Minutes From The Public Hearing

Daily Breeze

5215 TORRANCE BLVD * TORRANCE CALIFORNIA 90503-4077
(310) 543-6635 * (310) 540-5511 Ext. 396

PROOF OF PUBLICATION
(201 5.5 C.C.P.)

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

County of Los Angeles,

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the County aforesaid; I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above-entitled matter. I am the principal clerk of the printer of the **THE DAILY BREEZE**

a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published

in the City of **Torrance**
County of Los Angeles, and which newspaper has been adjudged a newspaper of general circulation by the Superior Court of County of Los Angeles, State of California, under the date of

June 10, 1974
Case Number **SWC7146**
that the notice, of which the annexed is a printed copy (set in type not smaller than nonpareil), has been published in each regular and entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement there of on the following dates, to-wit

Nov. 14,

all in the year 2005
I certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
Dated at Torrance

California, this 14 Day of Nov. 2005

Signature

This space is for the County Clerk's Filing Stamp

DB 11-78
Notice of Public Participation Hearings
California Water Service Company - Hermosa-Redondo Service Area
Application No. 05-08-000

California Water Service Company (Cal Water) has filed an Application requesting rate increases in the HERMOSA-REDONDO district of $1,313,889 or 7.43% in fiscal year 2006-2007, $566,600 or 2.96% in fiscal year 2007-2008, and $586,600 or 2.89% in fiscal year 2008-2009. The California Public Utilities Commission will hold Public Participation Hearings November 28, 2005 in Redondo Beach on the Company's application to hear customers' views on the proposed increases and any other aspect of the company's operations. As part of the hearing, Cal Water is also seeking your comment on its Urban Water Management Plan filed with the Application. Copies of the plan are available from Cal Water's offices and will be provided at the hearings.

In three other current applications, Cal Water has also proposed a new, alternative ratemaking mechanism called a "rate base equalization account" (RBEA). If the Commission approves this proposal, the costs of major capital improvements necessary to meet water quality standards and water supply needs in high cost districts would be spread among all 24 Cal Water Districts. Cal Water estimates that this would result in increased charges to all customers of approximately $0.61 per month. The Commission's staff has also indicated that it may propose special rates to lessen the effects of any increases on qualifying low-income customers.

The following table shows Cal Water's forecasted rate changes by connection type:

Monthly Metered Service Charge

		Proposed Rates in Cal Water's Application		
Meter Sizes	Present Rates	2006 Rate	2007 Rates	2008 Rates
5/8 x 3/4-inch	$7.80	$7.78	$8.13	$8.48
3/4-inch	$11.70	$11.67	$12.20	$12.72
1-inch	$16.72	$19.45	$20.33	$21.20
1-1/2-inch	$39.71	$38.90	$40.65	$42.40
2-inch	$59.44	$62.24	$65.04	$67.64
3-inch	$112.01	$116.70	$121.95	$127.20
4-inch	$192.89	$194.50	$203.25	$212.00
6-inch	$336.62	$389.00	$406.50	$424.00
8-inch	$501.21	$612.95	$650.40	$687.85
10-inch	$897.00	$894.70	$934.95	$975.20
12-inch	$1,287.00	$1,283.70	$1,341.45	$1,399.20
14-inch	$1,755.00	$1,750.50	$1,829.25	$1,908.00
Quantity Charges (Per Ccf. One Ccf is one-hundred cubic feet or 748 gallons)				
Potable Water –	$2.1040	$2.2756	$2.32	$2.37
Reclaimed Water –	$1.8031	$1.9570	$2.00	$2.04

Under Cal Water's proposal, rates for each year would become effective on July 1. The increases shown for 2007 and 2008 are estimates using current inflation factors. The actual 2007 and 2008 increases could be higher or lower based on the latest inflation factors available at the time the increases take effect.

Almost all residential customers in the Hermosa-Redondo District have 5/8" x 3/4" meters. The average customer uses about 13 Ccf of water per month and would see their monthly water bill increase by $2.21 or 6.3% from $35.15 at present rates to $37.36 in mid-2006, by an additional $0.97 or 2.6% to $38.33 in mid-2007, and by an additional $0.97 or 2.5% to $39.30 in mid-2008.

The effect on your water bill will vary depending on whether you use more or less water than these averages, or if you have a meter larger than 5/8" x 3/4". The rates shown on your monthly water bill may vary slightly from the existing rates shown above due to temporary surcredits or surcharges currently in effect in your area.

An Administrative Law Judge from the California Public Utilities Commission will conduct two Public Participation Hearing sessions on November 28, 2005, at 2:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m., in the Redondo Beach City Hall Council Chambers, 415 Diamond Street, Redondo Beach.

The Public Utilities Commission encourages you to attend these hearings and express your views. If specialized accommodations are needed, such as sign language or other interpreters, please contact the Commission's Public Advisor's Office at (415) 703-2074, toll-free at 1-866-849-8390, TTY toll-free at 1-866-836-7825, or regular TTY at (415) 703-5282 at least 5 working days before the event.

If you cannot attend a Public Participation Hearing, you may submit written comments to: Public Advisor's Office, California Public Utilities Commission, 320 West 4th St., Ste 500, Los Angeles, CA 94013, or by e-mail to Public.advisor.la@cpuc.ca.gov. You may also call the Commission at 866-849-8391 (toll free). Please mention that you are writing about Application 05-08-012. Your comments will be circulated to the Commissioners and will become part of the correspondence file available to the Commission as it decides this application.

Evidentiary hearings devoted to analyzing the need for the requested rate increase and ways of allocating any approved increases among different classes of customers are scheduled to begin in January 2006 at the Commission's Offices in San Francisco. Please confirm the schedule by visiting the Commission's website at www.cpuc.ca.gov, then clicking on the Daily Calendar link. These are technical hearings at which the Commission receives the testimony of experts on both sides who have examined Cal Water's application in great detail. Evidentiary hearings are open to the public but only those presenting evidence or cross-examining witnesses may participate. For more information about becoming a party and participating in the evidentiary hearings, contact the Commission's Public Advisor at the address above.

Parties at the evidentiary hearings may offer proposals that differ from those requested by Cal Water. After considering all proposals and evidence presented during the formal hearing process, the Commission will issue a final decision on Application 05-08-012 that may adopt all or part of Cal Water's proposal, amend or modify it, or deny the application. The Commission's final decision may be different from Cal Water's proposal.

A copy of Cal Water's Application and further information may be obtained from the company's local offices by calling (310) 257-1400. You may also contact the company's headquarters at 1720 North First Street, San Jose, California 95112-4598, or by calling (408) 367-8200.

CALIFORNIA WATER SERVICE COMPANY

Pub.: November 14, 2005

REDONDO BEACH, CALIFORNIA, NOVEMBER 28, 2005 - 2:00 P.M.

* * * * *

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE MC VICAR: Please come to order. This is the time and place set by the Calfornia Public Utilities Commission for the public-participation hearing in Applications 05-08-006 through -013, the applications of California Water Service Company for a general rate increases in eight districts, including the districts that we're here for today.

I'm Administrative Law Judge Jim McVicar.

We have two members of the public present. Neither has indicated that they'd like to speak, so what I'm going to do now is take a recess until any other members of the public show up. We will be in recess.

(Recess taken)

ALJ MC VICAR: Please come to order.

Why don't you have a seat for a minute first?

MS. COLBERT: Yeah.

ALJ MC VICAR: As I indicated before, this is the time and place set for the public-participation hearing in California Water Service Company's eight applications, including applications for districts here in Los Angeles.

I'm Administrative Law Judge Jim McVicar.

We have two more members of the public who have signed in and would like to make statements.

I typically ask the water company to explain a little bit about what it is they're asking for and why they need it, and then ask the Commission staff to explain how

they audit that request before we go to hearings on it. So first, I'd like to introduce John Foth, with the water company, who'll explain the water company's side.

MR. FOTH: Good afternoon.

ALJ MC VICAR: Off the record, please.

(Off the record)

ALJ MC VICAR: Back on the record.

Thank you very much, Ms. Chan.

We have two folks who have signed up this afternoon to make a statement. The first is Melody Colbert. So, if you'd come to the podium, please state your name. Spell your name for the record.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MS. COLBERT

MS. COLBERT: My name is Melody Colbert. M-e-l-o-d-y C-o-l-b-e-r-t. I am a resident of Rolling Hills Estates in Palos Verdes, and I'm a customer of California Water Service Company.

And I received the notice of request for a rate increase. And it seemed to coincide with the planned water main replacement project that I only learned about kind of by accident in attending a Rolling Hills Estates City Council meeting one evening. This was an audience item not on the agenda, so I didn't know that this issue came before the City Council. And several representatives of California Water Service Company were there to make a presentation, complete with PowerPoint presentation, to discuss how the water main needed to be replaced.

Turned out they had been working with a subcommittee from the City Council for about a year or so, unbeknownst to me, prior to that time. And they informed us that they needed to -- their plan was to construct a new water main in a main thoroughfare. That's Palos Verdes Drive North. And construction would take about a year and a half. And they would be closing down this main artery -- portions of this main artery -- over that period of time.

The reason this concerned me -- several reasons; but one was that -- due to my involvement with the projected -- the planned South Coast Golf Course on the former closed hazardous-waste Palos Verdes landfill, I was very aware of several things in that area; that there were many schools, residents, and daycare centers along that corridor that could be affected by a golf course being built on the landfill.

And then it also occurred to me that digging, trenching along that corridor not only would have a tremendous traffic impact, but also likely an air-quality impact. So one of the questions we raised at that meeting was: why was there no environmental impact report for this project? That was definitely going to impact traffic.

But even more so than that it was the nature of kind of surprise. Why was this issue or this item -- why did it come up as an audience item not on the agenda? Certainly there was plenty of time to agenda-ize the item.

So I went back and did a little research. And sometime -- not a month or two or -- several months later,

there was again another -- an emergency City Council meeting where they were discussing. The water service company came and made a presentation and said this is why they had to -- they gave reasons for needing to replace the water main, and why they had to tear up Palos Verdes Boulevard -- Palos Verdes Drive North, and not consider other routes.

Sorry. My thoughts aren't all that organized. I have -- I know the facts that I want to get out here, or at least, my perception of the facts.

Again, my research on the golf course -- proposed golf course project started raising questions, because I had this memo. And it was directed to the golf manager or supervisor or -- I don't know the term -- Steve Duron, who manages golf issues for the County of Los Angeles.

And there was a memo dated January 5th, 2000, from an individual named David Mesa. I don't know if he was a contractor for the County, or what his role was. There's no identification on this memo that I received; but the subject is California Water Service PV landfill site. And in it, it states that California Water Service operates and maintains existing 4-inch, 6-inch, and 8-inch service lines near the PV landfill site. At this time, it has no plans to design/construct new water systems.

It goes on to talk about -- potable water for the proposed golf course could be provided from a new water line. Location and size cannot be determined at this time.

So this memo -- and then this was for January 2000.

And then in 2003, there was a letter written as part of the draft environmental impact report for the golf-course project from the consultants for the golf course, saying that California Water Service Company will need to provide a letter to the project proponent indicating its ability to meet the project's potable-water needs.

Also as part of the draft environmental impact report, there's a letter from California Water Service Company on their letterhead, saying Cal Water will install facilities to the property line of the project, or if a dedicated right-of-way is provided, to on-site golf-course facilities.

So it just seemed odd to me that, as of January 2000, there were no plans to have -- change any water facilities or the water main. And suddenly -- not suddenly, but within a few years, I'm attending City Council meetings where the Water Service Company is saying our water lines are aging; we are not going to be able to meet the demand.

And they don't talk about -- they didn't talk about, in their -- in these meetings, the projects, or what was causing the increased demand; but certainly, clearly, these projects that include not only the golf course, but proposed hotels and other residences in the peninsula area --

I'm looking for another document here.

There was a special meeting, a City Council meeting -- the emergency meeting was February 22nd, 2005 -- again where the Water Service Company made their statements to the public and to the City Council about why the water

main needed to be replaced.

And they presented a -- or after the meeting, I requested a copy of the report from the California Water Service Company.

Part of the water -- part of that report said that, in determining the demand for water, that they anticipated an increased demand. They said in the document that they checked. They had met with all the planning departments of each of the cities.

So I contacted the Rancho Palos Verdes planning department, Gregory Pfost, P-f-o-s-t; sent him an e-mail, asking him when did the water company meet with their planning department.

And in the response to me, he says -- and this is dated April 2004; actually, this is prior to that meeting -- "I checked with all the planners at the City, and none recall specifically meeting California Water Service Company to discuss future needs." He says, "However, that doesn't mean we didn't furnish them information regarding future projects."

And he also included a list of projects from the City of Rancho Palos Verdes. And it included the South Coast Golf Course -- the proposed golf course -- and a hotel, and luxury residences that were planned in Rancho Palos Verdes.

So my question is: where is the increased demand coming from, that the water lines need to be replaced or increased in size?

As far as I can determine from the information I

have, it's all new projects: the golf course specifically in Rolling Hills Estates -- my city -- and hotel built by Donald Trump, and more golf courses. So I just don't understand why residents are being asked to shoulder the cost of new infrastructure, when the demand that's being -- increase in demand is not because there is increasing residential population, as the city is -- to use the term "built out." The peninsula area is built out. It's -- any new projects are going to be those that are built by developers on new land.

Just seems to me the developers should be paying the additional costs of -- if that's really why these water mains are being replaced.

The other -- another reason that was given at the meeting -- the council meeting that I attended -- was that the water mains are aging. And at that time, I believe they said the water main was about 50 years old.

So I did a little research to find out: what is the average age of water mains? When are they usually replaced? When do they need to be replaced?

And in -- again, in my research, I looked up water main replacement. And there were different sources. One source for some information was a study by the Ohio EPA. And it says their average -- water systems average 68 years.

And then an organization called "the Water Science and Technology Board" gives distribution, pipe age, and replacement rates. In theirs, they give -- I won't go reading all the information, but the upshot of it is: post

World War II pipes tend to have an average life of 75 years.

So the age of the pipes doesn't really seem to be a strong argument to me for why they need to replace the water main and disrupt a lot of the -- disrupt traffic, disrupt, you know, air quality, whatever else they're going to do and are planning to do in Rolling Hills Estates, and at the same time, perhaps cause some health risks.

Again, without an environmental impact report, we don't really know what the impacts are of this project. We don't know if there's any requirement to perform an environmental impact report, but certainly a project of this size, if it were done by any other developer, I am certain, would require an environmental impact report.

One other item that was cited, again -- the water company's presentation at the emergency meeting of the City Council -- was the condition of the pipes, condition of the water main. They cited -- as part of the presentation, it came up that there were 22 breaks over the last 30 years in the water main, and four breaks over the last five years.

And I don't have the quote, but this was a Water Service Company representative who was making the presentation. And these were just notes that I took.

So I didn't know -- I had no point of reference to know whether that was bad, average, good.

I did, again, a little research, and found there are 338 miles of water main in Palos Verdes of the Water Service Company. And it said 22 breaks in 30 years, and five breaks -- four breaks over the last five years.

So again, I went back to the Internet and looked to see if I could find any point of reference. And an article from a Pittsburgh publication is talking about their -- I realize geography makes a difference; land movement makes a different, but I'm only -- I only have general references at my disposal.

And this is someone speaking, quoted from the West View Water Authority in Pittsburgh. She covers 30 Pittsburgh area municipalities. They had 17 breaks in June -- this is in 2004 -- and 20 in July, out of 753 miles of water main. That's not too bad. This is the spokesman for the water authority. And they have about twice as much water main; twice as many miles.

Again, as part of this article, it says the National Industry Group says that might not be enough for Pittsburgh or any other aging city over the next few decades as pipes reach a standard of projected life spans to replace the pipes.

They give a -- there's a quote from the American Water Works Association. It says, "We don't generally replace because we think pipe is bad. We ask: is it sized correctly? Do we have expansion or growth coming up?"

The other thing we look at is its breakdown history. That's a good indicator.

So that's another one of my questions, you know. What is our -- the breakdown listing? Is this really bad? What is it in comparison to other municipalities or other water mains? And is the age something that -- our water

pipes are breaking down more quickly than others?

Again, these were reasons that were cited by the water company in their presentation on why the water mains needed to be replaced.

So, from my observation, the only reason I can see is because of new development. Again, why should residential customers shoulder the burden of paying for infrastructure, when it's developers of luxury resorts and golf courses whom I believe should be paying these -- the costs for the infrastructure?

That's my statement.

ALJ MC VICAR: Thank you.

Mr. Colbert [sic], would you like to make a statement?

Then I think I would propose to go off the record. And you and the water company folks, if you have questions, go ahead and ask your questions and get your answers.

And then if you'd like to wrap up with a summary of what you've learned, that would be fine.

Mr. Colbert [sic], please state your name and spell your name for the reporter.

STATEMENT OF MR. MC GUIRE

MR. MC GUIRE: It's Peter McGuire.

ALJ MC VICAR: Excuse me.

MR. MC GUIRE: M-c-G-u-i-r-e.

Right now, I live in Arizona, but I have a house over here on Rolling Meadows Road in Rolling Hills Estates.

Now, I -- Ms. Colbert and myself worked together

on this just a little bit, and put most of our information together, and she covered most of it. The subject matter that -- of course, I don't want to repeat the things that she has already mentioned, but I'd like to make a couple of additions. And maybe I have a couple of questions, too, of Mr. McVicar.

First of all, I don't know, in reading those documents -- Ms. Colbert, I didn't know if they were water line breaks. I saw them as water line leaks. I don't know if you call that a break or not.

In the 20-some years that I've been on the peninsula, I've never seen a water line break. I drove up and down PV Drive North over to Long Beach and to Westwood part of the time for those years, and never seen a water break yet -- or water line break yet.

I don't know what danger we're in over here. I know our PV has land movements -- I mean considerable ones -- over along PV drive south. And they just run the pipes on top of the road or on top of the land or the ground, and they seem to get along just fine. I don't know if this is a problem over there. I don't see any scheduled construction over there. And I think, well, if we had a break in our area, we might just have to do the same thing temporarily until you fix the break.

I think this is a lot of expense. Nothing was really mentioned here about the cost of some of these items. It was -- in our city, it's something like $7.6 million, which I consider a lot of money in any event. And I -- and I

consider 15 months of unbelievable inconvenience along PV Drive North, which is our main thoroughfare -- it's our main -- I would call it "east/west thoroughfare" for the entire peninsula. I don't know if you're aware of just what kind of an impact that would be, but it's enormous. We have schools along there and everything. I mean, people on the peninsula -- we don't have school buses, so people are driving their kids to school and things of that nature. There are huge backups there as it is, even without any construction, every single day. So I don't know. There was no -- there is no mention of this.

And I also would like to take issue with the fact -- the way this was -- the way this was proposed, and the way it was worked in our city with our City Council. And to meet quietly, never in public, for apparently one year -- none of us knew anything that was going on. We have no notes of anything like that. There are no minutes of these meetings that I know of. And then they put it -- item's not on the agenda to consider, and pass on. Now, I think this is very strange. And I think it's not very -- it's not such -- it's not something that I would consider the way to do things. I think it's rather sneaky.

So I don't know what's going on here, but suddenly, after some memos and comments about "we are built out. We don't need any more water service or additional water service," suddenly we have this enormous multimillion-dollar need to replace pipes. And, oddly enough, they start from one golf course, and go all the way

over to another golf course on the other side of the peninsula. And in the middle is the county's new golf course -- the proposed golf course.

And they want reclaimed water at all these golf courses, so it's a lot cheaper, I imagine. And it's my information that they are going to allow another entity to put reclaimed water pipes in the same ditch that they're going to put the California Water Service new pipes in, and, I think, maybe at no cost, because there was no cost mentioned in these comments. So I think there's another ulterior motive here: that of the reclaimed-water pipes in this ditch.

Now, if they had to do this with their own money, it would be a tremendous expense for them. And the coincidence of us needing new water pipes, when our water pipes aren't very old -- they don't leak, and they seem to be in better shape or better repair than, let's say, the national average, as Ms. Colbert pointed out in her studies. So I kind of question the project's need, based on the information that's been provided to us and the information that we've been able to discover in the meantime.

The way they, the water service here, explained our rate increases: well, 4 or 5 percent here, a little bit there, and so on. Well, it adds up to 25 percent, which I consider, you know, a lot of money for all the residents. And I think what's happening here is the residents are being asked to pay for water that's going to be brought to a few golf courses and Donald Trump, maybe, on the other side of

the hill. I don't know if the water is going to be -- any kind of improved service is going to be over there or not, but I don't think that -- I don't think this is fair.

I also would like to know, your Honor, if the California Water Service falls under the Public Records Act, so we can request records of the -- or from the California Water Service, like we do other public agencies. So if -- are you aware of that, or do you have any idea?

ALJ MC VICAR: Why don't you go ahead and finish your statement? And then we'll get to questions.

MR. MC GUIRE: Well, I'd like to get that in the record anyway as a request.

So in any event, I think that concludes my statements.

I concur with everything, all the data that Ms. Colbert presented. And I'd like to add those -- my comments to her comments as well.

ALJ MC VICAR: Thank you.

Let me make one quick statement.

California Water Service Company is a private company, regulated by the California Public Utilities Commission. And the Commission itself is subject to the Public Records Act; my understanding is that private companies are not.

Off the record.

(Off the record)

ALJ MC VICAR: Back on the record.

While we were off the record, we've had about a

20-minute to half-hour discussion between Ms. Colbert and Mr. McGuire on one side, and the company spokespeople on the other side. And I think now one of the company representatives would like to summarize that -- their plans with respect to this area. It doesn't need to be very long, from my standpoint.

STATEMENT OF MR. TAMBLE

MR. TAMBLE: Thank you.

California Water Service Company was proposing a pipeline project to install a 27-inch pipeline and a 24-inch pipeline on PV Drive North to Crenshaw, and then up Crenshaw to a proposed pump station, reservoir site.

The initial study indicated that PV Drive North would be the most practical pipeline alignment; but in preparing a traffic-control study for the project, and due to the length of the time it took to construct the pipeline, we found that it was not practical to install the pipeline at PV Drive North. So we've been investigating an alternative location through potential easement north of PV Drive North.

In addition, we have separated from the West Basin Municipal Water District recycled pipeline project. We had tried to coordinate facilities on PV Drive North between West Basin and Cal Water and Southern Cal Edison and some undergrounding that they had to do, but we have since taken another approach to separate the potable line project with Cal Water from the West Basin Municipal Water District recycled project.

ALJ MC VICAR: Thank you very much.

Do you have any other questions?

MR. MC GUIRE: I do. I'd like to make another comment yet.

ALJ MC VICAR: Do you want this on the record?

MR. MC GUIRE: Yes, please.

ALJ MC VICAR: All right.

STATEMENT OF MR. MC GUIRE

MR. MC GUIRE: Again, my name is Peter McGuire.

And I would like to know why we would have this 21 percent increase for -- I mean, forever, apparently, is what it looks like, because -- I mean, are we the only ones that are paying for all of this -- for $7.6 million worth of pipe-size increase for the entire peninsula?

In other words, I mean, is this going to be something that we pay for for another 20, 30, 40 years, or whatever?

ALJ MC VICAR: All right.

MR. MC GUIRE: Or is some of this going to be offset by -- wherever these new developments are?

I don't even know where this new need is; why we would need an increased-size pipe.

In other words, why couldn't we go to pipe bursting, and put a 20-inch pipe in? Why do we need a 24-inch pipe? It's my understanding we have enough water pressure. We have adequate -- we're all built out. We don't need additional water. And so why is it that we need this expensive project?

ALJ MC VICAR: All right. Before you answer, let me

state: I usually don't get into question-and-answer sessions on a public-participation hearing like this. So what I'm going to do is go off the record. And you can ask whatever questions you have. And then if somebody wants to summarize what they think they've heard, that's fine. So we'll go off the record.

(Off the record)

ALJ MC VICAR: Back on the record.

Thank you. We have no other members of the public here today, and nobody else signed up to make statements. So at this point, I am going to adjourn until 7:00 p.m. this evening, when we will be back in this room for the evening session. So we are adjourned. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at the hour of 3:30 p.m., a recess was taken until 7:00 p.m.)

* * * * *

AFTERNOON SESSION - 7:00 P.M.

* * * * *

ALJ MC VICAR: Please come to order. This is the time and place set by the California Public Utilities Commission for the further public-participation hearing in Application 05-08-006 through -013, the applications of California Water Service for rate increases in eight districts.

We had just one member of the public who was here a few minutes ago, and did not wish to speak. He had a question about sprinkler systems. And the company has answered his question. And he has now departed.

So we are in recess until either 7:45, or unless somebody else shows up. So we are in recess.

(Recess taken)

Please come to order.

We have one member of the public who is in the back who did not wish to make a statement, and we had two people who initially wished to make statements, two people from Palos Verdes district. And they talked to the company representatives at length of the record about the same projects that were discussed this afternoon in the afternoon session. They got all their questions answered. They do not wish to make a statement, and they have now departed.

So there is nobody else here from the public. And it's 7:45, and we are going to adjourn. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at the hour of 7:45 p.m., this Public-Participation Hearing having concluded, the Commission then adjourned.)

* * * * *