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CHAIRPERSON CORY: I will call the meeting to order. My apologies for starting late, but this morning has been a somewhat unusual morning.

Given the circumstances of the previous week and today in San Francisco, it would probably be appropriate to make some acknowledgment of the problems that are confronting us as a nation and as a people. It might be appropriate if we just, each in our own way, silently reflect upon those difficulties as each of us sees fit. Two deaths in San Francisco are more than I can understand, and nine hundred in Guyana are more than anybody can cope with. I think it might be appropriate if everybody would sit still and think about it. Maybe each of us in our own way might be able to make some sense or find some way to approach the problem better.

(Thereupon followed a few minutes of silence.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Thank you.

The first item on the agenda is the confirmation of the minutes of the meeting of October 26. Are there any corrections or additions?

COMMISSIONER DYMYAL: I move they be adopted.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Without objection, it is so...
Mr. Northrop.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHPROP: Mr. Chairman, there are two items on the agenda for which you have no material in front of you. The first is that this morning we had a sell-off in the Long Beach office for approximately 1,700 barrels of oil from the Huntington Beach field, from the Aminoil Lease E 392.1. The following companies submitted bids: Basin Petroleum, Alliance Oil Trading, Kern County Refining, Lunday-Thagard, Sunland Refining, DeMenno Resources, and USA Petroleum. In drawing by lot, the successful bidder was Basin Petroleum.

We have some other parcel to place. We have about five more parcels that could be sold off, some more in that same area. We are proceeding to sell those off.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Questions?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHPROP: There is a second item, Mr. Chairman and members. As you will recall, last month in a much lighter vein, we discussed the relocation of the osprey in Huntington Beach. That has been done.

Mr. Charles Fullerton, who is the executive director of the State Department of Fish and Game, is here to discuss that with the commissioners. I'd like to introduce Mr. Fullerton at this time, Commissioners.

MR. FULLERTON: First, on behalf of the ospreys
we want to present the commission with a certificate of
appreciation for the work they did. I think it's great they
could get something done in such a short period of time. As
a result, I'm sure the osprey is going to be indebted to you
if she can find a mate.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: How is the dating service going?

MR. FULLERTON: Not very well.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: This really goes to the staff
of the State Lands Commission and to the staff of Fish and
Game, who are really the people who got off the dime and got
something done. I want to thank all the people over at Fish
and Game for everything they did to make it happen.

MR. FULLERTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Without
you we couldn't have done it.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Thank you very much. We
appreciate it.

Mr. Northrop, don't get mad; get even.

(Laughter.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHRUP: Mr. Chairman, that
completes my report.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Charlie, there is not a mate in
the area yet?

MR. FULLERTON: Not yet, no. But she has taken to
the new nest very well. We expect that there is one some
place around. It's just a little early. It's about a month ahead of the regular mating season.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: But she has taken to the nest?
MR. FULLERTON: Yes, she has taken to the nest, and the transfer went very well.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: May I report that in the interim, during this last month, they dedicated the Bolsa Chica. Charlie had his pet clapper rail and his pet harvest field mouse down there. We did see an osprey in the area. I don't know whether it was a real one or one he let got just for the day.

MR. FULLERTON: Bill, you've got to quit telling our secrets.

(Laughter.)
CHAIRPERSON CORY: My pheasant hunt wasn't too good this last year.

(Laughter.)
CHAIRPERSON CORY: Mr. Northrop.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: That completes my report, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Mr. Golden.
MR. GOLDEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Two items of major interest relate to our coordination effort with the Coastal Commission and the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission.
The Coastal Commission item is the requests for public trust determinations.

    The number of requests from the Coastal Commission and its regional commissions for State Lands assistance in making public trust determinations is growing as the commissions get more deeply involved in the preparation and certification of local coastal programs pursuant to the California Coastal Act of 1976.

    Most recently, we have had requests for determinations of the extent of the public trust in the Sweetwater Marsh Area in San Diego Bay and in the Ballona Wetlands Area in Los Angeles County.

    While we will be sharing with the commissions' staffs what factual information we have regarding these areas, we have notified Mr. Michael Fischer, the executive officer of the state commission, that in order to do additional research necessary to make public trust determinations within the Local Coastal Program certification timeframe, we will need to obtain additional funding from some source. We have asked Mr. Fischer to meet with his staff to discuss such possible funding through the Coastal Commission. We will report to you our progress on obtaining such additional funding.

    The second item is on Pickleweed Associates. As you will recall, several months back I called to your
attention that there was a permit application pending before BCDC which posed major title problems to state lands.

The staff of the Lands Commission has just reached a tentative agreement with Pickleweed Associates in settlement of the titles to the land proposed for development. We are prepared to recommend a settlement of the title dispute between the state and Pickleweed in lieu of litigation and its accompanying costs and uncertainties.

This matter will be placed on your December agenda for review and, hopefully, approval. Once the title issue has been cleared, this applicant can proceed with his application before BCDC.

That completes my report, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I think it's a real tragedy for the legal profession that this thing is going to be negotiated and not litigated. Can you imagine having a US Supreme Court case called Pickleweed?

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: It's a tough one to pass up.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Pickleweed vs. Cory.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Any questions of Mr. Golden? I have a question that relates to the Coastal Commission and the fires at Malibu. There were newspaper reports that for those people to rebuild, they were going to
have to dedicate. Is that an erroneous report?

MR. GOLDEN: Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman. I investigated that, and it was actually just a misstatement in a fast sum-up of the situation. If they intend to expand, then they'd have to --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: But they can rebuild what they had without the government extracting any blackmail from them?

MR. GOLDEN: That's correct.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, Agenda Items C8, 43, 44, and 50 are off calendar for various reasons. Agenda Item 55 will be in executive session.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. The next item is the consent calendar. These are the items on the printed agenda that is available which are designated with the letter "C". They are C1 through C23, excluding C8.

Is there anyone in the audience who has any disagreement with the proposed staff recommendations on any of those items? They will be taken up in one group and voted on all together unless someone wants any of them excluded.

Do the commissioners have any problems with them? Hearing none from the audience, and without objection, the consent calendar, excluding Item C8 will be approved as presented.
Item 24: Western LNG Terminal Associates, a 30-
year general lease at Point Conception for 260 acres of
coastal tide and submerged land. This is pursuant to the
LNG Terminal Act?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: That's correct,
Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: As I understand it, our options
at this point are that we can approve this as it is before
us, or we have a deadline at which it will be --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: -- done for us.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: -- done for us.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: I might add that we
had requested last month to put it over. We have since
received a communication from William B. Wallace, who is a
county supervisor. You have that letter in front of you.
Counsel advises me that Supervisor Wallace's letter requested
to have some additional language inserted in our standard
form lease. Unfortunately, we do not have that luxury.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Is Mr. Wallace here?

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Is Mr. Wallace here?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: No.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The LNG Siting Act provides that
we shall use the standard form lease; is that right?

MR. STEVENS: That's right. It requires it.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: When this act was being
debated, if I recall correctly, this commission attempted to get some language to provide some flexibility in the negotiating process. We were not fortunate.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Your memory serves you correctly.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: You're saying I have to vote for this because the Legislature has so mandated?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: We were very lucky to get this much into the law, because this way we are allowed to set our rents. Otherwise, that might have been done for us.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to address the commission on Item 24?

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Before we vote on it, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I am going to vote for it, but I want the record to show that I have never been terribly excited about the Point Conception site. I felt there were some alternative sites that might have been better. But in view of the dictates of the Legislature, I have no alternative but to join with the rest of you, I hope, in voting for the lease.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: As I understand, the siting act provided that the location would be determined by the PUC, and that after they made that determination, then we could extract our pound of flesh in terms of revenue for the State.
If we don't do that, then it gets approved without a revenue component.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHPROP: That's the way it looks.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: So we are not approving the site per se. That has been done by the PUC. We are just saying, "As long as they are going to put it there, they ought to pay rent."

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHPROP: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER McCAUSLAND: I will second the Lieutenant Governor's motion.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: It has been moved and seconded that the proposed lease be approved as presented. All those in favor signify by saying "Aye".

(Ayes)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Those opposed?

It is carried.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Let the record show that my "Aye" was a very soft one.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Item 25: the termination of three leases and combining them into one lease with Chevron.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHPROP: That is really four terminal leases that were covered in three leases and now
will be in one, Mr. Chairman. This is the result of considerable negotiation between Chevron and staff.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Is there anybody in the audience on this item?

(Pause.)

CHAIRPERSON McCausland: No objection.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Without objection, Item 25 will be approved as presented.

Mr. Taaffe.

MR. TAAFFE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: There is a rumor running around, if you could please come forward, that at the conclusion of this lease you are saying "Sayonara".

MR. TAAFFE: At the conclusion of this week, I will be, yes. That's after 39 years.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: You've caused enough trouble.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: We have here a State Lands Commission resolution. I don't read out loud that well, but I will try.

"WHEREAS the State Lands Commission and staff have had numerous opportunities to transact business with E. J. "Ec" Taaffe, representing Chevron USA, Incorporated; and

"WHEREAS this relationship has been exemplified
by Mr. Taaffe's unrefined and, basically, crude approach to business; and

"WHEREAS his liberal attitude is highlighted best by his profligate use of his Shell credit card; and

"WHEREAS he has demonstrated his aptitude for change by learning how to spell and define 'environment'; and

"WHEREAS Ed once displayed a knack for flexibility by shelving Chevron's plan to build a refinery in the middle of Forest Lawn Cemetery; and

"WHEREAS Ed has played a key leadership role in promoting energy conservation by driving an electric cart around his palatial home; and

"WHEREAS Ed has decided to call it quits after an exemplary career to do some wildcatting -- or is it 'tomcatting'? -- on his own;

"NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government of Ireland be warned immediately of Ed's impending vacation and visit;

"FURTHER BE IT RESOLVED that a letter of thanks be forwarded to Chevron, USA, Incorporated, in gratitude for their having accepted his letter of resignation; and
"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED -- and sincerely
resolved -- that the State Lands Commission
and its staff wish Ed many happy and healthy
retirement years."

(Laughter interspersed throughout.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Ed, it's been a pleasure
working with you.

MR. TAAFFE: I very much appreciate it. Thank you
very, very much.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I hope you take it in the terms
it's offered.

(Laughter and applause)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Item 26.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, this is
a recommendation of a denial of a general permit to Robert
Sieglitz. Mr. Hight and his legal staff, as well as
Mr. Trout, have done considerable work on this, and I'd like
to have Mr. Hight review it.

MR. HIGHT: Mr. Chairman, this is a recommendation
of a denial of a permit for Mr. Sieglitz. Mr. Sieglitz,
unfortunately, is unable to obtain the necessary insurance
for the occupation of the proposed site, and we are placed
in kind of a precarious position, where the staff doesn't
believe it can recommend to the commission that it go ahead
with the lease without insurance.
I believe Mr. Sieglitz is here and would like to address the commission.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Mr. Sieglitz.

MR. SIEGLITZ: I am the subject in question. My name is Bob Sieglitz.

As staff just mentioned, I have contacted numerous insurance companies attempting to obtain liability insurance as required by the lease prepared by counsel for the commission, and I have been unable to do it for any reasonable cost.

Last Wednesday afternoon I got a call from Alan Scott of the commission office stating there may be one last resort. I called them. I got a call back this morning that there is no insurance available for a reasonable cost from that particular company.

I would like to request that the commission approve the lease, the modified lease as prepared by staff counsel, with the exception of two items. One of those items is the $100,000 combined-single-limit-coverage policy. The other item is the right-of-inspection item on the lease.

Other than the fact that I cannot obtain the insurance at a reasonable cost, the reasoning is that one of the suggestions made within the calendar item is that it is possible that I could find berthing space in a marina. I called every marina listed in the Sacramento phone directory...
this morning and got an answer from all but three of them, and every one of them said that there is no space available for my vessel.

The reason I would like to have the inspection item eliminated is that I feel it infringes upon my constitutional rights as far as having my property inspected. That clause basically says the State Lands personnel have the right to come up on lands owned by me at any time. There is no land that's owned by me that is subject to this lease. I'm not adjacent to a parcel of land that's owned by me. I'm leasing that parcel. All the other lands and property that I own throughout the state I don't feel come under the jurisdiction of the State Lands Commission.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Is the Lands Commission requesting to inspect the vessel or the land?

MR. SIEGLITZ: The wording is "to inspect the land".

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Is the land your land or the state's land?

MR. SIEGLITZ: The land that I'm parked at right now is leased property. It does not belong to me. However, as soon as practical -- I own property on the Sacramento River, and I will be moving my vessel to my property.

MR. HIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I believe the land referred to in the lease is the state land and what the
lease intends is that the area of the lease and the
occupation of the lease be open to inspection by the
commission staff at reasonable opportunities.

I think the major question that the commission
faces is the insurance problem.

CHAIRPERSON Cory: Where are we in terms of our
liability if something goes awry, if somebody gets
injured? This is to protect the state's general fund from
liability by having leased the state's property to a private
person. Is that the purpose of it?

MR. HIGHT: Correct, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON Cory: If somebody gets on the vessel
and gets injured --

MR. HIGHT: -- they would naturally sue the state
in addition to Mr. Sieglitz, and the state having the deeper
pocket -- we would naturally have a lawsuit against
Mr. Sieglitz to recover, but depending upon the value of that
suit, it might not be too fruitful.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Is the state pocket
"deeper"? I understood it was "obscene".

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER McCausland: It's not a question of
exposure.

(Laughter.)

MR. SIEGLITZ: In speaking with my attorney, he
sees no action that could create a liability for the state in that my boat is floating on the river -- any more so than a water skier or fisherman on the river.

I am the only boat, individual boat, I believe, that is actually not attached in any way to state lands that I understand this particular action is taking effect against in the Sacramento area -- that the lease is being required of in the Sacramento area.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: What is the uniqueness of his position?

MR. HIGHT: The commission initiated a program in 1975 to find trespassers of state land. There may be other vehicles or other vessels on the waterway. Unfortunately, we just haven't gotten to them. Mr. Sieglitz is in the position of being the speeder that got caught. We will eventually get to every person in similar circumstances.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: What is the circumstance?

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: A little background would be helpful to me.

MR. HIGHT: He has a minesweeper that's approximately 120 --

MR. SIEGLITZ: 136.

MR. HIGHT: -- 136 feet long moored by means of cables to the bank of the Sacramento River.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: When you talk about
"reasonable" and "unreasonable" premiums, give us some ballpark figure.

MR. SIEGLITZ: For a definite premium I got a cost of $3,800 a year. One quote said it would possibly be under $500 after a marine survey, but a marine survey would require taking the 136-foot vessel out of the water, which would cost approximately $4,000.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: My problem is that if somebody is on the vessel while it's moored there and gets injured, or runs into it and their boat sinks, and they say we shouldn't have allowed you to moor there --

MR. SIEGLITZ: Just as far as history, Mr. Cory, the boat has been there since 1951 off and on. It has never been involved in a litigation matter and has never subjected the state to any litigation matter. My attorney does not believe there is anything that could occur that --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: But our attorneys are saying we have the liability, and given the insurance premium rates for a liability policy, the insurance company must think there is some liability that might accrue.

MR. SIEGLITZ: I can get the insurance for free, without any additional charge, after I move the vessel up to my property and build a house. It would be an automatic extension of my homeowner's policy. So they consider it no liability on that basis.
COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Let me ask counsel: Is there such a thing as waiving liability where the state is concerned?

MR. STEVENS: I don't believe a waiver would be held binding, Governor. That's the problem we have with that.

MR. SIEGLITZ: In the lease that was originally presented to me, there is wording to the effect that insurance would be required "if so specified". There is wording to that effect four or five times throughout the lease. That indicates to me that there are possibly times when insurance would not be specified and has not been specified, based on this boilerplate lease.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Let me tell you my problem. I'm half with you and half with the state. I have great sympathy for you, but then as a commissioner I have a responsibility to follow the advice of counsel to protect the state's interests. If you could help in resolving that in the next two minutes --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: That's where we all are. It would seem to me that now, having been put on notice of the proposed problem, not to require the insurance would be knowingly accepting the risk, and I think that puts the state in a very adverse position in such a lawsuit.

MR. SIEGLITZ: I don't think it has been
demonstrated that the state has a risk.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: $3,800 is a substantial demonstration of risk.

MR. SIEGLITZ: But it's zero dollars on the extension of a homeowner's policy.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Virtually ever major homeowner's policy excludes licensed vehicles of various kinds in them. There was a recent court case, and there was legislation subsequent to it, that limited that extension that the courts put on that. Having been in the insurance business, I doubt that you are really going to be covered under your home-owner's policy.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Even if he were, that's tomorrow, not today.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: That's right. We are still sitting here with some risk. I don't see how I could reach that far for you. I appreciate your concern.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: What would happen if we deny this permit?

MR. HIGHT: Mr. Sieglitz would be forced to remove his vessel to a marina of some description some place.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Can we give him adequate time to do that?

MR. HIGHT: Yes.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: I've got great sympathy for
you, Mr. Sieglitz.

MR. SIEGLITZ: What type of "adequate time"? I could be moved up to property belonging to me within a six-month period or so. Can we say that this lease would not be necessary and go on a general recreational permit for that period of time?

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Can you make it shorter?

COMMISSIONER McCausland: Let me ask if our exposure is any different on the property owned by you than it is on this property. Would you still be moored on state land, although the state land is adjacent to property in your name?

MR. SIEGLITZ: I would still be moored on water in the Sacramento River.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: What does that do to the liability question?

MR. HIGHT: If in fact Mr. Sieglitz could obtain insurance through a homeowner's policy, then the state would be covered and he would meet the requirements to obtain a permit.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: What happens if he gets there and he is not covered on that homeowner's?

MR. HIGHT: That would be the same problem we're faced with now: no insurance.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: What actually happens in terms
of looking at the legislation? Does he file a copy of the policy or where it's listed?

MR. HIGHT: Yes, we require a rider on the policy, a copy of that, as proof of insurance.

MR. SIEGLITZ: I did make that suggestion, but there is the problem that there is presently no home on that property or building on that property for a homeowner's policy. So you are correct in assuming that there still is a real problem.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: What length of time can we allow?

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: I have a suggestion, Mr. Chairman. Give him until the next commission meeting in December.

MR. HIGHT: December 20.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Give him till then to look for a marina. Give him one last shot.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: He should come in with a proposal at the next meeting as to a time certain?

MR. SIEGLITZ: I appreciate the concern. Unless, though, staff counsel has positive indication that there are marinas available for me to moor at pursuant to their recommendation on the calendar item, I don't think there are any local places where it can be moored. Possibly I could go to Sausalito and add mine to 50,000 others, but I'm sure
that wouldn't be acceptable to either me or the commission.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: I am very sympathetic, and

I'm not prepared to be tough today. Perhaps just before
Christmas when my pocket is empty and I'm mad at everybody
-- I'd like not to make a decision today, I'd like to give
you a little more time.

COMMISSIONER McCAUSLAND: Fine.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I guess we can put this over.

You are buying some time until the next meeting. The
indications are that unless you come in with some specific
concept of time certain -- the question goes through my mind:
I don't see how you could have a homeowner's policy in effect
in six months in terms of actually having a structure
occupied and meeting those requirements.

You ought to come back with a specific plan. If
I had to vote at this point, my vote would be for denial.

MR. SIEGLITZ: Thinking in other terms, is it
possible -- I am the only boat in this specific instance,
and there are two other boats of the exact same size as mine
in the Sacramento River that have been there for at least as
long as mine have -- well, I take that back: for at least
ten years for the shortest one. I am still the only boat
being required to obtain a lease, insurance, et cetera.

If the state drops its requirement of having a
lease, does it then drop also its responsibility for
liability -- in the same sense that it would any other boats on the river?

MR. HIGHT: I don't understand your question, Mr. Sieglitz. The state would not drop its requirement for a lease.

MR. SIEGLITZ: It's been working on me now for about three years, but it hasn't had time to go after any of these other boats.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: That's going to happen. They are going to get theirs.

MR. SIEGLITZ: But that would give me enough time.

MR. HIGHT: One of the others I think you referred to is in a marina, and I don't know about the third one.

MR. SIEGLITZ: One of them is adjacent to Discovery Park. It's within two miles of my boat. The other is Captain Palmer's boat. It was on the shore for a long time. It's now floating because they got another high water. He was able to float it this year. It's on the Yolo side. They're identical size. They are sister ships.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: That other one was the one that precipitated this inquiry.

MR. SIEGLITZ: He hasn't been contacted by the State Lands Commission yet. I was.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I think he was.

MR. SIEGLITZ: He claims he wasn't. That's possible.
CHAIRPERSON CORY: I think he was. That's at the confluence of the American and the Sacramento?

MR. SIEGLITZ: No, that isn't Palmer's. That's the other one I was mentioning. Fairly close to the confluence, right.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: If the other one is in a marina, the marina's insurance policy covers the liability.

MR. TROUT: That's in litigation now.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Today I have no choice but to vote denial. Next month may be a different story.

COMMISSIONER McCUSAULAND: Just for the sake of my personal knowledge, would you stipulate that the vessel is currently seaworthy?

MR. SIEGLITZ: No.

COMMISSIONER McCUSAULAND: Is it your intent to make it seaworthy --

MR. SIEGLITZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McCUSAULAND: -- within five years?

MR. SIEGLITZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER McCUSAULAND: Within four years?

You're going to build a house first?

MR. SIEGLITZ: I plan on making it seaworthy within three. However, I've owned the boat now for three years and I'd planned on having it seaworthy within about two and a half, and I haven't done anything for a year on it.
COMMISSIONER McCausland: Is it possible to keep the vessel afloat at the current time?

MR. Sieglitz: Oh, yes.

COMMISSIONER Dymally: I move that this item be put over to the next meeting of the Lands Commission.

COMMISSIONER McCausland: No objection.

CHAIRPERSON Cory: Without objection, that will be the order.

Try to come up with some kind of plan given the impossible constraints you're under.

Item 27: Formation of a Santa Barbara Channel ad hoc study group on oil and tar seeps.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER Northrop: Mr. Chairman, since the recent earthquake in Santa Barbara, some people have felt that there has been an increase in seeps in the area. I am asking permission to form an ad hoc study group comprised of industry, county, state, and cities to take a look at this and to come up with some solution to this problem, or at least to take a second or third look at it.

CHAIRPERSON Cory: You will be contacting the commissioners for membership on this?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER Northrop: Right.

CHAIRPERSON Cory: Any questions?

Without objection, Item 27 is approved as presented.
Item 28. Mr. Hight, is this one yours?

MR. HIGHT: I pass to Mr. Trout.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Mr. Trout.

This involves Huntington Harbour and the change in the Nejedly Act.

MR. TROUT: That's correct. Some time ago Huntington Harbour requested a number of general permits for recreational use on lots they were selling. As part of that, the commission authorized the staff to make subsequent assignments from Huntington Harbour to the ultimate purchasers of the lots.

What's happened is that the Nejedly Bill provided for recreational pier permits without charge, and the prior authority does not seem to cover the new situation. We're simply asking that the commission authorize the staff to issue recreational pier permits on specified lots where they've been previously subject to commission review.

It's fairly simple, although the calendar item is kind of complicated.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Are there questions on this? Is there anybody in the audience on this item? Without objection, the proposed amendments requested by the staff are granted.

Item 29: A proposed title settlement and boundary line agreement in lieu of litigation, Parkwood 101 along
Belmont Slough.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, this is 58 acres plus a 50-foot easement and 199 acres off-site to come to a compromise agreement on the Parkwood 101/Belmont Slough (San Mateo County) exchange.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on this item? Any questions from commissioners?

Without objection, Item 29 will be approved as presented.

Item 30: Settlement of title and boundary problems in Union City, Alameda County (Ortiz Parcel) and exchange of interests for portions of Brown's Island and Point Edith parcel, Contra Costa County. Brown's Island is the land bank?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: And is there anybody in the audience on Item 30? Questions from commissioners?

Without objection, Item 30 is approved as presented.

Item 31: Extension of a substantial compliance provision in a boundary line agreement along the Colorado River near Blythe, Riverside County.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: A two-year extension to place riprap.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on this
item? Questions from commissioners?

Without objection, Item 31 will be approved as presented.

Item 32: Consideration of proposed findings and policy concerning environmental impacts of piers, buoys, and other structures on the ecology of Lake Tahoe.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, this is an item that was on calendar last time. It's Mr. Trout's concepts in reply to the bills which allow the proliferation of recreational piers. Lake Tahoe seems to be in some trouble. Jim has prepared this map.

MR. TROUT: There are two aspects of it. Our environmental processing unit has -- I think, properly -- pointed out that up to now the commission has been approving leases for recreational structures and other piers and buoys at Tahoe on the basis of categorical exemptions, which authorizes structures under 3,000 square feet and a few other kinds of things.

On the basis of a study that was done a year ago at the commission's request, there is some uncertainty as to the effect of these things. The study was called "The Cumulative Impacts of Shorezone Development at Lake Tahoe".

Fish and Game in California and Nevada have prepared studies. The exhibit there on the easel shows areas of sensitive fish habitat and spawning areas, and then
the little things that look like pins show significant
inlets that have fish habitat potential.

What needs to be done is we need to have an
environmental study made -- as was done in Huntington
Harbour and over in the San Francisco Bay Area along Corte
Madera Creek, I believe -- of the cumulative impact. In
other words, how many piers can you build at Lake Tahoe
without having a significant adverse environmental effect?

The commission really has a couple of alternatives
We could seek the funds, or at least go through the
Resources Agency to see what the possibilities are for
making such a study. We thought we had it with this one,
but the prior study really, as consultants often do, said,
"There isn't enough information, so we need another study."
That's what has to be done.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Who paid for that study?

MR. TROUT: It was a combination of the State of
Nevada, the State of California, and the United States
Government: the Corps of Engineers, the State Lands
Commission, and I think it was the Nevada Environmental
Protection Agency.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Did they meet their contractual
obligations?

MR. TROUT: Yes, under the constraints. There was
only a limited amount of money available, and based on that
limited amount of money, yes, we think they did. They were not allowed to develop their own data. They were pretty much compelled to use readily available data, and then they went out and did some questioning of people, and they put that all together.

The commission is now faced with a backlog of applications for leases that it has to deal with under the timeframe constraints of AB 884.

We can do a couple of things. We've tried to outline these options in the calendar item.

I think the scaff is leaning a little bit toward the finding that we don't have enough data and that pending completion of a cumulative EIR, applications be rejected so that we don't end up with time running -- with the exception of mooring buoys outside of the areas of sensitive habitat shown on that map.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I have a question on that.

There is a blank piece of shore between Carnelian Bay and Agate Bay. There is no cross-hatching there. So somebody could have one there?

MR. TROUT: A mooring buoy, I think --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: But not a pier?

MR. TROUT: That's right.

An exception also would be, perhaps, a multiple-use structure where a full EIR were done, such as a structure
that might be owned and shared by a number of homeowners in lieu of individual structures. That is the Alternative B in the calendar item.

Then there is the question of whether the commission would authorize a budget change proposal, for example, seeking funds to prepare a cumulative EIR or ask the Resources Agency to do it or to make the funds available from the license plate fund or something like that.

That's where we are. I think our staff's concern is the recognition of the fact that we think there needs to be some suspension of leasing activity for piers at Tahoe if we are going to live up to the spirit of the Environmental Quality Act.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Would you need legislation to use Lands Commission money, or could we do it without legislation?

MR. TROUT: The commission's revenue all goes into the general fund, and it would require an appropriation in some form: either a special bill or a budget item in the commission's budget or the Resources Agency or Fish and Game, or somebody who is willing to take it on.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: What's the ballpark figure?

MR. TROUT: Staff has been working on that. I don't know whether Dwight Sanders, who is in that program, has a figure or not. I would think it would be in the
neighborhood of maybe $50,000 to $100,000, maybe.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: That's a lot of money. It appears it needs to be done.

What specifically do you want us to do? To pick which option you go for to get the money?

MR. TROUT: That's only part of it. If the commission is willing to make a decision today, I think the decision needs to be made as to whether or not lease applications will be returned as a commission policy until the cumulative EIR is done -- other than for mooring buoys and possibly consideration of multiple-use facilities.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: You are talking then about a July 1st starting date if you are going to augment the budget?

MR. TROUT: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: So you are talking about a suspension from January 1 to June 30?

MR. TROUT: As a minimum. Then of course the study would probably take another six to nine months, something like that.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Nine months is too long. Make it six months. So you are talking about a suspension of about a year.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: At least.

MR. TROUT: I think that's right, Governor.
CHAIRPERSON CORY: This whole concept we didn't agree to, but the Legislature said, "This is the law; you're wrong; go do it this way." We've got the problem if we do this as to how they are going to react to our interpretation.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: I have a suggestion, Mr. Chairman: that we do this in two stages. We have a suspension from January 1 to June 30. Then if the money is in the budget, at our June or July meeting we initiate another six-month suspension. If the money is not in the budget, there is no point in moving any further.

MR. TROUT: Governor, if that's your motion, staff would suggest that it might be expanded a little bit to take care of applications now in-house. Till June 30 we could give the applicant the option of either leaving it in abeyance without the time running or we would return it without prejudice and they could resubmit it in July.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: If the money is in the budget, they'll just have to wait another six months.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on this item?

COMMISSIONER McCUSAULD: I'd like to move the staff recommendations with the modifications described by the Lieutenant Governor and Mr. Trout.

MR. TROUT: I think that would be Alternative B with the Governor's suggestion regarding the budget.
CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Without objection, we will approve Alternative B with the Dymally-Trout amendments.

Item 33: American River Report. Do you want us to concur in the American River Report?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, this is a report that follows a resolution from the Legislature. The Legislature was unclear whether we own the American River. The report said, basically, that yes, we own the American River, but it is not specific as to the lines from Nimbus Dam to the confluence with the Sacramento River.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: So this report says that we own the riverbed, but we don't know where the riverbed is.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Do we need action on that?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: We want you to concur in that.

COMMISSIONER McCAUSLAND: There is a bed in the American River.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: And it belongs to the state.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: And it belongs to the state, wherever the courts find it.

MR. STEVENS: This is at least a starting point,
Mr. Chairman, for a dialogue.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: I move concurrence.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Without objection, it will be approved as presented.

Item 34: The CEIP contract.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, this is the result of discussions we have had at previous commission meetings regarding the request for federal coastal impact monies to conduct a marine terminal safety study. This is a two-year study in excess of $303,000.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on Item 34? Questions from commissioners?

Without objection, it will be approved as presented.

Item 35: Wickland Oil. They want to have an EIR for --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: -- building a terminal.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: At Carquinez Straits?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Yes, in the Carquinez Straits, near the bridge.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Any questions from the commissioners? Anybody in the audience?

Without objection, Item 35 will be approved as presented.
Item 36: A resolution relative to leases and permits deemed approved under Government Code Section 65956.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, if we miss an 884 cutoff on time, this defines which leases and permits go into effect.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: This is a mechanism that if something falls through the cracks in the time limit, there is a lease and conditions that people have to comply with, the same as other people who did in fact have a lease approved.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: We hope we don't have to exercise it.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on this item?

Without objection, the resolution in Item 36 will be adopted.

Item 37: Addition to application lists and criteria adopted pursuant to 65942.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, we have no criteria on seawalls. What this does is give us criteria for seawall programs.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on seawalls?

Mr. McCausland.

COMMISSIONER McCUSAULD: This is an addition to
application lists and criteria. What is the status of the
EIR requirement on this kind of permit application?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: It must be addressed.
We must assess the environmental impact.

COMMISSIONER McCAUSLAND: So on the basis of the
filed application, you determine whether or not an
environmental impact report is required or a negative
declaration?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Yes, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER McCAUSLAND: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Are there further questions?

COMMISSIONER McCAUSLAND: No objection.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Without objection, Item 37 will be approved as presented.

Item 38: Authorization for refund to
Mr. S. E. Ryerson of an excess royalty payment. Is there anybody in the audience on this item? Any questions from members of the commission?

Without objection, Item 38 will be approved as presented.

Item 39: Prospecting permit on school land near Glamis, Imperial County, for the American Copper and Nickel Company. That is for uranium. They are going to add something to their name.

Is there anybody in the audience on this item?
Questions from the commissioners?

Without objection, Item 39 will be approved as presented.

Item 40: Certification of negative declaration for prospecting permit near Pine Valley, San Diego County, for Denby Jackson. Anybody in the audience on this item?
Questions from commissioners?

Without objection, Item 40 will be approved as presented.

Item 41: Leucadia County Water District and Trinity Sand and Gravel; maintenance dredging permits for 10,000 cubic yards or less in San Diego County and Trinity County.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: This is informative only, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. It has been noticed.

Item 42: Morris Tug and Barge; a mineral extraction lease on 1,560 acres of sovereign lands in South San Francisco Bay, Alameda and San Mateo Counties.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, there is a question on this, particularly in my own mind, as to whether an EIR prepared -- the staff prepared the bulk of the EIR, I am informed, but we did get some information and help from one of the bidders, who was not successful. I understand that Kay Bell, Jr., from Morris Tug and Barge is
here. For the record, we would like to understand that they are willing to underwrite the costs that were incurred by another party in helping us prepare this.

In a conversation with their representative before the meeting, Mr. Francis Hortig, Jr., we understand they are amenable to making this, but I would like to have that from them in the record.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Frank, as I understand it, the question is that somebody else did some work on the EIR and they may end up wanting to get their money back since they lost the bid. Is that the hassle?

MR. HORTIG: That is correct, Mr. Chairman. The lease was offered for bid subject to the condition that the successful bidder pay for the EIR, and my client, Morris Tug and Barge Company, is willing to pay for the costs of the preparation of the EIR.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: And you know what that is? That's a finite amount?

MR. HORTIG: We have an estimate from staff, sir, and that is acceptable.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: For the record, what is that estimate -- so they don't get sandbagged when it comes in at $84 zillion.

MR. HORTIG: It was reported in the range of two to three thousand dollars.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Is that correct, Mr. Everitts?

MR. EVERITTS: We don't know exactly how much Mr. Bell has expended, but that would be in the range.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. As long as we know.

MR. BELL: My name is Kay Bell. I don't represent Morris Tug and Barge at all.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: I'm sorry. Forgive me. Have a chair and identify yourself for the record, and we will straighten it out.

MR. BELL: My name is Kay Bell, Jr. I'm the original applicant for the lease in question. My purpose in being here today is to suggest --

I had a lower bid factor than Mr. Morris in this bid. Mr. Morris bid a bid factor of 1.81; my bid factor was 1.6 or something like that.

I would suggest that the commission review this further before they award this lease because, to my knowledge, Morris Tug and Barge doesn't have an Army Corps of Engineers permit for mineral extraction, whereas I have done that. I've had an Army Corps permit for some time.

I've held back my mining operation waiting for all these permits and for this lease to go through without extracting any minerals for many years now: four or five years on this State Lands Commission lease, for one thing. I
have an expensive piece of equipment sitting at the dock waiting to make some money. Mr. Morris has been dredging.

I wonder also about his arrangement with the State Lands Commission where he has been extracting minerals for some amount of time and how he has been doing this. This information has not been made available to me, although I've asked for it.

I'm trying to say that I think it needs more looking into, and I haven't had any input at all in the decision-making part of this, although I spent all this time on the permits and the leases. I've had no input at all to the commission regarding the final outcome here.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: You are contending that Morris Tug and Barge is extracting minerals from state lands without licensing permit?

MR. BELL: I don't know what licensing permit they have. To my knowledge, they have not applied for a mineral extraction lease. I know for sure they don't have a lease like this.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Do you have knowledge that they are in fact extracting minerals?

MR. BELL: Yes, I do.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: In what location?

MR. BELL: In a similar location as to this area in my lease package.
MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, I understand that this company is a successor to Pioneer Shell Company. Pioneer Shell has been harvesting shells from the --

MR. HORTIG: No. They are separate.

MR. TAYLOR: The only company I know of that is taking shell at the present time is Pioneer Shell, which we had an agreement with some time ago when we caught them trespassing. Their operation went back to a time prior to the time of the requirement of leases. They agreed to make a settlement with us over the situation.

We entered into an interim agreement whereby we were impounding the money derived from those operations. One, we had a problem establishing a price for the shell. Secondly, they had to go get their permits. Thirdly, that lease will go out for public bid in the next few months, now that the situation has been taken care of as far as preliminary processing is concerned.

It was my understanding that there will be at least one and perhaps two other bid offerings for shell in the Bay, and that will take care of the situation. It was because of the long-standing nature of the operation of Pioneer Shell and the fact that when they originally started the operation they weren't required to get any permits.

The other factor, which complicated the picture for Pioneer, is the fact that they claimed that the only
authority they did need for that operation was from Ideal Cement Company or, as it was then called, Pacific Portland Cement. They did do some shell-harvesting on a contract with them. Ideal Cement claimed ownership to all the Bay, which was the subject of our West Bay lawsuit.

So it was a combination of a long-standing operation and the fact that they claimed they had permission to be operating in those areas from the Ideal Cement Company, which claimed ownership to the area by virtue of patents. It was because of those two circumstances that they were allowed to continue on an interim basis.

As I say, they will be coming before the commission for approval. There will be a bid offering package coming in, at which time they may continue to operate or they may be put out of business, depending on how that bid offering goes.

There was considerable dispute over title to the bed of the Bay until we recently settled the West Bay case. That is the background.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Mr. Bell, is the extraction you're talking about being done under the name Pioneer?

MR. BELL: Not that I know of. As far as I know, Pioneer Shell Company is an inactive corporation. As far as I know, Mr. Morris's vessel, the South Bay, has been the one extracting the shells. If he is operating under the name of
Pioneer Shell -- he sure may be. Mr. Hortig mentioned to me that he did not operate under the name of Pioneer Shell when I asked him that down at the State Lands Commission meeting when we submitted the bids. Pioneer Shell Company is out of business as near as I know.

As I mentioned, the information to me is very limited in this respect, and it has been made difficult for me to obtain information from the State Lands Commission.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: In what way?

MR. BELL: I asked for this information --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: What information?

MR. BELL: -- when I was down there, as to who Pioneer Shell was and what the arrangements were under which minerals have been extracted in the last few years by Morris and what arrangements other than through the regular lease form were available for extraction of minerals in the area. It was mentioned that this was private information and it wasn't available to me.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Whom did you make that request of?

MR. BELL: His name slips me for a second. Ken Willard?

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Al Willard?

MR. BELL: Al Willard. This was at this last meeting.
CHAIRPERSON CORY: Is there any reason why that should be confidential information?

MR. BELL: I also asked at that time if I could inspect the bid packages and stuff like that to see whether Mr. Morris did have these Corps of Engineers permits. These Army Corps permits, it takes a long time to get them. For example, the Army Corps on May 23, 1977, withdrew Pioneer Shell's permit application because they hadn't been actively pursuing it.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Our leases require they have the Corps of Engineers permits before they can function; isn't that correct?

MR. HIGHT: That could be a condition precedent. They could obtain the lease, but it would be a condition precedent to them actually dredging.

MR. BELL: Which would be moot if he's already dredging anyway.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The question I would like answered here at this meeting is: If a member of the public comes in and asks for information, they should be able to get it.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, the only argument I'm aware of with regard to this situation is whether the bid packages of the individual bidders were available for public inspection, and the answer to that question is: No, they are...
are no. They are working papers of the staff until such
time as a determination is made by the staff as to which bid
package they will recommend. At that time that package
which is recommended becomes a public document, which is
available for inspection. The gentleman here was informed
of that by a letter signed by Mr. Willard. When that
recommendation was made, those records should have been made
available to him.

As an unsuccessful bidder, his package in our
opinion, would still be staff working papers and would not
be available for anyone's inspection. It's only when the
recommendation is made that the one package selected becomes
public.

That was the only thing I was aware of with
regard to this situation. Now if Pioneer Shell has no
relationship with this company that was the successful
bidder, and if that company has been out in the Bay
dredging, then we may have a trespass or damage action
against them for an accounting of all past minerals. That's
something different. That's a different action.

Eight years or ten years ago, when we started the
West Bay lawsuit, we surveyed the Bay for any trespassers
out there. Pioneer Shell was the only one we found
operating, with the exception of one other company, Bay
Shell, down in Alviso, and they went bankrupt about the time
we got to them and they shut down their operations.

It's very difficult to find those people out there. They come out in the early morning or at various times of the day. They only reason for the special circumstances with regard to Pioneer is primarily because they asserted they had a right from the Ideal Cement Company and also the fact that they had been in prior to any leasing program being authorized by the state.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: It is Mr. Bell's contention that we should not proceed with this in case this Morris Tug and Barge is trespassing and hasn't paid us in the past and that they don't have a necessary permit. Is that right?

MR. BELL: That, and also the fact that our dredging equipment is not similar. My equipment loads a barge with a dry material and has a discharge system that --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: What does that mean?

MR. BELL: It means that there is far less water involved in my operation per ton in moving material. There is less overflow and less surface discharge of water. All the discharge of water off my vessel is discharged through an anti-turbidity overflow system, which runs in the center of the vessel and which contains the water for long enough time so that it goes down without reaching the surface again. We've tested this, and it meets the California wastewater discharge requirements for surface turbidity as we have them
now.

To my knowledge, and from what I heard from the regional water quality control board, with them calling me and asking me if it were my vessel out creating surface turbidity, Mr. Morris's vessel makes much more surface turbidity than mine.

It's my opinion that the surface turbidity is only an eyesore and it doesn't do any damage to the fish, but this is a regulated function that did cost me a lot of money to engineer around, and it does to some degree slow down production in the operation. It was represented partially in my bid factor.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Do the lease requirements provide that they must conform to all of the standards?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: So that question is moot.

MR. BELL: Except that if you award a lease, you have to award it to somebody that can comply with the standards. Otherwise you don't have a valid lease. Otherwise you have the situation that's going on right now.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: To put this in perspective, the lease will require that they meet the standards. If they don't meet the standards, they will not be able to operate on the lease. If they can't do it, then we will be back up for another bid and you can come in and bid on it
and get it. I think that's really where we're at.

I miss the humour in this.

MR. BELL: I don't know. I guess I just don't
know how to deal with the government so well. I've done
this all myself and done my own EIR's and paid for them and
done this paperwork. I'm sure it would have been a lot
easier to hire an expert or something. I'm just laughing
at myself.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: You have the feeling it's
you against the system, right?

MR. BELL: Yes, that's how it feels, Right.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: You don't feel that the
whole process was fair.

MR. BELL: That's what I feel like, right.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: You believe that we ought
to take into consideration other factors than the price.

MR. BELL: Yes, I think that's so. Also, I think
the general lease form of someone setting out to do a
business that takes this much expense in capital investment
-- I think there's plenty of room for plenty of leases and
plenty of workers and people can extract things everywhere.
But there should be a more businesslike method where
someone can negotiate a certain extraction per the state
formula for a certain area where no one had applied for any
lease extractions.
I'm not against Mr. Morris operating. There's plenty of material for everybody and plenty of market. There's no problem with that. But I can't see petty arguments and competitive bidding over a lease with the state on something that takes so much capital investment and market-building and time.

I have requested and mentioned this from the very inception. It was only told to me that there is going to be competitive bidding on this this last year or so. That was the first time. Before that it was mentioned to me that we could negotiate a lease, because the precedent was being set by Pioneer, who had talked about this before and in a situation where the mineral quantities in exact spots weren't well known -- which they aren't. They're different. I find it different myself in just exploring.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Staff, prior to this bidding, we had a lease arrangement, another lease bidder? Is that what Mr. Bell is saying?

MR. TAYLOR: Our office was consulted about whether or not the competitive bidding procedures could be avoided.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHRUP: We tried to avoid it.

MR. TAYLOR: Our advice to them was that we couldn't find any precedent for avoiding it. We worked very hard on that. We have some hard circumstances
presented here.

There might be some consideration to amending the statutes, but those are the only statutes we have at the present time. We are going to require Pioneer to also submit itself to competitive bidding. That's the only way we know to handle the situation, unless there can be some liberalization or under situations enumerated by the Legislature we be permitted to do it in some other way.

There is no other statutory authority.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: The climate for negotiated leases -- we're just unable to do it.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Do you understand what the lawyers are saying?

MR. BELL: Right. I'm not writing the laws. I'm just saying a criticism I have. That's all. I'm not a lawyer, and I don't want to be, and I don't want to write the laws for you, because they may be wrong. I'm just trying to say, "They don't fit my operation, and they don't fit many people who are looking at doing some capital-intensive efforts at developing some state lands."

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Who is your assemblyman?

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Where do you live?

MR. BELL: I live in Belmont.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: You have a new assemblyman and a new senator, which is not to your advantage. This is
a matter that could be corrected by the Legislature. It seems to me that the issue you raise is quite legitimate and could be corrected by the Legislature. It would be well to talk with them about it.

MR. BELL: I'm trying to make a living. I can't wait another ten years for them to correct it. I've waited five years for State Lands to get around to my lease. I think the only reason they got around to it now is prodding from Mr. Hortig. Otherwise it might have been another year or two. I don't know.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Everitts, isn't it true that there are going to be two more bid offerings for shells in San Francisco Bay? There will be at least one coming up shortly, which he will be free to bid on.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: How short is "shortly"?

MR. EVERITTS: Shortly. Six months.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Could we expedite that? Could we do it in 90 days?

MR. EVERITTS: Possibly.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: To give him a chance to get another crack at it.

MR. BELL: If this lease is awarded to Morris, I'm going to go broke if I don't start operating. How would I operate? On the same basis that Pioneer has operated on for this number of years? Just go out and tell them how much I
took?

I don't even know how that deal goes. There must be some method for somebody to operate while his new lease is being done or something.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I would guess with the Pioneer thing there is auditing being done of how many shells are being moved. Is that what's happening?

MR. TAYLOR: They dropped significantly in the quantity they are taking. I think at the present time they are only taking one load a week to Petaluma for chicken feed. At the time we started this operation, they were taking a tremendous number of loads, because the Ideal Cement plant was still operating in Redwood City, and they were taking shells in there and selling them to the cement plant. That operation closed down due to thermal pollution probably six or eight years ago.

MR. BELL: Twelve or thirteen years ago.

MR. TAYLOR: Maybe it was that long. Time flies. But whenever that closed down, we got into the tail end of that, and then it immediately dropped off. There is not a significant operation at the present time to my understanding.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Where we are in this thing is that we are about to put the shaft to Mr. Bell. The law says the thing needs to go to competitive bid. We've gone
to competitive bid, and somebody else was the successful bidder. We don't really have the option of doing a negotiated lease. That's where we are, right?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Generally stated, Mr. Chairman, I think that's a fair statement of where it is.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Is somebody going to pursue the allegation that Morris Tug and Barge is taking shells without a lease and without a permit?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, that will be one of the first things Mr. Everitts will be instructed to do when this meeting is over.

MR. EVERITTs: I understood I was already so instructed.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: He is.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: That's all we can do about that part of it, Mr. Bell. I appreciate your concern. You have some money coming back, which is probably not enough to make you whole if you've already bought equipment.

MR. BELL: As I mentioned, I'm going to be forced to operate somehow or other.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: In that case, we will be looking for Mr. Bell to trespass as well.

MR. BELL: Right. You can look for me to trespass tomorrow. Come on down.
Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I have been on that side of the table with government myself, so I feel for you. That doesn't help you any, though, does it?

Without objection, the proposed lease to Morris Tug and Barge will be approved as presented.

Mr. Hortig, you might have you and your client confer with the staff in the relatively near future as to whether or not somebody is engaged in trespass.

MR. HORTIG: We will be very happy to cooperate completely.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Thank you, Frank.

Item 43.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Off calendar, and so is Item 44, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Item 44: Proposed KGRA classification and geothermal lease in Lake and Sonoma Counties. Anybody in the audience on Item 45? Any questions from commissioners?

Without objection, it will be approved as presented.

Item 46: First modification of the plan of development, Long Beach Unit.

COMMISSIONER DYMALLY: Mr. Chairman, I just have to tell you a human interest story. I went to Lake County
to campaign, and I was confronted with the question of whether they owned the lake or we owned it. I said we owned the lake, and needless to say, I lost in Lake County.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The first modification.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr, Chairman, this basically covers the first increment of tax payments, county tax payments, in the Long Beach Unit.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Any questions from the commissioners? Anybody in the audience?

Okay. Item 47.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, this is a fiscal review of Parcel "A", Long Beach. The estimates are in front of you for the fiscal year.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Questions from the commissioners?

Thank you.

Item 48: Authorize the Attorney General to file a disclaimer of interest in the lands to be condemned in United States of America v. 43.2 Acres of Land, More or Less, in the United States District Court. We don't have an interest?

MR. HIGHT: No interest, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Without objection, authorization is granted.

Item 49: Another one on 116.07 acres. Anybody in
the audience on this item?

Without objection, Item 49 will be approved as presented.

Item 50 is off calendar.

Item 51: Settlement of litigation and issuance of a 25-year commercial lease on a 2.7-acre parcel in Yolo County. This is a trespass item, I believe, that was negotiated out?

MR. HIGHT: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Any questions from commissioners? Anybody in the audience on this item?

Without objection, Item 51 will be approved as presented.

Item 52: Authorization for staff counsel and/or the AG to take all steps necessary to stop trespass and taking of state-owned minerals from the bed of the Smith River in Del Norte County.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHRUP: Mr. Chairman, this is not unlike Item 42, where there is trespass of minerals going on.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on this item?

Without objection, Item 52 will be approved as presented. Authorization is granted.

Item 53: Boatworks Marina, Lake Tahoe.
MR. HIGHT: Mr. Chairman, in addition, it has just come to the staff's attention that Boatworks Marina may not be under lease and is refusing to accept an assignment from a prior tenant. So we would like to expand that authorization to include the right, in addition, to sue him to come under the lease.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Without objection, Item 53 will be approved as presented.

Item 54: Alamitos Bay; nonsubstantive technical corrections and revisions.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Taylor has left the room.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Taylor indicates that this is a nonsubstantive technical correction. What I think he really means is he has covered his expenses for going down to Long Beach.

(Laughter.)

MR. TAYLOR: The settlement agreement that was approved by the commission a few months ago provided that it had to become effective by December 31st. That has not proven to be possible.

The county, due to reorganizations in the engineer's office, for a number of reasons, haven't completed their review. The county has not acted on the agreement. A number of other parties haven't been able to...
sign it and are not anticipated to be able to sign it before
the end of the year.

In addition, there is going to have to be a
lawsuit to clear out one interest before one party will sign.
The primary purpose of this calendar item is to
amend the agreement or to revise the agreement to provide
that we have an additional year for it to become effective.
There are other changes in the agreement of a
nontechnical nature: grammatical or corrected references
to the public record.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Nontechnical or nonsubstantive?
MR. TAYLOR: Nonsubstantive.
CHAIRPERSON CORY: I thought maybe you were
slipping one in there.
(Laughter.)
CHAIRPERSON CORY: The nontechnical ones are the
ones we've got to worry about, right?
MR. TAYLOR: It is needed before the end of the
year so we can save some of the signatures on the agreement.
CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on this
item? Questions from commissioners?
Okay. We will let you win one.
(Laughter.)
CHAIRPERSON CORY: In Item 54, authorization is
granted as requested.
Item 55.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, Item 55 should probably be handled in executive session, along with --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: -- another item on litigation.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: This will conclude our public portion of the meeting. We would like our audience to please, with some alacrity, absent themselves from the meeting room.

(Thereupon the public portion of this meeting of the State Lands Commission was concluded, and the meeting room was cleared for an executive session of the commission. The time was 3:25 p.m.)

---000---
CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, PAUL D. RAMSHAW, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing meeting before the State Lands Commission was reported in shorthand by me, Paul D. Ramshaw, and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting, nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 7th of December, 1978.

PAUL D. RAMSHAW
Certified Shorthand Reporter
C.S.R. License No. 3434