want to make it available for people at cost, or how would you like to do
that?

    MS. RIDENOUR: I don't understand. If this is a public scoping meeting, and I don't think this is your first scoping meeting, is it? No. So some of us were not even invited to the first scoping meeting.

    You have one notice in the newspaper today, unless you had others, okay. And we had insufficient time to prepare.

    KRISTI BLACK: We put notices in two newspapers when the Draft EIR was released.

    MS. RIDENOUR: What is the date for that?

    KRISTI BLACK: We can get that for you, unless Jessica knows off the top of her head. She's the one who put the notice in.

    MS. RIDENOUR: How would we know when the 45 days started?

    KRISTI BLACK: It started in the release of the notice of availability. The notice of availability was released on April 14. And I don't know how the libraries work and whether you can check things out, but I would assume they might have a copy machine where you can make copies. You can also request a copy, but I think Jensen can speak to whether CPUC might charge or how that works.

    MR. UCHIDA: I think the best idea is DVD.

    MS. RIDENOUR: I'm sorry. I can't hear you.
MR. UCHIDA: I think that would be your best option is a DVD. I think that's the best we could do.

MS. RIDENOUR: You have those here tonight for us?

KRISTI BLACK: We can send you one.

MS. RIDENOUR: That would be the total project, not just the environmental components of it?

KRISTI BLACK: The CDs contain the entire Draft EIR. So that printed document right there at the front table, we have that on DVDs, and we can send you one.

MS. RIDENOUR: What date do we need to have our response in by?

KRISTI BLACK: The comment period closes on May 31st, which is the day after the holiday.

Yes, in the back.

SPEAKER 2: Can you go back to the slide that has the web address for the comment period?

KRISTI BLACK: Yes.

SPEAKER 2: And does it have to be physically received by the 31st, or postmarked by the 31st?

KRISTI BLACK: I think I would say postmarked we would accept.

JENSEN UCHIDA: We'll accept anything that comes in around the date.

KRISTI BLACK: We do want your comments. I mean, that's an important part of the process.
SPEAKER 3: It says there postmarked by the 31st.
We were trying to clarify that.

KRISTI BLACK: Jensen said around that.

JENSEN UCHIDA: As long as we receive something --
SPEAKER 3: It says on there.

KRISTI BLACK: Yes.

SPEAKER 4: I have a general question.

KRISTI BLACK: Sure.

SPEAKER 4: Overhead transmission lines generate an electromagnetic field, the effects of which are not entirely certain. Could you contrast the overhead transmission line electromagnetic field with an underground transmission line of the same voltage and amperage?

KRISTI BLACK: I would suggest submitting that as a comment on the Draft EIR, if that's something you want to see in the document, because that speaks to the impacts of the project, not the content of the Draft EIR or the proposed project.

SPEAKER 5: There's been several Draft EIR's that's been approved and commented four times now. Is this the beginning of No. 5? Or the end of No. 5?

KRISTI BLACK: I don't know the exact number off the top of my head. There have been several, and as I mentioned in the presentation, there was actually an
approval of Valley-Ivyglen in 2010.

For Alberhill there hasn't been a Draft EIR yet. There have been three scoping periods. The one last year was the third.

For Valley-Ivyglen, for the new application, I believe this is the first.

Is that correct?

JENSEN UCHIDA: Yes.

KRISTI BLACK: This is the first for the new resubmitted modified Valley-Ivyglen Project.

SPEAKER 5: Is this with both of them combined?

KRISTI BLACK: Yes, both of them are covered. They're still separate permit application processes. So if you were to look up the administrative proceeding, they would be separate, but as far as --

SPEAKER 5: Are they coming together?

KRISTI BLACK: Not in that proceeding. But because there are so many similarities, the CPUC decided having one EIR that covers both made more sense and would be better, maybe just less confusing and not -- but would be better than having two separate documents. So the processes for both projects under CEQA and environmental review are now tracking each other.

Does that help clarify? It's complex.

SPEAKER 5: It helps a little bit, but I'm kind of
wondering when the reviews are going to be final. I mean, of course they've said this is the final several times. Now we're at another final.

KRISTI BLACK: The Final EIR will contain the response to comments on the Draft EIR, and barring any changes -- like if SCE changes their project, then we might need to go back. But barring any changes, the Final EIR would be certified, which means the CPUC finds it's adequate, and then it would go in to the Administrative Law Judge Proceeding where then they would consider approval of a CPCN or PTC, and then the schedules might vary because those are two separate processes for the two separate projects.

SPEAKER 7: How are we to be involved in that?

KRISTI BLACK: I have information on another slide about the administrative proceeding. So I recommend contacting the Public Advisor. Their role is to help people be involved in the administrative proceeding.

SPEAKER 8: Just a general question. Within the boundaries of Lake Elsinore, what percentage or approximately what percentage of the lines would be undergrounded, and what percentage would be above ground? And how many other poles are you combining on these poles to eliminate the existing lines with the new lines?

KRISTI BLACK: That is a good question. As far as
SCE's proposed project there -- and SCE can correct me if I'm wrong, because this is off the top of my head.

For Valley-Ivyglen, one segment which is Segment VIG8 is proposed to be underground, and in the Draft EIR we have the mileage of that, but I want to say it's five --

Two. SCE is in the back.

Two out of 25 miles or so for Valley-Ivyglen, 27 miles. So less than 10 percent of Valley-Ivyglen.

For Alberhill, none of the lines are being proposed underground.

SPEAKER 7: Is there a reason?

KRISTI BLACK: That would be a question for SCE.

I'm not SCE.

I'm with Ecology and Environment, and we work for California Public Utilities Commission. The public utilities commission is not a proponent for or against the project. So we're just looking at the environmental impacts of the project.

SPEAKER 7: Now, if they take into consideration the environmental impact, that's all there is, on undergrounding more of the lines?

KRISTI BLACK: I believe we looked at undergrounding all of Valley-Ivyglen as an agency, Alternative M, and we did look at that.
SPEAKER 7: Thank you.

KRISTI BLACK: Yes.

SPEAKER 8: City of Lake Elsinore is going to have severe aesthetic problems, I think, going along 3rd Street and along Highway 74, if I read it right. Also, over by the inlet channel there's part of a parachuting type of activity over there starting to get people, and, you know, with high type power lines with aircraft and that kind of stuff in that area --

KRISTI BLACK: As far as the conflicts with the recreational users, I don't remember off the top of my head, but when we take a break we can go look at the Draft EIR.

SPEAKER 8: Looking at the routing of some of the lines going in, it's kind of hard to figure out -- are there already eminent domain on all those line ways that they're going to put the lines in?

KRISTI BLACK: No.

SPEAKER 8: So they still have to go through the eminent domain process?

KRISTI BLACK: Right.

SPEAKER 8: So the people that own the property don't know that they're going to try to take the property yet?

KRISTI BLACK: I don't know if they might do private
negotiation. That's not part of the EIR because that process in and of itself doesn't have environmental impacts. So we look at what happens when SCE builds something.

SPEAKER 8: Does this have anything to do with the power lines that originally were going to go -- I think they were going to go straight to San Diego. They had another routing at one time, and that project got killed.

KRISTI BLACK: I don't know the answer to that question.

SPEAKER 9: Not to sound cynical, we were at a previous environmental impact meeting, and we did put proposals in for some modifications, primarily going underground in certain areas. It sounds as though those proposals aren't going to happen, potentially.

My question to you is, do we really have an impact here? Is this plan already pretty much implemented, and will our comments really have much impact, personally, do you think?

KRISTI BLACK: I will say, in the Final EIR we are mandated to respond to your comments in writing. And as far as making a decision about the project, it's not Jensen's job at the CPUC or our job to have a stance on whether the project is good or bad.

The Draft EIR isn't about merit. It's about
disclosure and telling the decision-makers what the
environmental impacts are of the decision that they are
expected to make on the project, whether that be approve
the project, deny the project, or approve an alternative.

SPEAKER 10: When do they determine to go
underground? For example, in Alberhill they have no
underground. Well, there's one section going down Conard
that is going in everybody's front yard. They don't show
any of that in these pictures. These pictures show dirt
and hills that are dead. All these are homes, and
they're planning on, like 11 or 12 going across Conard,
which to me seems it should go underground, and to most
everybody in that area.

KRISTI BLACK: I would recommend submitting that as
a comment.

SPEAKER 10: I believe it has been submitted several
times.

KRISTI BLACK: Okay. On the Draft EIR I would
recommend submitting that as a comment.

SPEAKER 11: In the preparation of the EIR, what
number was used for the cost differential between high
tension lines versus undergrounding? Was there a dollar
amount attached to those?

So you're making a determination,
recommendation, for a specific alternative, and one being
undergrounding the entire project, but that wasn't
considered or that was not accepted or promoted.

And my question is, there must have been a
cost consideration that you people drafting the EIR had
to come up with. So do you know what that was?

KRISTI BLACK: Part of looking at alternatives
includes feasibility, which includes economic
feasibility, but there are several other components that
you would look at, such as reducing substantially or
avoiding a significant environmental impact of the
proposed project and meeting the project objectives. So
the analysis of the alternatives and why we selected in
the Draft EIR certain alternatives environmentally
superior is all in the Draft EIR, including how we waive
those factors.

SPEAKER 12: Are the economic factors included in
that to the residents of Lake Elsinore?

KRISTI BLACK: What do you mean? Can you clarify?

SPEAKER 12: The economic impact to the residents of
Lake Elsinore, are they figured in on your
decision-making when proposing the project?

KRISTI BLACK: I'm not a decision-maker. Do you
mean deciding the environmentally superior alternative?

SPEAKER 12: Correct.

KRISTI BLACK: I don't believe that the general
economic impact on residents of Lake Elsinore was considered.

SPEAKER 12: Thank you.

KRISTI BLACK: Can I have a new person.

GRANT TAYLOR: Good evening. Thank you for being here tonight. My name is Grant Taylor. I'm with the City of Lake Elsinore. I just wanted a few questions for clarification, if I could.

Looking at your dual track of the CEQA and the General Proceeding, it talks about the CPUC making the final determination, the Administrative Law Judge. I'm assuming that's up at the main office in San Francisco. Is the city allowed or invited to attend that meeting?

MR. UCHIDA: Is the city invited to the proceeding?

GRANT TAYLOR: The City of Lake Elsinore will bear the brunt of this project for everybody else's service. We'd really like to be present at that meeting if at all possible.

MR. UCHIDA: It should be included as a project proceeding.

GRANT TAYLOR: will we have to request that? Will we get an invite?

MR. UCHIDA: No. If you give me your information, I'll get it to the law clerk.

GRANT TAYLOR: I appreciate that.
The EIR was very thorough, about the size of Britannica Encyclopedia. I didn't have a lot of time to review it, but from what I saw, I saw scales of the poles; I saw how many there were. Was there a map in the EIR that shows the locations? I didn't see that. I want to make sure the poles are outside of our ultimate right-of-ways. When we improve our streets for development, we don't want a pole in the middle of the street that has to be moved later. Was there a map for that effect in there? I didn't see it.

KRISTI BLACK: I do believe there is one. The other tool that we have is through the project websites. It's a web viewer, and I'm going to try to pull it out.

So if you go to either Alberhill or Valley-Ivyglen websites, look for Web Viewer Link, and it will pull up this web viewer, and it works just like Google maps. You can zoom in, zoom out.

GRANT TAYLOR: And it will give you those locations?

KRISTI BLACK: Yeah. This third from the left item is called layers, and then turn on the ASP structure locations and you can scroll down and Valley-Ivyglen is in here too. And then you can zoom in to where you're interested in, and you can see -- so this is just for example. This is near SCE's proposed substation sites. You can see the locations of the structures.
GRANT TAYLOR: Very good.

Also, I didn't see any specifics on the substation. Are there any elevations, renderings, that show the massing, how big it is?

All I saw was a little site plan. It talked about 20-foot walls. It talked about a 49-foot structure for switch back racks, which I have no idea what those are.

Were there any type of renderings that I missed in there?

SILVIA YANEZ: Normally the substation layout and the map of the site --

GRANT TAYLOR: I saw the site plan, yes. That was it?

SILVIA YANEZ: The viewer can give you different elevations --

KRISTI BLACK: Do you want to see a visual simulation or --

GRANT TAYLOR: I want to see --

KRISTI BLACK: -- or more of an engineering drawing?

GRANT TAYLOR: It's the entryway to our city. I want to see what it looks like. When I hear a solid 49-foot steel structure, I go, "What does that look like?"

KRISTI BLACK: There are some visual simulations.
That's not in the project description. It's in the aesthetics.

GRANT TAYLOR: Okay. So it's the view samples?

KRISTI BLACK: Yeah, and also in the map books at the front table we have them.

GRANT TAYLOR: Okay. Very good.

The CPUC did the bare minimum public review. 45 days is the bare minimum. That's what we got.

This is a big document. I'm really wondering if the CPUC can give us some more time. There's a lot of stuff to look at. At least 60 days, preferably 90 days to give us more time to make some meaningful comments and not rush and miss things.

MR. UCHIDA: We'll discuss that internally and see what we can do.

GRANT TAYLOR: Thank you very much.

KRISTI BLACK: Thank you.

SPEAKER 13: I live in an unincorporated area of (inaudible) lines going through District 1 which is County, Riverside County, which means that the people who represent me are in the county, not the city of Lake Elsinore. Are these people also going to be notified?

Furthermore, Wildomar I noticed that the lines go up the outlet channel on (inaudible).

KRISTI BLACK: We notified the local cities and the
county. In fact, we've had meetings with Riverside County, particularly about development along State Route 74 that's planned.

SPEAKER 14: Quick question. I'm using your web here, and you show the staging area --

I live in the Rosetta Canyon Community which is part of the (inaudible) and Central and you chose a staging area that affects my home. But that's neither here nor there, but right outside of our community the path that you've chosen, it's like an S tag. It requires a guy-wire on our property. We're in a specific planned area where we have great lakes and we pay a lot of taxes because all of our utilities are underground, and you want to put a guy-wire right actually at the monument to our association.

Is there a way that you can -- What's the determination for using a pole that doesn't require a guy-wire, like double steel structured pole as opposed to one that does require it. And further you guys bought the property and put --

KRISTI BLACK: We're not SCE. I just want to interrupt and say I'm not SCE. We evaluate the project as they propose it.

So I would actually recommend getting in touch with SCE. They're here.
SPEAKER 14: We did in 2010.

KRISTI BLACK: Do you mind raising your hands, SCE, where you can direct him with specific questions about this, and I would also recommend still submitting a comment on the Draft EIR about that as well. But the reasons of why they're proposed -- that we evaluate the project as they propose it.

SPEAKER 14: You just evaluate the pole there and the environmental impact of that.

KRISTI BLACK: What's the last part again?

SPEAKER 14: If that pole has any type of environmental impact.

KRISTI BLACK: Right.

SPEAKER 15: I think it would be very good for you to give one of those books to the city of Lake Elsinore since there's so much involved in this situation. To Mr. -- where is he?

GRANT TAYLOR: I'm sorry. I didn't hear you.

SPEAKER 15: I asked if they'd give you, city of Lake Elsinore, one of these books here so you can be able to tell people if they want to come into the office and ask questions.

GRANT TAYLOR: Great idea. Already done. We have one at the public counter. If anybody wants one, couple of the staff members have one. We'd be glad to let you
look and share. We printed out some hard copies of the disks. Feel free to come by the community development part of the city hall.

KRISTI BLACK: Thank you.

SPEAKER 16: On the Ivyglenn Project, can I ask why the two undergrounds got approved and what their reasoning to do that was for?

KRISTI BLACK: The proposed project has not been approved. Or are you asking about the --

SPEAKER 16: You said there's two areas that were underground.

KRISTI BLACK: Valley-Ivyglenn Segment 7 is proposed to be underground and it's 2 miles long.

SPEAKER 16: What is the reasoning that they're proposing that?

KRISTI BLACK: SCE?

SPEAKER 16: How come they're laughing?

KRISTI BLACK: I don't think they're laughing.

SCE SPEAKER: Edison is here today out of respect for the process --

SPEAKER: We can't hear what she's saying.

SCE SPEAKER: So we'll allow that process to go forward. We have a hotline that you can call Edison.

KRISTI BLACK: Thank you. I appreciate that.

SPEAKER 16: She doesn't want to answer?
KRISTI BLACK: She's going to provide you with a way to ask them questions like that. Because some of these questions as to why they proposed it a certain way, that's not what we know. So I'm kind of putting them on the spot, actually, by saying that, but they do have a team that can answer questions like that.

SPEAKER 17: So she can't answer what the determining factor to going underground are?

KRISTI BLACK: Again, they propose that segment underground.

SPEAKER 16: Why?

KRISTI BLACK: SCE is going to provide you with a person to get in touch with to answer that. It's not a CPUC project. The CPUC did not determine certain segments would be proposed underground or overhead.

SPEAKER 17: On your rendering up here, how far can you zoom in on that rendering? Can we actually see the dimensions of those poles?

KRISTI BLACK: No. They're just point data.

SPEAKER 17: Point data. Okay. So where in your aesthetics are you addressing the visual rendering of what those poles are going to look like throughout Lake Elsinore? Are we seeing before photos and after photos of what the proposal looks like?

KRISTI BLACK: In the aesthetic section there are
visual simulations, including one of the substation sites. We have the Draft EIR up here, and we also have some map books that have those simulation drawings.

SPEAKER 17: Including all those 27 miles of transmission lines?

KRISTI BLACK: No. They're at key view points that have been identified.

SPEAKER 17: So back to your slide that talks about the aesthetics, how are you planning to mitigate the aesthetics?

KRISTI BLACK: The mitigation is in the Draft EIR. Again, for Alberhill we've identified that it's a significant and unavoidable aesthetic impact; so it cannot be mitigated to less than significant.

SPEAKER: That is based on cost?

KRISTI BLACK: That's because if you look at the picture of the substation, if you put up -- you can't shield it. It's a big change from --

SPEAKER: I'm talking about the transmission lines themselves. So there's no way to underground those lines and mitigate the aesthetics is what you're telling me?

KRISTI BLACK: The aesthetics of the 115 kV lines, the impact of those outside of the substation site were found to be less than significant with mitigation in several places, and mitigation there's several measures,
SPEAKER: In the Draft EIR, does it address the difference in cost between undergrounding on a per mile basis?

KRISTI BLACK: No, it does not.

SPEAKER: How do we get those numbers?

KRISTI BLACK: That's not part of the environmental review. If you want to submit a comment for that, you're welcome to.

SPEAKER: There will be plenty of comments, but I'm just saying the suggestion that the two miles that you're undergrounding versus the 27 (inaudible) as to who makes that decision on aesthetics and what the differential is in cost, and we're --

KRISTI BLACK: Again, SCE proposed the project that way; so we're evaluating it.

The CPUC cannot require mitigation for impacts that have been found less than significant, and CPUC can only require mitigation from significant to less than significant, and there is mitigation in the EIR to reduce certain aesthetic impacts to less than significant.

SPEAKER: What does the CPUC consider less than significant on a visual site line to the lake.

KRISTI BLACK: I'm going to have to request that you read the Draft EIR because I think other people have some
comments, and this discussion about aesthetics could take up a lot of time; so I'm going to ask that for --

Thank you.

SPEAKER: Could you rewind? I think you said no --
I think this is what you said. You said according to the environment there's going to be significant, I don't know, habitat problems and that can not be mitigated; so wouldn't that automatically say you can't do the project?

KRISTI BLACK: The biological resources impacts can be mitigated to less than significant. The CPUC can approve a project that has significant environmental impacts. It would have to issue what's called a statement of overriding considerations.

SPEAKER: What is that?

KRISTI BLACK: You can provide a comment on the Draft EIR and be involved in the CEQA process.

SPEAKER: Is the online map you're using here part of the Draft EIR?

KRISTI BLACK: It's not. It's a tool to be able to see -- you know, a lot of people want to see where poles are in relation to their house or whatever, and it's just a tool to help that, but it is the same data that was used for the maps in the EIR.

SPEAKER: I'll be submitting a proposal comment on this. Just so you know, Grant, as she pointed out to
you, this is the only way to drill down into where the
towers are. There are parts of this where when you
activate the layer that says where the structures are,
ythey actually don't line up with where the line is and
that impacts one of my properties. I think you and I
talked about that and you said, "I'm not sure which is
correct. Why don't you come to the meeting." That's a
little frustrating.

KRISTI BLACK: I think the lines are conceptual
because if you zoom out, you know, the scale doesn't
matter as much, but the poles are more accurate.

I would recommend you submitting a comment on
that. That's something we can address.

SPEAKER: I have something that has been bugging me
and that is, why are these lines going up?

KRISTI BLACK: SCE is proposing these lines for the
objectives that were in the presentation and are also in
the Draft EIR. So the Draft EIR describes why SCE is
proposing this and it has to do in general with
reliability. There's been a lot of growth in the area,
and there will be in the future, and this is meant to
address that.

SPEAKER: I thought that's what solar panels were
for.

KRISTI BLACK: If you would like to submit that as a
comment, you are welcome to.

Any more questions, or do we want to take a quick break?

One more.

SPEAKER: If the city decided to amend its underground ordinance to require the lines be underground throughout the city, would you have to redo the EIR?

KRISTI BLACK: That's something we would have to discuss internally. I don't have an answer to that right now.

SPEAKER: Fair enough. Thank you.

KRISTI BLACK: Yes.

SPEAKER: I'll save mine.

SPEAKER: Just one final question. I'm new to this so I'm just getting up to speed, if I can get up to speed. But the idea is Southern California Edison basically proposed this route and gave it to you to then go and research and prepare the EIR; is that correct?

KRISTI BLACK: Right.

SPEAKER: All the decisions made as to what was underground or routing, everything, was done by Southern California Edison, not you people?

KRISTI BLACK: For the proposed project.

SPEAKER: For the Valley-Ivyglen project.

KRISTI BLACK: Yes. SCE proposed the project.
That's what's described in Chapter 2, but the alternatives that are analyzed are what the CPUC has come up with.

SPEAKER: Those alternatives are binding or only recommendations?

KRISTI BLACK: They are recommendations. We look at alternatives, select environmentally superior -- one for Alberhill, one for Valley-IvyGlen. The commission, when it's making its decision at the end of this process, they don't have to agree with that decision and can approve different alternatives. There's some procedural hoops to that.

SPEAKER: Who decides what's acceptable as far as the mitigation is concerned? Are we involved in that decision?

KRISTI BLACK: You can definitely comment on the mitigation and say that you don't like a mitigation measure or propose an additional mitigation measure or say you don't think one is sufficient.

SPEAKER: Is our city involved in the final decision? Not the individual but our city.

KRISTI BLACK: What do you -- can you clarify?

SPEAKER: Are elected officials involved in the final decision as to what's acceptable for our city?

Do we lose control of our city's ability to
make decisions, what's best for us?

Other than comments, do we actually have any power to impact what's best for our city?

KRIStI BLacK: As Jensen stated, the city can get involved in the administrative proceeding process. I'm not sure what you mean by power or anything like that.

SPEAKER: Do we have -- who approves it?

KRIStI BLacK: The California Public Utilities Commission has jurisdiction over approving SCE's application or denying it or approving an alternative.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

KRIStI BLacK: Okay. Next.

SPEAKER: One question. The city of Chino Hills of Group Valley were slated at a noneconomically superior project, just like you were saying for us; however, they thought that it was undergrounded after all.

Why was, after that proceeding that has been going through it, and now in fact they are -- why is our city not allowed to have the more aesthetically appealing yet economically less feasible project?

What determination do you guys use within your analysis of the DEIR to determine that our city is going to support it aesthetically?

KRIStI BLacK: That was a very long complicated question. I would say the Draft EIR is prepared pursuant
to CEQA.

CPUC has a duty to mitigate significant impacts to less than significant or if not less than significant to the extent that's feasible.

If you disagree with conclusions in the EIR, including conclusions about undergrounding, I invite you to submit a comment on that.

SPEAKER: So our city is going to have to spend $2 million by (inaudible) to the CPUC like they did over a five-year period? I mean.

KRISTI BLACK: I'm not sure what you want me to say about that. Our team is here preparing the EIR pursuant to CEQA. I can't speak to what was done on other projects or outside of the CEQA process on this project.

SPEAKER: Thank you.

KRISTI BLACK: I think that's all the questions.

We can either take a quick break or we can jump right into the verbal comment period. Let's just do a show of hands, who wants to take a quick break?

I think we're going to go right into the comment period. Looks like a minority of people.

What we're going to do, we have a court reporter here. She is over on your left.

So Jessica has the speaker cards that were filled out earlier, and you're still welcome to submit
speaker cards if you think of something that you want to say, and she will bring the microphone to you. And I suggest speaking directly to the court reporter so that she's able to record your comments. And members of the audience, while other people are giving comments, please keep any comments, clapping, anything, to yourself so that the court reporter can hear everything and record everything accurately.

JESSICA MIDBUST: Terry Morarty.

KRISTI BLACK: Sorry, Jessica, if I can interrupt. We're going to limit comments now to three minutes. Silvia up here on the right will give you --

Actually, Silvia, if you can move towards the court reporter, since people will be speaking toward her. She'll give you a one-minute warning. If we still have time left after the comment period, people who have already commented can speak again, but right now let's limit it to 3 minutes.

JESSICA MIDBUST: I'm going to walk around and hand this to people who have submitted comment cards.

VERBAL COMMENTS

JESSICA MIDBUST: Terry Morarty.

TERRY MORARTY: I would just like to suggest that
you go with the Option M and put it all underground. The aesthetics is the main thing to me. The Valley, we live in a beautiful Valley and the more things like this that are put into our area, the worse it looks. And I just think it all needs to go underground. That's all.

KRISTI BLACK: Next speaker is John C. Gray.

JOHN GRAY: 50 years ago the health hazards of smoking cigarettes was not yet acknowledged.

50 years from now the health detrimental effects of the strong electromagnetic fields surrounding high tension wires might get acknowledged, depending on who pays for the study. Undergrounding reduces the electromagnetic fields significantly. There is a strong health reason, as well as aesthetic, to underground all the lines in the entire project.

KRISTI BLACK: The next commenter is Ace Vallejos.

ACE VALLEJOS: My comment is that we need to get -- I did not know anything about this. There's a lot of people in the area, I feel, that don't know about this. And my opinion, we need to have more time and need to do a better job of notifying the community so we all know what's going on and so we can give our input adequately. That's my comment.

KRISTI BLACK: Thank you. The next commenter is Larry Namedal.
LARRY NAMEDAL: Well, I'm looking at a map and there's a Serrano Valley line on the other side of the 15. Why don't they follow that?

You don't have this map. And it's going to the same place; so you wouldn't have to come through Lake Elsinore. You wouldn't even have to come down the 74. The line is already in. Just put the towers next to all this, and keep it out of our sight, because it's going to impact the property values. People are not going to come out here anymore. And I bought a house out here because it's supposed to be a nice area. I didn't buy a house to look at high tension lines.

And that's not even in your map, your little book, about the other line, is it? Yes? No?

KRISTI BLACK: This period is just for comments. We're not responding.

The next commenter is Chris Hyland.

CHRIS HYLAND: I pass. I've already got mine in.

KRISTI BLACK: Next commenter is John O'Doherty.

JOHN O'DOHERTY: Good evening. My name is John O'Doherty, and I'm a property owner on 3rd Street. And I did review the Draft EIR, particularly in relation to segment VIG which is mostly on 3rd Street. And I have these comments here, and I have already e-mailed them to your organization.
And the first one is a minor one, is that in reading the study most people look at the I-15 as going north-south, and, of course, north is kind of 45 degrees, and the document is a bit confusing with regard to what is north and what is south or east and west.

In any event, if you look at the map up there, my big question is on the road to the VIG, the Ivyglen, that shows the map, you can see up there that if you zoom in on 3rd Street, it makes absolutely no sense to me why the line is jogged to come south to 3rd street and then up 3rd Street and then back up. I don't know if it's Conard, onto 74.

My big question is, why was 3rd Street picked for the routing through the city instead of going all the way up to 74? And I don't know where that came from. And I surmise that Edison has an easement on 3rd Street which is a very minor easement, and that's the excuse for running the line on 3rd Street with apparent disregard for everybody on that line.

In fact, you talk quite a bit in the report on saving money -- I should say Edison does -- in the draft document about saving money, but we're adding approximately a half a mile of power lines by just jogging onto 3rd Street instead of turning on 74. And I really would like to know, and I put that question here,
why that decision was made to just come farther south than necessary, why you just didn't go straight on 74.

KRISTI BLACK: 30 seconds.

JOHN O'DOHORTY: A lot of people got more time in questioning.

My question, a lot of people asked, of course, the kind of poles on the location of 3rd Street; so I'll skip over that one.

And I am also asking the question, is everybody -- is Edison aware of the new drainage, storm water drainage channels coming down 3rd Street right on the line where these poles are supposed to go?

Also, there is a huge masonry wall built right under where I understand you mean to put the poles and --

KRISTI BLACK: I think we're at time. If we have more time at the end --

JOHN O'DOHORTY: I'm not that far away from being finished.

In reading the document, there seems to be an awful lot more concern for motorists and what is seen and the visual effects than there is for the residents and the property owners along the line. That's kind of an amazing thing, which brings me to the comment that was already made, is there absolutely no mention in the document about electromagnetic radiation, which that
gentleman over there brought up. That's a huge, all the
impacts that are mentioned in the document are temporary
impacts during construction. No mention of it of
negative impacts after the whole project is installed.

Also, on the underground thing, I was at a
council meeting here some time ago and brought up this
matter, and the city council stated that all the power
lines on 3rd Street were going underground. Now, that
doesn't appear to be very true here.

Finally -- two more of my quick points. In
your appendix there is a discussion on the whole idea of
going underground, and the document does state that that
is entirely feasible. So there is no reason why all
these power lines couldn't go underground through the
city of Lake Elsinore.

Final point is there are photographs, there
are a whole series of photographs taken of the road of
the VIG line. There isn't one single photograph taken of
3rd Street. 3rd Street is one of the major thoroughfares
in the city, and there isn't a single photograph taken
going up or down 3rd Street showing what's going on
there. So that concerns me. Thank you.

KRISTI BLACK: Thank you. Next commenter is Bruce
Slingerland.

BRUCE SLINGERLAND: I'm just going to follow the
gentleman ahead of me with statements that we're directly impacted in that same area. And, again, bringing up the citizens issue -- we did at a prior environmental impact meeting submit verbally and written, you know, a lot of issues to the plan, to the proposal. They were going underground in our areas and, you know, it didn't happen.

So my concern is that we're making statements, we're making written comments, and making verbal statements and, you know, is it really going to have any sort of an impact?

Like this gentleman said before, the understanding of the SCE routing of the lines, jogging as they do, versus just heading straight down Highway 74, or as the other gentleman proposed, going through an area that's very rural that doesn't even impact Lake Elsinore. It's kind of hard to understand SCE's logic in what they're doing with the routing of their lines. That's our concerns.

I'll also submit written comment to go along with the verbal statement. That's just my opinion.

Thank you.

KRISTI BLACK: The next commenter is Barbara Paul.

BARBARA PAUL: Thank you. I'm a resident of the Temescal Valley. I am also a long-standing member, with my husband, of Glen Eden Sun Club.
Thank you very much for putting this on the cover of the EIR report. It is a beautiful photograph, blue skies, white puffy clouds, the 15 freeway looking south with Glen Eden on the right-hand side.

Glen Eden is included in the EIR with photographs figure 4.1-4A before and after photographs. I have gone into the map, the layering effect, and I have seen what is going to happen to the front of Glen Eden Sun Club. Across Glen Eden property there is proposed anywhere from 7 to 13 of these poles. You might as well put a fence, barbed wire on top, with a guard station because it's going to look like a prison behind there.

I am speaking as a long-term member of Glen Eden. Glen Eden last year submitted their comment letter and they suggested alternative M, all underground. We will again, if we have not already done so, submit another letter by the deadline again suggesting everything be put underground. That's my comments.

Thank you.

KRISTI BLACK: The next commenter is Leonard Leichnitz.

LEONARD LEICHNITZ: Hello. My name is Leonard Leichnitz. I'm the president of Lumos Communities. We're the property manager for the old rodeo grounds which was approved to build some houses. The owner of
that is JLJ, and we're the property manager for them.

The purpose of the Draft EIR is to allow the public to comment on environmental impacts for a project, a proposed project, but it's a little difficult to do that when you can't tell where it's going to be built. As we said informally during the Q and A session, you have an ARCviewer available online, and that data provided is -- there's some discrepancy between where the structures are going to go and where the line is shown.

Now, currently, the right-of-way is across Franklin from our proposed project or our future project. At table 2.2 of your Draft EIR, Segment ASP4, it says it will be located exclusively in existing right-of-way.

As I said, on the ARCviewer that doesn't seem to be the case. And that discrepancy is repeated a couple of times through the EIR, including figure 2.2E, although it's hard to drill down into them; so I can't tell exactly.

I would ask in the Final EIR that this discrepancy be resolved because I would have comments on the environmental impacts that the line could generate if it were to cross Franklin rather than stay in the existing right-of-way. Thank you.

KRISTI BLACK: Thank you. The next commenter is Mike Matthews.
MIKE MATTHEWS: Hello. My name is Mike Matthews.

First, I'll make the -- I don't have a problem with progress, and we're doing a lot of it in Lake Elsinore, making the city look nice for the people that live there, and enticing other people to move in.

My issue is with the health, the effects on health, environmental impacts, and other issues that the people in Lake Elsinore are going to have with the erection of these poles.

Bruce here, he talked about going through the 3rd Street annexation area with the poles. For some reason they are having poles erected, 100-foot poles, come on, 100-foot poles, 16 inches in diameter going through a residential neighborhood. It's zoned RE, residential estates. It's a nice little neighborhood, lots of families.

Unfortunately, they didn't choose the most preferred way, which would be 1,000 feet east of the neighborhood, which is where existing poles are there now. You've got SCE owned property. Okay. You got existing poles, and you could run all the poles you want.

If they insist on going through the neighborhood -- this is one of the few neighborhoods that you have these high tension wires going through -- why can't they go underneath the ground? There's no reason
why you guys need to put these poles up, impacting the
residents in that area, which include home values, health
issues -- first few people have talked about health
issues. Unfortunately, it's never really good -- set in
stone that there are significant health issues, but there
have been health issues identified.

Now, I feel that along with the rest of the
people in my neighborhood, and I'll speak for every one
of them, that an alternate solution be looked at and
taken advantage of instead of impacting the economic and
health of the people in that area. Thank you.

KIRSTI BLACK: Thank you. The next commenter is
Linda Ridenour.

LINDA RIDENOUR: I would like to comment, not having
read your environmental studies, and say, if any of your
studies were based on Alberhill Environmental Studies, I
question them all. The Alberhill -- company hired by
Alberhill had significant areas that didn't include the
vernal pools, et cetera, et cetera. So if there's
anything like that in there, then you need to provide
documentation that you actually did those areas in
question.

If there is a species that are sensitive or
endangered, I don't understand how you can mitigate
against that. That does not seem right. If one
department of the government says this is a very important plant or animal, then how can another group say, "Oh, no, well, it's not important because" -- so those are some of my problems.

Also, these gentlemen have been talking about human experimentation, because if we find out later on down the road that those were significant impacts on the children, on themselves, then that's going to be a problem. I don't know if they can sue, but certainly somebody should be held accountable for that.

Also, normally during construction there is tremendous dust, noise, perhaps lights, causing difficulties with the Palomar lighting area and a whole bunch of things like that. You say temporary. Temporary could be months. I think it should be more specific, although I'm looking forward to reading what you're going to send me. And I think all these people would like to know that too. Thank you.

KRISTI BLACK: Thank you.

Next commenter is Grant Taylor.

GRANT TAYLOR: Thank you, again, for coming. We appreciate the opportunity to hear your presentation, offer testimony.

I understand the need for the project. When you plug something in, when you turn on a switch, you
need electricity. I get it. The concern is the way it's implemented and the impacts on the residents and the businesses of Lake Elsinore.

This will serve a wide area. I think there were seven or eight cities in unincorporated county that would be impacted. Temecula, Murrieta, Murrieta Hot Springs -- zero impacts, but they will receive the benefit. I think they should bear some of the cost in mitigating impact on Lake Elsinore. It's all about money, the undergrounding, the mitigation.

The County of Perris, Menifee, Wildomar, some impacts, not nearly as much. Lake Elsinore will bear the brunt of these impacts, these poles zigzagging through our cities.

I would hope that the California Public Utilities Commission would be willing to work with the city to find ways to address the aesthetics, mitigate the impacts, soften the impacts, and protect our residents and our businesses.

Also, future developments -- finally the great recession is over. We have a number of very good projects on the books. I would hate for this project to disrupt projects that are underway or deter any future projects that would bring commerce, some money to help us improve our city.
We very much look forward to an invitation to the California Public Utilities Commission decision. We would like to see the five commissioners, hear their deliberations, offer testimony, feel that our voices were heard.

And last, but not least, we very much like an extension of that 45 days. For a document that resembles the Britannica Encyclopedia it's a lot to digest. At least 60 to 90 days to give us an opportunity to be thorough, do our due diligence, and provide meaningful comments. Thank you.

KRISTI BLACK: Thank you. That's the last speaker card that we have.

Did anybody else want to make a verbal comment?

Our next speaker is Kim Cousins.

KIM COUSINS: I have to comment on the presentation. I fully believe it's a little disingenuous for us to see a map with blue lines or dots on the map as far as where a tower could be or individual tower is placed on the drill down without understanding the aesthetic impact on the community in total.

Certainly in neighborhoods power lines don't need to be strung, and they certainly can be underground, but this is a pristine Valley, that we're very proud of,
that is on a major growth pattern, third fastest growing city in the Riverside County, fifth fastest growing in the state of California, and this can significantly impact us financially as far as attempting to attract new homeowners, as well as businesses, to this community.

You know, when you have a city council and planning commission that review the paint colors on a building and the color of materials, its brick or a wood or rock on the sides of the building, and we have this kind of a presentation that doesn't show the aesthetic impact, it doesn't do any service to this community whatsoever. So I highly encourage you -- as Grant said, we need a longer extended period of time. The city council of this city is empowered to speak on behalf of these citizens, and they need to be at the table having those discussions about what you're attempting to do with this City for the future.

KRISTI BLACK: Thank you. Does anyone else want to make a comment?

So I think that concludes our meeting.

Thank you all for coming. As a reminder, the comment period ends May 31st, the day after the holiday, and we look forward to getting your written comments after this meeting.

There is another meeting tomorrow, if you
would like to come to that. It's in the afternoon in Perris.

Thank you.

(Whereupon the proceedings concluded)
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