

ROSEVILLE CITY HALL COUNCIL CHAMBERS

Roseville, CA

Wednesday, August 8, 2007

7:00 P.M.

Reported by: JILL R. MCLEOD, CSR #10071  
DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS  
1107 2nd Street, Suite 210  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
(916) 498-9288

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

1 MR. HILL: All right. I guess we are ready to go and I  
2 want to call the meeting to order. My name is Peter Hill.  
3 I'm a member of the Rocklin City Council and the chairman of

4 the South Placer Regional Transportation Authority or SPRTA,  
5 and SPRTA member jurisdictions are the cities of Lincoln,  
6 Rocklin, Roseville in Placer County, and I would like to ask  
7 each of the other members of the Authority Board to introduce  
8 themselves starting with Primo.

9 MR. SANTINI: My name is Primo Santini. I am a council  
10 member of the Board of Supervisors, Placer County, and I  
11 would like to thank our host.

12 MR. UHLER: My name is Kirk Uhler, and I am a member of  
13 the Board of Supervisors.

14 MR. GRAY: My name is Jim Gray. I am the mayor of  
15 Roseville.

16 MR. HILL: SPRTA's purpose is to coordinate planning,  
17 design and construction of regional transportation  
18 improvement, such as the Placer Parkway. Placer County  
19 Transportation Planning Agency, or the PCTPA provides  
20 staffing to SPRTA.

21 The purpose of tonight's public hearing is to receive  
22 comments on the Placer Parkway Corridor Preservation Draft,  
23 Tier 1 EIS/EIR; and I want to make a note that this is a  
24 public hearing and it's an opportunity for the authority  
25 members, for us to listen to you. It's not a question and

1 answer period and neither the Board nor the staff will be  
2 responding to questions or comments.

3 The sole objective tonight is to listen to your comments  
4 on the draft EIR/EIS, and I want to turn the meeting now over

5 to Celia McAdam, who's the executive director of the Placer  
6 County Transportation Planning Agency. She is going to act  
7 as a moderator tonight and she will give you more information  
8 about the procedures that we will have for this meeting.

9 MS. MCADAM: This is on? Okay. Hopefully.

10 MR. HILL: No. It's not on.

11 MS. MCADAM: There we go. Okay. Well, thank you, and  
12 we appreciate everyone coming out here tonight, taking your  
13 valuable time to provide your comments on the Placer Parkway  
14 environmental document.

15 I would like to outline some of the guidelines we are  
16 going by for this hearing, so you know what is going on, what  
17 the plans are, how we are going to handle things as we go on  
18 this evening and throughout the remainder of the  
19 environmental document process.

20 Your comments can be written or oral. Both of them work  
21 equally well and are treated the same and you're encouraged  
22 to make comments about any part of the corridor preservation  
23 proposed project or the draft environmental document. All of  
24 the comments that are received at the public hearing and  
25 within the formal comment period will be recorded and

1 transcribed and they will be part of the formal record, and  
2 then following the comment period, the staff will be  
3 reviewing all of the information that is received from you  
4 folks and from other members of the public and other agencies

5 and will prepare responses that will be included in the final  
6 environmental document.

7 If you want to know more about future meetings, we  
8 really encourage you to sign in at the sign-in table as you  
9 enter into the lobby.

10 For written comments, you can either use the form  
11 provided, which is the comment card here and we have  
12 self-addressed envelopes out there in the lobby as well for  
13 you to send those in or you can write them out here tonight  
14 and provide them in person or mail them later, whichever  
15 works best for you, or you can simply write a letter. That  
16 works equally well and the address is on the form, and as I  
17 said, we do have the envelopes. Comments are due by August  
18 the 20th. That is the end of the comment period.

19 And also, as we are going into tonight's hearing, we do  
20 have a court reporter here that will be recording your  
21 comments verbatim.

22 Let me briefly introduce the project team. We have Stan  
23 Tidman, who is with SPRTA and PCTPA. He is the project  
24 manager for the Placer Parkway, as well as Denise Hike, who's  
25 part of the consultant team, and then out at the front desk,

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

4

1 we have Julie Watson and Cynthia Page.

2 Now, in a minute, we will be hearing from Stan Tidman.  
3 He will be giving a brief presentation and then we will begin  
4 the testimony.

5 Now, in terms of the testimony, we have a couple of

6 guidelines you need to know about. First of all, if you want  
7 to testify, you need to fill out a blue speaker card. Those  
8 are at the table in the lobby, and then in just a minute,  
9 Julie will be standing at the back of the room. If you  
10 decide midway through the hearing that you want to get up and  
11 testify, you can go ahead and do so and hand that in and I  
12 will be calling people up in order.

13       You have a 3-minute time limit and all speakers that are  
14 registered will be heard, even if it takes the hearing beyond  
15 9 o'clock, so we want to make sure that everyone gets their  
16 chance. Speakers may speak only once and I also just want to  
17 reiterate that you can also provide written comments if you  
18 don't choose to speak here tonight, and those details, as  
19 well as the viability of the comment cards, those details,  
20 how to do that are, there is a board out in the lobby that  
21 gives those details; so with that, I would like to turn it  
22 over to Stan Tidman to start the presentation.

23       MR. TIDMAN: Thank you, Celia. Can everybody hear me?  
24 Okay. Great. I would like to spend just a couple minutes to  
25 do basically three things. First -- and Kevin, if we can get

1 the, I think the third slide up on the screen. While he is  
2 doing that, I will basically give you a brief project  
3 background, talk a little bit about what is in the Tier  
4 Draft 1 EIS/EIR, or as the draft, as I will refer to it, and  
5 a slide about what the project team will be doing over the

6 course of the next year. Kevin and I are still working on  
7 the system here. I think he has got it here.

8 As everybody is aware, the Placer Parkway project is a  
9 high priority regional transportation facility that is to  
10 connect State Route 70 and 99 to State Route 65. It's a  
11 project that is listed in the Sacramento Area Council of  
12 Governments, or SACOG, Metropolitan Transportation Plan and  
13 we basically have, the problem or need, as it's called out,  
14 is simply this area is one of the fastest growing areas in  
15 the Sacramento region and we will have a lot of resulting  
16 congestion in both western Placer as well as south Sutter  
17 Counties.

18 The solution or the purpose for the project is basically  
19 to preserve a corridor for a future right-of-way and that  
20 right-of-way will eventually help to address both local and  
21 regional transportation congestion as well as provide access  
22 to employment centers that are both planned and in current  
23 general plans as well as projected development in the area.

24 A little bit about the project. The study area, I don't  
25 know about your cursor, if you can follow along, and I will

1 try not to get this in the Board's eyes, but if you see this  
2 area here, this is basically State Route 70/99 on the west,  
3 State Route 65 here on the east, generally, Baseline and  
4 Riego here across to the south, and then to the north, Sunset  
5 Boulevard West and Howsley Road. The Placer/Sutter County  
6 line is in this general area and you will see that the

7 project area actually takes in a small sliver of northern  
8 Sacramento County.

9 In the draft, you're going to see a fair amount of  
10 references to the three segment areas to the western, here to  
11 the north, the central and then the eastern. In these areas  
12 in the west, we are looking at a 500-foot wide corridor for  
13 the Placer Parkway, from generally, Pleasant Grove Road here  
14 on the west to Fiddymont on the east, a 1,000-foot wide  
15 corridor and then a 500-foot wide corridor to its connection  
16 point at State Route 65.

17 So again, that is an overview of the project area. As  
18 we have worked through the project, and Kevin, next slide, we  
19 have run across five reoccurring or continuing issue areas,  
20 and Kevin, can you actually stream those all up there on the  
21 screen, if you wouldn't mind.

22 The first one is one that we have heard a great deal  
23 about from property owners, particularly in Sutter County,  
24 about what is the range of feasible alternatives? Where are  
25 they and why is it taking so long to identify one? Well, we

1 are getting closer.

2 The second issue area has to do with an environmental  
3 streamlining tool called tiering. You are going to hear a  
4 lot of references to Tier 1 and general developments of  
5 detail; Tier 2, very project level oriented types of detail,  
6 and again, I have a separate slide for that one.

7           The third issue area has to do with two underlying  
8 principles or policies with the Placer Parkway. Access in  
9 that 7-mile segment that I referred to between Pleasant Grove  
10 Road and Fiddymont as well as what is called a no development  
11 buffer zone. The area that is actually outside of the  
12 right-of-way and to the east of the 500-foot or 1,000-foot  
13 corridor. These principles basically have been developed to  
14 try to make sure that the future parkway is a high-speed,  
15 free-flowing facility that will help to minimize growth  
16 adjacent to it.

17           As we kicked off the project back in 2003, there were a  
18 fair number of elected and official developers as well as  
19 environmental groups who were pretty skeptical about these  
20 two policies, so over the course of a year, we worked back  
21 through each of these policies, the background for them, and  
22 a direction that we got from the committees was to basically  
23 continue on to clarify some of the language, particularly  
24 with the no development buffer zone and Tier 2 work, and that  
25 is basically what we have done.

1           The fourth issue area has to do with dealing with  
2 aquatic resource provisions of the Clean Water Act and a fair  
3 amount of work with the U.S. Army Corp. of Engineers, USEPA  
4 and the State Department of Fish and Game.

5           Back in August of 2003, we had an early consultation  
6 meeting with these groups, thought that that would be  
7 basically it, but three, four years later, we have actually

8 had 16 to 17 meetings dealing with, again, tier-level review  
9 of issues related to aquatic resources. All this work is to  
10 be of benefit to us in later Tier 2 environmental reviews,  
11 and the final challenge that we have been dealing with has to  
12 do with pending as well as anticipated development, and  
13 again, I have a separate slide to talk a little bit about  
14 that.

15 But back to the tiering concept. Again, this is  
16 something that I mentioned as a streamlining tool for  
17 environmental reviews of large infrastructure, like the  
18 Placer Parkway that would have several phases or stages.

19 At the Tier 1 level, where we are right now, we are  
20 dealing with a very broad base level of detail, which is  
21 going to emphasize the relative differences among the five  
22 build corridor alternatives that I will be mentioning here in  
23 just a minute.

24 At the Tier 2, as I have mentioned, we get into much  
25 more specific design and construction-related impacts, and

1 again, later detail.

2 From the parkway's perspective, at Tier 1, what we are  
3 trying to do is identify and select a corridor for future  
4 preservation.

5 Tier 2, as I have mentioned, we are basically going to  
6 be looking at the impacts of identifying a roadway alignment  
7 within that specific corridor. So again, distinction between

8 general and more specific Tier 2 related types of work.

9 From a planned and proposed development perspective, I  
10 think this is a pretty powerful slide. It basically gives  
11 you an idea about some of the planning as well as urban  
12 development proposals that are either taking place within the  
13 project study area or immediately around it. Again, to the  
14 west, Monday night we were in Yuba City here, just off of  
15 70/99 and the proposed Sutter Point.

16 Moving across the county line, the Placer County Board  
17 of Supervisors just approved the Placer Vineyard specific  
18 plan, and there are any number of other ones, Sierra Vista,  
19 Creek View, Regional University. Sorry, Kevin. I am  
20 probably moving too fast for you. The proposed Placer Ranch  
21 specific plan, and even including the comprehensive City of  
22 Lincoln general plan, weave that in with some of the work  
23 that SACOG has been doing on its blueprint plan as well as  
24 conservation plan, it makes for a very dynamic project and  
25 vicinity area for reviewing proposals.

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

10

1 All of these projects have different scopes of work,  
2 processes, schedules. What some of them do have in common is  
3 that they will actually be finished before our Tier 1 work is  
4 completed and the concern there is that we do not, at this  
5 point, want to preclude any viable corridor alternatives with  
6 those development approvals, so we have actually had a number  
7 of different developer representatives on our study advisory  
8 committee to share information as well as to try to

9 coordinate outstanding issues.

10 That is a very brief overview of what's been going on  
11 from a project background perspective. I would like to move  
12 now quickly into a summary of the actual draft itself.

13 The steps that you see here are the basic ones. The  
14 blue highlighted area is where we are in the process right  
15 now. Celia mentioned that the deadline for receiving  
16 comments on the draft is August the 20th. Once that date  
17 comes and goes, we are going to be actually responding to all  
18 the comments that we have received here at the public  
19 hearings as well as any written ones, considering those,  
20 identifying a preferred alternative in the final EIS/EIR and  
21 do some administrative work and documents that we have  
22 complied with the appropriate federal and state environmental  
23 processes.

24 From an analysis perspective, I have three points that  
25 are fairly important to make. Number 1, the document, as you

1 can imagine, analyzes the impacts of selecting a corridor and  
2 acquiring it, but as you can also guess, there are not an  
3 awful lot of direct impacts to resources by just selecting  
4 and acquiring property; so the draft goes one step further  
5 and actually takes into account reasonably foreseeable  
6 impacts of actually operating, building and operating a four  
7 to six-lane freeway within each one of the proposed corridor  
8 alternatives.

9           We do that for three basic time frames. The first, the  
10 existing conditions or baseline, 2004. 2020, that is the  
11 theoretical, for planning purposes, opening year for the  
12 Placer Parkway and that is based on general plan build-out  
13 for Placer County, Sutter County, City of Roseville, Lincoln,  
14 Rocklin and adjacent jurisdictions; and then the final time  
15 frame that we look at is 2040, 20 years after the theoretical  
16 opening of the Parkway.

17           This is a condition that the Federal Highway  
18 Administration is very interested in. A key assumption is  
19 there is build-out of general applicable plans, plus most of  
20 the development that you see on that proposed development  
21 slide, so we are basically bracketing growth between 2020 to  
22 that 2040, cumulative condition in 2040.

23           And finally, the draft analyzes a fair amount of  
24 different types of impacts, direct, secondary and cumulative,  
25 and for an example, Kevin, the next slide will actually show

1 you that we havenot confined our analysis to only that  
2 55-mile, 55-square mile area, the project study area that you  
3 see there outlined in black, but in the case of secondary and  
4 indirect impacts, which include growth inducement. We have  
5 actually moved it out quite a bit, to basically Sierra  
6 College Boulevard here on the east, to I-80 on the southeast  
7 and south, up to the Sacramento River to the Feather River,  
8 Nicholas Road, and then actually to the northern boundary of  
9 the City of Lincoln's proposed New Spirit Influence; so once

10 again, we haven't confined our analysis -- or the draft does  
11 not confine its analysis to only the project study area.

12         A little bit about the alternative selection process.  
13 Again, I think we have mentioned we started work on this in  
14 2003 and the SPRTA board actually adopted the range of  
15 alternatives in September of 2005, and these are the ones  
16 that are actually evaluated in the draft and these are all  
17 based on a comprehensive, technical and public review  
18 process.

19         We used environmental screening and transportation  
20 screening along with criteria like avoiding fatal flaws,  
21 avoiding and minimizing to resource areas as well as  
22 comparing each one of the potential alternatives to the  
23 project's purpose and need. We did that for a number of  
24 steps.

25         We used a preliminary planning document called the PSR,

1 project study report. We actually identified back in 2001  
2 some very conceptual alignments, ran them, again, through  
3 that screening process. We modified the alignments. We  
4 refined them several times. We worked with the resource  
5 agencies on a series of what we call avoidance alternatives.  
6 How can we meet purpose and need without a new transportation  
7 facility or a shorter one?

8         And then finally, we actually considered several  
9 landowner alignments later on in the process. And again, all

10 of this was based on a rigorous public as well as agency  
11 public participation program.

12 I think we had actually 15 advisory committee meetings.  
13 We had two environmental public scoping meetings in 2003, two  
14 public meetings in 2004, newsletters and meetings all over  
15 Sutter County as well as Placer County with local agencies.

16 All of that work resulted in the five build alternatives  
17 as well as the draft looks at a no-build, or a project that  
18 would not have the Placer Parkway included in it. And again,  
19 this map may be a little bit hard to see, but again, Kevin,  
20 if you can follow along with me, on the west here, State  
21 Route 70/99, on the east, State Route 65, the southerly  
22 boundary of Baseline and Riego, and then again, to the north,  
23 Sunset Boulevard West and Howsley, the same western, central,  
24 and eastern segments that you saw on the project area map and  
25 all of the build alternatives terminate here at State Route

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

14

1 65. There would be a new interchange with a parkway in the  
2 City of Rocklin's Whitney Ranch Parkway.

3 Starting from the west, I would like to run you through  
4 the five build alternatives, and again, the first three  
5 actually begin at an interchange that would be approximately  
6 a half a mile north of Riego Road.

7 The first alternative is the red alternative. It's  
8 actually the longest one, 16.2 miles through this area. The  
9 second -- I will let Kevin catch up. The second one is the  
10 orange alternative, and again, it takes off on a more

11 diagonal path through the central here before terminating at  
12 65. The blue alternative actually starts off at the  
13 Locust Road alignment. That is the Sutter/Placer County  
14 line, before again sweeping to the north and to the east here  
15 at 65, and then the last two build alternatives would  
16 basically make a connection here at Sankey Road.  
17 Alternative 4 is the yellow. And the last alternative,  
18 Number 5 is the green. It's actually the shortest of the  
19 corridor alignments at 14.2 miles.

20 While we have this map on the wall, I would like to draw  
21 your attention to some of these wow-out areas here. These  
22 are conceptual interchanges that are considered in the draft,  
23 and in the western segment, there would be two. At least  
24 two. One at the state route connection and one here at the  
25 Sutter County area, and up to 3, if you were going to make

1 the connection at the north of Riego connection, from  
2 Fiddymment to, excuse me, from Pleasant Grove to Fiddymment at  
3 the 7-mile segment that I mentioned earlier, no interchanges  
4 are proposed with this Tier 1 proposal. But then there would  
5 be an interchange at Fiddymment, Foothills and again at  
6 Whitney Ranch Parkway.

7 And once again, the draft document does consider the  
8 no-build alternative. The draft is a comprehensive one. It  
9 looks at these 13 environmental issue areas. The work is all  
10 based on a tier level, level of data collection analysis with

11 the three different time frames that I mentioned, and we  
12 outline a fair amount of mitigation strategies to reduce  
13 potential impacts in all of these areas.

14 The draft concludes that with any one of the build  
15 alternatives, there would be impact to a number of the 13  
16 issue areas that you saw on the previous slide.

17 I have four very brief examples to give you an idea  
18 about, just what the magnitude of some of those are, from a  
19 farmland's perspective. You may remember Alternative 1, the  
20 red one that kind of runs in the southernmost alignment, that  
21 would have the most effect on converting farmland, at about a  
22 1,000 acres. Alternative Number 4, which is the yellow  
23 alternative, would have the least impact at about 800 acres.

24 You can imagine we spent a fair amount of time on  
25 traffic and transportation. All of it would reduce connector

1 routes in and around the project study area. However, none  
2 of these would alleviate traffic congestion during peak hours  
3 on portions of State Route 70/99 and indicated State Route  
4 65.

5 From a biological resources perspective, once again, all  
6 of the build alternatives could affect, potentially affect  
7 seven special status species and their habitat. For example,  
8 Alternative Number 3, the one that had the blue segment that  
9 kind of ran along Locust Road, the county line there, would  
10 affect approximately 127 acres of varietal pool complexes,  
11 while Alternative 4, the yellow one would affect only 106

12 acres of varietal pools.

13           The draft does spend a fair amount of time on growth  
14 inducement. One would be -- one of several factors, and I  
15 would remind you about the proposed development factors, one  
16 of several factors that would encourage growth primarily  
17 because it would be expanding and improving the Regional  
18 Transportation System, so the draft makes a series of  
19 conclusions, but what I would like to do is leave you with  
20 three, which I think are fairly important ones.

21           The first has to do with impacts, and as you came in  
22 tonight, we do have summaries of what's called the executive  
23 summary. In that, there are several 11 x 17 pages that  
24 summarize the potential environmental effects of all five  
25 build alternatives, plus the no-build, and if you take a look

1 at it, you will see that for some resource areas, there is  
2 not an awful lot of variations. The impacts are fairly  
3 similar, so there is not a wide range of variations, so I  
4 think that is a key.

5           Number 2, from a CEQA perspective, or California  
6 Environmental Quality Act, which requires us to identify an  
7 environmentally superior alternative, the draft concludes  
8 that the no-build alternative is that environmental superior  
9 alternative, but I have two comments on that. That makes  
10 sense, no project, not an awful lot of effects, except that  
11 it wouldn't meet the project purposes and need; and Number 2,

12 it would result in a significant amount of traffic congestion  
13 and delay, again, within the project area and its vicinity.

14 And then finally, the preferred alternative. We have  
15 talked about this just a little bit. This is something,  
16 again, based on your comments tonight and any written  
17 comments that we get by the 20th, as well as, again, making  
18 our rounds with our federal, state, regional and local  
19 partners, we will actually identify this preferred  
20 alternative in the final EIS/EIR.

21 So lastly, the next steps, what we are going to be doing  
22 over the course of the next year. We have talked about  
23 responding to comments, about identifying the preferred  
24 corridor alternative. We are going to be completing the  
25 Tier 1 EIS/EIR, hopefully by summer of '08, so right around

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

18

1 this time next year, we will be back with this final, and  
2 there will be a public final one on the Placer side and one  
3 on the Sutter side, and then we can actually begin to think  
4 about acquiring and preserving a corridor for the Placer  
5 Parkway.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. MCADAM: Thank you, Stan. We would like to start  
8 with the public testimony and the first speaker card that I  
9 have is Don Perera.

10 MR. PERERA: I am going to pass. The couple of  
11 questions I had, he answered them fine.

12 MS. MCADAM: Okay. So then on to Number 2. That was

13 quick. Olga Widnes.

14 MS. WIDNES: Good evening and thank you. I will be  
15 brief. I just wanted to mention that 11 years ago, my  
16 husband, Claude and I moved here from Marin County. We now  
17 reside at Sunset Roseville. There are about 3,000 plus  
18 homes, a small area. There was nothing around here, and I  
19 mean nothing. The closest store was Albertson's, and I said,  
20 oh, my God. I can't go all the way there for bread and milk,  
21 you know, and look at it today. It's amazing what has  
22 happened in this area. It's wonderful. The growth and all  
23 the stores and everything that we have had, and I think this  
24 Placer Parkway is the answer to everything that we need here.  
25 I think it's a wonderful idea and I wish you the best of luck

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

19

1 with it. God speed. Thank you.

2 MS. MCADAM: I actually have no other speaker cards.

3 MR. HILL: We had three in Yuba City. Come on, folks.  
4 Nobody else?

5 MR. GRAY: Somebody get up and say something.

6 MR. HILL: Okay. Going, going. Come on up and speak  
7 and then you can fill the card out after you speak.

8 MR. POLING: My name is Chris Poling and I live at  
9 5530 Sunset Boulevard West, and I am really speaking on  
10 behalf of my wife and neighbor, who took the initiative to  
11 put together some comments for your consideration. It's in  
12 the form of a petition, and essentially what it says, or I

13 should preface this with saying it may not be within this  
14 scope of Tier 1, but the main point that it's looking at is  
15 the area of the corridor which is outside of the  
16 alternatives, which is east, the section between Fiddymont  
17 Road and Ameruso, (phonetic) the neighborhood there, and what  
18 we are concerned about is the impact of the parkway, how  
19 close it comes to the proximity to our neighborhood, the  
20 Sunset Boulevard and Ameruso community, so I just want to  
21 submit this for your consideration, and I am not sure where  
22 it will fall into this process, but that is essentially it.

23 MS. MCADAM: You can submit those and they will be part  
24 of the record, all written testimony.

25 MR. HILL: Anybody else? Okay. Thank you very much for

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288

20

1 coming. The public record is closed. Thank you all for  
2 coming.

3 (The record concluded at 7:30 p.m.)

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

DIAMOND COURT REPORTERS (916) 498-9288 21

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA )  
 ) ss.  
2 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO )

3

4 I, JILL R. MCLEOD, a Certified Shorthand Reporter,  
License No. 10071, duly certified by the State of California,  
5 do hereby certify:

6 That the foregoing statement was taken before me at the  
time and place first herein set forth;

7

8 That the foregoing transcript is a true and correct  
record of the testimony given by counsel and all proceedings  
had at the time and place of examination, as recorded by me  
9 stenographically, to the best of my ability, and thereafter  
prepared into transcript form via computer-aided  
10 transcription;

11 I further certify that I am a disinterested person, and  
that I am in no way interested in the outcome of said action.

12

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2007.

13

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

---

Certified Shorthand Reporter  
State of California