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Ladies and gentlemen,
I'd like to get the meeting started. This is a meeting of the State Lands Commission. I'd like to have the call of the roll, please.

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Bell.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Present.

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Ackerman.

MR. ACKERMAN: Present.

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Jervis.

MR. JERVIS: Present.

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Hight wants to make a statement for the record.

MR. HIGHT: Thank you.

For the record, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Jervis will be representing the Controller in a nonvoting capacity.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you.

Mr. Ackerman, representing Mike Curb, will do the voting.

The minutes of the meeting of August 23rd were distributed with your agenda. Are there any corrections, additions, or other comments?

MR. ACKERMAN: Move adoption.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: If not, we'll assume they are adopted.
The next item is the report of the executive officer. Mr. Northrop.

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, members, thank you.

The first item is the DOE hearing on crude oil pricing held by the Department of Energy in Long Beach on the 6th and 7th of September. They were to discuss whether the definition of "heavy oil" should be changed.

On August 17th the decontrol of 16-degree-API-gravity-and-below crude oil was accomplished. Then the President's order indicated that if there was such a change, should the DOE raise the gravity, the results of this will be announced by mid-October.

The present decontrol of heavy oil will generate some additional revenues. It is proposed to plow back a portion of the additional revenues for production acceleration, which will be discussed by Mr. Thompson in the Long Beach calendar item.

While we're on this subject, Mr. Chairman and members, I would like to introduce William John Lamont, who is our Washington counsel and has represented us very ably before not only the administration on some issues, but DOE as well. I wonder if at this time Mr. Lamont would care to share with the commission some of his views on this.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Welcome, Mr. Lamont.

MR. LAMONT: Thank you, Mr. Bell.
The Washington end of the business has been a long and rather weary road in trying to get some degree of recognition of the problems of heavy oil, of pricing as they existed under the regulations of the FEA and the DOE, and trying to get them to recognize the fact that the State of California is a valid, properly incorporated state within the union of the United States and not a private corporation, and trying to work our way through the peculiar confrontation that has been made necessary by the collision of the extraordinarily complex federal regulations and the not terribly simple state statutes governing the operation of oil on the tidelands.

On heavy oil decontrol I think we have some excellent news there that Bill brought. The President's heavy oil decontrol order of August 17th was expressly stated to be only a preliminary. Even as a preliminary, decontrolling oil below 16 degrees was a rather nice culmination of a rather long and weary road of hearing. We have been in one hearing or another -- regulatory, exception, exemption, or otherwise -- for almost, I guess, three years now, or better than three years.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: At least three, yes.

MR. LAMONT: Each time we have managed to get a little bit. This time I think we have a little bit more. The President did direct the decontrol of oil below 16
degrees, and expressly ordered the Department of Energy to hold hearings and to make recommendations to him as to the degree of further exemption that is to be made. Clearly, there is to be some further exemption. As of the immediate moment, it is very difficult to figure out where they are going with it.

There has been some discussion of the possibility that they might decontrol or release from the Department of Energy controls oil of a rather substantially higher gravity, possibly even as high as 25, and more certainly in the area of 20, but this would be accompanied by a refusal to give an exemption from the windfall profits tax for the oil which is above 16 degrees or above some intervening number. There are many options, and I don't think we really can or have to bet on any of them. I think all of them will be fairly good for the operations of the State Lands Commission.

The second point, of course, is that since 1974, when the Federal Energy Administration withdrew the state exemption retroactively, the accounting problems required under Chapter 138 and the rather bewildering federal requirements have been in constant collision, and we have exceptions and exemptions operating there. Those arguments are still pending. In each of them we are continuing the argument, to the extent that we are in a formal proceeding, that the Tenth Amendment does accord to a state of the
United States a rather substantial amount of sovereign power in its own right and that in operating with respect to the public lands and the resources thereon, we're exercising that sovereign right.

Finally, we're still carrying forth that same argument in relation to the forthcoming windfall profits tax -- or to the possibly forthcoming windfall profits tax. In the House, in connection with the President's proposal, the House Ways and Means Committee adopted, and the House approved, an exemption for all revenue from state-owned oil which is dedicated to education. It's no cutoff date of when it would be dedicated, leaving for the states the option, if they wish, to replace funds normally spent for education with oil funds normally spent for other purposes, thereby devoting the oil to education.

That is probably going to be unnecessary, because in the Senate the Senate Finance Committee has now adopted without any significant dissent -- it was not even a recorded vote, so far as I know -- an amendment which will exempt all state oil income to the extent that it is used for normal state activities.

I think this will govern, because again, there is no real opposition to it in either the House or the Senate once it is presented in terms of its being the state versus the federal government and that the federal government ought
not to be taxing the state.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: On that point, I know this is ridiculous to ask, but the Department of Finance, of which I am a representative, is now in the process of just starting to put together the 1980-81 state budget, including its contributions to local government, and had considered the House amendment as possibly causing us to restructure our entire budget, including our aid to local government. If they are serious on that, that really makes us approach our budget in an entirely different way.

Do you have any concept whatsoever as to when any agreement might be reached about this by the two houses?

MR. LAMONT: No. I would think that you might still want to leave your budgeting process flexible --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: We run out of time in December.

MR. LAMONT: But then so does this Congress, thank God. It will be a compromise between whatever passes the Senate and what has already passed the House. Your bottom line then is the Pickle amendment with the education exemption. We think it would be somewhat above that, and we would bet on it, but budgeting and betting are two different processes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you, sir. Did you have one last point you wanted to make?
MR. LAMONT: There is one last point I wanted to make. As Mr. Northrop reminded me, the Senate Energy Committee has given a rather strong signal to the Department of Energy as to where it thinks "heavy oil" definition limits ought to be. In amending the Defense Production Act of 1950 on the so-called "Synfuels Bill", the financing of synfuels, heavy oil is included as a synthetic fuel, in effect, and by virtue of the Kassebaum-Cranston Amendment the committee has directed that the government guarantee a market for the output of heavy oil at not less than 90 percent of the world market price for oil of comparable grade and gravity.

Of course, this is just an amendment adopted by the committee, but it's a rather strong signal as to where the Congress thinks heavy oil ought to be.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Not the spot market, but the world market price?

MR. LAMONT: That's right.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: That's interesting: no concept as to where "heavy oil" stops or starts.

MR. LAMONT: I might also add that it reflects Senator Cranston's very active participation in this process. As majority whip and a former State Lands Commission member, it reflects a considerable amount of clout.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you very much,
Mr. Lamont.

MR. NORTROP: Mr. Chairman, we would like to have a short executive session after the end of this meeting regarding some oil litigation.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: All right.

MR. NORTROP: In May I received a letter from the Great Basin Unified Air Pollution Control District (covering Alpine, Mono, and Inyo Counties) discussing particulate emissions or dust emanating from Owens dry lake bed. The letter stated that the emissions have had an adverse effect on the health of residents of Inyo County and portions of Kern County, as well as having a severe effect on visibility at the China Lake Naval Weapons Center.

The district contended that since the State Lands Commission is the owner of the bed of the lake, the commission has primary responsibility for control of dust from the lake bed. More recently the Southeast Desert Basin Air Pollution Control Council supported Great Basin's position.

Although staff does not agree that the commission has liability, we have cooperated with the APCD and have joined in a task force to review the problem in more detail to determine if it is the responsibility of State Lands to control the dust. The task force includes representatives from the air pollution control district, State Lands, the
County of Inyo, the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, the Bureau of Land Management, the China Lake Naval Weapons Center, the U.S. Soil Conservation Service, Inland Counties Health Systems Agency, and the Lake Mineral Corporation (who is a lessee of State Lands and on the agenda today).

To date the task force has held two meetings. A variety of scenarios have been discussed varying from no action to completely reflooding the lake. Immediate proposals consider selectively stabilizing areas of the lake bed with various chemicals or vegetation.

Commission staff has repeatedly cautioned the task force that regardless of whose responsibility abatement is, even if it's feasible, large sums of money will be required. Obviously, the only source of such funds is through legislation.

In support of that concept, staff met in my office yesterday with Supervisor McDonald from Inyo County, who understood our problem; Dennis Myers, deputy district attorney; and Charles Fryxell, the Great Basin air pollution control officer, to discuss funding. Present also were representatives from Senator Stiern's office and Assemblyman Wyman's office and from the Air Resources Board.

We propose to continue with this task force and, in fact, have already agreed to participate informally in a
proposed field investigation with the Naval Weapons Center and the Department of Water and Power to identify and evaluate potential mitigation measures. Field studies to identify areas most sensitive to wind erosion would be completed at the same time. An experimental stabilization plot will be established. This could lead to ultimate management of the dust problem.

Mr. Chairman and members, I have a letter here from Gene Tackett, supervisor of Kern County, and I want to quote one sentence:

"We urge the support of the State Lands Commission in controlling the dust from the dry lake bed."

Then I have a letter here from the chairman of the board of supervisors in Kern County, which quoted in part reads:

"The board of supervisors recommends that the implementation of necessary control measures may be complex and expensive, but there is nevertheless a critical need to attempt corrective action. Your consideration of the board's position in this matter will be sincerely appreciated."

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Both of those letters are from Kern County?
MR. NORTHROP: One was from Kern County, and one
was from a supervisor of Kern County.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you.

MR. NORTHROP: I'm informed that a representative
of the district wishes to make a brief presentation to the
commission.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Your name for the
record, please.

MR. FRXELL: I'm Charles L. Fryxell, air
pollution control officer.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Please go ahead.

MR. FRXELL: I will make it short and not take
up too much of your time.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Tell us who made the
lake dry in the first place.

MR. FRXELL: It came about by the City of
Los Angeles.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: I just wanted that for
the record.

(Laughter.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Please proceed.

MR. FRXELL: Earlier this spring, the district
began receiving numerous complaints concerning high dust
concentrations in and around the lake area. The district
investigated these complaints as part of our job, as we're
charged to do under state and federal law, and we determined that the dust was in fact coming from the Owens dry lake. The investigation further revealed that the State Lands Commission owns the lake bed and, in the district's opinion, then has primary responsibility for control of the dust.

I had some correspondence with Mr. Northrop concerning this, and the task force was set up. At the first meeting I was left a little bit aloof as to the State Lands Commission's position. Staff at that meeting said they would participate up to a point, but no responsibility would be admitted.

At this time I addressed the air pollution control board and apprised them of the situation and of the State Lands Commission's position. They then directed me to come and appear before the commission here and to fully apprise the commission of the extent of the problem.

Since then, we had another task force meeting and a meeting with your staff yesterday afternoon. Primarily, what I'm here to discuss is not the task force aspect, but the district's responsibility in correcting this nuisance problem. It's the district's feeling that before any resolution of the problem, the State Lands Commission is going to have to accept the responsibility. We'd like to do this in a cooperative effort rather than by other methods. I think we can get a lot more done that way.
State Lands Commission staff yesterday related some feelings of frustration in what they were going to do and what type of program or whatever had to be done, but I believe until the responsibility is accepted it's pretty hard to devise a program to abate a problem.

So we have basically three things: there is a critical problem affecting the health of the people in Inyo County, especially in two communities very close to Owens Lake; there are solutions to it; and the district wants to continue to work with the State Lands Commission in a cooperative effort.

That about concludes my presentation.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Your primary mission in coming here today is to suggest that you feel that the first step would be the assumption of responsibility by the State Lands Commission and then proceed with attempting to arrive at a solution? I'm trying to paraphrase what you just said.

MR. FRYKELL: That's correct.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you, Mr. Fryxell. Is there any comment by the executive officer?

MR. NORTHROP: I don't know whether counsel wants to comment now or not.

MR. HIGHT: Mr. Bell?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Mr. Hight.
MR. HIGHT: The research that we have done to date indicates that the commission is not legally responsible for the problem. However, we're willing to cooperate in the planning effort to try to resolve the problem. I think any admission of liability on the commission's part at this point would be inappropriate.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: The lawyers have a term for the situation where you say, "Well, I'll go ahead with the suit, but I won't admit liability." What is that word?

(Laughter.)

MR. MYERS: Mr. Chairman, may I address the issue?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Yes.

MR. MYERS: I'm Dennis Myers. I'm the deputy district attorney from Inyo County, and I represent the commission and also D.A.'s office of Inyo County.

I disagree with counsel's evaluation. We've also studied the legal aspects of it, our district attorney's office and the district attorney's offices of a couple of other counties.

We totally disagree. We think this commission is very liable in this situation.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you.

MR. NORTHRUP: That concludes our presentation on that item.

Mr. Chairman, items 27, 43, and 44 are off
calendar.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Let me just take a
minute to take them off calendar. You sped them so fast I
might have missed them.

MR. NORTHROP: Items 27 --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: That was on the consent
calendar?

MR. NORTHROP: No, that was on the regular
calendar.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: That's off calendar?

MR. NORTHROP: That's off calendar.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Which are the other two?

MR. NORTHROP: The other two are the last two,
Mr. Chairman: 43 and 44.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Obexer and Son is off?

MR. NORTHROP: Counsel has had some conversations
with their counsel, and we're hopeful that we'll be able to
arrive at some kind of equitable agreement.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you, Mr. Northrop.

MR. NORTHROP: With that, Mr. Chairman, my report
is complete.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Does that complete the
executive officer's report?

MR. NORTHROP: It sure does.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Is there a staff report
today on the State Coastal Commission?

MR. NORTHRUP: I don't believe so at this time.

Mr. Golden is not with us today, so I don't believe we have that.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Fine. We'll pass that item.

The next item is what we call our consent calendar. I believe the first 23 items are on the consent calendar. Is there any item in there, Cl through C23, which any member wishes to withdraw from the consent calendar to be heard separately?

MR. ACKERMAN: No.

MR. JERVIS: No.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Is there anyone in the audience who wishes them to be heard separately?

Hearing none --

MR. ACKERMAN: I will move those items be approved.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: I have a motion to second. The consent calendar, Cl through C23, is approved.

We now go to the regular calendar. The first item on the regular calendar, item 24, is the Wickland Oil Company.

MR. NORTHRUP: Mr. Chairman, this is an EIR in which the State Lands Commission is the lead agency for the
Kickland Oil Company for a new petroleum terminal on the
site of approximately 36 acres of filled tide and submerged
lands. Mr. Dwight Sanders of our staff, the chief of the
environmental and planning section, was in charge of this
EIR, and I would like to have him at this time briefly tell
the commission where we've been on that EIR.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman, my name is Dwight
Sanders. I'm the chief of the planning and environmental
coordination unit within the executive office of the
commission. With me is Joseph Rusconi, staff counsel, who
was counsel to and through this whole process.

The picture that I've given you indicates the
two areas in question. One is a lease of filled land and
submerged lands, and the other is a lease of tide and
submerged lands for a wharf facility.

The environmental impact report, as mentioned by
Mr. Northrop, was prepared under the aegis of the State
Lands Commission. In the process of the EIR, there were two
hearings in deference to the one required by law: one here
in Sacramento and one in Crockett. There were two
predominant environmental issues that surfaced that are both
within the purview of responsible agencies and within the
purview of the State Lands Commission. I will briefly
enumerate those and will respond to any questions thereon.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: All right.

MR. SANDERS: One is the air quality issue. Pollutants generated by the project are largely attributable to the ships that will be calling at the terminal. The air quality question is within the legal purview of the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, which has already issued a permit to the Wickland Oil Company. That permit is now under appeal through their administrative appeal procedures.

The second issue is the one of public access, which is within the purview of both BCDC and the State Lands Commission. Within the calendar item you will notice that the State Lands Commission has specified that access be provided to the commission within the project area.

The third issue, which is completely within the purview of the State Lands Commission, is responding to the issues of geology and seismicity. At present the facility is only in a conceptual state. Detailed working drawings are not in existence at this time. The staff has provided, in effect, that the detailed engineering drawings will be submitted to staff prior to construction of the facility and that those drawings will conform to the engineering evaluation provided within the environmental impact report.

Lastly, there is the question of oil spill. The EIR found that additional measures for oil spill containment
and gasoline cleanup were necessary. As mitigation to that impact, the commission is requiring two things: (1) the submission for review and acceptance of an oil spill contingency plan prior to the operation of the terminal. That plan, as envisioned, would be reviewed not only by the State Land Commission staff, but by agencies such as Fish and Game, Water Quality, and BCDC, who also have specific expertise in this area.

(2) Again, prior to the operation of the terminal, the review and acceptance by the State Lands Commission of a comprehensive terminal operations manual.

If there are any questions as to the impacts or their mitigation measures from commission members, I would be most happy to respond.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: I thank you very much. I just had two letters passed out. I also have, by the way, an appearance request from Suzanne Rogalin, who is energy analyst for BCDC on this item.

MR. NORTHRUP: Citizens for a Better Environment have a letter in that should be recognized at this time. Perchloroethylene is the new solvent to be used as an offset. They have some concerns on that product. The letter also carries several other comments on the EIR -- as well as a letter from the Hercules Environmental Resources Committee.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: The Hercules
Environmental Resources Committee is a separate organization?

MR. SANDERS: Yes, sir, Mr. Bell.

MR. ACKERMAN: Are most of the objections that were raised to this on the air quality aspects of the project?

MR. SANDERS: Yes, sir, they are, Mr. Ackerman.

I might add also as a point of clarification and just to summarize the manner in which the document dealt with the issues that have been raised, Citizens for a Better Environment has raised primarily the specter of the carcinogenic effects of perchloroethylene, the solvent that will be used by the dry cleaner in place of a Stoddard solvent. That particular substitution is part of the trade-off package negotiated between the applicant and the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District.

Specifically with regard to that point, OSHA standards at present state that a concentration of 100 parts per million is allowable in a work surrounding of perchloroethylene. The perchloroethylene concentration 100 meters from the dry cleaning plant will be 0.015 parts per million. In recognition of further studies necessary to determine whether in fact perchloroethylene is a carcinogenic agent -- that is recognized, but the concentrations are so minuscule in comparison to the
allowable OSHA standards it might beg the question on this particular issue,

MR. ACKERMAN: Do I understand, then, that the real question on the air quality issue concerned not the Wickland project itself but the determination of what the offset was to be?

MR. SANDERS: That's correct, sir. Again, that is within the precise purview of the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: That is a responsibility of the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District?

MR. SANDERS: Yes. The definition and negotiation and determination of adequacy, pursuant to their rules and regulations, of a tradeoff package is their responsibility.

MR. ACKERMAN: Was that part of the basis for the appeal, the permit issue?

MR. SANDERS: Yes. The appeal is based on five issues, of which the carcinogenic nature of the solvent is one. Another issue that is being raised is the action of the district prior to the certification of the final EIR.

MR. ACKERMAN: In order for the project to go ahead, I assume the air quality control district has to issue a permit.

MR. SANDERS: They have done so already, and that permit is under appeal, so that permit must be finalized in
some way, shape, or form before that project can go ahead.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Not being an attorney, I just want to be sure: If the appeal is found to be valid, then the Bay Area Air Pollution Control District may not issue a final permit; is that correct? Or they may withdraw their permit? Or is the final action that they can't do anything about it?

MR. SANDERS: Correct me if I'm wrong, Joe, but it would be my understanding, sir, that the permit would then be invalid, the existing permit would be invalid, and the district would again start from go.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: They'd have to start over?

MR. SANDERS: Yes, and obviously the material and analysis contained in the environmental impact report would be available for their use.

MR. ACKERMANN: Does that mean that if this item is approved today on the calendar and the permit was successfully appealed, then the item would have to come back before the commission?

MR. SANDERS: Again, it's my understanding that the conditions of the commission's permit would be that the applicant receive permits from all other applicable agencies involved, I do not believe that the lease would have to come back to the commission under those
circumstances, primarily because the permit is issued by a responsible agency rather than the commission itself.

MR. HIGHT: Mr. Chairman,

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Mr. Hight.

MR. HIGHT: As a condition of obtaining a lease, the applicant must obtain permits from all other appropriate governmental agencies, and the permit would not be executed until such has taken place.

MR. ACKERMAN: Then approval of this item is conditional upon the final appeal?

MR. SANDERS: It's subject to the obtaining of all other necessary permits by the applicant.

MR. ACKERMAN: Okay.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: I know BCDC can stop the thing anyway.

MR. SANDERS: As you have referenced, there is an agreement between the State Lands Commission and BCDC. As you are aware, BCDC's approach to a permit is such that they will not accept an application until a final EIR has been certified by the lead agency.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: And generally will not issue a permit or accept anything until the State Lands Commission has already acted.

MR. SANDERS: That's correct.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: They sort of make a
fetish of that.

MR. SANDERS: So there is indeed time between the commission's action and BCDC's consideration for negotiation on any issues involved.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Are there any other questions?

MR. JERVIS: No.

MR. SANDERS: I believe Suzanne Rogalin of BCDC does wish to address the commission.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Yes. I think I should then call on Ms. Suzanne Rogalin.

MS. ROGALIN: Our staff has commented upon the draft EIR on the Wickland project, and we congratulate your staff for a basically excellent document. There are only three items we wish to comment upon today: public access, the marsh, and an aspect of oil spill prevention.

Under the McAteer-Petris Act maximum feasible public access to the bay consistent with a project, whether it is housing, industry, or ports, should be provided. Such access usually takes the form of a continuous path along the shoreline.

Wickland representatives, however, have stated that such public access at their site would interfere with operations and security. If these objections to the shoreline trail or access point were found to be justified by
BCDC, then the commission might accept in-lieu public access at an appropriate inland location near the project, as suggested in Policy 1 of the Bay Plan.

The East Bay Regional Parks District, the Contra Costa Coastal Corridor Parks and other groups have proposed a shoreline trail from Point Pinole Regional Park to Martinez Shoreline Regional Park. This concept was endorsed in the Public Access Supplement to the Bay Plan as endorsed by our commission.

The East Bay Regional Park District has submitted plans for the dedication of the hills and a trail to cross the Wickland property along the crests of the hills, eventually arriving at the county parking and view site off Highway 40 at the eastern end of the property. BCDC staff agrees it would be a great public benefit to dedicate the hills as open space. If this is not feasible, however, then clearly some variation of the park district's proposal for a continuous trail predominantly along or in view of the bay seems a reasonable minimum.

We would ask that there be a requirement in the State Lands lease of maximum feasible public access consistent with the project.

On our second point, there is agreement between BCDC, the park district, Fish and Game, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife that the ten-acre marsh on the western edge of the
property is an area of environmental significance and should be improved and dedicated to an appropriate public agency, such as the East Bay Regional Park District.

Finally, BCDC staff commented in the EIR that Wickland Oil Company should be responsible, as the terminal operator, for deciding if tugs should be used in docking vessels. The response to this comment in the final EIR stated (and I quote):

"It should be emphasized that the safety of the vessel rests with the master and pilot, and is out of the realm of the applicant's control."

We were not commenting on vessel safety, but on oil spill prevention and liability.

One of the conditions placed upon Pacific Gas and Electric Company by BCDC when granting a permit for the fuel dock at Pier 70 in San Francisco was that tank ships should be assisted to and from the pier by two or more tug boats. Our commission may find, as it did in the case of PG&E at Pier 70, that tug boats may be required at the Wickland Terminal.

We thank you for your cooperation on this project.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you, Suzanne very much.

Was I correct in saying -- maybe I shouldn't even ask it, but lately when we've been going down to BCDC, we
usually raise the question or at least inform the commission that the State Lands Commission has or has not issued permits, and it's always my impression that the commission would prefer to have us take our action before they make their rulings.

MS. ROGALIN: That is true.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: All right. Is there anyone else to appear on item 24 on the Wickland Oil Company?

MR. DIEPENBROCK: I'm John Diepenbrock, I'm from Diepenbrock, Wulff, Plant and Hannegan. I'm an attorney for Wickland Oil Company. Roy Wickland, vice president of Wickland, is here and is available to answer any questions which any of the commission members might have in respect to the operation of the plant or the construction of the terminal, the status of the permit, or any other aspect.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you, Mr. Diepenbrock,

MR. DIEPENBROCK: I might say only this, that in respect to the substance of what you're considering, obviously there is work to be done in the matter of public access to the terminal. Wickland is not unwilling to get into that subject and has been in a dialogue. It does have a continuing concern about public safety in connection with the active operations of the terminal and with the close proximity of the Southern Pacific right of way. There have
been instances already of damage done to the property through irresponsible access to the property, and our main concern is to be sure that access is handled in an orderly way.

This may mean that the specific provisions of the second lease that is before you for the larger parcel may need to return to the commission for further consideration following the completion of the dialogue with BCDC, but we are assured by the staff that we will work out a mutually satisfactory arrangement, one that is mutually satisfactory to the commission staff, to BCDC, and to Wickland Oil Company, and we're hopeful that that can be done expeditiously.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you.

Just to check back, we said that if this were turned down or changed, it would not have to come back to us. But if we did have adjustment of the access, particularly an agreement with BCDC or something like that, this would have to come back on the 36-acre parcel, wouldn't it?

MR. NORTHPROP: Mr. Chairman, we believe this item will probably be back to the commission on two separate occasions: one on the access, which we're working with; and the second on --

MR. SANDERS: -- the oil spill contingency plans
and terminal operations manual approval. So this is not
the last time the commission will see this project.

MR. NORTHROP: There probably will be a
hypothecation of the lease for construction funds.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Our role today, though,
is to issue two new industrial leases; is that correct?

MR. NORTHROP: That's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SANDERS: And also, sir, to certify the EIR.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: And certify the EIR,
which was that great big fat thing I looked at yesterday
on my desk; is that correct?

MR. NORTHROP: That's right, Mr. Chairman.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: They did a rather
comprehensive job. I'll say that for them.

MR. ACKERMAN: One final question on the comments
from BCDC. My understanding is that the access problem
will specifically be brought back to the commission at a
subsequent meeting.

MR. NORTHROP: That's correct. We will bring it
back on the access problem -- or on the access solution.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: They have to thrash that
out with BCDC to satisfy them.

MR. ACKERMAN: With that, I will move approval
of the item.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: All right. Mr. Ackerman
moves. I second. All in favor --

MR. ACKERMAN: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Aye. That is approved.

The next item on the calendar is item 25, land bank agreement.

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, as you recall, we had a land bank agreement on Browns Island. We have exhausted the land available in that land bank, so we are now establishing a new land bank in Suisun Bay in Contra Costa County of 441 acres.

We will use this land to mitigate on areas of state ownership in the release of state ownership.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Any further discussion on authorizing this new land bank agreement? Now that we've used up Browns Island, we need another one, don't we?

MR. ACKERMAN: So move.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: I have a motion and a second. All in favor, say Aye.

MR. ACKERMAN: Aye.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Aye. Item 25 is approved, which now allows us to go to item 26.

MR. NORTHROP: Item 26 is the first parcel of land to be taken out of the 441 acres. Staff informs me it's about 16.6 acres. It is satisfying a mitigation requirement.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Without objection --
MR. ACKERMAN: No objection.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Without objection, then, item 26 is approved.

Item 27 is off calendar. Item 28, Curtis Carley.

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman and members,
Mr. Trout has a photo here of an anchor that was recently retrieved from the Pacific Ocean near Fisk Mill Cove. When the anchor came ashore, a representative of Parks and Recreation at first impounded the anchor and then released it, but informed the salvor, Mr. Curtis Carley, that we had an interest.

What I'm asking here is authorization to approve the salvage value and set some kind of price with Mr. Carley on this anchor.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Do I assume it's going to be a reasonably --

MR. NORTHROP: It will be in line with the regulations and laws of the State of California.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Is there any objection to item 27? If we don't approve it, we get stuck with the anchor.

MR. ACKERMAN: No objection.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: All right. There is no objection to item 28. Item 28 is approved.
Item 29.

MR. NORTHRUP: Mr. Chairman, item number 29 is a retracement survey and map in Santa Monica, which is necessary, I believe, for action the Attorney General is contemplating in that area.

MR. ACKERMAN: No objection.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: No objection? Item 29 is approved.

Item 30, Parks and Recreation.

MR. NORTHRUP: Mr. Chairman, item 30 is a 11-month general agency permit for Parks and Recreation in the City of San Buenaventura, Ventura County, for beach maintenance, patrol, and lifeguarding in that area, which we're informed by Assemblyman Imbrecht's office is subject to rip tides.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: This is one we've considered before in other ways?

MR. NORTHRUP: I made reference to it in the executive officer's report last time.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Okay, Anyway, we've worked out a mutual agreement where we had the problem of the state trying to take care of something that really was a city responsibility.

MR. NORTHRUP: What happened, really, is that the city made the beach so attractive, and the adjoining
property, that now the access is there and people are bathing without realizing there was a serious problem.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: So we're taking care of it. Without objection --

MR. ACKERMAN:  No objection.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL:  Without objection, item 30 is approved.

Item 31, denial without prejudice.

MR. NORTHROP:  Mr. Chairman, this covers two applications for state-owned property. In conformance with AB 884, the commission must take some action at the latest at this meeting. We are recommending now without prejudice.

MR. ACKERMAN:  No problem.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL:  Without objection, item 31 is approved.

Item 32.

MR. NORTHROP:  Mr. Chairman, item 32 will be addressed by Mr. Hight.

MR. HIGHT:  Item 32, Mr. Chairman, is the authorization to accept a quitclaim deed for a portion of the Tule berm around the Rindge Tract. This is, hopefully, the start of a settlement of the Rindge Tract controversy.

MR. ACKERMAN:  No problem.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL:  There is no objection to item 32, and we will accept the quitclaim deed.
Item 33, authorize necessary action.

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, items 33 and 34 will be addressed by Mr. Thompson of our Long Beach operation. He's going to explain to us why the County of Los Angeles is overassessing.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: I'd like to hear that.

We have that problem with our Del Mar racetrack. We have it in many other places.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't know whether I'll give you the answers or not. I'll give you the questions and the problems.

The Los Angeles county assessor has given the Long Beach unit a valuation of $443 million as of the lien date in 1979. This is two sections. It's $101 million for land and improvements and $342 million for mining rights.

We believe this figure for mining rights is unrealistically high. His value for the 1978 mining rights was $215 million. The problem is the value of mining rights that are attributed to new reserves, which the assessor claims to be valued at $145 million. This is an increase of 67 per cent over 1978.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: May I stop you just a second? Since we're supposed to be using 1975 values under Proposition 13, they get the price up by saying we're finding new reserves?
MR. THOMPSON: This is the analogy they used: if you had a house and you add a swimming pool or something like that. This is the "added valuation" concept.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: They place a current value on that portion which is added?

MR. THOMPSON: Alteration or addition.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you.

MR. THOMPSON: That's what this concept is. This addition was put on after we had produced over 25 million barrels of oil with a net value of $75 million during the 1978-79 tax year.

Getting back to your question of how this valuation is done, under Proposition 13 the value is the prior year value plus the value of the additions, less the value of the 1978 production, plus two per cent per year, plus the value of any increase in the ultimate production, which is the "new reserve" concept. This increase, then, this extra element, is called "new reserves" and is created by factors such as new drilling, well stimulation, and after-recovery operations, or prolonged life on the end because we get better crude oil prices.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Prolonged life?

MR. THOMPSON: Right. In other words, if you anticipate getting higher crude prices, higher than your operating costs in the future, then you'll be able to
operate the property longer and therefore produce more oil.

We're proposing an appeal of this particular assessment.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Could I just ask about that? I'm sorry to interrupt again. We do have a lien date, don't we? '79 or something like that? Are they anticipating increases in oil prices past the lien date in terms of valuing --

MR. THOMPSON: This is a bone of contention with us, and it's never quite clear to us what the assessor may use. We think it should be the oil price as of lien date. They say whatever concept they have of what it might be in the future, plus any reasonable information they gain within a short period after that and before it's actually put on the rolls. I think they turn over in August and they're finalized at the end of this month.

MR. JERVIS: Do you suppose the Los Angeles assessor knows something about oil prices that Mr. Lamont doesn't know or didn't tell us this morning?

MR. THOMPSON: Well, if there's anybody who really knows anything at all on exactly what crude oil prices are going to be, they have a very unusual crystal ball.

MR. JERVIS: Did they consult with you, John?

MR. LAMONT: No.
MR. ACKERMAN: Prior to the passage of Proposition 13, did the county ever use this technique before?

MR. THOMPSON: The technique, in effect, was used because every year we do it the same way. With real estate you can normally find comparable sales. This is how valuation is normally done. Or with inventory, I guess, you'd have some pricing mechanism.

For oil properties, if you can find a comparable sale in the area, you can use that approach. But for large properties, such as this, they just aren't sold. So what you do is you take and run a future cash flow of what the property is going to produce, you estimate what the oil production is going to be and what the cost is going to be, and then the key thing is what oil price you are going to use to get the gross revenue.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: So he's using the income stream method.

MR. THOMPSON: Right, that's the income stream method. Along this income stream method, we are taxed here through a possessory interest concept against the field contractor. That's the entity in which the assessor taxes us indirectly, and those taxes then go into that profits account.

What they've done here is in extending this life of the field to get more reserves, they've exceeded the
length of the contract that the possessory interest holds.

Last year, or very recently, they lost a case on this
particular issue, and therefore this is one of the bases of
our particular appeal. You cannot tax that possessory
interest for any longer than the term of the contract for
which that possessory interest exists. They have extended
this one four or five years beyond that. We've talked to
the Attorney General on this, and they've recommended this
approach on this.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: If I understand it
properly, they're not actually putting the possessory
interest against the state, but against the operating
company.

MR. THOMPSON: Who has the possessory interest,
the right to produce.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: And their contract only
extends to a certain time, so the remaining possessory
interest in the contract can only run to the contract
termination date. They're extending this valuation
method --

MR. THOMPSON: They are running the reserve life
of the unit beyond that and have made the mistake, we think,
in this particular case of using the tail end as being part
of --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: As part of the
contractual obligation of the private party.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. We don't think that's right.

We've already discussed this with the county counsel. He's quite aware of it, and that will be a cross he has to bear from here on on all these possessory interest deals.

If we can win this one, the same situation next year again -- we will always be bumping against this same fixed-year time.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Mr. Thompson, are we being asked here only to file an application for reduction of the possessory interest amount?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Or are we doing more than that in this action?

MR. THOMPSON: We're asking for your commission to go in and join with the rest of the participants in the Long Beach Unit and file an appeal for this particular amount. Actually, in this case we'll probably be the agent, just as we were for the 1977 appeal. Incidentally, we're finally going to get a hearing on that on November 13th or 14th of this year on that issue.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: By the way, what is the value to the state, Mr. Thompson? If it's against the private companies, why should the state have an interest?

We'd better put that on the record.
MR. THOMPSON: This actually becomes a cost in the net profits account. Part of the contract says that all taxes assessed against the contractor shall become an expense in the expense account, so therefore these taxes reduce our net profits and therefore reduce the revenue to the state.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: That's the point I wanted to make. It's to the state's fiscal interests, and almost a fiscal necessity, to join the private contractors in this.

MR. THOMPSON: This is an issue that comes up year after year, so we do have to get some policy there on the transition point on how to handle this under Proposition 13.

There are a couple of other issues we'd like to bring up in this appeal also. There is the question that we believe all these new reserves should go in at the year in which they actually show up. In other words, you take the previous year's extrapolation of how the revenue came in, any difference in a year goes in that, and use that particular year's discount factor. Most of these reserves are at the end. They use an average discount factor, which in effect moves the value up much further in the life, and therefore they're higher value. We don't think that's actually the way the Board of Equalization Rule 468 should
have been applied. We've talked to staff members on that, and they tend to agree with us on that.

Another question, of course, is the argument of whether crude oil and gas prices are used as of lien date. That's an open issue.

Then another major issue with us is the capitalization rate. It's really the discount rate against this cash flow. They use about twelve per cent actual discount and then add a little over one per cent for taxes. I think this doesn't really reflect the cost of money at risk. No bank is going to loan you money to buy a property at twelve- or thirteen-percent interest, and there is a certain risk involved with the properties, an environmental risk. So we think that capitalization rate is completely out of line.

So it would be our recommendation that we be allowed to appeal this with the rest of the participants in the Long Beach Unit.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you.

MR. ACKERMAN: How much money are we talking about?

MR. THOMPSON: Potentially, this could be a million dollars. In other words, if this added reserve portion could be reduced to what we think is reasonable, if you take a hundred million dollars off in the added reserve
portion, that would add up to a million dollars at one per cent.

MR. ACKERMAN: No objection.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Without objection, then, we will authorize necessary action towards filing an application for reduction.

I believe, Mr. Thompson, you also have item 34.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. At the time this 1978-79 plan and budget was prepared in February 1978, we had to provide at that time two estimates of revenue because of crude oil pricing uncertainties. That was because the entitlements adjustment that the DOE had made in January of 1978 had had no impact on our getting ceiling prices. We were still lagging about 60 or 70 cents below ceiling price.

After the budget was adopted, in June they made a further adjustment, which then allowed ceiling prices to go up, so we did get the higher revenue that we had placed in the estimate. All this is just a summation of our expenditures and revenues. It's just a final closing.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: A closing statement.

MR. THOMPSON: We recommend your approval of it.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: This is not yet getting into a 1979 expenditure of --

MR. THOMPSON: I would like to talk to you about this year's budget when you clear this item.
ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Well, it's not before us at this time. If you are going to spend more money, I don't want to hear too much about it.

(Laughter.)

MR. THOMPSON: I would impose on you to listen to me for a few minutes, because we need a little direction.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: I'll tell you what: why don't we take our action on this item first?

MR. THOMPSON: Very good.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Mr. Northrop, did you have a comment?

MR. NORTHROP: No.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Any objection on item 34?

MR. ACKERMAN: No objection.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Without objection, then, item 34 is approved.

Now, Mr. Thompson, do you want to tell us about any 1979-80 problems?

MR. THOMPSON: Again, when we prepared this year's budget, which we had to do in February, we were a little bit uneasy again about oil pricing and inflation. For inflation we put in eight per cent as a cost escalation. We were very optimistic at that time. We know currently, of course, that it's now running thirteen to fourteen per cent. By the time
it gets out to actual costs to us with the ripple effect it will probably be as high as twenty per cent later on this year. This is of necessity going to require some augmentation to cover that.

However, on the positive side crude oil price increases are coming on very well. Because of this particular trend in release, earlier we had increased our drilling rigs from the three that were in the original plan and budget to five. Now we've had even more recent developments in the decontrol of heavy oil and the proposed decontrol of upper tier at 4.6 per cent per month.

Based on this, our recommendation would be that we add another drilling rig in about 30 days and buy additional drilling equipment so we can augment another rig about the end of the next quarter. All of these will add up to an expenditure of about fifteen to twenty million dollars.

We'd like to get some direction from you and some feeling so that we can bring an augmentation in next month for this.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Is the purpose behind this, particularly in adding the additional rig, to speed up drilling since we're getting better prices for oil and it's now economically in our interest to produce it? Will this mean that we will expand the production of our field and produce more oil for the economy?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. We definitely think that this will
accelerate the oil production and add additional reserves. We think this is consistent with the commission's policy that you set a couple of years ago when you said you will tend to plow back a reasonable amount of all additional revenues you get from crude oil price increases.

We project that the lower-tier release to upper tier and the monthly crude oil price increases, which now are running at 9.2 per cent per year, will collectively add up to about a 21-per-cent-per-year increase in crude oil prices, which should offset that portion of the cost increase coming up because of inflation, plus the plowback for additional drilling wells.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: The additional drilling wells -- would you want to put any estimate at all on what your additional production might be in terms of barrels?

MR. THOMPSON: Hopefully, we will be able to slow down the decline in the unit. Whereas before we were declining at almost 12 per cent per year, we've recently flattened that to 8 per cent per year, and hopefully, we will be able to flatten it even further.

At the present time -- I've forgotten, but I think we're currently producing over 10,000 barrels a day more now than we would have been if we hadn't started -- as I recall, almost a year and a half ago the commission came in and started augmenting funds for additional activity and
additional rigs. I think right now we are at least 10,000 barrels a day ahead of the trend that we were following before. In the future, I think we will do the same. We will be flattening this trend and definitely adding future reserves.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Over a five-year period or something like that, you're anticipating the possibility of maintaining the field in production without a decline in rate?

MR. THOMPSON: I can't exactly say that, but I can say that normally -- we've taken a look at projects, and now with crude oil pricing the way it is, we're probably looking at payout of investments now probably at around the two-year range. So we're only deferring two years, and then you'll get your payback plus the incremental after that.

So as we start this leapfrogging process, every well we drill now is a sunk fund now recovered in two years, but giving additional revenue in the future. The revenue return in the future should be large in this particular case.

I believe Mr. Lamont also told you about the Synfuels Bill. The definition there is for 20 degrees API. Again, this gives you an inkling of what he was referring to. There may also be some relief under the heavy oil. Again, there may also be relief somewhere in the excise tax portion.

So it all looks very favorable now, and we
certainly would like to go ahead with this type of expansion.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: So it becomes much more logical to spend more money in our drilling effort.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. We think this is definitely the time to really go.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: I can remember three, four years ago when we were sitting on the federal government not even giving us as much as they gave everybody else in the country, and it was becoming rapidly unprofitable to even produce.

MR. THOMPSON: Well, at that time we couldn't even see payouts at all. With frozen crude prices and inflation, we actually had a loss in crude value all the time, so sometimes we got the infinite payout on it.

MR. NORTHROP: Our situation, Mr. Bell, still is that of the 160 largest producers in the United States, we're number 19, but our income per barrel is more than two dollars a barrel less than the lowest income of the other 160 largest producers. So we're still in bad shape.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: That's really an excellent incentive for us to produce oil, isn't it?

MR. THOMPSON: I take it that we'll go ahead and bring in an augmentation next month?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Why don't you at least
bring it in, yes.

MR. THOMPSON: Very good.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

Item 35, mineral extraction lease.

MR. NORTHRUP: Mr. Chairman, this is a mineral extraction lease by competitive bid. The successful bidder was the Olin Jones Sand Company.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: This would authorize the issuance of a mineral extraction lease on 474 acres of tide and submerged lands in Carquinez Straits, Solano and Contra Costa Counties. I have an appearance request by F.J. Hortig, consulting engineer for the sand company.

Mr. Hortig, did you merely turn this in to indicate that you are here in case there were any questions, or did you wish to protest the item?

MR. HORTIG: No, sir, Mr. Chairman. I am F.J. Hortig, and I submitted the slip only to indicate I am in attendance and would be available to answer questions if any.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thank you. I asked because I thought you probably wouldn't be that familiar with the activities of State Lands Commission.

(Laughter.)

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: To set the record set, Mr. Hortig was the executive officer of the State Lands
Commission for -- how many years?

MR. HORTIG: Thirteen.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: Thirteen years.

Is there any objection to issuing the mineral extraction lease? Any comments?

MR. NORTHROP: No.

MR. ACKERMAN: No problem.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: I have no problem, so item 35 will therefore be approved without objection.

Item 36, geothermal resources lease.

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, this is for the denial of an existing application for a prospecting permit and a denial of a prospecting permit extension. This area is a geothermal area that has had prospecting permit applications and one prospecting permit on it which now has expired -- or we're asking for a denial of an extension.

Staff feels that this area is in an area that is unquestionably a geothermal producing area, and we feel that this area could better serve the state if it were put out for a competitive bid, as we have in the past on known geothermal areas.

You have in front of you a letter from one of the holders of the prospecting permit, the attorney for the Northern California Power Agency. They request that this be postponed. Staff brings this to your attention, but
respectfully recommends that we continue with the calendar item. The substance of the letter indicates that in fact there is a geothermal discovery immediately adjacent to the parcel.

For that reason, we ask that the commission follow the staff recommendation and deny the permits and the extension and allow staff to proceed with a competitive bid proposal.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON BELL: I have, Mr. Northrop, two requests to appear on the item: one from the attorney representing the Northern California Power Agency, who also sent in the letter; and the other is Mr. C.E. Woods from Aminoil. Why don't we hear first from the Northern California Power Agency?

MR. MCDONOUGH: I'm Bruce McDonough, Mr. Chairman. I brought Dave Tuttleman, who is an attorney for the agency, and Joseph Padilla, who is an engineer with the company.

I should point out that the letter is not really from me, but from Mr. Martin McDonough of the same office.

The Northern California Power Agency, as you see from that letter, is a joint-powers agency of the state made up of 11 cities in Northern and Central California. The agency was formed so that these entities could look for and develop new sources of energy for their inhabitants.

As part of this development program, they entered
that are easily gotten to. Now, obviously we're going to take those first because of the fact that that's the least expensive rock for us to get on to the breakwater. So good business sense says that that's our first major priority. However, when you take out some of these words that make it somehow we can be caught up into a mining operation trying to get to the base of a rock that only the tip of which is sticking through the sand and we spend all of our money -- we've only got budgeted approximately ten to $12,000 for this rock removal and movement. So it could be a limiting factor to us.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: We now have a motion amended at this point with "readily" removed, "accessible" becoming --

MR. BELL: Taking into consideration both the objection from the audience and from the Harbor District representative, I would like to reamend that wording to say "should utilize all movable rocks." I don't want to make it too easy, but I don't want to have to make them dig the whole thing up in order to get it. I don't want them to mine it.

MR. ALDERSON: Mining would be a --

MR. SCOTT: Wait a minute.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I think the record should reflect that I think that there's a clear indication on all
the Commissioners that nobody is contemplating quarrying or mining of rock.

MR. LYTTON: That's my understanding.

MR. BELL: And if you gentlemen can help me with a better wording, --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: May I suggest "reasonably" as a word that might be --

MR. BELL: Reasonably what?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: "Reasonably accessible."

CHAIRPERSON CORY: If we have --

MR. BELL: "Surface rock that's accessible."

MR. PRATTE: What was the question?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: They're still working on it.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: "That prior to using the intertidal rock the district should utilize all movable surface rocks located landward..."

MR. BELL: And I don't want them to have to dig anything up anywhere, you know. I want them to be able to pick up anything that they can get their hands on above the intertidal zone.

MR. PRATTE: I would think it would be reasonable to go for that rock movable surface rock, first; however, prior to any removal of rock from the reef, I think it
should be investigated: What is below the surface at the mouth of gulch? It hasn't been investigated.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I understand that point and I think the Commissioners understand it and I think we've come to a different conclusion. We understand your viewpoint and we're about to reject it at this point.

MR. PRATTE: I just wanted to make it clear that if it was interpreted that the surfing community agreed with the way the conditions are going, and we--

CHAIRPERSON CORY: We understand. I think we understand that this does not contemplate solving all of your problem or perhaps any of it.

CHAIRPERSON NORTHOP: Mr. Chairman, the Manager, Dwight Sanders, of our Environmental and Planning Section has made a suggestion for your consideration.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman, in a perhaps changing in effect four words reading as follows: "That prior to using intertidal rock the district shall utilize and then crossing the word, eliminating the words "readily assessible" or "assessible and" so that it would read: "That prior to using intertidal rock the district shall utilize all suitable rocks located landward..."

MR. BELL: No matter how deeply they're buried?

MR. SANDERS: Well, that, Mr. Bell, I think perhaps would be under the definition of "suitable." Now, --
MR. BELL: It's not to me.

MR. SANDERS: -- suitable rock may be governed or could be governed by the same definitions as the Corps.

MR. BELL: Do we have a Corps word of art that fits "suitable"?

MR. HADLY: Mr. Chairman, David Hadly again. I think suitable is meant to include Corps specification for rock.

MR. BELL: How about suitable to be used in a breakwater?

MR. SANDERS: That's correct.

MR. HADLY: Yes.

MR. BELL: It doesn't have any reference to where it lies when you pick it up?

MR. HADLY: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: But if we use the suitable and then add just a simple sentence that this does not contemplate mining.

MR. BELL: Right.

MR. SANDERS: Yes, sir.

MR. BELL: I don't want mining anywhere. I don't want it in the reef.

MR. PRATTE: Could there be guidance from the Commission to encourage the Harbor District to pursue all reasonable alternatives for which they do not at this time
have a permit for?

MR. BELL: For which they do not have a permit for.

MR. PRATTE: That is the rocks which we have recommended as alternatives which have not been investigated and evaluated and which —

MR. BELL: Not in the assignment.

MR. PRATTE: Which are feasible alternatives.

MR. BELL: Mr. Northrop.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Yes, sir.

MR. BELL: The question raised indicated that there were rocks south of —

CHAIRPERSON CORY: No Pass.

MR. BELL: -- No Pass,

MR. PRATTE: South of Deadman's Gulch and between Deadman's Gulch and No Pass.

MR. BELL: We are dealing today with the assignment of the lease.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Right.

MR. BELL: Does that assignment include this area?

MR. SCOTT: I don't believe so.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: I don't believe so.

Mr. Hadly, would you care to address it? I don't think it does.

MR. HADLY: Mr. Bell, the best estimate that we
have in evaluating the '78 Coastal Permit in consultation with Rick Rayburn from the Regional staff is that the '78 permit would allow rock removal from above mean high tide between the breakwater down the beach to Deadman's Reef, and there's not a lot of rock there, and also the area immediately above mean high tide at Deadman's Gulch but no further down the beach.

MR. BELL: So it is outside of their present permit area.

MR. PRATTE: Yes. And it's within the lead or within the area of the cove which is being leased to the Harbor District.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: We have a motion and a redraft before us --

MR. BELL: Of A.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: -- of A.

MR. SCOTT: Mr. Cory, may I say something, please? Your recommended wording on A is permissible with the district. Our concern now is Mr. Lytton's modification or amendment of the motion to include a fifth condition which is not included in the written staff report to us; and that is dealing with the size of the rock. Our understanding is the Corps --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The size of the rock is included in B-C of the written agenda.
MR. SCOTT: Oh, we don't have that.

MR. ALDERSON: That is not in ours.

MR. BELL: Revised 7/11.

MR. SCOTT: Oh. We have not received that. I'm sorry.

It is our understanding that the Corps is using the 24-inch figure as an average. Mr. Hadly indicates that his impression was that that's a maximum. We're not really sure at this meeting. What I'm fearful of --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: You want to put it over?

MR. SCOTT: No. What I'm suggesting is, if that's a limitation put on by the Corps which obviously it is, that that condition be removed as to maximum or average input and add that prior to any removal that we have a Corps permit and that Corps permit will then take that into consideration.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: It seems to me that that permit, that limitation there makes me far more comfortable as a Commissioner to vote for it, that we are specifying in fact that you are getting 570 of something of a very specific nature rather than what else might be going on. If that's a problem, it seems to me we ought to talk because I understand what that means and if we pull it out and leave it to the Corps of Engineers, those are the same wonderful folks who give us levee stripping and their
judgment is lacking in certain areas and I'm not willing to just go with whatever the Corps of Engineers want to do. I've worked for them. There's some good people there. One of the best jobs I ever had in my life was the Corps of Engineers. I should have stayed where I was I guess.

(Laughter.)

MR. PRATTE: Mr. Cory, I believe from my conversations with the permit analyst at the Corps of Engineers, they were recommending a 24-inch minimum size, not to go below smaller than 24 inches. I've heard this maximum. I don't understand. It's incomprehensible to me.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I think if you walk away from this thinking about it, I think I would believe that your interests are better served by having a 24-inch maximum rock size in there than not having it.

MR. PRATTE: Yes. I would like to understand what it says and what it means.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I know what it means and I believe the other Commissioners do. I think it's about time for we as Commissioners to decide what we're going to do with this and move on with the rest of the agenda. If you have any other specific questions, Commissioners, any other points of clarification, we'll try to deal with them. Otherwise, I think we ought to proceed. We've agonized over this probably more than it should have been
agonized over.

Are you ready for a vote?

MR. TROUT: Mr. Chairman, the staff clarifies to exactly what version it is we're now going to put in the permit that the Commission is voting on. What staff now has is:

"That prior to using intertidal rock the district shall utilize all suitable rocks located landward..."

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHRUP: And then a mining phrase.

MR. TROUT: And then the condition --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: That this does not contemplate mining.

MR. BELL: This does not contemplate mining.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHRUP: I think we're pretty clear on the motion.

MR. PRATTE: I had a suggestion brought to me as far as the size limitation. Perhaps there could be a 24-inch minimum size above mean high water and a 24-inch maximum size below mean high water.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Any Commissioners wish to amend anything any further?

MR. BELL: Well, we're dealing with a northerly one-half of the intertidal zone when we speak of the 24-inch
MR. PRATTE: Okay.

MR. BELL: So I think that covers your question.

I'm not sure.

MR. PRATTE: Yes, that is clarified.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Are we ready for a vote?

All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

(Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Motion is carried.

MR. ALDERSON: Thank you, gentlemen, for your patience.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Item 2 is off calendar; is that correct?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: That's correct, Mr. Chairman. So is Item 3.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Item 3 is off calendar?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Yes, sir.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Item 4, Decon Corporation. This is reinstatement of a lease and a consent to assign and amend the commercial lease governing .61 acre parcel, Sunset Bay, Orange County.

Anybody in the audience on this item?

Without objection, Item 4 is approved as presented.

Item 5, authorize approval to develop and sign an agreement with Union Oil. This is for an EIR for four
exploratory wells off of Point Conception, Santa Barbara County.

Anybody in the audience on this item?

MR. BELL: I understand this to be a reinstatement agreement which Union Oil with an EIR?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Questions from members?

Without objection, Item 5 will be approved as presented.

Item 6, authorization to offer for competitive bid a five-year mineral extraction lease, Carquinez Straits, Solano which is, what, sand and gravel?

Anybody in the audience on this item?

Without objection, Item 6 will be approved as presented.

Item 7, approval of principal of an exchange of State-owned lands. This is down on the Colorado River where some farmers are trying to help us solve our ownership problems and this will enable them to proceed. It seems to be a worthwhile step in the right direction to solving some naughty title problems.

Is there anybody in the audience on this item?

Have I already prejudiced everyone?

Questions from Commissioners?

Without objection, --
MR. BELL: No objection.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: -- approval in principal will be granted as staff recommended.

Item 8, denial without prejudice of various applications for use of State-owned properties as set forth in 1200. These are where we're running up against a time permit.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Trout has got some deletions from the list.

MR. TROUT: Mr. Chairman, since the preparation of the calendar item, five of the ten applicants have come in and granted the Commission and staff a 90-day extension on processing. Most of these have now indicated they will agree to terms. So on page 48 of your agenda, we would like to remove from the action the second, third, and fourth items, Jackson, Fathom 8 and Jonsson, J-o-n-s-s-o-n, and the last two items on the page, Pierce and Kase. That would leave Wilcoxson, Dondero, the City of Stockton, and Orantes as the items that you are denying the application without prejudice.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, I believe there's someone in the audience who cares to speak.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Yes, sir. Could you identify yourself for the record?

MR. ORANTES: My name is Louis Orantes. I'm
WP 3378.

I have a recreational walkway and a boat hoist down on Sandy Beach Road. I do not have a recreational floating boat dock and I do not have a breakwater which is what it says here. I was contacted by your office in '75 to renew my lease and I sent my check in and answered all the questions. I sent a picture of the dock back and the State kept my check, but they never sent me my lease.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: What say you, Mr. Trout?

MR. TROUT: The gentleman is correct. We're in a time period where we have to either, the Commission has to either deny or grant the lease. We have not worked out the details of the lease, but this would be very similar to Item 11. The recommendation is that it be denied without prejudice. We would reinstate the gentleman's application and go ahead and work on the lease and not require any more money from them.

MR. HIGHT: One other option, Mr. Chairman, would be that Mr. Orantes could give the Commission a 90-day extension in which time perhaps we could arrive at some solution.

MR. BELL: I'd be willing for that.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Would a 90-day extension be acceptable to you?

MR. ORANTES: Will I have to appear again in 90
days?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: No.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: No. We should be able to solve it all by just getting the paper work to you.

MR. ORANTES: What seems to be the hangup?

CHAIRPERSON CORY: We're going to discover what that is. If they took your money, they should give you a lease. Is the 90 days agreeable to you, sir?

MR. ORANTES: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Thank you, and I apologize for the inconvenience.

MR. ORANTES: It's all right.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: So we've removed Mr. Orantes from this list; is that correct?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Right.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Anybody else in the audience on these items?

Without objection, the amended list with the denials without prejudice are hereby made.

Item 9, approval of a map and survey of deeded trust grant. This is pursuant to a statute; is that correct?

MR. HIGHT: Correct, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Any questions?

MR. BELL: No problem.
CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on this item?
Without objection, approval is granted.
Item 10, authorize issuance of a supplementary Letter of Understanding to PG&E for rental. This is to accommodate for the low rental incomes and handle it on an annual basis --
EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: That's correct.
CHAIRPERSON CORY: -- rather than a quarterly and that PG&E will probably be here and we can catch them.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: They're not going to go.
CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on this item?
Without objection, Item 10 will be approved as presented.
Item 11, recreational, residential use permit for submerged lands.
Is there anybody in the audience on this item?
Anything we should know about?
EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: No, Mr. Chairman, I think --
MR. TROUT: This is straightforward. This would be the solution to the gentleman's problem.
CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Any questions from
Commissioners?

MR. BELL: No problem at all.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Without objection, Item 11 will be approved as presented.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Item 13 which we removed from the Consent Calendar, Burkhardt.

MR. TROUT: Mr. Chairman, I think that it would be both in the essence of time and because they are similar items, 13, 14 and 15 could be taken together.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay.

MR. TROUT: The situation applies to all of these.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: What makes you think we care about time? But go ahead.

MR. TROUT: Just giving you that option.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Go ahead, let's take them all up at once quickly.

MR. TROUT: The upland owner has apparently asked the occupants of structures here to leave. There's a dispute as to whether or not they have a right to remain. What the Commission is doing here would be to authorize the continued use of the structures. We would like to amend each of these items to include the following condition.

This permit is issued concurrently with permittee's rights, if any, to occupy the adjoining land or structures. This permit shall automatically terminate if permittee's
right to so occupy is terminated by act of law, judgment, or otherwise.

What has happened here is apparently a prior representative of the upland owner granted permission for these people to be here and now attempts are being made to terminate that right. We're not trying to referee it, we're just trying to legalize the trespassing.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Any questions? Anybody in the audience on these items? Without objection, 13, 14 and 15 will be approved as amended.

Do we have any other items to come before us? 16 we did on the Consent Calendar.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, just for the record, we will present for your consideration next month a calendar item to authorize the Executive Officer to issue short-term letter permits on an emergency basis to applicants facing project funding or construction deadlines much as we saw in the first three in the Executive Officer's report this morning. We'll discuss it more at that time.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Wanton power grab by bureaucracy.

(Laughter.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER NORTHROP: I have written down who was laughing.

MR. SANDERS: I've heard that before.
CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Is there anything else to come before the Commission? Then after you get that last paragraph, you won't need us any more? You won't need to have meetings after that.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. We stand adjourned and our next meeting is noticed in the agenda, I believe.

(Thereupon the State Lands Commission Meeting was adjourned at 11:40 a.m.)
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