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CHAIR DAVIS: Good morning. I am State Controller Gray Davis.

I want to welcome you to this hearing of the Lands Commission, and thank you for attending. I could tell by your response that you all know Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor of this state, and a member of this Commission.

The purpose of today's meeting is to hear testimony to determine whether or not this Commission should declare an oil sanctuary for most of the Humboldt and Mendocino County coast that is not now already covered by a similar protection granted a portion of that coast -- about 48 miles -- by the legislature some years ago. So, we will be concerning ourselves with about 214 miles of coastline that is not currently protected by the designation of oil sanctuary.

As you all know, Dan Hauser, who represents many of
you, put legislation on the Governor's desk, which had the support of both Republicans and Democrats, passed overwhelmingly in both the Assembly and the Senate to declare these 214 miles an oil sanctuary. Unfortunately, the Governor vetoed that legislation.

I don't think the Governor should have the last word on this subject, and I don't think his action sends the right signal to Washington. At present, 66 percent of the state has been declared an oil sanctuary by previous actions of the legislature, actions they began taking in 1955, and took incrementally up until about 1972. For reasons not totally clear to me they have overlooked these 214 miles that we are today to consider. And, we are here to hear from you to determine whether or not this area should be included in the oil sanctuary provisions that have been extended to 66 percent of the coast.

Many of us were together when the Interior Department came out here last winter to determine whether or not Lease Sale 91 should proceed. I think your testimony and your objections to that sale, as well as mine and Lieutenant Governor Leo McCarthy's, had something to do with the ultimate decision to postpone final action on that until 1989.

Another reason we are here today is to insure that neither the Congress nor the next president is under a
misimpression that these 214 miles of coastline are fair game
At present, the decision makers in Washington may well ask
themselves why this area is not protected as an oil sanctuary
when so much of the California coast is.

So, today's hearing is to determine whether or not we
should, as a Commission, grant that authority which would be
indefinite in length and would insure that this coastline
deserves that same kind of protection that most of the
California coastline currently has.

The last thing --

[Applause]

I personally don't believe the Governor's action
represented the prevailing view in California. I think that
if we adopt the sanctuary today that will send the right
signal, the signal that most accurately reflects the public
sentiment in this state about drilling anywhere along the
coastline, but particularly in these rugged but at the same
time sensitive areas off of Humboldt and Mendocino Counties.

I am now going to call on the Lieutenant Governor for
any remarks he wants to make at this time.

We then have one piece of administrative business
which won't take too long to discharge, and then we will
begin the hearing.

COMMISSIONER MC CARTHY: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

I want to add my "welcome" to all of you to this very
important meeting of the State Lands Commission on the critical subject of an ocean sanctuary off of the Humboldt - Mendocino coast. For more than a year there has been an enormous tug of war going on -- those who want to drill off of this coast with those who are opposed to drilling. I think each side have had their day.

The Reagan administration at one point succeeded in having its plans for Lease Sale 91 put into an appropriation bill, and fortunately the California Congressional delegation had the strength to block it one more time.

And, then as the Chairman indicated, Assemblyman Dan Hauser wrote a State Bill that passed the legislature and got to the Governor's desk, and unfortunately Governor Deukmejian vetoed that bill.

And, we are here today to consider whether it is time to end this tug of war, whether it is time to settle this issue once and for all.

This coastline is this community's life line.

Commercial fishermen, inn keepers, and coastal business owners depend on the special integrity of the north coast.

Mendocino and Humboldt Counties receive at least $230 million dollars each year in tourism dollars, and more than $100 million each year from commercial fishing. These dollars are earned by hard working people to put food on their tables, to live in decent homes, to send their kids to schools, and to
meet the challenges they face in their everyday lives. This income enables hundreds of working men and women to build a better life for themselves, and for their families.

This coast is also sustenance for the soul -- unpolluted air, horizons unmarred by derricks and tankers, clean oceans, and abundant marine and coastal wildlife, all make this magnificent area very special to all Californians, not just those who live here.

I am convinced that drilling would destroy this magnificence. Exploratory oil drilling emits as much of the main component of smog as 23,000 cars, each travelling 50 miles a day for a year would emit. Drill ships generate between 1500 and 2000 tons of drill muds and cuttings. Drilling and tankers increase the likelihood of oil spills endangering the wildlife and fish. Seismic testing disperses fish, and kills fish eggs.

In the past the legislature has had the foresight to prevent such destruction by creating ocean sanctuaries in the Santa Monica and San Diego Bays, and from the San Luis Obispo - north border, stopping at the Mendocino border.

Today the State Lands Commission has a good opportunity to reverse Governor Deukmejian's veto, and to permanently protect this precious area of the coast for all Californians, and for millions of Americans who come here and enjoy this part of the coast with their families.
I look forward to hearing from all of you today, but I want to make it unambiguous: I intend to support the establishment of ocean sanctuary today.

[Applause]

CHAIR DAVIS: Thank you, Leo.

One other point I neglected to mention that I should: the Congress has been successful in the past several years in arguing to -- let me put it another way -- our Congressional delegation from California has been successful in convincing other colleagues from internal states that don't have quite the same sensitivity we have to the coastline, that in areas where the state has acted to establish an oil sanctuary, in those areas we should discourage drilling off in federal waters. As you know, our jurisdiction extends three miles out, and beyond three miles the federal government has jurisdiction.

So, another reason to have this hearing is to preclude the Congress from being under the mistaken impression that we think these 214 miles of coastline are appropriate for oil drilling. Their success in the past, in using the establishment of an oil sanctuary as reason why the federal government shouldn't drill in their federal waters, has persuaded me that we ought to have this hearing today and take the appropriate steps, so I just wanted to add that as well.
The Chair notices the presence of a quorum; however, I am disappointed that the Governor has not sent anyone from his office to participate in this meeting. There are however two of the three members of this Commission present, so we can conduct our business.

I don't notice anything about the Minutes of the previous meeting?

Do we have -- we are dispensing with that?

All right.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: We don't have that --

CHAIR DAVIS: There is one administrative item involving American Telephone and Telegraph Communications.

Will the Executive Officer explain Item 1 on the Agenda.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes.

Item 1 is an application from AT and T for a lease right-of-way for the laying of a fiber optic cable across Cordelia Slough and Carquinez Straits, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR DAVIS: Have we received any communication in opposition to this?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: No, this is a non-controversial item, sir.

CHAIR DAVIS: Would anyone here care to be heard on this matter?

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: What is the
CHAIR DAVIS: Excuse me?

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: What is the matter?

CHAIR DAVIS: I can't hear you.

COMMISSIONER MC CARTHY: What is the matter.

CHAIR DAVIS: The matter involves a request by -- this is not the matter we are here today on. This is an administrative matter, involving a cable application that American Telephone and Telegraph has before the Commission.

As a courtesy I always ask at all of these meetings if there is someone here who wants to speak in opposition to that matter.

[No response.]

Hearing none, is there a motion?

COMMISSIONER MC CARTHY: So move.

CHAIR DAVIS: All right, that application is approved on a two to zero vote.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Excuse me, sir. On Item 2 we do have some written testimony you would probably like to have added to the record.

CHAIR DAVIS: There is a communication, I believe, from the Congress that ought to be read into the record.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: From the Congress?
EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: From the Congress?

CHAIR DAVIS: Yes.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Have you got it?

CHAIR DAVIS: I have a letter in front of me from signed by Congressman Mel Levine, Leo Panetta, and Barbara Boxer, urging us to adopt the sanctuary; expressing disappointment that the Hauser Bill was vetoed; and speaking highly of this area of the coast; and detailing the reasons why they think a sanctuary should be granted.

If you don't have a copy of that, I will --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes, we do.

CHAIR DAVIS: -- all right.

So, that should be entered into the record.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Also, there are 26 other pieces of testimony in writing, in favor of the sanctuary; and three opposing the sanctuary, while the decision awaits the CCORS study.

CHAIR DAVIS: All right, all of those will be entered into the record.

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

CHAIR DAVIS: Now, before we go any farther, I just want to seek concurrence from the counsel for the Lands Commission, as well as the Attorney General, that the Commission is within its authority, should it so decide to
grant an oil sanctuary to these 214 acres that we are here to
discuss.

It is my view that under Public Resource Codes 6301,
the Commission has exclusive jurisdiction over all ungranted
tide and submerged lands owned by the state, and that while
it has never acted in the past to grant an oil sanctuary, it
has taken action tantamount to establishing moritoriums,
whether it be oil drilling, or granting permits for docks in
Tahoe, or sales of state owned land.

So, it is my view that we have the authority to take
this action, and I just want to first put that question to
the counsel for the Commission, Bob Hight, and then put it to
the Attorney General's representative.

CHIEF COUNSEL HIGHT: Yes, Mr. Chairman, you have
correctly stated the current California law which provides
that the Commission has exclusive jurisdiction over ungranted
tide and submerged lands. These lands falling within that
jurisdiction, you have the complete discretion on whether to
lease or not to lease, and in this action to declare a
sanctuary.

CHAIR DAVIS: I haven't met you before -- do you
represent the Attorney General?

DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL HOLT: Yes, Mary Holt, from
the Attorney General's office.

The Attorney General's office is in complete
concurrence with the counsel for the State Lands Commission. The Commission has the authority to declare a policy of oil and gas leasing sanctuary.

CHAIR DAVIS: Thank you.

All right, we have a number of people that have asked to be heard on this issue, and I want to do the courtesy of calling elected officials to the microphone first, so I would like to call Supervisor De Vall, who represents much of this area.

MR. DE VALL: Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a pleasure to welcome you to Mendocino, and to the north coast of California.

But, there are two people who have spokesmen here today that I will yield the floor to before I take my time, and the first is Rick Provenso, on behalf of California State Senator Barry Keene, and the second is Rachel Binah, on behalf of Governor Dukakis.

MR. PROVENSO: Good Morning, Commissioners, my name is Rick Provenso, and I am here representing Senator Keene, who was unable to make it today. He sent this statement along that he is very glad you are here today.

"Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, as the Representative of the Senate District covering the north coast, I urge you to adopt the proposal to make the state waters off of Mendocino and Humboldt Counties a sanctuary zone. That will reverse
the damage done by the Governor's ill-advised veto of AB 284, a bill that would have protected sections of the Mendocino and Humboldt coastline within the State Lands Commission oil and gas sanctuary system, and that Assemblyman Hauser and I saw successfully through the Legislature last session.

"What is baffling and politically unacceptable is that the Governor's veto leaves those most fragile and pristine sections of the entire coastline the only unprotected state waters from Santa Barbara to Oregon. It is within your power to change that disturbing reality.

"The sanctuary plan would also strengthen efforts to halt oil development in federal waters off those portions of the coast. Most of the proposed sanctuary area is adjacent to the 1.1 million acres included in the federal government's proposed Lease Sale 91. This lease sale has been politically deferred, but depending on what happens on November 8th, it could surface again soon after the elections. Should that happen, restrictions placed by California on state tide and submerged lands could very well influence what actions an unfriendly administration takes on lease sales for the federal outer continental shelf.

"I admire your outstanding leadership on this nationally, if not internationally, significant issue. Future generations will applaud you."

Thank you.
CHAIR DAVIS: Thank you.

MS. BINAH: My name is Rachel Binah, and I have the honor and privilege of reading a letter addressed to you from Governor Michael Dukakis.

"Dear Chairman Davis, and Commissioners. As President I will designate marine sanctuaries in Santa Monica Bay, and from Big Sur to the Oregon border, and I will work with California citizens and leaders to determine what additional areas should be permanently protected.

"I offer my strong support for your efforts to protect the state-owned tide lands and coastal waters. Federal, state, and local governments each have an essential role to play if these beautiful and valuable resources are to be preserved. Unless the state waters are protected, these areas will remain at risk.

"Again, I applaud your efforts to provide protection to state waters and coastal areas.

"Sincerely, Michael S. Dukakis."

MR. DE VALL: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors --

CHAIR DAVIS: Supervisor, excuse me for a second.

Just in the name of fairness -- does someone care to read a statement from Vice President Bush?

[No response.]

All right -- apparently not -- please proceed.
MR. DE VALL: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that Mr. Bush
would not disagree, but I feel that he would -- if he knew.

This coast is a national treasure which deserves the
recognition of Yellowstone, and better treatment than
Yosemite.

I applaud your agenda. Your foresight in recognizing
that the north coast needs protection is supported by the
citizens of this state and the California legislature. Only
the Governor is of the opinion that this portion of the coast
does not deserve the same protection given by law to those
those counties north and south of Mendocino and Humboldt.

Assemblyman Dan Hauser's AB 284, and Assembly Joint
Resolution 91 brought extensive testimony to legislative
committees in Sacramento. One fact above all rings true time
after time: no spokesman for the oil industry, no pro-oil
legislator, not even the Governor himself, has accepted the
challenge to debate, to refute the fact that an oil spill off
of this coast can not be cleaned up.

The California Coastal Commission has confirmed that
the average height of sea and swell is beyond existing
clean-up technology. The best information available from the
United States Coast Guard confirms that offshore and onshore
currents, speed, and track, are at best, estimates.

The California Coastal Conservancy has initiated
numerous projects and spent million of dollars in recognition
of the unique beauty, national and international prominence
of the Mendocino coast. The Mendocino County Board of
Supervisors has taken every action possible at the state
level supporting legislation introduced to protect this
coast. Many cities and counties the length of the California
coastline have joined in this effort to bring protection
here.

Congresswoman Boxer knows the long-term value of this
coastline, the richness of the ocean resources, and the facts
about our carefully balanced local economies, and introduced
federal legislation to bring permanent protection to the
California coast and ocean waters. Senator Alan Cranston
shares this goal and has introduced similar legislation in
the U.S. Senate.

Your action today will be historic. The importance of
it goes far beyond the coast of Mendocino and Humboldt
Counties. A "yes" vote today is appropriate, it is just, it
will be remembered by future generations as a sincere and
real effort to protect this coast from ruin; and perhaps most
importantly, it will send a clear message to the Congress
that ocean sanctuary is supported in California, in Kansas,
in Chicago.

The small amount of oil that might exist here can be
easily replaced with a national energy policy with some guts.
Big oil may own this Governor, it may buy the next president,
but Mr. Chairman, big oil will not stop the people of this county from protecting their ocean.

[Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take just a few more minutes and go through a brief slide presentation which I have shown to the California Coastal Commission in their consideration on this subject.

I know that time today is short, and I would hope that if we get into a time bind that people might yield their speaking order so these slides may be shown.

Is there a possibility of dimming one or two of the lights? Whichever one it is.

[Slide Presentation.]

SLIDE No. 1.

Mr. Chairman, the chart in this slide clearly shows the areas of controversy, and the recommended areas proposed for ocean sanctuary. AB 284, if it had been signed by the Governor, would have provided limited protection in that area shown from the bottom of the chart to Del Norte County.

SLIDE No. 2.

These slides proceed from south to north. The Usal Road travels north from Highway 1 and proceeds in through the
the Sinkyone Wilderness. At some point the road is almost a
thousand feet above sea level.

SLIDE No. 3.

Throughout this area and along the coast small coastal
tributaries enter the sea. Many are impossible to reach
except on foot. Some of these produce salmon and
steelhead -- difficult to reach and fragile -- the smallest
amount of oil would be a detriment to their delicately
balanced environment.

SLIDE No. 4.

The riparian wetlands of the north coast streams are
the habitat for migrating anadromous fish species. No
spokesman for the oil industry has ever had the audacity to
say that their modern technology can protect or clean areas
such as these without damage.

SLIDE No. 5.

Further south the highway generally runs along the
bluff tops some 100-plus feet above the mean sea level.
There are few access roads to the many pocket beaches. In
the event of a spill, most supplies would have to be hand
carried. Imagine how, if this beach were oil covered, you
would proceed to order its cleanup, and how you would remove
tons of oil-soaked hay.

SLIDE No. 6.

This and the next slide are within one-half mile of Point Cabrillo's marine sanctuary, and the final resting place of the vessel "Frolic" a coaster that ran aground, and in so doing brought the first Europeans to Mendocino County.

In other areas of the coast the nearest road parallels the coast a half-mile or more to the east. The bluff edges are fragile, slowly receding due to erosion from winter runoff.

SLIDE No. 7.

Vertical bluff edges simply do not allow access for reasonable clean-up efforts. These difficult-to-reach holes are favorite areas for abalone divers during the season.

SLIDE No. 8.

The Mendocino coast is a combination of small out islands, rocks, coves, beaches -- most of which are small -- and river inlets. It is ridiculous to believe that an oil spill could ever be cleaned up on this coast.

SLIDE No. 9.

The town of Mendocino sits above Mendocino Bay, the
edge of which has, again, very limited access. It is here that the ocean sanctuary movement was born, recognizing that only sanctuary would bring adequate protection to this irreplaceable and unique coast.

SLIDE No. 10.

To the southeast of Mendocino lies the bar and mouth of Big River, a major tributary in Mendocino County. Its more than 1000 square miles of water shed is rich in salmon-rearing potential.

SLIDE No. 11.

The wetlands of Big River cover many acres. They are currently free of industrial waste and chemical pollution.

SLIDE No. 12.

The marsh grasses run deep, prohibiting access. Damage to this rich intertidal area, due to an oil spill, would be disastrous.

SLIDE No. 13.

From the air, the wetlands continue inland for some miles. The Georgia Pacific Haul Road, on the north side of the river, offers limited access to some areas, none to others.
The Laguna, some five miles up Big River, has been the subject of years of study. The river is tidal on a day-by-day basis, some seven miles inland.

Access, once again, is difficult if not impossible. This stretch of the river is west of the Laguna.

At Chapman Point, the bluff edge is again, sheer. The rocks, even on a calm day, are difficult to reach.

At Little River, just south of Mendocino, an aerial photo again shows the broken coastline. Weather conditions allow the fleet out of Fort Bragg an average of 35 weeks a year. The balance of the time it is too rough for the boats to get out. Little River provides a limited anchorage inside the cave -- at the top right of the slide.

The mouth of the Navarro River, about ten miles south of Mendocino. This is one of the few beaches accessible to vehicles at sea level. The Louisiana Pacific Corporation is
building a large fish hatchery upstream in this tributary, with the support of the State Department of Fish and Game, and the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors.

SLIDE No. 19.
South of the Navarro is a seal haul out. As stated in testimony before the Commission last year in Sacramento, and again in San Francisco, these rocks were abandoned by the colony when seismic vessels operated in the vicinity.

SLIDE No. 20.
Winter 1967. The erosion bloom of the Navarro River runs well out to sea and is then carried south by the California current. During other months of the year, the Davidson current sets northerly, and neither current has been adequately tracked to the extent that it can be predicted with accuracy.

SLIDE No. 21.
The sea stacks of the Kansas coast, and of Coffey's Cove -- perhaps the best known photograph of the Mendocino coast. It says it all. There is no alternative -- only ocean sanctuary.

SLIDE No. 22.
South of Greenwood/Elk the coast is higher. The bluffs on average -- more often than not -- vertical.

SLIDE No. 23.

Over the years, access trails for fishermen and "ab" divers have been dug in. This one drops over 140 feet.

SLIDE No. 24.

Fog is common on this coast, and unlike San Francisco it doesn't lift or blow off around noon -- the cause of many ocean accidents -- it can linger on the coast for days. One of the objectives of sanctuary is to prevent the risk of spill during times such as these.

SLIDE No. 25.

And, let's not forget that no one, not even the chairman of the board of Chevron Oil, can control the ocean. No one know when or how high her seas will be, or how winds, swells, currents, seas, states, and storms, may combine to break transfer lines and send oil onto this down-wind coast.

Offshore oil cannot be mitigated. It cannot be rationalized. Our coast, this ocean, deserves better than to become another Kesteron toxic dump. This ocean gives us life and meaning to California. We do not need this oil. What we need is something to believe in. We need to know that
this ocean will be protected, and that we can take fish from its waters, free of fear of pollution. We need to know that our beaches will be clean, and the water clean, for this and following generations.

We have ruined too much of this world. It is time to give part of it meaningful protection.

Thank you.

CHAIR DAVIS: Our next witness is a Supervisor from Humboldt County, Wesley Chesbro.

MR. CHESBRO: Good morning. My name is Wesley Chesbro, and I am a County Supervisor from Humboldt County. I would like to begin by a couple of off-the-script remarks to the audience about the situation here this morning. I would like to ask everybody who has come here to speak to join me in abbreviating their remarks, and I will explain why: this is not the same situation that we were in last February in Fort Bragg. These people are our friends. And, although both of their times is very limited, one of them is running for the United States Senate and has a lot of things to do today.

So, remember this is not a filibuster, which is what we were involved in in Fort Bragg, so let's try to -- I am going to try and abbreviate my remarks. Let's try to move quickly, so that they can act today, while we are all still here, and while the press is all still here.
I would like to begin by expressing my deep gratitude to both of you, Lieutenant Governor McCarty, and Controller Gray Davis, for showing the foresight and leadership of proposed protection of the scenic grandeur and the rich fishery of the Humboldt and Mendocino coastline. Should you adopt this proposal, future generations of Americans -- and not just north coast residents -- but future generations of Americans will look back upon this decision as a turning point in the battle to protect our coastline from ocean destruction.

The Humboldt County Board of Supervisors has a long history of opposing oil drilling in the sensitive fishery areas off of our coast. Beginning in 1981, when Secretary of the Interior Watt proposed to massively open the northern California waters to indiscriminate drilling, our board has voted to support protection of the most productive fishery grounds in California, in the state and federal waters off of Humboldt Bay. We have done this by endorsing various moritoriums and yearly delays in federal waters, and we have also supported efforts to place the state waters -- the sensitive areas in state waters off our coast under state protection.

As has been mentioned Assemblyman Hauser and Senator Keene fought long and hard for many years to finally this year to see our wishes enacted through sanctuary legislation.
As you know, they succeeded only to have it shot down by our shortsighted and visionless Governor.

In the absence of leadership and representation by the Governor, your roll as the State Lands Commission becomes that much more important. With the veto by the Governor to give the north coast the same consideration as the rest of the California coastline, the responsibility to protect our coastal environment falls on your shoulders.

In the coastal area that we are talking about, it produces 64 percent of the sole, snapper and other bottom feeding fish caught in California. San Francisco may be famous for dungeness crab, but more than half of it is caught off of the Humboldt County coastline.

Ports in Mendocino, Humboldt, and Del Norte Counties bring in over half of California's prize salmon catch. We are not willing to sacrifice the livelihood of our commercial fishermen for a few days' worth of oil. These fishermen are our friends and our neighbors and for 100 years they have risked their lives to bring high quality protein to the dinner tables of America.

Your Commission has a critical role to play in the absence of responsible leadership from the Governor. I congratulate you on embarking on this proposal, particularly Leo McCarthy and Gray Davis, and in absentia I extend my criticism to the Governor for not representing us and not
providing any leadership.

Thank you for coming to the north coast and providing
us the leadership that is lacking in the White House and in
the Governor's office in Sacramento.

[Applause.]

CHAIR DAVIS: Thank you.

The next elected official who wants to speak is J.
Bryce Kenny, Trinidad City, a Councilmember from that city.

MR. KENNY: Good morning Chairman Davis, Commission
McCarthy, State Lands Commission staff, fellow citizens of
Mendocino and Humboldt Counties, and all interested members
of the public.

The City of Trinidad, in Humboldt County, has
consistently opposed offshore oil and gas development. We are
against it. We have said it quite often. Incidentally, I am
a commercial fisherman by trade, too.

It is a particular pleasure to address you today. At
last I can come to a meeting and say, "I am for it. It
sounds like a good idea to me."

Sanctuary -- I like the word. I like what it says,
what it means: sacred place. Now this is honesty in
government. This is telling it like it is.

Sanctuary -- a safe haven; a place of peace and
harmony; an image of what is happening on the north coast,
and what must happen in the entire nation.
Controller Gray Davis and Lieutenant Governor Leo
McCarthy have supported H.R. 920 by Congresswoman Barbara
Boxer, and Senate Bill 884 by Senator Alan Cranston.
Presidential candidate Michael Dukakis has pledged sanctuary
in federal waters out to 200 miles. The State Legislature
approved Assemblyman Hauser's and Senator Keene's bill to
designate Humboldt and Mendocino Counties as a coastal
sanctuary. If Governor Deukmejian vetoed the action, if
Senator Wilson and Vice President Bush have remained
non-committal, still do what we must during the coming
general election, but ocean sanctuary must finally be seen as
beyond partisan politics and as an expression of an earth
ethic, a renaissance of spirit and of caring, a recognition
of human kind's responsibility to live in harmony with all
life.

Gentleman, the public responsibility you hold is well
met by the proposal you have before you today:

- Free navigation for commercial and sports fishing
  vessels;
- Clean air;
- Clean water;
- Clean beaches;
- Productive wetlands and estuaries.

Don't back down. Do it. Because it is the right
thing to do.
With that, I am going the honor my friend Wesley Chesbro's request, and turn over to the next speaker, in the hopes that everyone gets a chance to speak today.

Thanks, gentleman.

[Applause]

CHAIR DAVIS: The next elected official is Thea Gast, a Councilperson of the City of Arcata.

MS. GAST: Thank you Lieutenant Governor McCarthy, and Controller Gray Davis. I appreciate the opportunity to address you this morning on behalf of the Arcata City Council.

In 1980, the City Council adopted an energy policy following the approval of the voters of the City of Arcata, of an advisory proposition which stated that:

"In accordance with America's renewed determination to be energy self reliant, be it resolved that the citizens of Arcata and their city government are committed to the enactment of conscientious energy conservation measures, and the accelerated development and active promotion of safe and economical alternative renewable energy sources for our community."

It further states that the city government of Arcata supports safe, clean, and efficient energy sources which are compatible with the resources and health and safety of the
north coast, such as conservation, solar power, and power
generation from wood wastes.

If this administration had enacted measures which
would have conserved energy through automobile fuel
efficiency, appliance efficiency, retrofit building programs,
and mass transit, millions of barrels of oil would have been
saved.

We believe that through conservation and alternative
energy sources, energy needs can be met without the
potentially harmful effects of oil and gas development off of
our shores.

We also have a number of concerns about oil
development off the shores of Humboldt County. These
concerns include:

- The negative effects of an oil spill on Humboldt Bay,
  including the Arcata marsh and aquaculture projects;

- The effects of a developed coastline on tourism when
  the principle draw for tourism has been our undeveloped
  coastline;

- And, the effects of degraded air quality on those who
  are environmentally sensitive, many of whom have moved here
  because of our unusually pure air.

The Arcata City Council is on record for supporting
legislation creating a California ocean sanctuary along the
California coastline, and we further support energy
conservation measures and an accelerated and active promotion of safe and economical alternatives to renewable energy sources.

The Arcata City Council supports the establishment of an oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone.

And, we thank you also for your support.

[Applause.]

CHAIR DAVIS: Thank you.

Next, I would like to call Theresa Staber, who is a field representative for Assemblyman Dan Hauser, who as you know carried the oil sanctuary legislation.

MS. STABER: Many times I have the opportunity to speak on behalf of Assemblyman Dan Hauser, but I can tell you today he sincerely regrets not be able to be here.

This is his testimony that he sent:

"I want to express my gratitude to both Lieutenant Governor Leo McCarthy, and State Controller Gray Davis, for bringing the State Lands Commission to Mendocino County, where the battle to protect not only the north coast, but all of America's coasts and oceans, has surely been centered.

"The people of Mendocino do not act to protect this coast out of selfishness or because they wish to shirk their national duty, or because they are dilettantes searching for some new fad. No, these people have been working for 10 years to protect it. They have written thousands of letters,
made thousands of phone calls, spent countless hours organizing both local people and our friends from other parts of the country and the world. They have even travelled to Sacramento and to Washington at their own expense to lobby members of the Legislature, and of Congress, that the destruction of the coast is not in the national interest, the destruction of the coast which will surely follow drilling in our waters is the destruction of one of our great national treasures, a treasure that is worth more than the paltry amounts of oil that may be present.

"And, while their tireless work has not been completed, it has already reaped its rewards. With their invaluable assistance, I have carried legislation supported by the State Lands Commission to prevent drilling off the Mendocino and Humboldt coast. And, as you know, we were successful this year in getting AB 284 through both houses of the legislature, and to the Governor, with the support of a number of Republican Senators, that this Governor, to whom the coast is simply a resource to be exploited, saw fit to veto AB 284, will be, I believe, a major factor in determining Governor Deukmejian's political future in this state two years from now.

[Applause]

"I understand that the State Lands Commission is considering using its administrative powers to place the
Mendocino and Humboldt state waters in the state's sanctuary zone, and I strongly urge you to do so. While such action would not be as strong as legislative action on protecting our coastline, it may be that under this Governor that is the best we can hope for.

"If the Commission does decide to take that step, I want you to know that you would do so with my full support, and that I believe that such a step would be entirely consistant with my plans to reintroduce AB 284 at the beginning of the next legislative session in December.

"I would also like to take this opportunity to address the citizens of Mendocino County, and all of those throughout the state and the nation who treasure and value our national coastline. I would like to tell you that despite the rantings of a few, your efforts to protect this coastline are heard and felt throughout the nation. Your efforts have been recognized, even by the enemies of this coast, as incredible, remarkable. There is no oil company executive in America who did not believe that they would by now have their oil derricks in place, who did not believe that with their friends in the White House, that all of this would not have been over by now -- the citizens defeated, and the corporations in charge of our destiny.

"And, let me tell you that those corporations are not used to being out-lobbied, out-thought, and out-maneuvered,
and there are no more of a surprised group of individuals in
America that they still have not won. But, they believe that
they will win, and so despite our great successes we must not
let down now. Over the next few months there is much that we
must do.

"First, we must elect Leo McCarthy to be our next
United States Senator.

[Applause]

"I believe that with Leo and Alan Cranston leading the
fight in the Senate, and Barbara Boxer and Mel Levine leading
the fight in the House, we can create an ocean sanctuary,
permanently on our coast.

"Second, we must ignore the Republican spin-masters
and forget this nonsense that Michael Dukakis will not be
elected President of the United States. He will only not be
elected if we believe that he cannot be elected, and stop
working for that victory. Mike Dukakis will halt Lease Sale
91 and his administration will help shepherd the ocean
sanctuary legislation through the Congress.

"If George Bush is elected, he will move rapidly
forward with Lease Sale 91, and you know he will never sign
an ocean sanctuary bill.

"Third, we must not neglect the Governor of our state.
We must continue to hammer at him in every way we know that
our coast is inviolable, that we will not allow him to pardon
the oil companies when what they have in mind is nothing less than rape of our coast.

"Fourth, we must continue to be effective manipulators of the media. One picture of an oil derrick on an otherwise pristine coastline on the evening news is worth thousands of letters to congresspersons from other states, representatives who presently have no reason to oppose drilling in California.

"Finally, we must continue to make use of one of the most valuable tools we have in this fight: the thousands of visitors that come to this coast each year. We must make sure that not one of them leaves here without fully understanding the threat that we are confronting. We must make sure that not one of them leaves without writing a letter to his or her congressperson or senator, telling them to save this coast. We must make sure that each of them promises to tell at least ten other people about the north coast and what we are fighting.

"Once again, let me extend my thanks to Leo and Gray, and the commission staff, for the hard and extraordinary work you do to protect all of the state's coastal waters, and even more importantly let me extend my great gratitude to the people of Mendocino for your unflagging spirits in defense of the magnificent coast. If it hadn't been for the hundreds and hundreds of calls and letters I received urging me to
press ahead with AB 284, and before that with AJR 91 which put the State Legislature on record in support of ocean sanctuary, I had moments when I might have been inclined to quit, but your support and energy sustained me, and made what had once seemed almost impossible, seem eminently achievable.

"It is a testament to your skills that we have come all the way to the end of the Reagan administration and there is still not one oil well as far as the eye can see. It is a testament to your perseverance that I know that together we will win this fight and win it permanently."

Thank you.

[Applause.]
so that he has an opportunity to hear balanced points of view
before he casts his vote.

I am taking these in the order that people signed up,
so the first name on the list is Lilly Parsons, representing
the Mendocino Community School.

MS. PARSONS: Hello, and thank you so much for coming
to support us all.

I would just like to say that the main reason -- if
you have any doubt -- is right out there, is that as soon as
you drive up here you look out there and that is what we are
talking about, and that is what is in this room right here,
and we are behind you all the way.

And, thank you for fighting for tomorrow's youth.

CHAIR DAVIS: Thank you.

The next person who signed up is Susan Miller.

MS. MILLER: Good morning. Thank you for coming.

Well, we have come a long way, and we have a long way
to go.

I am Susan Miller. I am an environmental consultant,
and I live here in Mendocino. I want to thank the people
here and the people who are not here for working to protect
the earth. I want to thank the people for making the see life
here and for showing us examples. I want to thank the young
people for coming here. We love this place, and we love the
earth.
I was put here in the program to help provide a framework for this hearing and for your actions.

Sala Burton, Sylvia Coddington, and Kim Moonwater, who have gone before us have been our inspiration, and Barbara Boxer continues to carry the vision.

This is the history of the ocean sanctuary movement:

ten years ago, the people of Mendocino and the Mendocino coast became aware of the oil companies and the federal government's plans for adversely affecting the coast with offshore oil development. We went all-out to fight Lease Sale 53. Starting in 1979, we had the Mendocino County Technical Advisory Task Force on the Outer Continental Shelf, made up of a dedicated group of citizens, fishermen, retired oil company employees, teachers, biologists, energy experts -- a cross section of that community -- we studied the government's plans, and we concluded that any offshore oil development was not worth the risk to the environment.

The Carter administration's Secretary of Interior, Cecil D. Andrus, came to the very same conclusion and deleted the north and central coast of California from further considering of oil company plans. The Governor of California, Jerry Brown, agreed and was an important figure in this struggle. We knew that the use of renewable, nonpolluting energy resources, and fishing enhancement, were companion issues.
Then the administration changed to Reagan, Watt, and Hodel. More lease sales were planned for California, as well as for other states. We realized that we were being tried more than once for the same crime. We saw that the government was trying to keep us occupied by reacting to their schemes; meanwhile, much of Alaska was leased, and so was the Santa Maria Basin, more of Santa Barbara, more of the Gulf.

In the midst of this, we came to the conclusion that we would not separate our fate from that of the Humboldt coast, and that the compromise of saving Mendocino and letting go of Humboldt is rejected.

We care about the ruination of Alaska, the Gulf, and Santa Barbara, and I would like to say: why don't you not allow any more permits in Santa Barbara, too?

In 1984, Rusty Norvell proposed the idea of ocean sanctuary. Since our own Congressman Bosco favored compromise and drilling, he asked Congresswoman Burton to further the idea. Sala told Rusty that Congresswoman Barbara Boxer was the right person for the job of carrying ocean sanctuary through the house. By 1986, Barbara had written her California Ocean Sanctuary Bill, and Senator Alan Cranston had written his version. We were at the point then where Barbara's bill started the revolution of defining total and permanent protection for California.
Then Flo Norvell brought up the point that a national grass roots coalition would be necessary to pass this bill in Congress. Well, that sounded like an awful lot of work. So, to create a national movement here -- like ending the Viet Nam War, or the right to choose abortion -- it just seemed like a lot of work and a lot of time. It seemed hard. Could we make a national movement and fight oil at the same time? Could we let go of all of the stumbling blocks that the federal government and the oil companies were putting in our path to distract us from carrying on the revolution? Yes.

A major change occurred during the federal hearings here in February. The communities united and proclaimed that we would protect the ocean at all costs, and this message was broadcast around the country by the media. We became inspiration for other communities facing destructive and disruptive corporate and governmental plans.

This summer pollution in the waters off of the east coast helped to unite the country in the realization that not only California needed to be protected. Here we saw that our national grass roots movement needed to embrace all of the coastlines across the nation. We realized that we did have the ocean sanctuary -- we have the ocean sanctuary now, and all we need to do is to protect it. And, we need to get other people to help. No one can give us what we already have. And, we began to live the truth of ocean sanctuary.
Ocean sanctuary started here, and has spread the revolution of awareness and sensitivity to the earth and nature. This movement is encompassing protection of the land, the air, and of the earth's life, as well as the ocean.

Every small act furthers this the goal, and it starts within each of us, connecting with ourselves, and connecting outward to others, to the ocean, to the earth.

Thank you for coming.

[Applause]

CHAIR DAVIS: Thank you.

The next speaker is Brandon Cusick.

MR. CUSICK: Hello, my name is Brandon Cusick, and I have a dream.

My dream is that one day I will bring my kids back to see the beautiful coast where I am growing up, and it will look as clear and as clean as it does today.

I was in France last summer, and not only did I have a great time, I went to lots of interesting places, and I believe that the most important place was the famous town of Lourdes, a famous town where miracles have taken place, where handicapped people drink the holy water from a spring which lets them see, talk, or walk.

On August 10, when I was there, I thought of my town. I told my French family about the threats of offshore oil drilling. They couldn't picture beaches without oil, due to
the fact that all of the beaches in France are covered with oil.

I was thinking it would take a miracle to save the Mendocino coast, so, I took my bicycle water bottle, and I filled it with the water from Lourdes. Today I will take this water from Lourdes and pour it into our beautiful ocean. If a miracle is what we need, then I hope that the holy water from Lourdes will help my dream come true.

[Applause]

I invite you to walk with me out to the headlands and see the holy water hit the sea, because you are a big part of the miracle that I am going to save our coast.

Thank you.

[Applause]

CHAIR DAVIS: All right, I am going to call on one more witness who wishes to speak in support of this sanctuary, and then I want to call on the couple of people who have had the courage to speak in opposition to it -- well, no -- I mean I want to call on Robert Raymond, an acting judge from Mendocino County.

MR. RAYMOND: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I think it important first to announce that I am a credentialed Republican. I don't think it is important that I am a Republican. I think it is important that you should know that the action you contemplate -- and in which I must
assume is virtually certain, from your initial comments -- is an action which has the applause of every thinking person.

[Applause]

I thought it important to appear here, in order that this meeting should not have the appearance of a Democratic convention, altogether.

I echo the feelings of those who preceeded me: young Brandon Cusick; the young woman who pleaded with you for the future of our children, our coast.

I am going to heed the admonition to be brief, but that you might know that in the dark of night Republicans share the feelings and sentiments of Democrats.

Let me tell you that I brought as Exhibit A the picture of young Benjamin, my grandson, who will have his first birthday this weekend, and as I read about the world and observed what happens with it, I came to the conclusion that what you do today can conceivably be a vital first step that Benjamin might have a world worthwhile to inhabit.

There are Democratic friends in back of me who know that I have been to Sacramento to lobby the passage of 284, and that I am widely credited with the fact that at least it got as far as the Governor's desk. I did meet with Senators of the Republican persuasion who changed their vote, as you undoubtedly know. I have a very deep conviction that the salvage of earth must begin somewhere, and I do believe that
today you can take that step.

No thoughtful person, whatever his persuasion, can read this recent article from the *Wall Street Journal*, about whether -- though there may be oil out there -- is it desirable that we burn it? Is it desirable that we continue a policy of proliferating in the atmosphere those things which cause Benjamin's future to be very much in doubt?

I am sure that each you in your positions are aware as am I of the recent report of the Republican Environmental Protection Agency, and its forecast of the affect of pollution in the atmosphere, and its forecast of a world significantly "different" from the world that exists today, and it continues -- the report predicted, however, that basic requirements for food and water would be met in the United States, though conceivably in the third world.

And, so I have come here to say that there are thoughtful Republicans -- a great many of my friends here, today -- who applaud what you have in contemplation, who believe that Benjamin and his friends are entitled to a world better than that which affords basic food, and basic water.

[Applause]

For what I -- first of all, let me deride you for depriving me in your opening comments, of many of the things I would have said. I deeply appreciate the time that you so deeply commit now to this consideration, and I do want you to
know, once again, that the action that I must foresee from
your opening comments does have the applause of all of the
thinking segment of the Republican party.

Thank you.

[Applause]

CHAIR DAVIS: The Lieutenant Governor wanted to make a
comment.

COMMISSIONER MC CARTHY: I just wanted to thank you, sir, for that testimony. May your kind of Republican
flourish and multiple.

Mr. Raymond, I served in the Legislature with Senator
Peter Baird of Marin County, and Senator John Nejedly of
Contra Costa County -- both Republicans -- both men provided
inspirational leadership on a range of environmental issues.
I only wish they were in the Legislature today.

I would say, when you went to Sacramento to talk to
members of the Legislature, you did something beyond merely
appearing here, and making a good statement. What we
desperately need right now, and what so many in this audience
are providing, is action beyond the initial words, action
that will cause a current of public opinion, action that is
directed right at elected officials, to get them to move on
this issue. It is not enough to fight this war year to year.
We need permanent statutory protection, and this is what this
is all about.
CHAIR DAVIS: All right, in keeping with my earlier comments of allowing the opposition to express its sentiments, I am calling on Mike Fergus from the Western Oil and Gas Association.

MR. FERGUS: Good morning, and thank you very much. Many of you do know me. I have been following the issue -- excuse me, I don't mean to turn my back on you, the Commission, but just for the sake of the audience -- many of you do know me from over the years. I have been in on this issue for about 10 to 15 years, and a basic thing that I would like to impart to you is that we do appreciate and understand where you are coming from, very seriously. It is not a case of a callous attitude. I would hope that you would believe that, and I think that Richard Charters, Wesley Chesbro, and Norman, will attest to that -- at least as to the genuineness -- thank you.

My name is Mike Fergus, and I am a representative of the Western Oil and Gas Association, and it is commonly referred to as WOGA. We represent approximately 60-member companies that are responsible for the majority of exploration, production, transportation, and marketing of oil and gas in the seven western states, and many of our members have been involved in oil exploration and production activities off of California for a number of years.

We would like to take this opportunity to convey to
the Commission our industry's concern regarding the proposal
being considered here today. Such a proposal of placing
offshore areas off limits to any oil and gas exploration and
development, we believe, ignores information already provided
to the Commission, as well as its own self mandated
California Comprehensive Offshore Resources Study effort
presently under way.

The Commission staff just completed the first phase of
this study. At the direction of the Commissioners, a series
of 13 public hearings and two public-forum workshops were
carried out throughout the summer. More than 370 participants
attended these hearings from San Diego to Eureka. As the
result of those public forums a CCORS -- acronym for the
study -- a CCORS study guide was released this past Thursday
outlining the scope and purpose of that study. Of particular
interest is the Statement of Purpose:

"The purpose of CCORS is to develop a broader
understanding of the state's coastal environment, and
its energy needs and sources. CCORS is intended to
provide information to the Commission in determining
if a particular offshore project is in the best
interest of the state."

Given this stated purpose, it would appear that
today's hearing reflects a prejudgment of that CCORS study
results.
Administrative decisions that can preempt the planning process -- of which CCORS is an integral part -- renders the study effort, in our opinion, meaningless so far as offshore energy resources are concerned.

Speaking of energy needs and resources, we must not forget that California, along with our nation, has a voracious appetite for oil and gas products. California leads the world in gasoline consumption behind only the USSR and the rest of the nation. Although our state is the fourth largest producer of oil, nonetheless it too is a net importer of oil, just as is the rest of the country.

But, in spite of our voracious appetite for oil and gas, we continue to ignore one of our most perspective areas for oil and gas discovery, and that is offshore California.

The basis for the Commission's proposal seems to be the perception that offshore development poses a severe risk to the environment, as well as the fishing and tourism industries. We believe, however, that the record speaks for itself, and that the perceived risk is not supported by actual facts --

[Remarks from audience.]

-- an unbiased and an objective examination of the record will clearly show that offshore operations can and do take place in a compatible manner with other uses in the coastal zone -- as evidenced by offshore Southern California,
and the economy down there --

[Remarks from audience.]

-- for example, since the offshore program began over
35 years ago, more than 30,000 wells have been drilled with
only four major spills in the entire nation's federal
offshore area --

[Remarks from audience.]

-- of the four, one reached shore, the Santa Barbara
spill of '69, yet that same time span saw more than 10
billion barrels of oil and 72 trillion cubic feet of natural
gas produced.

The local environmental record is just as impressive.

According to the U.S. Coast Guard data, covering the period
from January '80, through April '87, of the total number of
oil spill incidents less than five percent occurred as the
result of offshore petroleum, exploration, production, and
pipeline operations. Those incidents involved a total of only
291 barrels of spillage, or -- on an average -- only about
1.5 barrels per incident.

Should the Commission's proposal be adopted it could
have a profound impact on the potential flow of millions of
dollars into the state treasury from oil development in the
state's tide lands.

From 1976 to 1987, revenues to the State of California
totaled $3.5 billion dollars. The state education system,
state projects, energy research, and Parks and Recreation, to
name a few, have greatly benefited from these state tideland
revenues. California public higher education system received
almost $1 billion through the capital outlay fund from these
revenues.

Given our outstanding record in
offshore operations, the numerous economic benefits to the
state from the development, and the nation's increasing
dependence upon unstable foreign sources for almost 50
percent of our oil and gas needs, we ask the Commission not
to arbitrarily eliminate any perspective offshore areas from
future exploration and production activities.

We also urge the Commission to allow the CCORS effort
to provide the necessary information for future decisions
regarding potential energy development in state waters.

We thank you for this opportunity to present our
views, and would be pleased to provide any information that
we can.

Thank you very much.

And thank you -- [directed to audience].

CHAIR DAVIS: I just want to challenge a couple of
remarks that you made.

I happen to know that last month alone there were
three major accidents involving oil drilling. There was an
oil explosion in Southern California in Fillmore that burned
for seven days, had about $5 million dollars worth of property damage, and one worker was seriously injured.

Again, in Southern California, in the San Fernando Valley, Mobil's pipeline -- underground pipeline -- exploded not once but twice, dumping about 210,000 gallons of oil in the L.A. River and on Ventura Blvd. Now, this is a pipeline that the State Fire Marshall inspected within the last year, and found to be safe.

So, accidents are a fact of life with oil drilling. No one can deny they can happen, and I think your assertion that there has been only four accidents in a number of years, just does not -- the facts belie that statement.

MR. FERGUS: Offshore, sir?

CHAIR DAVIS: No, oil drilling occurs onshore and offshore.

MR. FERGUS: Yes, it does, but I was referring to the offshore realm, nationwide, as far as our industry's track record is concerned.

CHAIR DAVIS: Well, what about the explosion of Occidental's in the north sea? That was offshore drilling, and 167 people were killed.

MR. FERGUS: A gas line in the kitchen, that is correct, sir.

CHAIR DAVIS: So, it is --

[Remarks from audience.]
CHAIR DAVIS: -- you know, any industrial activity, particularly oil drilling, is not without accident; and it is legitimate, I believe, for this Commission to take whatever action it thinks is appropriate to protect this coastline.

I think it is also important to remember that this is an issue that became part of the public debate through the actions of others -- Assemblyman Hauser, the action of the Legislature, and the action of the Governor -- basically put the question of whether or not this 214 miles of coastline should be protected. So it is out there, it is under consideration, and the people in the Congress may well get a misimpression. They may well feel that we don't care that much about this 214 miles, so I believe it was important to come here to have a meeting to discuss whether or not we should protect these 214 miles and that decision, as to whether the federal government will drill in this area, is almost certainly going to be made before our study is completed in late '89 and 1990.

And, so for all of those reasons, we felt it was important to come here to discuss declaring a sanctuary off of this coastline.

MR. FERGUS: We think CCOLS' effort is important, as I know that you do, too, and that was one of the basis of our concern.
CHAIR DAVIS: Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to oppose the issue before us?

MR. TAHIR: I would like to know what a minor spill is considered?

CHAIR DAVIS: I gather that is a rhetorical question?

MR. TAHIR: What is considered a minor spill?

[Remarks from audience.]

CHAIR DAVIS: Let's first -- I share your sentiments, and they will be duly noted for the record.

What is your name?

MR. TAHIR: Kevin Tahrir.

CHAIR DAVIS: Kevin?

MR. TAHIR: Kevin Tahrir.

CHAIR DAVIS: All right, we will treat that as testimony, and please enter that into the record.

Do you want to speak in opposition, sir?

MR. MARSH: Yes, sir.

CHAIR DAVIS: Please state your name for the record.

MR. MARSH: My name is Rogge Marsh. I am a geologist. I work for Exxon Company, U.S.A.

[Remarks from audience.]

COMMISSIONER MC CARTHY: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR DAVIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MC CARTHY: I would like just the three or four people that have hissed or called out when the last
or four people that have hissed or called out when the last witness was testifying to reverse the tables and imagine this room was filled 97 percent with people who support offshore oil drilling, and there was an environmentalist up here testifying.

Now, you know where we are inclined to go on this issue, and it is important that this Commission's hearing be respected, and that includes allowing these witnesses to give their testimony without being hissed or harrassed.

Most of the audience understands that. I would just ask the two or three who don't to please restrain themselves.

Thank you.

MR. MARSH: Thank you. I appreciate that.

I am a geologist, as I say, and I wanted to talk to you today about dependence. You know, we geologists particularly appreciate the fact that civilization is very dependent on what we get out of the earth, whether it is the clay that is used for fillers in our tooth paste, or the limestone and the iron that goes into the buildings that we work and live in, or the oil that we use to make synthetic fibers for our clothes, or put in our cars to drive here today.

In the United States we are especially dependent on oil, as I am sure you know, two-thirds of our energy comes from petroleum. and this is probably an historical thing that results from the fact that for many years, for most of
This century in fact, the United States was the largest oil producer in the world, and we provided 80 percent of the oil that the allies used in two world wars. However, with all of this historical production that we see today, our production is declining.

Last year production declined in the United States 4.5 percent. That doesn't sound like much, but it is the largest drop that has occurred in the last 13 years. At the same time, our consumption is going up, as it has in the last three out of the last four years, we've used more petroleum than we did the year before.

Of course, with production going down and consumption going up, imports from foreign sources have to make up the difference. We now depend on -- 40 percent of all of the petroleum, liquid petroleum that we use, comes from sources outside of the United States. And, it looks like that is going to get worse. The Department of Energy just released a study that anticipates that imports will grow 6 percent in 1988, and they project almost 8 percent in 1989.

So, we are, in many ways -- the reason I am here today, one of the reason is, because we appear to be painting ourselves into an energy corner. Now, we have some options of course, using less is perhaps the best option -- and I am sure that would meet with your approval --

[Applause.]
-- I thought I would get some agreement on that --
but, that appears to be very difficult to do in an era when
we are paying less for gasoline than we did five years ago.
Renewable energies and synthetics are good ideas, and I
couldn't agree more, but the economics are impossible today,
and coal and nuclear have some really severe environmental
problems, as again most of you know.

As a geologist I look at these options, and I see that
our best option to stem this increasing reliance -- this
increasing dependence on foreign oil -- is coming from
continuing to look for the oil that is in our piece of the
rock.

The California offshore has always been a good place
to look for oil, at least over the last 20 years. In the last
20 years, the largest oil fields have been found -- the 4
largest oil fields that have been found in the United States,
15 percent of those -- six of them -- have been found off
California.

Well, what about the state waters off Mendocino and
Humboldt Counties? Is there enough oil to worry about?
Well, as a geologist I have been around long enough, and I
guess I am humble enough to say that I don't know, but I also
know that no one else can predict whether oil is out there or
not. The only reliable geologist we've ever found is the
drill bit. The earth that we depend on has spread its natural
resources in rather unreliable and quixotic distributions.

Leasing California state water bottoms is not likely to solve either the U.S.'s energy problems, or California's, but then a nation as large and diverse as ours has never relied on a single area for its energy. It has relied on all areas: California, Alaska, Texas.

And, now with our production declining this concept is even more valuable than before. This area, along with the other areas of the United States are still our best options for solving our energy problems.

It is difficult for me to understanding the objections to the industry as I look at the offshore drilling record. The industry has 21 platforms in the water today, in offshore waters, and we introduce about less than two gallons of hydrocarbons into the water each day. You can contrast this with the oil seeps off Santa Barbara which each day put out 25,000 gallons.

The concern over the production platforms' impact on air quality is difficult for me to understand, too. The average diesel platform emits air emission like about a dozen diesel trucks.

The concern for tourism: when I see that Santa Barbara's tourist spending has doubled since 1980.

The fish catch: since 1968 it has grown off California over 400 percent.
Now, speaking again as a geologist, I can't tell you that the state waters will ever produce any oil and gas, but I can say for certain, that if they are never leased they will never help us reduce our dependency on oil — on foreign oil.

Now, I realize the current perception of a glut. It makes it difficult for us to worry about energy, but let's don't forget the lesson we learned in the '70s: that everything including energy supply is cyclical. What we've got too much of -- or more than enough of today -- is surely going to be in short supply tomorrow.

Thank you.

CHAIR DAVIS: Let me just ask a couple of questions.

It is my understanding that about 85 percent of the oil that is produced in California is produced onshore, so, only about 15 percent of the oil generated by California -- and we are the -- as someone said, and you may have said it or your predecessor may have said -- that we are the fourth largest producer of oil in the country. Only about 15 percent of that is produced offshore, and the balance is produced onshore.

MR. MARSH: I don't have that number in my head.

CHAIR DAVIS: Well, those are the statistics that staff gave me, and I have reason to believe that that is the case.
MR. MARSH: I will take your word for it.

CHAIR DAVIS: Also, I, at one point, talked to the president of a very major oil company — on the same magnitude as Exxon — and I said, "Every time we take an action out here the Department of Interior is always trying to bang us over the head saying we are not doing our part to meet the nation's energy needs."

I said, "What if we drilled every known site onshore and offshore in the United States? To what extent could we diminish our dependency on foreign oil?"

He said, "Maybe one percent."

So, this whole argument about needing to pump oil to make us energy independent is just bogus. It will never happen. We don't have the capacity to do it.

[Applause]

The real challenge is to make Detroit make energy efficient cars, and to be looking beyond, you know, a fossil fuel economy. At least to be making some preparations for the day when the planet can produce the fossil fuel that we need.

MR. MARSH: I think that is an excellent idea.

CHAIR DAVIS: I rest my case.

MR. DELL: I would like to respectfully request — I have expert testimony, which is extremely important and just happens to fit in with this, and while it is fresh in the
people's mind, I would like to address this testimony now.

CHAIR DAVIS: Well, let me put that issue aside for a moment.

Is there anybody else in the room that would like to speak in opposition to this proposed oil and gas sanctuary designation?

MR. DELL: Mr. Chairman --

CHAIR DAVIS: Do you want to speak in opposition, sir?

MR. DELL: Opposition? No.

CHAIR DAVIS: I am looking to see if there is anyone else that wants to speak in opposition?

[No response.]

All right.

What I propose we do, and I will be guided by the reaction of the audience. The Lieutenant Governor has a commitment he has to make. I want to enable him to record his vote, open the roll to do that prior to his departure.

I am also willing to record my vote at that time; however, if you people who took the time to come here would like me to stay to continue to hear your testimony, then I will not record my vote until you have concluded, so that anyone who wants to speak here has been given the opportunity to do so.

So, what I am really saying is, would you like to see an official action by the Commission now?
Even if it means that many of you who have come here
today won't have the opportunity to come up here and testify;
is that all right?

[Applause.]

MR. DELL: Mr. McCarthy, sir.

CHAIR DAVIS: Are you objecting to the sentiments that
were just recorded?

MR. DELL: No, I have something to say that won't take
long. I have something very important to say.

CHAIR DAVIS: All right, fine, come up.

MR. DELL: My name is Cecil Dell, and I thank you very
much for coming.

When we had our hearings in Fort Bragg I got
concerned, especially about the geological problems in the
Point Arena Basin. They are planning to put 12 wells there. I
wrote to Barbara Boxer's office asking for a geological
survey of that area. It was sent to me -- a very precise
document. It was -- it says: "A reported deficiency in the
geological and marine safety assessments of the draft
environmental impact statement for OCS Lease Sale 91."

Now, it goes on and on and on with the deficiencies,
but the one that I want to bring to your attention is that
those 12 wells are scheduled to be put right on top of the
San Andreas fault. If that fault shifts one foot, we will
have every major platforms with all of those pipes shattered
have every major platforms with all of those pipes shattered at the ocean bottom. There is absolutely no way in the world to clean that up or to stop it — none.

That is the first thing I want to say.

The second thing I would like to say is that the Department of Interior has been telling us all along about energy independence — we have to drill because of energy independence. I want to read you something that came from Asia Week Magazine, okay?

"No one noticed, or hardly anyone, when a few weeks ago a rather special tanker docked in the Republic of China on Taiwan. On board were 400,000 barrels of crude petroleum. The noteworthy thing about this sticky black cargo was its source, the United States."

We are selling our oil to foreign countries. I don't get it. So, I wrote Barbara Boxer again. "How much oil are we selling?" They went into a real deep study, and went against a brick wall, but this is what they found out: each month, so far as they can determine, we are exporting $2.4 million worth of oil out of this country. We are exporting petroleum products worth $346.5 million a month out of this country.

If you were to extrapolate that out, in a year's time, it would far exceed all of the oil that could be out there. We are giving it away. It doesn't make sense to me.
Next point. She also -- Barbara Boxer's office told me that the problem is not so much that we are exporting oil, it is that we don't have a national oil policy.

So, I get -- the paper comes in, and I go, "By God, the U.S. is easing out of fuel standards." They are dropping it from 27 to 26 miles per gallon, instead of getting up around 30. Just that one mile-per-gallon drop, again exceeds all of the oil that could be possibly sitting out there. I don't get it, okay?

The next thing I want to put out here is that there was a study -- we are talking about there is all of this energy, nobody is doing anything about it, okay, according to K.O.E. Goring, [sic.] an agriculture engineer at the University of Illinois, and a pioneer researcher in agricultural fuel, the potential market for soy bean oil as diesel fuel is practically unlimited. In the average year, American farmers burn 50.7 metric tons of soy beans -- turn out metric tons of soy beans, easily yielding, in terms of energy, the equivalence of 1.7 billion gallons of fuel, diesel fuel. He says we can do this today, no problem. Why isn't the government providing any money for alternative energy? Why are they standing here wanting to come out here and drill? I don't get it, okay.

Now, okay, we are summarizing. We got the Point Arena Basin sitting on the San Andreas fault; we got tankers
shipping oil out to Japan and Taiwan, and we can't even find
out how much is going to -- I would like you to find that
out, it would be very interesting to publish that fact some
day -- we don't have an energy policy; the gas companies, the
automotive industry, is screwing us over; we are not getting
alternative energy supplies under way.

Something stinks, okay? I have just figured out what
it was. Ronald Reagan has just taken a shit in his own bed,
but I have just been informed that senile old men do things
like this.

Now, the other thing that I would like to point out is
that Jack Acevido is running around on the radio, in the
press, telling everybody that Barbara Boxer's Sanctuary Bill
has been modified to allow the dumping of nuclear submarines
off of our coast. That is a blatant lie.

Thank you.

[Applause]

CHAIR DAVIS: All right, again I want to thank
everybody for coming, for their patience and for their
willingness to accommodate the Lieutenant Governor's
schedule, but I do think we have heard a representative
sample of opinion.

I personally have heard nothing that would dissuade me
from my bias to extend the sanctuary protections that now
apply to 66 percent of the coast, to the 214 miles not
covered in Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

[Applause]

The action we will take here today is unprecedented. The Lands Commission has never done this before, but I think it is absolutely essential to send a message to the next Congress and the next President that these 214 miles are not fair game, that --

[Applause]

-- the Interior Department should keep its hands off of this coast. This coast is not only beautiful, but it -- well, the coast is beautiful and it contributes importantly to the economy of this community and to the state.

I have heard nothing that suggests to me that the risks involved in oil drilling, the complications of the weather, the difficulty of cleaning up an oil spill, in any way will be compensated by revenues generated from drilling.

If at some point, 2, 3, -- 400 years from now, the price of oil is $200 to $300 per barrel, and if some future Lands Commission members think it makes sense to drill at that price, let them make that decision, but when we are talking about $14 a barrel oil on one side of the equation, and the Mendocino Humboldt coastline on the other, then there is no question in my mind of what to do.

[Applause]

In January, the Interior Department came here to
plunder this coast. Leo and I have come here to protect it.

And, with that I would like to move that this body declare the Humboldt and Mendocino coastline, not presently so protected, an oil and gas sanctuary.

[Applause]

That is only one vote. We have to let the Lieutenant Governor speak and then cast his vote.

COMMISSIONER MC CARTH: Mr. Chairman, I am proud to play a role in protecting the Humboldt and Mendocino Counties coast and state waters.

This is only the first step today. Today we are sending the signal: we want to end this tug of war.

The next step -- and I vow to take it -- is to create an ocean sanctuary under federal law to apply this same doctrine to federal waters.

[Applause]

I confidently and proudly support your motion to declare these state waters an ocean sanctuary.

[Applause]

CHAIR DAVIS: The Chair will recognize one final speaker.

MS. LEWALLEN: Yes, my name is Eleanor Lewallen, of the Ocean Protection Coalition, and a sea vegetable harvester. On behalf of all of the people of Mendocino County, I would like to thank you and give you shirts that say
"California Ocean Sanctuary".

You are causing a ripple effect that is going to change the world. You are being responsible.

Thank you.

[Applause]

CHAIR DAVIS: Thank you.

MS. LEWALLEN: We want you to wear that in Congress as you work on the California Ocean Sanctuary and Fisheries Protection Act, and make it national, thank you.

This one is for Claire Dedrick, who is the Executive Director of the State Lands Commission. Thank you so much for being responsible to California.

[Pause in proceedings while shirts are handed out.]

CHAIR DAVIS: Finally, I want to thank all of you who have travelled from some considerable distance to be here, to express your support for this action. As I said, I think it will send a clear message to the Congress, a clear message to the Interior Department, and a clear message to the Governor of this state, to keep his hands off the Mendocino and Humboldt coast.

This is a magnificent area. It is now designated -- at least in state waters -- an oil and gas sanctuary, and if there is no further business --
Is this really important? I am about to close --

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER OF AUDIENCE: I just wanted to know if written statements can be added to the record?

CHAIR DAVIS: Yes. Actually, that is a good point, and thank you for raising that.

There were a number of you -- and I very much appreciate your patience and tolerance on this issue -- a number of you who came here prepared to testify, and if you would please provide the Commission with your written testimony, Claire Dedrick is the woman in the yellow jacket, and she will accept that testimony, and we will include it in the official record of these proceedings.

Thank you again. This special meeting of the Lands Commission stands adjourned.

[Adjourned at 12:15 p.m.]
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Sierra Club endorses Calif. and Nevada Regional Conservation Council. ENDORSES Boxer's and Cranston's.
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SPACESHIP EARTH EDITION
Dymaxion Sky-Ocean Map
The Dymaxion Sky-Ocean map shows our planet as it really is — one-world island in a one-world ocean — without any visible distortion of the relative shapes and sizes of the land and sea areas, and without any breaks in the continental contours.

Dear Leo McCarthy,

Please do establish an oil & gas leasing sanctuary zone for Mendocino & Humboldt state waters.

Sincerely,

Marina Russo

Spaceship Earth and Dymaxion™ Sky-Ocean Map © Buckminster Fuller 1982
Additional information, maps available Fuller Institute-0201 Market St. #510, SF, CA 94104-3864
1743 S LaCienega Blvd., L.A., CA 90035
The Dymaxion Sky-Ocean map shows our planet as it really is — one-world island in a one-world ocean — without any visible distortion of the relative shapes and sizes of the land and sea areas, and without any breaks in the continental contours.

Dear Jesse, Huff,

Please do establish an oil & gas leasing sanctuary zone for Humboldt and Mendocino state waters.

Sincerely,

Mareva Russo

Spaceship Earth and Dymaxion™ Sky-Ocean Map © Buckminster Fuller, 1982
Additional information, maps available Fuller Institute 1994
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M. Russo
P.O. Box 972
Trinidad, CA
95570
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C. S. Mattel

1943 S. LaCienega Blvd, LA, CA 90035
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Dear Gray Davis,

Please do establish an oil + gas leasing sanctuary zone for Humboldt + Mendocino state waters.

Sincerely,

M. Russo

Spacastap Earth and Dymaxion Sky-Ocean Map © Buckminster Fuller, 1982
Additional information: maps available Fuller Institute, 3604-Markar St., Pasadena, CA 91107-4454

1748 S. La Cienega Blvd., L.A., CA 90035
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TO: STATE LANDS COMMISSION OF CALIFORNIA
FROM: LISA TERRA CLARK
55501 S. Hwy 1 #27
GUAALDE CA. 95445
OCT. 26th, 1988

I strongly support Ocean Sanctuary
and am thankful for your energy
towards making it a reality
in Mendocino + Humboldt counties.

This area is a national treasure
and those of us fortunate enough to
live here, witness daily its awesome
beauty + power. feel a strong responsibility
to protect it from the oil industry.

We can do much through conservation
+ exploring alternative energy + implementing
sustainable energies to solve our national
energy problems + to protect our environment

LISA TERRA CLARK
THE NEXT DOCUMENTS ARE POOR ORIGINALS

MICROFILMING SERVICES will not assume responsibility for the image quality
I have a simple point to make: There is no compelling need for oil from this coast, and in the absence of such a need the people's will must prevail. Having been told forcefully in 1973 that there's not enough oil, we still believe it, 15 years later. "We are exporting our Alaskan oil and clipping our producing wells. The so-called Old Fart states suffer economic decline. The petroleum-exporting countries cannot find markets for their products nor a bottom to oil prices. Mexico is absolutely prepared because, among other things, she cannot sell her oil. In the Persian Gulf alone there are measured, untapped reserves of oil greater than all the planet's sea except In his jar. There is too much oil everywhere! This is not a matter of debate. It's in the daily news, and it drives the oil industry and the Interior Department's rationale for their plans to develop the north coast. Unless the security or wellbeing of the entire nation requires this oil—and plenty..."
It does not; our economy and our environment both cry out for less oil--then the will of this vitally affected coastal population, the ordinary unprivileged citizenry, the people must prevail, as long as there is a government that acts by consent of the governed.

Our Constitution does not guarantee the profits of oil companies. It guarantees government for the people. How can our will be clearer? This place is as decided as any other. Ask the opinion of any dozen Alaskan natives and you will surely get 13 responses, but in this we are one: "We do not want oil here. We want our shining sea protected by law, because, without protection, some of us would see it darkened with black before we see it blackened with oil.
California State Lands Commission / Sanctuary Meeting
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA, 95814

Dear Sirs:

Thank you for making this Ocean sanctuary meeting possible. This is a very important issue for all of us who live here on the north coast.

I urge this commission to support Ocean sanctuary off the coast of Mendocino and Humboldt counties. Our coastal waters are some of the most productive in the world and supports many industries.

Our coastal waters are also some of the most turbulent waters in the world ocean, making the possibility of an oil spill inevitable. Which of course would be a disaster. An oil spill clean up would be
impossible under the rough seas that exists off our coast. & the effects of the oil spill disaster in Santa Barbara of 1969 are still being felt there almost twenty years later.

Two thirds of our world is water and we can't afford to pollute any more, as is now being done at an alarming rate. I urge you to support all other forms of energy to lessen our dependence of fossil fuels.

Once again,
Thank You,
JoAnne O'Neill
16640 N. Hwy. 1
Ft. Bragg, CA
95437
THE NEXT 100 DOCUMENTS ARE POOR ORIGINALS

MICROFILMING SERVICES WILL NOT ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE IMAGE QUALITY
Attention: State Lands Commission:

We are pleased to have an opportunity to voice our opinion about Ocean Sanctuary for the California State waters in Mendocino & Humboldt Counties.

We were so upset when Governor Anderson passed A.B. 284. It was such a betrayal. People throughout Mendocino County and all over California have worked so hard for State & Federal Ocean Sanctuary then to have our own Governor turn us in the back, especially after a Federal moratorium was granted.

We feel oil rigs would ruin the costal coast for fishing, tourism & our air quality, which could cause our lumber industry great harm. Also harmful to our health.

We are so glad you are coming to Mendocino for a hearing and you have the authority to make a designation to extend Sanctuary in Mendocino & Humboldt counties. It doesn't seem fair.
that all the other coastal counties in California are covered by Sanctuary, but not Mendocino & Humboldt counties. Why should these two counties be discriminated against & left out.

Why can't our leaders wake up & see we need to focus on alternative fuel and energy? Some of our population is working very hard and would sacrifice to preserve our environment. If we don't provide a safe living environment for the future then we better say goodbye to our world.

Sincerely,

Gerri & Sam Morse

Sam & Gerri Morse
14073 Pt. Cabrillo Dr.
Mendocino, CA 95460
Statement to: State Land Commission of CAL.
From: James Clark 3550 S. Hw. 1 #27
Crescent City, CA. 95531.

I fully support Ocean Sanctuary off the
Mendocino & Humboldt county coast. The California
North Coast is an ocean sanctuary. Now, All that
is needed is laws to be enacted to protect the coast.
A majority of coastal residents oppose the development
of oil on the coast. We have moved here
because of the beauty, clarity, and spiritual
nourishment of the joining of the ocean & land.
We did not come here to be wildcatters &
pipe jointers. The residents of the coast have
been working hard to develop a diverse & sustainable
economy to support ourselves. There is no
historical precedence to off-shore oil development
in these counties. The introduction of the oil
industry will dramatically and irrevocable change
the nature of our community. I lived in a rural
community in Wyoming for several years. Oil and
gas development dramatically changed the air
quality and of the region. Areas of the lead
were polluted. People moved to the area, not
because of a commitment to community & land,
but because of profit and exploitation. Everything became expensive and transient. When the bust came, everyone left, leaving those left with a commitment to community to put together a life and environment ravaged by the oil exploration industry. I do not want that to happen here. Industry invades so much of our life and land of this planet. We don't have much unspoiled land and scenery left in our country. Save our coast, save our community, exact ocean sanctuary now!

Thank you
FROM:
MENDOCINO ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH LAB
BX 182, MENDOCINO, CA 95460

GENTLEMEN:

WE wish to state that we support Alon Sonatuny wholeheartedly.

We also want to announce a twocounty marine biology survey which will be undertaken in 1989. It will include species counts, water and bottom sampling as well as detailed sampling at all river streams, and other points of potential pollution.

This will provide a base line survey which can be used as a basis for detecting unreported future pollution from any possible exploration or drilling activities.

We earnestly hope such pollution will never occur and that we will do everything in our power to see that this coast is protected.

John Such
Director-MERC
SPECIAL MEETING OF THE STATE LANDS COMMISSION: CONSIDERATION OF WHETHER TO ESTABLISH AN OIL AND GAS LEASING SANCTUARY ZONE COVERING STATE-OWNED TIDE AND SUBMERGED LANDS WITHIN MENDOCINO AND HUMBOLDT COUNTIES

Noyo Women for Fisheries is an autonomous organization of women concerned about issues which affect the Northern California fishing industry. Based in the coastal community of Fort Bragg, California, our membership is unique. Our members represent a full spectrum of Northern California fisheries---salmon, sablefish, rockfish, crab, sole, herring, shrimp, and sea urchins plus a broad spectrum of related businesses---seafood processors, retailers, gear and hardware suppliers and support facilities.

We urge you to establish an oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone covering state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt counties. Also, that no oil and gas leasing or development would be allowed within the designated sanctuary zone. We would hope that your staff would refrain from accepting applications for oil and gas leasing or development within the sanctuary zone.
If there should be oil development along our coast the impact of an oil spill would be devasting to our fisheries. Without a strong commercial fishing industry our local community would suffer great financial loss. Noyo Women for Fisheries feel that the commercial fishing industry on the Mendocino Coast is too important to be jeopardized by gas and oil development. Please, give us what you have given other California counties, an oil and gas sanctuary area along Mendocino and Humboldt county.
The Fortituous Timing Of Oil Disasters in April and May of 1988

By

Jacques R. Helfer

Note: Mr. Helfer is a World War II veteran, an internationally known naturalist, a teacher, a respected newspaper columnist and the author of many technical scientific articles and popular books. His books include "The Natural History Of Mendocino," "The Mendocino Zoological Staircase," "99 Birds Of The Mendocino Coast," "Trees And Treelike Shrubs Of The Mendocino Coast," "The Redwood Titans," "How To Know The Rocks And Minerals" and "How To Know The Grasshoppers, Crickets, Cockroaches And Their Allies," the last having been republished in a new edition by Dover in February of 1988.

For more than 50 years my home has been on an ocean bluff just north of Mendocino. Watching storms and sunsets, fishing, observing the birds, walking the beaches and sometimes composing poetry or painting the scene I have enjoyed the clean natural surroundings.

Because of my special training and interests I have studied the flora and fauna of the intertidal zone in more detail than most people and so I could point to a great many specific examples of creatures that would be adversely affected if we had oil spills in this area.

In the interest of brevity I will mention just three intertidal beetles of the family Staphylinidae (Rove Beetles) that would not survive an oil spill of any substantial size. Two of these, Diaulota and Liparocephalus, are diminutive predators that hide in cracks in rocks when the tide comes in. Utilizing little bubbles of air they carry with them they are able to remain submerged for some hours, emerging to feed at low tide. Diaulota is entirely dark in color but Liparocephalus usually has the head, pronotum and legs orange colored.
Living on ocean beaches another local Rove Beetle is conspicuously hairy and has the front legs modified and somewhat shovel-like for digging in the sand. Yellowish with a black pattern and measuring almost 3/4 inch in length this is *Thinopinus pictus*, the Beach Rove Beetle.

In my newspaper columns I have mentioned Cormorant Island, just off the Mendocino Headlands, which has an important sea bird breeding colony and which has been designated as an area of special ecological importance, supposedly enjoying special protection.

For years the TV news has been showing us in detail what happens to sea birds and shore birds that are fouled with oil. Oil companies and government agencies do not bother to deny that oil spills produce ecological disasters. Instead they try to persuade us that such disasters are all in the past. The oil industry has learned its lessons, they suggest, and we now have little or nothing to fear from oil company operations.

How this works was shown when Public Affairs Manager Rich C. Hansen of the Shell Oil Company published a reassuring letter to the editor in the Mendocino Beacon late in April. "In the 20 years since the Santa Barbara channel blowout" he said "the technology of offshore drilling and production have improved dramatically and I believe our environmental records prove that fact."

As it happened the 175,000 gallon Martinez Oil Spill occurred at the same time that Rich Hansen’s letter was appearing in the Beacon. The oil spill at Suisun Bay was an ecological disaster but the timing of the empty words and false assurances of PR man Rich Hansen’s letter could not have been more dramatic or better timed.
J. Helfer—Fortituous Time Of Oil Disasters in April and May of 1988 Page 91.

Just a few days later Shell Oil Co.'s Norco, Louisiana operation suffered major damage when its cracking plant exploded. Several human lives were lost and property damage ran into the millions of dollars. About 1% of the U.S.A.'s gasoline production was lost in that explosion.

As shown by the February 3-4, 1988 Oil Hearings at Egles Hall in Fort Bragg, public opinion is virtually unanimously opposed to oil exploration and development along the northern California coast. The reasons for this overwhelming opposition are many, varied and compelling. No pressing need for the oil that may lie beneath the continental shelf has been shown. Recent events prove beyond dispute that oil company operations are hazardous. I urge everyone to actively oppose Oil Lease Sale 91.

I support the Ocean Sanctuary proposal.

J. Helfer
P.O. Box 31
MENDOCINO, CA 95460
TO THE STATE LANDS COMMISSION
RE: SANCTUARY ZONE MEETING 10/26/88

GREETINGS,

AS A NATIVE COASTAL CALIFORNIAN, I SUPPORT THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THIS OIL AND GAS LEASING SANCTUARY ZONE, AND I OPPOSE OIL DRILLING AND EXPLORATION OFF THE COAST ENTIRELY.


ONE EXAMPLE OF THE RECOGNITION OF UNIQUE MARINE ENVIRONMENT ON THE COAST IS THE CABRILLO PRESERVE ESTABLISHED BY THE DEPT. OF FISH AND GAME. NO FORMS OF LIFE MAY BE TAKEN WITHIN 1000 FEET OF THE HIGH TIDE MARK DUE WEST, OR WITHIN 1000 FEET NORTH AND SOUTH OF THE LIGHTHOUSE. THOSE BOUNDARIES WILL CERTAINLY NOT KEEP OUT OIL AND POLLUTANTS.

WE ALSO HAVE AN ESTABLISHED FISHING INDUSTRY HERE ON THE COAST. ALTHOUGH THE TRAWLERS HAVE TO SHIP OUT OF STATE WATERS, THE SALMON AND URCHEIN BOATS DEPEND ON AREAS CLOSE TO SHORE. AGAIN, WE NEED TO LOOK AT THE WHOLE PICTURE. IT TAKES ONLY ENOUGH TOXINS TO ALTER THE PLANT LIFE TO, IN TURN, ALTER THE ENTIRE FOOD CHAIN. A FOOD CHAIN THAT ULTIMATELY INCLUDES ALL OF US.
WE HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO OURSELVES AND TO FUTURE GENERATIONS TO KEEP AN UNPOLUTED AND UNDISTURBED AREA JUST AS IT IS. WE HAVE SEEN TIME AND TIME AGAIN THE DAMAGE CAUSED BY THE COMBINATION OF OIL AND OCEAN, AND IT IS TIME WE LEARNED SOMETHING FROM IT. A GAS AND OIL LEASING SANCTUARY ZONE IS A GOOD PLACE TO START.

THANK YOU,

PAM WRIGHT
428 E. PINE ST.
FORT BRAGG, CA, 95437
For the record—
I urge the State Lands Commission to approve sanctuary for the Mendocino/Redwood coast edge.
Our local economy depends on its unaltered, undeveloped status, notably fishing and tourism.
It's an old rule that it is improper to fool the food supply, which offshore oil rigs—or even intrusive exploration—certainly would.
Impacts of oil exploration & development on the roads here would be severe— I speak as a public transit driver.
I am passionately convinced that preservation of this unique shoreline will benefit the nation's future generations much more than whatever short-term benefits might accrue to the oil industry through offshore oil development. Please work for the greater good, the longterm, and the children.

Thank you.
Liz Hedges
Box 1036
Mendocino CA 95460
To: Ca. State Lands Commission

From: Cathy Finigan

My name is Cathy Finigan and I was born in San Francisco and raised in Arcata which is on the Humboldt County coast. I have lived in Ukiah for the past fourteen years and come to the coast often for rest as well as business.

The Humboldt County coast is absolutely spectacular. As a child my wonderful father took us kids, all five of us, to the beach often. The beach was a part of our lives. We went to the beach in any kind of weather—on a clear windy day or in the pouring rain. It didn't matter. If we wanted to go to the beach, we went and we loved it. We even went to the beach in the black of night. It was in the pitch black that us kids discovered little fluorescent organisms in the sand that glowed in the dark. It was a childhood experience that I will never forget. I wonder if children of the future will be so lucky. The beauty of this place never ceases to amaze me, and continues to nurture me and leave me in awe.

What makes the protection of this coast so important is that it is so vastly beautiful, rich in resources and so uniquely accessible to all Americans, rich and poor alike.

It is hideous to think of drilling for oil in this exquisite piece of America.

Just as it is against the law to even soil the American flag which is just a symbol, a mere piece of cloth, it must be against the law to soil the real "America, the Beautiful", which is right out here within our grasp.

To establish an ocean sanctuary is our patriotic obligation!

Sincerely,

Cathy Finigan
704 N. Oak St.
Ukiah, Ca. 95482
(707) 462-2819
Mr. Chairman — Gray Davis
Lieutenant Gov. — Leo McCarthy
Dir. of Finance — Jesse Huff

Let me welcome you to our county!

My name is Michael Bunnfield. I'm here today as the chairman of the Mendocino-Lake Group of the Sierra Club representing over 600 members of Mendocino and Lake counties. I'm also representing the good people of the Mendocino Environmental Center in Ukiah.

While we are concerned with and involved in issues of general importance regarding resource protection, quality of life, the health of our rivers and streams, and the future viability of our forests and woodlands, there is no issue of greater magnitude, in my view, than that with which we are today concerned.

You see, the North Coast tie-lands are, for us, the only remaining bastion of our wild American heritage that has a
CHANCE OF REMAINING FOREVER A SOURCE OF INSPIRATION & SUSTENANCE. WE HAVE WITNESSSED, IN 2 GENERATIONS, A TREMENDOUS & GENERAL ASSAULT ON THE ENVIRONMENT DUE TO DEVELOPMENT, POPULATION PRESSURES & ECONOMIC EXPLOITATION.

YET WE STILL HAVE OUR COASTLINE, OUR COAST FISHERIES, OUR ABALONE BEDS, OUR WILD NORTH COAST ACCESS TO A WORLD OF SEA OTTERS, SEA LIONS, SHOREBIRD & MANY OTHER CREATURES THAT HAVE ELSEWHERE DISAPPEARED ENTIRELY.

MANY OF THE PEOPLE I KNOW WELL HAVE WORKED PATIENTLY, WITHIN THE CONFINES OF A SOMETIMES INSENSITIVE OR UNCARING SYSTEM AND HAVE SEEN YEARS OF EFFORT SEEMINGLY WASTED. THE DISAPPOINTMENT HAVE BEEN GREAT, IF IN MANY CASES, NO ONE, IN PARTICULAR CAN BE BLAMED.

IT HAS COME TO PASS, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT THE SIERRA CLUB, AN ORGANIZATION THAT WAS ORIGINALLY STARTED AS A MOUNTAINEERING GROUP - HAS HAD TO GIVE UP MOUNTAINEERING AS OFFICIAL OUTINGS BECAUSE THE LIABILITY COSTS HAVE BECOME
To great to bear.

I know we all have seen thousands of ways in which our relationship with the rest of the world has been compromised to the point that relatively few of us can find the challenge and beauty of our wild environment.

It is, to the citizens of these northern counties, critical that we not allow oil and gas leasing or development along our coast, but instead demand ocean sanctuary. Now, I don't want to take up your time with an endless string of arguments against development, but I do wish to remind us all of a few things.

The EPA estimates that:

1. The amount of oxygen demanded by muds and cuttings from the offshore oil and gas industry might be already more than 6 times greater than the total oxygen demand of all ocean dumped municipal sewage sludge. Oxygen is, of course, the lifeblood of the ocean.

2. Drilling muds and formation waters from oil rigs contain arsenic, copper,
Barium, cadmium, chromium, lead, mercury, nickel, oil, grease & solvents. These contaminates accumulate & concentrate in the food chain & it becomes dangerous to consume fish & shellfish that become so contaminated. In fact, public health warnings are already commonplace in developed areas such as many of our lakes, bays & estuaries. An unconscionable percentage of our nation's shellbeds have been completely destroyed by pollution. Oil residues have been shown to continue for 50 yrs. in the sea floor once they have been deposited.

(3) The U.S. Coast Guard, the Minerals Management Service & the Intl tank owners pollution federation all agree that there is little hope for containing & cleaning up a major oil spill even in "moderate" seas. The seas off our coast exceed that "moderate" rating routinely. We have here in our waters mammal breeding & haulout areas, major wetlands systems.
- Of numerous major spawning streams and rivers, commercial fisheries of Ft. Bragg earned $33,519,466 dollars in 1987.

- 34% of the world's 80 species of whale are found off our own coast. Even a rare spotted leatherback sea turtle has been seen near Ft. Bragg.

- Enough — I am sure you will hear more about the incredible variety of life that exists here that will be threatened by oil and gas development.

Let me finish by asking a few questions:

1) Is it really intelligent to use the health of our coast and fisheries for a few weeks supply of oil?

2) This is not a partisan issue. I must ask, how can we justify drilling when our nation's political leaders have reversed the energy policies of the previous three administrations, slashing budgets for energy conservation, rolling back fuel efficiency standards for autos, reversing energy...
EFFICIENCY PROGRAMS & FUNDING FOR HOME, OFFICE HEATING, APPLIANCES & MASS TRANSIT?

3) HOW CAN WE ACCEPT WHAT WILL WE BE ABOUT THE INCREDIBLE AIR POLLUTION THAT WILL BE GENERATED?

THE 30 OR SO RIGS PROPOSED WOULD GENERATE AS MUCH AS 7000 - 25,000 CARS GENERATE DEPENDING ON WHOSE STATISTICS YOU USE - EACH!

I ASK YOU CHAIRMAN, COMMISSIONERS, TO SPARE US THE DISAPPOINTMENT OF THE INHERITANCE OF WHAT OFF SHORE OIL DRILLING WOULD BRING US... WE SUPPORT YOU IN YOUR EFFORTS HERE TODAY... WE BELIEVE IN THE WORTHINESS & IMPORTANCE THAT THIS HEARING COULD HAVE FOR THE FUTURE OF THE NORTH COAST.

FINALLY, LET ME WRAP THIS UP THIS WAY... MY WIFE & I ARE SPORT-DIVERS. AT FIRST I THOUGHT IT MUST BE A WORRIED, UNCOMFORTABLE EXPERIENCE TO ENTER THESE COLD WATERS, OFTEN SHOULDERED IN FOG, WAVES Hitting AGAINST THE ROCKS. I THOUGHT ANYONE
ENTERING THESE WATERS MUST BE A KIND OF ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER. BUT WITH MODERN DAY EQUIPMENT WE ARE ABLE TO ENTER A COMpletely NEW WORLD. THE EARTHLY TREASURES THAT LIE HERE AT OUR FEET ARE AWESOMELY BEAUTIFUL. IT IS VERY MUCH LIKE SPACE TRAVEL. INSULATED FROM THE COLD WE EXPLORE THE CREVICES & KEEPS OF A FOREIGN WORLD. WHEN WE EMERGE FROM THE ANCIENT ANTIDELU- VIVM DEPTHS WITHOUR A GRATEFUL WE FEEL GRATITUDE & EXHILARATION. I CANT TELL YOU HOW MUCH THIS MEANS TO US. TOO MANY SACRIFICES HAVE BEEN MADE. LETS PROTECT SOMETHING, LETS SAVE SOMETHING! YOU HAVE A GREAT OPPORTUNITY HERE! GENTLEMEN, PLEASE LET ME BEG ОN THE BEHALF OF THE 600 MEMBERS OF THE SIERRA CLUB & THE SEVERAL HUNDRED MEMBERS OF THE ECC THAT YOU TAKE THIS GREAT OPPORTUNITY TO PROTECT & PRESERVE OUR GREAT NORTH COAST.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH BORNFED
The Honorable Gerry E. Studds  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife  
U. S. House of Representatives  
Washington, D. C. 20515  

Dear Mr. Chairman:

In answer to your request of March 11th, I wish to state that I have read and can attest to the facts described in Mr. Roy Dalthorp's six page response to you.

I served as an operator for ten years at the North Slope Crude Oil Topping Unit (COTU) jointly owned by ARCO and EXXON.

We, as operators, were conditioned to view oil spills whenever possible as less than the supposedly "reportable" five gallon volume...unless witnessed by outsiders. If a spill was not "reportable" there would be no problem and no disciplinary action taken even if the amount was in the hundreds of gallons. Covering up and concealing spills and tank leakage was standard procedure for COTU Operators and Management. I worked during the ten years at the COTU itself, the storage tanks and fuel shack as well as at the nearby Surfcoat tanks.

During those years we had constant leak problems with our diesel, jet fuel, gasoline and reformate tanks. The liquids just disappeared into the gravel between the surface and the tundra. I assisted in the unsuccessful attempts by management to install workable bladders in some of the tanks. It was obvious as the years went by that management just didn't care, so long as they didn't have to spend any money to make things right. When the gravel became so saturated that the surface became "mushy" and obvious to visitors, management would carry out cosmetic surface work.

I often saw the sheen caused by the oil leaking out of the oil pools lying below the gravel surface of our COTU and Surfcoat pads. I had occasion to look in the test holes and saw the oil reaching more than a foot deep.

Often on the night shift I carried out the "rover" duty which included lighting the flare pit at a designated middle of the night time to conceal the black smoke caused by the liquid waste we disposed of in the pit. Also we were required to get rid of other waste chemicals and...
by injecting them into the line to the TAPS. Housecleaning was accomplished by "dumping" into the TAPS through our "blow down drum".

Our Operating Procedure required us to circulate fresh water through the entire COT Unit to break up the salt plugs. We disposed of the water through the line to the TAPS. We could never admit to more than negligible amounts of water in the incoming crude and outgoing residual crude. As we injected 100% water, we had to "fix it" so the water didn't show in the sample tests. Sometimes we had to water wash two and three times a day. We recognized that management was making especially super profits for our employers as the water was metered and sold at residual crude oil prices.

Tampering with and bypassing the flow meters were part of the routine to "balance out" the midnight reports and cover for the oil spills and leaky tanks, etc. When visitors were expected we had to replace the seals on the flow meter bypass valves. Also, we disconnected the hose from the fire-water system and blocked off the valve that provided the fresh water for "water washing" the Unit.

My service at the COTU was from June, 1975 to February, 1985 at which time I was discharged after a 4,500 gallon "reportable" fuel spill caused by a faulty meter. The meter had been malfunctioning and caused several spills during the prior year...but management refused to spend the money to repair or replace it.

I am prepared to testify in person if you desire.

Very truly yours,

Archie Hardy

cc: Congressman George Miller Chairman Subcommittee on Power and Resources
House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee
June 1, 1988

The Honorable Gerry E. Studds
Chairman
Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife
Conservation and the Environment
Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee
U. S. House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

A former member of ARCO's Prudhoe Bay Management Group has become aware of your written requests to Mr. Dalthorp, Mr. Archie Hardy and Mr. Carl Faust. As part of ARCO's North Slope operating team he attended numerous Management Meetings, commencing in the early 80's, at which the Crude Oil Topping Unit (COTU) problems were extensively discussed. The gentleman states that the problems of particular interest to you and Chairman George Miller were:

1. Continuing fuel tank leaks and the resultant significant fuel losses disappearing into the gravel pad.

2. Misuse of bolted water tanks to store diesel and the associated continuing fuel leaks.

3. The Prudhoe Field Managers and the senior Alaska ARCO Officials were well aware that these uncontrolled losses were disappearing into the gravel pad.

4. The Management was extremely tight-fisted with the funds required to rectify and prevent these and other similar problems. In fact EXXON at times appeared to be even more frugal than ARCO in denying and delaying fund approvals required for proper maintenance, prevention of environmental damage and safety.

5. For example, ARCO/EXXON Management sold their COTU produced diesel into the North Slope market place from Husky Oil's Naval Petroleum Reserve sites to the Flaxman and Gull Island Drilling Operators. It was imperative for Management that all means of storage be pressed into service such as the COTU's bolted water tanks without incurring the expense of installing proper storage, loading and distribution facilities.
a) Additionally, ARCO pressed into diesel storage service three 10,000 barrel crude SLOP tanks, one at each of its Flow Station facilities processing crude for the Trans Alaska Pipeline System (TAPS). This negated the design and operational requirements wherein one tank was required to divert "dirty" crude (high in water content and contaminants) back through the treater system to separate out the water and impurities -- while the second tank was required to hold crude in reserve to release into the TAPS when necessary at day's end to make up for daily production shortfalls. With the one tank blocked off for diesel storage at each Flow Station the second was making up shortfalls into the TAPS with whatever (dirty or clean) crude it contained. For years these circumstances prevented proper operation of each Flow Station and often provided no possibility of diverting identified "dirty" crude from flowing directly into the TAPS.

6. In the mid 1980's personnel reporting to this gentleman advised that they witnessed accumulations of oil in holes bored into the COTU pad for construction purposes.

The gentleman is reluctant to have his name released at this time. He agrees to be interviewed by you or your designated Committee Investigator on these matters and other matters concerning ARCO's questionable operations at Prudhoe during the years of his employment on the North Slope. Also, he is willing to testify to the above in public should you hold Hearings.

Very truly yours,

Charles Hamel

Copy as requested to:

The Honorable George Miller
Chairman
Subcommittee on Water and Power Resources
Battle rages on between Alyeska, environmentalists

By PATTI SPIER

The Alyeska affair began in April 1985. A Virginia oil broker named Charles Hamel captured headlines when he filed a complaint with the Alaska Public Utilities Commission charging Alyeska with selling watered-down oil. Hamel blamed the oil companies for the loss of millions of dollars on a crude oil deal he was engineering and for the loss of his lucrative brokerage business.

Since then, Hamel has been the driving force behind most of the allegations against Alyeska. He readily admits he wants the oil companies to reimburse him for the $12 million or so he thinks he is owed. Until that happens, Hamel says, he will continue to call on his growing network of Alyeska employees and oil industry sources to feed tips to the DEC. He is not without his own cynicism that what he believes is evidence of environmental wrongdoing by Alyeska.

The APUC still has not ruled on whether there is excess waste in the oil that comes down the pipeline from the North Slope. The administrative law judge who heard 12 days of testimony in 1985 has given birth to two babies since then but has yet to issue a written decision for the full commission to consider.

Soon after the APUC hearings, Hamel launched an attack on the way Alyeska handled oily ballast water from the Lower 48. He said the company's ballast water treatment plant was not working, that tons of oily sludge and other pollutants were being discharged into Port Valdez.

It has taken the federal Environmental Protection Agency and Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation the last three years to sort out those claims. About two years ago, the EPA found that Alyeska had violated its permit and that the plant was not operating as well as anticipated. EPA ordered the company to make substantial changes to the treatment system.

Then the EPA set to work on a new environmental permit for the plant, a permit that the agency promises will address all other environmental concerns.

Jan Hastings, the EPA official working on the permit, said last week the final version is still weeks, perhaps months, away.

The DEC, which must approve the permit, already has expressed concern over the permit and the new treatment method put in place by Alyeska. The state doesn't think the plant as it now stands has the capacity to handle all the wastewater that is run through it when oil production is as high as it is now — more than 2 million barrels a day.

DEC wants Alyeska to build more storage tanks and holding ponds so the wastewater will have more time to be cleaned before it is emptied into the port. And DEC officials have indicated they won't sign off on the environmental permit unless their concerns are addressed.

Alyeska, for its part, has threatened to slow the flow of crude oil from the North Slope — which would cut into the state's treasury as well as the oil companies' — before it will build expensive new facilities.

While EPA and DEC have been addressing the first question of environmental pollution in Port Valdez, Alyeska has turned up the heat on Alaska, its owner companies and other firms connected to the pipeline company in other ways.

Just last week, EPA proposed a $90,000 fine against one of Hamel's targets — MAPCO Alaska Petroleum Inc. — for mishandling hazardous waste. Hamel had alleged MAPCO was endangering the pipeline by putting hazardous waste into it.

The DEC, which must approve the permit, already has expressed concern over the permit and the new treatment method put in place by Alyeska. The state doesn't think the plant as it now stands has the capacity to handle all the wastewater that is run through it when oil production is as high as it is now — more than 2 million barrels a day.
After 200 Years
Australia Changing

LONDON, Jan. 25 — Since arrival of the first cargo of British convicts to Australia 200 years ago the Australians have overcome extraordinary privations to build a productive, adaptive and stable society.

Flexibility will continue to be the key word for Australia as the world moves into the 21st century. The downturn in the world economy has seen a withdrawal of foreign capital. To restore economic growth and living standards, the nation will need to improve its standard of education and encourage an innovative society more likely to succeed in world markets.

Australia is already adjusting to a new geopolitical reality. Just as the United Kingdom turned its back on its European neighbors, Australia is now coming to the realization its future is in the Pacific.

The danger for Australia is that it will react to the new conditions too slowly. New Zealand has done more to deregulate its economy than its larger neighbor has even attempted. Perhaps it is too dependent on the hope that agriculture or a new rush for minerals will haul it out of trouble.

It is hard, of course, for the mother country to make that particular criticism of its child. She suffered in much the same way herself. The problem may be hereditary. Its identification should not prevent the best of birthday wishes.

The United States' Crude Oil Hypocrisy

HONG KONG, Jan. 15 — No one noticed — or hardly at, we — when, a few weeks ago, a rather special tanker docked in the Republic of China on Taiwan. On board were 400,000 barrels of crude petroleum. The noteworthy thing about the sticky black cargo was its source: the United States.

For many Americans the idea of exporting petroleum is rather unsettling, but if they are able to get used to the idea, it could swiftly do away with one of the crudest hypocrisies in international commerce. The nation that constantly berates others for restricting exports and imports is itself a big offender. For reasons of "self-sufficiency" — the same argument used by Japan's farm lobby — Washington embargoes resources under the nobler sounding banner of "energy independence."

Gasoline shortages are old memories; handwringing over foreign energy dependence is a worn-out political theme. That the issue survives at all is no doing of the U.S. oil industry, much less of consumers.

The ban is testimony to the political power of U.S. maritime unions, transporting oil from Alaska to the wearer 48 states is about the only thing American seamen have left going for them.

It has always made good economic sense to sell Alaskan oil to East Asia rather than shipping it down the length of North America, through Panama and up the East Coast.

Seeing that every 100,000 barrels exported reduces the trade deficit by a billion dollars and that production is about 2 million barrels a day, the sale of Alaskan oil to Asia would help restore balance to the huge U.S. trade deficit. But before Americans start entertaining visions of a $20 billion windfall, it should be remembered that half the crude is refined for the U.S. West Coast market. And Japan, wary of embargoes, says it would take no more than 200,000 barrels if allowed to import.

Though the deficit-reducing angle may be exaggerated, the principle remains. A nation that complains of trade barriers should be lowering its own.

Official Urges Focus on Facts of Life

LAGOS, Nigeria, Jan. 18 — Mr. Kofi Totobi Quakyi, [Ghana]'s secretary for information, has asked workers to focus on the hard and often bitter facts and realities of life, bearing in mind that the consequence of management's inaction would be the irrational workers' demands in the past was the price Ghanaians have paid in stiff adjustment policies.

He cautioned them against vain criticism of management without a full appreciation of the issues and urged workers to obtain and read material on national economic issues to keep informed so that any criticisms they might come up with would not be imaginary, but related to the issues at stake.
III.

AIR POLLUTION

Air pollutants generated by oil and gas industry operations on the North Slope include oxides of nitrogen, particulates, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide and toxic air pollutants. Discussed below are: the major sources and environmental effects of air pollutants on the North Slope, the adequacy of requirements designed to control and monitor pollutant levels and impacts, and compliance problems.

MAJOR SOURCES OF AIR POLLUTION

Natural Gas Fired Turbines and Heaters

The primary sources of air emissions from North Slope oil and gas facilities are natural gas-fired turbines and heaters. This equipment is used to supply power to produce and transport oil and gas; to separate gas, oil and water; and to inject gas and water into the subsurface oil reservoir.

ARCO has compiled an emissions inventory for air pollution sources associated with oil and gas development, primarily turbines and heaters, that have been issued permits by ADEC. The results of this inventory are reproduced on the next page.
Corrosion leads to leak

The Associated Press

FAIRBANKS — Corrosion has eaten two more small holes in ARCO Alaska's oil collection system at Prudhoe Bay, and the company will replace 10,000 feet of pipe, the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation says.

"Not much leaked out," Brad Fristoe, the DEC's district office manager for the North Slope, said Monday. "In one instance about one barrel of crude oil and four barrels of water leaked; in the other, four barrels of crude and about 10 barrels of water leaked."

The pipes gather the oil, water and gas produced at a drill site and carry it to flow stations. A drill site frequently contains several wells.

"Right now, ARCO is looking at replacing about 8,000 feet of one 20-inch-diameter flow line and about 2,000 feet of another," Fristoe said. But, he said, the two new leaks occurred in a third flow line and more pipe may need replacing.

The leaks occurred east side of the Sag River. Fristoe said all four drill sites on that side of the river will be inspected for corrosion.

Fristoe said there could be a number of causes, ranging from the water or gas to some other factor.

He said it will take ARCO several months to positively identify the cause of the corrosion.

ARCO has had as many as 70 people working to clean up the leaks, Fristoe said.
Fishermen ask EPA to halt work on permit

By PATTI EPLER, Daily News reporter

A Cordova commercial fishermen's group has asked the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to suspend work on a new permit for the Valdez oil-shipping terminal.

Fishermen United is concerned that studies done for Alyeska Pipeline Service Co. by a private consulting firm — studies on which EPA is basing the new permit — are scientifically unsound and possibly were prepared illegally.

At the same time, the fishermen have asked the state Department of Environmental Conservation to hire Thor Lysyj, a highly regarded California chemist, to reviewnumerous pollution-control studies prepared for Alyeska by Woodward-Clyde Consultants, a worldwide environmental consulting firm.

The fishermen said it was Lysyj's methodology Woodward-Clyde used in conducting tests of a new treatment technology, that Lysyj is a recognized expert in wastewater treatment methods and that he has conducted several previous studies of the Alyeska plant for both DEC and EPA.

Additionally, the CDFU noted that Woodward-Clyde is being investigated by the state for practicing chemical engineering in Alaska without a license.

"If Woodward-Clyde 'overlooked' the appropriate legal channels to conduct business within the state, we are concerned they may have 'overlooked' the appropriate scientific protocol as well," said Fredericka Ott, a CDFU board member, in a Jan. 6 letter to EPA.

DEC officials said they had not reviewed the letter and EPA officials could not be reached Tuesday.

State commerce officials, who conducted the Woodward-Clyde investigations, have turned their findings over to the attorney general's office for review and would not comment on the case, saying it is "an ongoing investigation."

Bill Pyle, Woodward-Clyde's Alyeska manager, was hesitant to talk about the allegations until the state has finished its investigation.

But, he said, the company doesn't believe it violated licensing regulations because the work it did for Alyeska is considered "environmental engineering, which the company is licensed for, not chemical engineering." 

"The people on the project were extremely well-qualified to do the work," Pyle said.

EPA has been investigating environmental pollution at Alyeska's ballast water treatment facility in Valdez for nearly three years. The agency is working on a final version of an environmental permit that governs the discharge of oily wastewater into Port Valdez — water that has been carried on tankers as ballast and must be cleaned before it can be emptied into the port.

"Last year, Alyeska began using what the company says is an improved treatment method, a biological oxidation process in which bacteria essentially eat the hydrocarbons out of the wastewater, according to environmental officials."

The treatment method was started after laboratory tests by Woodward-Clyde showed the method would remove substantially more hydrocarbons.

But the fishermen, citing comments from a University of Alaska scientist and a DEC chemist, say the Woodward-Clyde study is being "contested by the scientific community."

The long-overdue environmental permit is too important to the safety of the marine ecosystem for EPA to fashion the permit without a sound scientific review of the study, the fishermen said.

Ott, a scientist who specializes in oil pollution, said Jon Button, a microbiologist with the University of Alaska Fairbanks and David Knuth of DEC challenge the scientific soundness of the tests.

"To me, it is a gross oversight on the part of the regulatory agencies to base a permit upon data which is hotly contested within the scientific community," Ott wrote to DEC Commissioner Dennis Kelso.

In October, Knuth criticized Woodward-Clyde's report on the effectiveness of biological treatment, saying the company reached "incorrect conclusions through the use of poor scientific practices. He suggested the toxic hydrocarbons might simply be going into the atmosphere or being absorbed by rubber stoppers used in the laboratory studies.

Button has written several letters to EPA about the biological treatment process touted by Alyeska and Woodward Clyde. Generally, he challenges the effectiveness of the treatment method because bacteria doesn't grow well in cold water. Button also has suggested the toxic compounds might be simply going into the air or being turned into more lethal substances by the treatment method.
Mapco Inc. is being investigated by Congress and the EPA on charges its refinery has put hazardous wastes into the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

(Story on Page 5)

Congress, EPA Investigate Charges Against Mapco Inc.

By R. E. Taylor

WASHINGTON—Congress and the Environmental Protection Agency are investigating charges that a Mapco Inc. refinery near Fairbanks, Alaska, has been injecting a trickle of hazardous wastes into the Trans-Alaska Pipeline.

Charles Hamel, an oil broker from Alexandria, Va., has charged that the plant injected more than 100 barrels of chemicals, some labeled as hazardous waste or acid, from January to March. He also has said that crude solutions from a refinery process were pumped into the lines.

Mr. Hamel contends that the waste could corrode the pipeline, damage refineries downstream or pollute Prince William Sound near the pipeline terminal at Valdez, Alaska. But neither Alyeska Pipeline Service Co., which operates the pipeline for eight major oil companies, nor West Coast refineries using Alaskan crude, have reported any problems. The Alaska Division of Oil and Gas said that even if the chemicals were injected, they would be so diluted that the pipeline wouldn't be damaged.

Still, the EPA and Congress' General Accounting Office are trying to determine whether waste disposal laws were violated. But Al Ewing, head of the EPA's Anchorage, Alaska, office, said putting hazardous wastes in the pipeline may not violate federal law. He said the agency probably would find minor violations but nothing "catastrophic."

Ronald Hagen of Fairbanks, Alaska, a former employee of the refinery, said he saw barrels from the plant's storage area being emptied into a tank—the contents of which are discharged into the pipeline. But he said he didn't know what was in the barrels. Sen. Howard Metzenbaum (D., Ohio), who requested the GAO probe, said another former plant employee claims to have been fired for cooperating with federal investigators.

In Tulsa, Okla., David Leslie, Mapco's vice president for public affairs, said that the refinery, which is in North Pole, Alaska, is authorized to withdraw crude oil from the pipeline for its refinery operation and to return elements of the oil that it can't sell locally. He said the refinery doesn't generate any toxic waste and hasn't pumped any into the pipeline.

The Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, responding to Mr. Hamel's charges, audited the plant on March 5 for the EPA. Larry Dietrick, head of the EPA's Fairbanks office, said the agency will have to make "some very close calls" in deciding if a violation occurred. An EPA official said the agency recently requested more information from Mapco and expects to reach conclusions in June.

H.E. Bond, president of Arco Transportation Co., a division of Atlantic Richfield Co., a part-owner of the pipeline, initially said that if true, actions alleged by Mr. Hamel "are likely to endanger human lives and cause harm to the environment and to important facilities."

But Arco and the pipeline reported that they found no hazardous wastes in the nearly two million barrels of crude oil arriving daily in Valdez. John Ratterman, manager of public affairs for the pipeline, said that—based on talks with Mapco—"we have no reason to believe that there's anything at all to the allegations."
October 26, 1988

California State Lands Commission
Crown Hall
Mendocino, California

Dear Commissioners,

The Mendocino Land Trust wishes to state its support for a decision by the California State Lands Commission to establish a sanctuary in the coastal waters of Mendocino and Humboldt counties which would prohibit offshore oil and gas leasing and development in those waters.

The goal of the Land Trust is to "protect and enhance natural areas, open space, coastal and river accesses as well as productive agricultural lands....to help maintain the unique character and quality of life of our county. To provide citizens with opportunities for scenic, recreational and educational enjoyment in the county."

The impact of offshore oil projects with attendant onshore facilities are diametrically opposed to the purpose of the Land Trust. For the benefit of future generations we urge you to establish the sanctuary.

Sincerely,

Betty Barber
President
Salley Stewart

I HAVE LIVED on the Pacific Coast for the past 35 years. I lived in Sunset Beach, Huntington Beach and now Mendozas. I grew up with the smell of oil well "Mozzi," Southern California lost its beautiful beaches to the Oil Corp. please save the Northern Coast for our children.
October 26, 1988

State Lands Commission
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Gentlemen:

We strongly endorse the Commission's proposal to establish an oil and gas leasing sanctuary covering the state tide lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties. This is particularly gratifying, because Governor Deukmejian recently vetoed similar protective legislation authored by State Senator Barry Keene.

We commend the Commission and hope that similar sanctuaries can be eventually be established in all the coastal areas threatened with oil and gas leasing from Sonoma County all the way down to San Diego County.

Sincerely,

Roscoe A. Poland
Director

As we save the natural world, we also save ourselves.
OCEAN SANCTUARY -- An idea whose time has come!

Our oceans are in a state of crisis; we can't delay their protection any longer. Every day, in almost every major newspaper in the United States, there is another story about ocean pollution - caused by oil spills, by dumping of medical wastes, by dumping of sewage or by toxic runoffs. The problem grows larger every day.

And the problem is not ours alone. Almost every country in the world faces problems of ocean pollution. People all over the world are realizing that something must be done, and it must be done quickly.

Here in the small town of Mendocino the grassroots concept of Ocean Sanctuary was born. Ocean Sanctuary is based on the conviction that the oceans belong to everyone and must be permanently protected from exploitation and pollution.

We need Ocean Sanctuary to preserve our oceans as the national treasures they are, just like the Grand Canyon and Yosemite. We need Ocean Sanctuary to protect and enhance environmentally sound commercial uses of the sea.

We need Ocean Sanctuary to assure us that there will be no further offshore oil drilling. The Greenhouse Effect has been recognized as a potentially devastating force to our economy and our environment. The Greenhouse Effect is accelerated by burning fossil fuels. This is the time to be looking for alternative fuels that are safe, non-polluting and renewable. This is not the time to speed up the process of offshore oil leasing.

We need Ocean Sanctuary to protect a major source of food and oxygen for the planet. People everywhere are concerned about the destruction of the rain forests and the resulting loss of oxygen that would occur. Yet the plankton in our oceans are what create up to 70% of the free oxygen that we breathe. Can we afford to allow pollution to destroy this fragile ecosystem?

We need Ocean Sanctuary to assure us that there will be no dumping or burning of toxic wastes and chemicals. We can't let medical and toxic wastes replace driftwood and seashells.

Once the delicate balance of life in our oceans has been upset by the inevitable oil spills, air pollution, noise and other products of industrialization, our coasts will be gone forever.

This must not happen. This does not need to happen. The solution starts right here, today, in the town of Mendocino. The answer is OCEAN SANCTUARY.

OCEAN SANCTUARY COORDINATING COMMITTEE
P.O. Box 498, Mendocino, CA 95460

NICK ALTERNAN
10-26-88

State Lands Commission
Leo McCarthy
Gray Davis

Re: Ocean Sanctuary in State Waters

From: Valerie Hansen, a resident speaking as an individual

In favor of protection of this coast from offshore oil development on several grounds:

The threats to the ecology:

- Oil spills are obviously the most dramatic danger; no estimates were made in the MNS' EIS on potential impacts to our communities locally where impacts would be greatest if which are at highest risk.

- Loss of marine wildlife, fish & birds, which have mutual aesthetic & recreational values, from not only oil spills & leakages but also from concentrated industrial activity which development would bring. Infrastructure of that development will result in further loss of habitat.

The threats to the economy:

- Tourism brought $120 million in direct travel expenses, 23,000 jobs, a 20% million in payroll.

   $17 million, 2,700 jobs, $17 million payroll
About 90% of the co. bed tax in 1987 was produced on the Coast — 90% of the co's No.1 growth industry is related to the pristine Mendocino Coast environ.

$21 million in abalone, taken by sport in 1985 according to Fish & Game (and that's just the legal catch!)

In 1986 more than 10,000 singles fished N. Coast ocean waters (sacred City to J.B.)

About 2 million people use the Mendocino Coasts parks & beaches every year, according to State Park Signers — 2 more use is requested than can be accommodated!

Our Flourishing arts community — nationally & internationally recognized — is largely tourism-dependent.

The threats to economic development:

We are geographically isolated, with little developed infrastructure other physically on in labor force, without prime "industrial" sites in the traditional sense of industry. Our future growth depends on small entrepreneurship marketing to others as resource-based endeavors such as using sawmill hardwood products, aquaculture & ocean farming,
more local processing of our local products, and I believe, overstepping even light manufacturing development to move directly into the information age 3) electronic transfer & production. For that, we are ideal — our isolation & our natural, unspoiled beauty are very conducive to creativity, concentration individual productivity.

This is not only my belief — the county used the first of its "Real Renaissance" funds to commission a study by an independent firm that said practically the same thing:

... the point is that we need our pristine environment as our base for our future diversification, quality development. (If you want to apply this to Greenhouse Effect ... I think some could be said of the whole world!)

I also believe that many of the port & industry segments for offshore development are specious on the grounds that:

→ Alternative sources of energy can & should be developed.

→ We have no "domestic oil industry" in the true sense of the word & we will see more amalgamation of U.S. & foreign firms as producers realize they need to control pump & other fuel market prices.

→ Oil prices are a result of political & financial factors — not supply. There is a glut of supply!
The U.S. has -well- capped & shale oil recovery programs, on hold. [P.S. ask Utah & Colorado what believing oil development promises her done for them.] because we can import oil cheaper than we can produce it - & we have loaned such huge sums to foreign oil producers, we must now buy their oil so they can afford to meet the interest on our loans or we'll all go bankrupt!

The cost to the taxpayers of U.S. efforts to protect Mid-East oil are tremendously - in the fall of 1987 they were $20 million a month! This is in addition to the subsidies granted by our national government in the form of tax breaks granted for oil-related R&D.

... but most of oil we protect in the Persian Gulf went to Japan & Europe!

There are other facets to the global oil market - all of them about as crazy as these - & I have written your office about them so I will end now & thank you for being here & being concerned.
My name is Herb Lobell. I am a member of the Mendocino County Democratic Central Committee and a member of the State Executive board. Two years ago the County Central Committee asked us to take the following resolution to the Democratic State Convention.

WHEREAS, THE COAST OF CALIFORNIA is a place of rare beauty, a national treasure that is visited by millions of people each year from this country and those from foreign lands; and that the well being, health, and livelihood of coastal residents depend upon the integrity of the marine environment.

WHEREAS, THE PACIFIC OCEAN OFF CALIFORNIA is currently threatened by oil exploration and drilling, deep sea strip mining, and the dumping and burning of toxic wastes and that any of these activities would irreparably damage the marine environment.

WHEREAS, AS CALIFORNIANS, it is necessary that we accept the responsibility and take the initiative to protect this national treasure; and noting that coastal city and county governments, the California Legislature, the Democratic Party, California commercial and sport fishing industries, a broad spectrum of business and community groups, and the great majority of Californians, are all on record as opposing offshore oil development and support permanent protection for California's coastal and marine environment.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the California Democratic Party endorse and support (the principles of) Congresswoman Barbara Boxer's California Ocean Sanctuary Act that will create a zone of permanent protection off the coast of California in areas that are not already developed; that will prohibit the extraction of fossil fuel, the dumping and burning of toxic waste, and will prohibit deep sea strip mining; assure the protection of the marine environment; and protect commercial and sport fishing.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the Chair of the California Democratic Party requests that the Democratic National Committee support and endorse Congresswoman Boxer's California Ocean Sanctuary Act.

Resolution submitted by the Mendocino County Democratic Central Committee

It was adopted by the State Party and placed on the Democratic State Platform. Earlier this year this resolution was taken to the National Convention and became part of the Platform of the National Democratic Party. I am proud to say that both the Democratic candidate for President and the Democratic candidate for United States Senate has made commitments to implement these Ocean Sanctuary resolutions.
There were bills submitted in the last session of the House and Senate and will be resubmitted at the coming session. An Ocean Sanctuary bill was passed in the State Assembly and Senate and unfortunately vetoed by the Governor. Ocean Sanctuary is no longer a partisan issue as I am sure people from the other side will testify to later this morning. The idea of an Ocean Sanctuary, which started on this isolated, rugged coast, and carried forth by a small, rural County in Northern California has become a national crusade.

Gentlemen, you have a wonderful opportunity today to create an Ocean Sanctuary in State waters, and we Democrats promise this...that the Democratic Representatives in the House, Senate, and White House, will extend that Sanctuary another 197 miles into Federal waters.

Herb Scoll
P.O. Box 223
Mendocino, CA 95460
707-937-2102
P. O. Box 1117
Redlands, CA 92373
October 26, 1988

The California State Lands Commission
Sanctuary Meeting
1807 Thirteenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Sirs,

I am a 51 year old woman who learned to scuba dive four years ago. I've dived for two weeks on the Great Barrier Reef in Australia; I've dived Little Cayman in the Caribbean; I've dived Fiji; I've done many multi-day boat trips to the Channel Islands of California.

Last week, on October 17, I dived in Mendocino County for the first time, by charter boat out of Point Arena. Spectacular! As beautiful and colorful as anywhere I've done anywhere. Metridium fans, corals, that flowered at 80 feet! You could see the pinks & reds with no artificial light. And the nudibranchs! Such size was incredible. My dive partner has dived in Tubbataha Reefs in the Philippines. She too was amazed.
The fun of us who do not that day have talked of little else since. We went to charlie that boat again (all Praise to Pat Bello and Second Semester Cruises) and get back to that reef to fish others.

Please help Californians preserve and protect these wonders. I feel that as dive equipment becomes more sophisticated, cold water diving will become more comfortable and appeal to a larger group of divers. The marvels I saw will surely lure them to our coast.

What a privilege it was to dive that unexplored reef. Please keep it that way for others and for me.

Ocean Sanctuary Now!

Sincerely,

Janet DeBar
Hello:

I commended Gary Davis & Leo McCarthy for this very important meeting so considerate. Please establish no oil & gas leasing sanctuary zone off Humboldt & Mendocino coasts. Our coastline needs to be protected for all to enjoy.

Thank you, Deah Prager.
Dear Commissioners,

I don't know one person in favor of offshore drilling. I would definitely do more harm than good, common sense tells me that.

Yes, we should establish an offshore drilling zone, within Mendocino and Humboldt County!! P. Taylor

COASTAL MAJESTY
Clearing fog reveals chunky islands topped by firs in this picture typical of the Northern California and Southern Oregon Coasts.
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We need to keep our fishing industry & our tourist industry with our beaches for our children, we should lose it all to drilling with offshore drilling yielding so little!
Sue Rutherford
P.O. 883
Carmel-by-the-Sea, CA 93923

The Calif. State Lands Commission
Sanctuary Meeting
1807 13th St.
Sacramento, CA 95814
Dear Commissioners,

I urge you to create a sanctuary within the three-mile limit along the Humboldt and Mendocino County coasts. It is a step toward protecting our ocean. I do not understand how Dr. Kneese, and the Reagan administration continue to be so unconcerned about our wishes to protect the ocean and coast from oil damage.

Thank you for considering the Sanctuary issue to be of importance!

Sincerely,

[Signature]
California State Lands Commission
1807 Thirteenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Gray Davis, Chairman

The State Lands Commission's
decision to consider extending
"sanctuary" against oil and gas
drilling in state controlled waters
off Mendocino and Humboldt Counties
is to be commended very highly.

I strongly support the extension
therewith protecting the entire coast
north of Santa Barbara. It surprised
me that two of the counties with
uniquely majestic sections of the
California coast are not protected
while others are.
I was thoroughly discouraged when SB. Deukmejian vetoed AB 384 after it was passed by the legislature. It hardly seemed possible that the will of those who represented Cal. voters could be ignored.

Why destroy one of the cleanest, pristine of the California coast shrinking for oil when the use of petroleum products may damage the world’s climate, when the drilling for extraction of oil may destroy the ecological balance needed for ocean productivity and when new sources of energy need to be developed?

Keep up the good work and extend the sanctuary to Mendocino and Humboldt Counties’ coast lines.

Sincerely,

Meriam Brownson
October 21, 1988

Mr. Gray Davis, Chairman
State Lands Commission/Sanctuary Meeting
1007 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Davis:

I support the creation of an oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone in state waters within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties. Such a sanctuary exists elsewhere in California, and I believe this has been beneficial to local communities.

Sincerely,

Evelyn Delany
Supervisor, District 3

ED/bkm
(2819c)
Dear State Lands Commission,

I am writing to address the consideration of an offshore oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone. I am in full support of preserving the state-owned tide and submerged lands as a non-drilling zones. Also, I might say, that I am in support of Cancelling Lease sale 91 and establishing it as a sanctuary for non-oil and gas exploration.

The ocean off the coast of California is a large diverse world that should be appreciated for its beauty and diversity in its pristine state. Drilling or exploration would bring about toxics that are lethal to many species in even the most minute traces. We need to protect this as one of the last unmanipulated resource bases remaining. As it is we already are dumping enough unmonitored toxics that have an unknown impact on its environment and ecosystems.

We need to learn from our previous mistakes where drilling is concerned. Our government needs to increase advocacy of a national energy policy and spend less time looking for detrimental fossil fuels. Support the ocean sanctuary.

Thank you,

Gregory K. Bean
Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for holding a special meeting in a very special place along our spectacular northern California coast.

Please include the following personal views as part of the formal record of the October 26, 1988 meeting in Mendocino.

As a native Californian (born in the old Hanley Hospital on West Cliff Drive overlooking Monterey Bay at Santa Cruz) I have always considered it a privilege to live near and enjoy our ocean waters and rugged coastline for the greater part of my 70 years.

Coastal living and the "pursuit of happiness" in many recreational forms was part of my growing up. A move northward 35 years ago gave me an opportunity to know the northern coastal areas from Sonoma County north to the Oregon border. Presently my husband and I reside above the very popular Moonstone Beach, the northern extension of a long coastal stretch from the Mad River to Little River, which includes Clam Beach County Park and Little River State Beach. Thousands of residents and visitors enjoy this area, plus many nearby so-called pocket beaches along Scenic Drive between Moonstone Beach and Trinidad Bay.

When lease sale 91 was announced as a possibility down the line local residents learned that all our coastal areas and coastal views were threatened with intrusions; that oil platforms could be located just 3 miles off shore in federal waters. Personally, our view would be directly toward an oil rig - or two - if that sale became operational. Along this same stretch of coast we can witness the California gray whale migration - and we are concerned about the impacts that any developments might have on their well-being.

The current threats of exploration/drilling along the Mendocino and Humboldt County coasts within the Commission's jurisdiction are simply not acceptable. These coastlines are precious and should remain uncluttered. They are certainly precious to us in the late years of our lives, since beach activities now are mostly walking, beachcombing and photographing.
We do not believe that developments resulting from any oil exploration/drilling are compatible with the uses we see on the popular beach fronts. No beach user wishes to encounter oil globs from an accidental oil spill. Here we see the current crop of young people with surf boards, boogie boards, kayaks, sailboats and wind surfers, horseback riders, frisbee players, fishermen, picnickers—the list could go on and on. I doubt that visits to the beach and other coastal areas would be a pleasurable experience—not with the lurking threat so visible off shore.

What we need is a good conservation/energy policy, not a messed up coastline.

We urge the Commission to approve establishment of a Marine Sanctuary Zone along the Mendocino and Humboldt County coastlines within State waters. This would help allay our fears.

Thank you for considering these views. The decision is yours to provide protection to an unspoiled natural heritage—our coastlines.

Sincerely,

Lucille and
William C. Vinyard
California State Lands Commission/
Sanctuary Meeting
1807 13th Street
Sacramento CA  95814

October 19, 1988

To Whom It May Concern:

There are many reasons for establishing a marine sanctuary along the Humboldt and Mendocino Counties' coasts. But they all come to the same thing: we need our shrinking pristine coastal areas at the same time that we need less oil. Because our counties are sparsely populated it has been difficult for us to oppose the rich and powerful interests that would like to extract dollars from any and every source. Yet a relatively small number of activists (but a large percentage of the population) has kept the petrochemicals industry at bay year after year. We need to protect these off-shore lands permanently. It is time to free these dedicated people so they can spend their time, energy and money on other projects.

The deteriorating global climate is caused in part by the burning of fossil fuels resulting in an increase of atmospheric CO2. We are already witnessing extremes of heat and cold, wet and dry—with loss of crops; it will get worse. In California we have watched our dry forests burn.

We need to conserve energy. In Worldwatch paper #84, "Rethinking the Role of the Automobile", Michel Renner says, "The major barrier to high fuel economy is not technological but political: How can corporations and motorists be persuaded to produce and use less fuel-thirsty vehicles? Left to their own devices, both industry and consumers will enjoy the free ride afforded by low fuel prices and will neglect fuel economy. Governments need to adopt a strong framework—a set of new standards and taxes—to boost fuel efficiency." And they need to make valuable coast lands unavailable to oil.
Most of this country's hazardous waste is generated by the petrochemicals industry. Polluted air, water and soil is having serious effects upon the health of plants, animals and humans. I work daily with people like myself who have environmental illness—who have been poisoned by products and materials made from petroleum. For an excellent assessment of the problem and this illness see the San Francisco Chronicle's series by Elliot Diringer beginning October 17th.

Many environmentally ill people live here on the northern California coast where the air is still relatively pristine. Six or seven are living at this moment on a stretch of coast between Trinidad and Big Lagoon—very few miles. Our health improves here. We are good neighbors: we eat organic food, encouraging non-chemical farming. We live modestly on the land, respecting its beauty and consuming few of its resources. Our numbers are growing; you or someone you love may soon become ill and need the clean air we have have managed to preserve here.

Wherever the petrochemicals industry has established itself it has left behind it a trail of devastation: cancer as in Kern County and Louisiana; destruction of valuable coastal wet lands as in Louisiana; financial havoc and sometimes ruin as in Oklahoma, Texas and Mexico; loss of other, sustainable, less destructive industry—again Louisiana.

This is an opportunistic and unscrupulous industry. For seven years Exxon tankers dumped salt water into the Hudson river and took on fresh water which it took for use in its refineries in the West Indies and sold to thirsty islanders—without permission from those who had the rights to the water—and without paying for it.

Humboldt and Mendocino Counties do not have budgets that permit the lawsuits that inevitably occur when cities and counties (and states) must sue (or are sued by) oil companies to
establish jurisdiction over their own lands or to set standards for air and water quality—as happened recently in Santa Barbara.

The supposed need for more oil, for "oil independence" with more and more consumption of our own resources, is a lie. Now, while oil is relatively plentiful and cheap, is the time to learn to conserve what we have, use it more efficiently, develop other sources of energy and give industry the opportunity to devise energy efficient methods of production. If oil is in ever shorter and shorter supply as we are told, all the more reason to use less of it—to make it last.

Clean air and clean water is, on the other hand, already in extremely short supply and vanishing. This is the real problem—and its solution lies in the mining, refining and consumption of less and less oil.

Barbara B. Logan
P.O. Box 834
Trinidad, CA 95570
October 21, 1988

The Honorable Gray Davis
Controller and Chairman
State Lands Commission
1807 - 13th Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. Davis:

The California Chamber of Commerce requests that the Commission not establish an oil and gas leasing sanctuary in state tidelands off the coast of Humboldt and Mendocino Counties. The Chamber and numerous other organizations and individuals have participated in hearings throughout the state on the Commission's comprehensive study of offshore development activities and environmental issues.

It would be precipitous of the Commission to short circuit that extensive public involvement by declaring a sanctuary for hundreds of miles of the coast before the comprehensive report is even written.

The Chamber additionally questions the cited statutory references as authority for the proposed sanctuary order. These and other sections of the public resources code do not authorize blanket land withdrawals from lease sales without specific statutory enactment.

The State Lands Commission has a fiduciary duty to manage state tidelands in a prudent manner which includes environmentally sound utilization of the natural resources. Complete withdrawals of large sectors of land from any leasing activity is not prudent particularly when considering the revenue which will be foregone for our public school and college systems.

Respectfully submitted,

C.W.H. Solinsky
Resources Director

CC: Hon. Leo McCarthy, Member
    Hon. Jesse Huëf, Member
October 23, 1988

California State Lands Commission
1807 - 13th Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Commission Members,

I strongly urge you to establish the ocean sanctuary, protecting the waters off Mendocino and Humboldt Counties from oil drilling and exploration.

Too much of California's beauty has been sold to the highest bidder, forever lost to us and to future generations. At some point, some time, someone must say no more.

Please say it now. Thank you.

Sincerely

Karen Wolerton
9057 Oak Avenue
Orangevale, California 95662
CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION SANCTUARY MEETING
1807 Thirteenth Street
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
OCTOBER 24, 1988

DEAR COMMISSIONERS,

PUBLIC INPUT, VERBAL AND WRITTEN, HAS BEEN STRONG AGAINST OFFSHORE OIL DRILLING ALONG THE MENOCINO AND HUMBOLDT COAST, AS WELL AS OTHER COASTS. YET, PUBLIC INPUT IS CONSTANTLY BEING REQUESTED. THE FACT REMAINS THE SAME: THERE SHOULD BE NO DRILLING OFF OUR COAST. IT IS TOO UNSPOILED AND TOO BIOLOGICALLY DIVERSE TO TAMPER WITH. WE NEED PLACES LIKE THIS TO REMAIN UNSPOILED SO THAT PEOPLE CAN HAVE PLACES TO FEEL THEIR PART IN NATURE AND PLACES TO REMAIN UNSPOILED TO REMIND US THIS EARTH IS WORTH PRESERVING.

SANCTUARY IN THE CALIFORNIA WATERS OFF MENOCINO AND HUMBOLDT COUNTY IS CERTAINLY AN IMPORTANT STEP.

DRILLING OFF SHORE IS WRONG BECAUSE OF THE NEGATIVE ECONOMIC EFFECT ON FISHING AND TOURISM. BUT MORE IMPORTANTLY, IT IS WRONG FOR SOCIETAL AND MORAL REASONS.

Billie & John Crowley
Cottagers
Gray Davis, Chairman
The California State Lands Commission
Lt. Governor Leo McCarthy
1807 Thirteenth Street
Sacramento, Calif. 95814

Re: Public Hearing on Proposal to create an
Ocean Sanctuary zone on the Mendocino and
Humboldt coasts.
Wednesday, October 26, 1988
Crown Hall, 1901 Ukiah St.
Mendocino, Calif. 95460

Dear State Controller Davis and
Lt. Governor McCarthy:

We wish to be on record as favoring the
creation of an Ocean Sanctuary Zone in state
waters off the Mendocino and Humboldt coasts to
prohibit oil and gas drilling, mining and the dump-
ing of toxic and nuclear wastes.

Where we have lived as permanent residents
since 1962 is about 8 to 10 miles south of a pro-
posed conglomeration of oil drilling platforms if
Lease Sale 91 is approved under a new administra-
tion in Washington. This is also one of the areas
where Mendocino's pine, fir and redwood forests
grow almost to the shoreline.

One of our concerns is with the possibly
damaging effect on onshore vegetation of emissions
from offshore oil drilling and onshore refining.
For almost a century and a half the Humboldt and
Mendocino coastal areas have been among Californ-
ia's prime timber producers. The Northern Cali-
ifornia coast (and a bit of Oregon) is the only
remaining natural habitat of the coastal redwood,
Sequoia sempervirens. Its range extends only about
30 miles inland. The preservation of these trees
in health is far more important than a few days or
a few weeks of oil. They are among the oldest life
forms on Earth.

Thank you.

Fionna Perkins
Richard H. Perkins
October 24, 1988

Mr. Gray Davis
Chairman
State Lands Commission
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Chevron wishes to express its serious concerns regarding the State Lands Commission's proposal to establish an oil and gas leasing "sanctuary" in State-owned tide and submerged lands in Mendocino and Humboldt Counties. At issue in this proposal is not whether the State Lands Commission should or should not lease such lands for nothing is currently compelling the leasing of those lands. The important issue is the process by which the Commission should make such important decisions.

For the past several months, and with major expenditures of resources on workshops, public meetings, and other activities, the Commission has been pursuing development of its California Comprehensive Offshore Resources Study (CCORS). According to numerous statements by the Commission and staff, CCORS is necessary because the Commission needs more and better information to make decisions whether specific oil and gas projects are in the best interest of the State. However, despite the Commission's emphasis on CCORS as a critically important part of the Commission's planning and decision-making process regarding oil and gas activities, the Commission has apparently decided that CCORS is both unnecessary and irrelevant as the Commission rushes to what can only be viewed as a politically-driven decision to establish a leasing "sanctuary". The Commission appears willing to entertain such decision without benefit of the environmental, socio-economic, or energy-related data and information CCORS is intended to provide.

For those of us who are participating constructively in the CCORS process, it is extremely frustrating to see proposals such as this "sanctuary" which indicate that the Commission is ready to prejudge the results of the CCORS. Even more alarming is the indication that CCORS eventual results will be ignored whenever politics might dictate a different result.

We urge the Commission not to approve the sanctuary proposal, but to support and pursue the more rational public policy planning process it has itself initiated in CCORS.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]

KEA:pc

cc: Ms. Claire Dedrick
October 24, 1980

California State Lands Commission
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Subject: Establishment of a No Oil Drilling Sanctuary in State Waters off Mendocino and portions of Humboldt Counties.

TO: Members of State Land Commission

I am writing to express my strong support that your body should establish a Oil and Gas Leasing Sanctuary Zone in State waters within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties. The Sanctuary Zone would cover those areas not presently prohibited under the Public Resources Code.

By your action in establishing such a sanctuary, you would preserve and protect that portion of our beautiful California coastline from the danger of future destruction by oil and gas developments.

It is apparent that over 75% of the citizens of California support such a move on your part. Please take immediate steps to implement this at once.

Sincerely,

Sam P. Karas

SUPERVISOR - DISTRICT 4
MONTEREY COUNTY
THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
MONTEREY COURTHOUSE - 1200 AQUARIUS ROAD, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93940
SUPERVISOR - DISTRICT 4
SAM P. KARAS
ADVISOR TO THE SUPERVISOR
(408) 647-7744

SPK/10-28-80
Mr. Gray Davis, Chairman  
State Lands Commission  
1807 13 Street  
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Chairman Davis,

Since the inception of the California Comprehensive Offshore Resources Study last year, the California Coastal Operators Group and our Associates organization have participated in good faith at the two workshops (in April) and many of the hearings throughout the state.

We have also worked constructively with local groups in the Santa Barbara area providing input for their response to you as to the approach the study should take.

From the beginning, the Commission stated that the purpose of the study was to gather information on oil development in state tidelands so that you could make informed decisions on future leasing and projects in state waters.

It is very disappointing to see that you are ignoring your own stated purpose for the study by proposing to establish an offshore oil and gas leasing sanctuary covering state lands adjacent to Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

The proposed action is counterproductive and merely reinforces the view by many that the study was nothing more than a political tool.

If this is not the case, we urge you to defer any actions on this issue in Mendocino on Wednesday until the CCORS work is complete, and meaningful data is available to make an informative Commission decision. Should you proceed with the sanctuary, it will arbitrarily preclude development of potential oil and gas reserves that are so vital to California and the nation. As Controller, I'm sure you are aware of the significant tax and royalty revenues that accrue to the state from oil and gas production.

Sincerely yours,

Terry Covington

121 Gray Avenue • Suite 3 • Santa Barbara, California 93101 • (805) 966-7113
cc: Mr. Leo McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor
Mr. Jesse Huff, Director of Finance
Ms. Claire Dedrick, Executive Officer
October 17, 1998

The California State Lands Commission
Sanctuary Meeting
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Gentlemen,

On behalf of myself as editor and publisher of Pacific Coast News and the 2,000 readers, supporters and advertisers of this community newspaper from Stewarts Point north to Manchester:

OUR VOTE IS YES FOR OCEAN SANCTUARY NOW - WE WANT TO PROHIBIT OIL AND GAS DRILLING OFF OUR COAST

Residents and business on this coastline are nearly 100% dependent on tourism for our income and livelihood. Preserving the natural beauty and peacefulness of our area ensures our future. Oil and gas drilling threatens to pollute our coastline visually and environmentally. Our marine life already suffers from pollution and we don't want any more.

We enthusiastically support the State Lands Commission proposal to create an ocean sanctuary within State waters along the coastline offshore of Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sybil Spencer
Editor & Publisher

Enclosure

P.S. Please give us more advance notice of your meetings in our area.

Sybil Spencer
Publisher & Editor

Publisher & Editor

P.O. Box 1311
Gualala, CA 95445
PUBLIC SEWER SYSTEM FAVORED

Anticipated opposition fireworks against the old mill site on Gualala Ridge for the proposed public sewer system fizzled due to a shower of praise for the project at Thursday's (9/22) public hearing.

More than 50 people attended the 7 p.m. meeting in Sundstrom Mall.

Maria Lafer of the State Water Quality Board advised that Clean Water Grant funding is still pending for the $5.66 million project now slated for one of two sites being considered.

Both industrial zoned sites, owned by Gualala Redwoods Company, have been offered to the CSD as a long-term renewable "gift lease" for $1.00 a month or $12.00 a year. In Sept. 7, 1988 letters to the CSD, Arnold F. Wallen, Director of Gualala Redwoods Company, offered 40 acres in Mendocino County or 70 acres in Sonoma County for the project.

Lafer, along with Ken Davlin and Rob Roscoe of Oscar Larson & Associates provided updates and fielded questions about the project.

Those who testified before the CSD board unanimously favored a public sewer system including Richard and Marina Welches. Owners please see Page 2.

FROM THE GRAPEVINE

Rumor has it that State Assemblyman Dan Hauser plans to visit Gualala in late October.

The Village Cobbler was robbed on Sept. 19 or 20. Owner, Dennis Ranieri said the burglar apparently used a crowbar on the back door, took numerous women's items and the cash register. The loss was estimated at about $1,000.

Several business owners are discussing the potential need of a part-time Deputy Sheriff for Gualala.

Point Arena is said to have had the highest growth rate of any city last year but please see Page 4.
The California State Lands Commission  
1897 13th Street  
Sacramento, CA  95814  

Dear Members of the Commission:

This letter is submitted in support of the proposal to establish an oil and gas leasing Sanctuary Zone in State waters within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties. We welcome the Commission's initiative in this matter and urge you to take positive steps to protect these critically-important nearshore areas.

Residents of the north coast are deeply concerned about Lease Sale 91. Thus, there is strong support for Representatives Boxer and Levine's HR 920 to create a federal Sanctuary off our coast. Sanctuaries in both State and Federal waters will provide the protection this special coastline deserves and must have.

Thank you for consideration of our views.

Sincerely yours,

Susie Van Kirk,  
Chair
McKinleyville, Ca 95521
1500 Dena Dr.,
October 18, 1993

California State Lands Commission
Sanctuary Meeting
1807 13th St.,
Sacramento, Ca 95814

Gentlemen:

We are very much in favor of establishing an oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone in state waters within Mendocino and Humboldt counties. We believe the probable damage to the environment and to the local fishing industry substantially outweighs the possibility of discovery of a major fuel source within these waters. And, at some future time, should our need for oil and gas become critical, we can then, perhaps with improved techniques, review this decision.

Sincerely,

Robert Whitmore

Helen Whitmore

Robert Whitmore
October 18, 1988

The California State Lands Commission/
Sanctuary Meeting
1807 - 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chairman Davis and Commissioners:

I am writing to urge you to establish the oil and
gas leasing sanctuary zone within Mendocino and Humboldt
counties, as proposed for consideration at your special
meeting on October 26, 1988, in Mendocino.

Those of us who live in Pacific Grove are indeed
fortunate to have a bit of the California coastline so
near our homes. But we are also mindful of our responsi-
bility to work with the States to maintain and preserve
this great national asset for the benefit of all Californi-
ans.

We are pleased to join with other coastal communities
in accepting this responsibility, and we are grateful for
the assistance and leadership of the Commission which is
so vital to this effort.

Establishment of the proposed sanctuary zone will be
another tangible demonstration of the dedication of the
Commission to the protection of the California coastal regions.

Sincerely yours,

Robert H. Nunn
City Council

cc: City Manager
    Mayor Morris Fisher
October 19, 1988

Mr. Gray Davis, Chairman
California State Lands Commission
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Sanctuary Meeting
October 26, 1988

Dear Mr. Davis:

On behalf of the City and County of San Francisco, a member of the Central Coast OCS Regional Studies Program, I am submitting this letter of support for the proposed "sanctuary zones" covering State tide and submerged lands in Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

The risks to the State from offshore oil and gas development are well-known: oil spills, dumping of drilling wastes, air pollutant emissions, threats to marine life and commercial fishing and tourism industries, to name a few. Given the questionable need for the production of more oil and gas resources, we believe that there is an unjustifiable burden of risk which the State would have to bear in the event of oil and gas development off of our coast.

As indicated in the background material which accompanied the meeting notice, the State tide and submerged land areas off of the central California county coasts are already designated as "sanctuary zones". Nevertheless, the potential harmful effects of oil and gas exploration and development do not respect county lines. We therefore believe that it is important that the lands off of Mendocino and Humboldt Counties be afforded the same protection.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on your proposal.

Sincerely,

Barbara W. Sahm
Environmental Review Officer

cc - W. Chabot
Lois Drobish
854 9th Avenue
Westhaven, CA 95870
(near Trinidad)

Copy forwarded to:
John L. Nugent, Dir. Comm.
10/07, 9:40 AM.
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The Calif. State Lands Commission
1807 - 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RECEIVED
OCT 26 1988

("Driatonyz" Meeting)

STATE LANDS COMMISSION
October 23, 1968

I strongly urge the State Land Commission to establish oil and gas leasing "sanctuary zone", prohibiting oil and gas leasing or development, covering state-owned title and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

Both my heart and my head strongly support the "sanctuary" — to preserve our pristine coastline thereby to promote tourism, to prevent the great threat of large oil spills, and to sustain our fishing industry, among others.

Hope Kelley, insane. F. Drobak
10-23-88

CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION
RE: SANCTUARY MEETING
OCT 26 IN MENDOCINO

I AM UNABLE TO ATTEND YOUR MEETING HOWEVER PLEASE KNOW I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL TO EXTEND THE EXISTING SANCTUARY WHICH I HOPE WILL PROHIBIT OIL AND GAS DRILLING WITHIN THE ZONE.

LYNN PETRA NELSON
200 LOON ST
FOSTER CITY CA 94404
(415) 349-4719

Lyn B. Nelson

RECEIVED
OCT 26 1988
STATE LANDS COMMISSION
WE MUST SAVE OUR MAGNIFICENT SPACCOAST, TEAMING WITH WILDLIFE, FROM BEING INDUSTRIALIZED. PLEASE DECLARE MENDOCINO COUNTY TIDELANDS A SANCTUARY FROM OFFSHORE DRILLING.

Copy forwarded to: [Signature]  Date: [Fill in] by: [Signature]
LOVE YOUR MOTHER

CALIF. STATE LANDS COMMISSION
"SANCTUARY MEETING"
1807 13TH ST.
SACRAMENTO, CA 95814
California State Lands Commission,

As a property owner, county employee, lover of clean air and water and natural beauty, I strongly urge that an oil and gas leasing Sanctuary Zone be established in Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

I am writing on behalf of myself and family, and the Social Concerns Committee of St. Paul's United Methodist Church in Point Arena. The mendocino coast has some of the cleanest air and water on this planet. We caught the tail end of a San Francisco oil spill a few years ago so we understand that clean up technology is almost completely ineffective in these waters. Please do what you can to protect the future of our coast.

No oil drilling!

Sincerely,

(Claire Boykin)
October 24, 1988

California State Lands Commission
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: Sanctuary Meeting

Sirs:

In my work as a group insurance specialist, I meet with many employers and their employees. I frequently engage these people in discussions beyond the specific insurance matter, a personal contact I enjoy and learn from.

The oil drilling issue off the coast of California is an issue that every person I have met and talked to about 'the coast' has an opinion on. The matter of the coast is an emotional one and most of the people I've discussed it with feel quite strongly opposed to offshore drilling.

As Californians, we are proud of the abundance and variety of natural resource in our State. We simply are not convinced that the modest oil reserves off the California coast are of strategic importance to the United States; we suspect that these reserves may be important to those who will profit if drilling were allowed.

You have heard every eloquent plea to save our rare and wonderful coast for future generations; please take heed. Drilling off the California coast will have a negative impact on that important national asset. Let us take a stand for the preservation of our environment. Make us proud of our state government and make the Mendocino-Humboldt coasts a sanctuary.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Mark H. Downing

MHD/jw
October 23, 1988

The California State Lands Commission
Sanctuary Meeting
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

As a California coastal resident, I am very much concerned with oil and gas leasing and development on coastal waters. The planet's oceans are experiencing the unprecedented onslaught of pollution contamination to dangerous levels heretofore never experienced. To even consider inviting not only potential oil spills, but disrupting delicate underwater ecosystems is unconscionable.

It is time for our energy-consuming nation to consider alternatives to ruining the environment for resources before the environment and the planet becomes a legend in the memory of the universe.

I urge the State Lands Commission to recommend establishing an oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone, prohibiting oil and gas leasing or development, covering State-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humbolt Counties.

Sincerely,

Bonnie Parker
201 Glenwood Circle #8A
Monterey, CA 93940

cc: Supervisor Karin Strasser Kauffman
Montery County

Assemblyman Sam Farr
October 24, 1988

P.O. box 976
Willits, CA 95490

Gray Davis, Chairman
California State Lands Commission
Sanctuary meeting
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Mr. Davis:

We urge you to establish the ocean sanctuary for the California coast from Santa Cruz to the Oregon border. The coast of northern California is unique, and we must preserve its pristine nature for future generations. Indeed, let's preserve it for our own enjoyment as well:

The amount of oil known to be there is not worth the price of endangering our wildlife, our ocean, and our beaches. Bold action in support of this proposal is needed now to ensure protection of this scenic wonderland, which is also an important fishing resource.

Let's give a strong statement on environmentalism, so that those who come after us will not have to attempt to clean up the results of our lack of vision.

Sincerely,

Patricia de Belloy Williams
Earl E. Williams
Patricia de Belloy Williams, H.L.S.
Earl E. Williams, L.C.S.A.
October 25, 1988

The California State Lands Commission
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, California 95814

RE: OFFSHORE CALIFORNIA
Mendocino and Humboldt Co, CA
State Lands Commission
Meeting October 26, 1988
Establishment of Sanctuary

Gentlemen:

Union Oil Company of California is extremely concerned with the Commission's proposal to establish a sanctuary zone which prohibits oil and gas leasing or development or state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

It is Union's understanding that the Commission directed its staff to conduct the California Comprehensive Offshore Resources Study (CCORS) to provide the necessary information to make rational decisions on such topics related to coastal resources. Now, however, it appears that the Commission will be circumventing its very own planning tool by arbitrarily establishing the proposed Sanctuary before CCORS can provide the data which would facilitate an informed decision on whether or not offshore oil and gas leasing and development should take place off the coast of Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

Union strongly urges the State Lands Commission to postpone the decision on establishment of the proposed Sanctuary until such time as CCORS can provide a full range of information bearing on such a decision.
As always, Union thanks you for the opportunity to present its comments.

Yours very truly,

UNION OIL COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA

J. S. Attebery
California District Land Manager

RJS/JSA: ddr
ID: 3675L
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California State Lands Commission
Sanctuary Meeting,
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, Ca. 95814

Gentlemen:

I support a prohibition of oil and gas drilling off the coast of Humboldt and Mendocino Counties, including seismic testing or any other evaluation of sub-surface deposits of minerals.

First, there is an oil glut in the world. Second, oil engines are causing the greenhouse effect with excesses of carbons in the atmosphere. Third, there are solar technologies, new battery systems and related hardware to completely replace automobiles with solar cars—we really don’t need more oil. We need freedom from the oil monopolies.

As a chairman of the second aquaculture conference in Alaska, published by the Univ. of Alaska, as an author of "Salmon Ranching of the North Pacific", a short booklet published by College of the Redwoods in 1983, may I claim to know considerable of the scientific knowledge of the North Coast.

The ocean is unexplored as yet, scientifically. Interdependencies of organisms on the food chain is as yet a mystery. Much more is known of the land ecology. In time, maybe more exploration and research can evaluate the effects of environmental degradation of oil drilling and gas well drilling in the ocean.

As a young man, working as a rodman running oil well elevations in Texas, I stood on the derrick floor when a gas well began blowing out, and I know of eye-witness knowledge, the potential degradation of gas wells to the surrounding environment. I just can’t imagine the increased effects of gas well blow-outs on the ocean floor, and what that might do to the interdependencies of affected biotic life—that’s just a risk not worth taking.

I object, strenuously, for many reasons.

Sincerely,
Leo Baldwin
October 26, 1988

Gray Davis, Chairman
State Lands Commission
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Chairman Davis:

The timing of the October 13th notice announcing your October 26, 1988 Mendocino Sanctuary Meeting was very unfortunate. The announcement provided far too little notice for a major policy discussion of this kind. The Commission is mid-way in the CCORS program which has been billed as a prerequisite to this type of decision. Lastly, with no plans or requests before the Commission to develop this area, it appears to be an inappropriate step to take.

Consideration of this action is a major policy step concerning the tidelands of the People of California. As Chairman of the Lands Commission, you have been placed in a position of trust for the public. Making a decision on less than two weeks notice without a substantial review of the facts is a major concern.

Second, you and commissioner McCarthy have been pushing for more than a year to conduct the CCORS program as a first step in major tidelands management policy decisions. The ARCO project underwent years of consideration and finally the CCORS project was launched because of a perceived lack of information. Now this proposal is made that would lock up miles of the California coast after just one meeting. Studies should be made of the potentially significant future impacts. This type of approach, being used to adopt a sanctuary, undermines the credibility of the CCORS effort.

Any consideration of a sanctuary should await completion of CCORS and adequate study to evaluate the long term impacts of such a decision.

Sincerely,

Gary Bartlett, Chairman
IAGC, West Coast Operations Committee-Marine
Dear L.T. Governor,

They have no right to drill off our coast. They will not only make the ocean dirty but they will kill a lot of the animals in the sea. If the rigs would not have so much of a chance of a spill, many fewer people would vote against Oil drilling. Please help stop this drilling off our beautiful coast. We want no oil drilling here. I hope you think that way too. Please vote for Ocean Sanctuary.

Signed,
Joseph H.
The Albion Whale School

Belle Sommer
Post Office Box 568
Albion, California, 95410

California State Land Commission,

I am not very old
But, I want our ocean to stay blue and full of fish,
I want to go to the beach I want to have fun and change colors.

Sincerely,
Belle Sommer
Dear State Lands Commission,

I am 13 years old and I go to the Albion Whale School. I think that you should keep the ocean clean and clear be covered with oil. I don't want to see birds covered with oil. Most of all, I don't want to see ugly oil ripples out in the horizon.

Yours truly,

Sasha

Finds The Far
Dear Lt. Governor,

They have no right to drill off our coast. The whales will start to die faster and wash up on our beaches. The beautiful beaches will turn in to grave yards. We won't be able to have parties on the beaches. There will be no salmon fishing industry and lots of people will loose their jobs.

We want no oil drilling!

Odin & Reilly
Dear California State Lands Commission,

My name is Fred Harris.

I really don't want anyone to test or to oil drill off the coast of California.

I really like playing in the water and on the beach. The beach is like a person. If the beach changes, the person changes.

Thank you,

Fred Harris
I want Ocean sanctuary! No Drilling

I feel that neither the government nor private business have a right to drill. No one has the right to the ocean. It is the sea animals home. It would make me angry if someone wrecked my home. It's just not fair. I hope you'll see it my way. Thank you.

Donovan Clark
Student of the Albion Whale School

age 14
Re: California Ocean Sanctuary

I am writing to urge you to support ocean sanctuary.

I think you shouldn't have oil rigs in the ocean. It hurts two things. It pollutes the sea and it pollutes the fish. That the people eat and it is not good for peoples bodies. It makes them sick. It pollutes the food that the sea animals eat. It gets in their whales and after awhile and then they die.

Yours truly,
Matt Jones
Albion Whale School
Re: California Ocean
Sanctuary

I am writing to urge you to support ocean sanctuary.

I live on the Mendocino coast and I like the ocean a lot and if you run it, I will be sad and mad.

The Mendocino coast is a rare place and you should not run it.

Sincerely yours to macro

The J
Re: California Ocean Sanctuary

I am writing to urge you to support an ocean sanctuary.

I think you shouldn't drill on the coast because it looks bad.

Your truly, Jack Bush
Re: California ocean sanctuary

I am writing to urge you to support ocean sanctuary.

I live on the mendocino coast. I see the ocean almost everyday. If I see the oil mines out in the ocean it would be disgusting.

My dad is a commercial fisherman and I doubt he would want to fish anymore.

Yours truly,

Oscar H Miller
Albion Whale School
Dear Government, Oct 26, 1988

Please stop offshore oil drilling. Do not kill the fish. Just because you want oil for cars and stuff it makes the ocean ugly and kills the stuff in the ocean and the birds. I do not want to see it when the fish wash up on the shore and the
Whales suffer and the birds die and the oil tanks are in the ocean.

I am 8 years old.

Sincerely,
Yono Earth
Dear Government:

Oct 26, 1988

Please stop off shore oil drilling because it kills animals that have a happy life just like you do. They all want life just like we do and they deserve life too. They help other animals survive. When they need meat, when oil drilling is happening and fish have children there is just another bunch of dead fish in the ocean. Plus oil drilling ruins the beautiful sight and I'm sure that if you took some time and looked at the ocean you would be surprised at how beautiful it really is.
I'm telling you how I really feel about you doing this because it's like murder. I like going to the beach and seeing the big beautiful coast, not horrible oil and oil tanks instead. Please please please please please don't ruin the coast and stop oil drilling.

Sincerely

Tordy, age 7

Diamond
Jubilee Piacida

October 26, 1988
Oct 28, 1988

California State Board
Commission

I am nine years old and
go to the Albornoole
school.

It is not good to have
offshore oil drilling
because animals could
die and pregnant moms
animals could have
babies born dead.

Please don't kill on
ocean our coast.

Yours truly

Deva Torres
October 26, 1989

Kite, I am 9 years old

No oil drilling

No oil drilling

No oil drilling
October 26, 1988

The California State Lands Commission
Sanctuary Meeting
1807-13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Sirs,

I am submitting the following written testimony about the consideration of whether to establish an oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone covering state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt counties:

(1) Ecological and environmental risks:

(a) Oil spills: The possibility of an oil spill, such as occurred in the Santa Barbara Channel in 1969, the "puerto Rican" tanker spill in San Francisco Bay in 1961, and the classic lesson from the "Torrey Canyon" tanker disaster of 1967, this possibility alone, is by itself enough to contraindicate such hazardous and irreversibly damaging operations.

(b) Air pollution: Offshore drilling within state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties would be a major source of onshore air pollution due to the prevailing winds in these areas.

(c) Toxic Discharges: Poisonous compounds found in drilling muds and regular periodic discharges of small quantities of oil affect the marine life they invade for miles around as a result of dispersal by diffusion and prevailing ocean currents.

(2) Economic and industrial implications:

(a) Commercial fishing: The entire fishing industry depends upon a clean and balanced marine environment in order to maintain a healthy catch. If the inshore or offshore marine plant communities which are the spawning grounds of the fish which inhabit the area (sole, cod, haddock, herring, etc.) are poisoned, the toll will be extended to include reductions in the respective adult fish populations. Even the physical presence of drilling rigs and their attendant anchors and cables present hazards and prevent access to fishing areas. Shock waves
from seismic exploration cause additional
damage to fish eggs and larvae.

Tourism and the coastal community: Many of the
coastal communities affected by oil and gas
leasing on state-owned tide and submerged lands
within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties are
economically tourist oriented. Since there is,
to date, no practical way to clean up an oil
spill that has "landed", it would take only one
such incident to destroy an entire summer season,
perhaps more than one summer season. What the
visitors to this region want are pristine beaches
and unbroken horizons, not oil rigs and
refineries.

I strongly urge you to establish an oil and gas leasing
sanctuary
zone covering state-owned tide and submerged lands within
Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

Sincerely,

Marcia Snyder
F.O. Box 1105
Mendocino, CA 95460
Dear Sirs,

I am submitting the following written testimony about the consideration of whether to establish an oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone covering state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt counties:

(1) Ecological and environmental risks:

(a) Oilspills: The possibility of an oil spill, such as occurred in the Santa Barbara Channel in 1969, the "Puerto Rican" tanker spill in San Francisco Bay in 1981, and the classic lesson from the "Torrey Canyon" tanker disaster of 1967, this possibility alone, is by itself enough to contraindicate such hazardous and irreversibly damaging operations.

(b) Air pollution: Offshore drilling within state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties would be a major source of onshore air pollution due to the prevailing winds in these areas.

(c) Toxic Discharges: Poisonous compounds found in drilling muds and regular periodic discharges of small quantities of oil affect the marine life they invade for miles around as a result of dispersal by diffusion and prevailing ocean currents.

(2) Economic and industrial implications:

(a) Commercial fishing: The entire fishing industry depends upon a clean and balanced marine environment in order to maintain a healthy catch. If the inshore or offshore marine plant communities which are the spawning grounds of the fish which inhabit the area (sole, cod, haddock, herring, etc.) are poisoned, the toll will be extended to include reductions in the respective adult fish populations. Even the physical presence of drilling rigs and their attendant anchors and cables present hazards and prevent access to fishing areas. Shock waves
from seismic exploration cause additional damage to fish eggs and larvae.

(b) Tourism and the coastal community: Many of the coastal communities affected by oil and gas leasing on state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties are economically tourist oriented. Since there is, to date, no practical way to clean up an oil spill that has "landed", it would take only one such incident to destroy an entire summer season, perhaps more than one summer season. What the visitors to this region want are pristine beaches and unbroken horizons, not oil rigs and refineries.

I strongly urge you to establish an oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone covering state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

Sincerely,

Dean Reynolds
Orchard Park, K-3
Davis, CA 05616
October 26, 1988

The California State Lands Commission
Sanctuary Meeting
1807-13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Sirs,

I am submitting the following written testimony about the consideration of whether to establish an oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone covering state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties:

(1) Ecological and environmental risks:

(a) **Oil spills:** The possibility of an oil spill, such as occurred in the Santa Barbara Channel in 1969, the "puerto Rican" tanker spill in San Francisco Bay in 1981, and the classic lesson from the "Torrey Canyon" tanker disaster of 1967, this possibility alone, is by itself enough to contraindicate such hazardous and irreversibly damaging operations.

(b) **Air pollution:** Offshore drilling within state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties would be a major source of onshore air pollution due to the prevailing winds in these areas.

(c) **Toxic Discharges:** Poisonous compounds found in drilling muds and regular periodic discharges of small quantities of oil affect the marine life they invade for miles around as a result of dispersal by diffusion and prevailing ocean currents.

(2) Economic and industrial implications:

(a) **Commercial fishing:** The entire fishing industry depends upon a clean and balanced marine environment in order to maintain a healthy catch. If the inshore or offshore marine plant communities which are the spawning grounds of the fish which inhabit the area (sola, cod, haddock, herring, etc.) are poisoned, the toll will be extended to include reductions in the respective adult fish populations. Even the physical presence of drilling rigs and their attendant anchors and cables present hazards and prevent access to fishing areas. Shock waves
from seismic exploration cause additional damage to fish eggs and larvae.

(b) Tourism and the coastal community: Many of the coastal communities affected by oil and gas leasing on state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties are economically tourist oriented. Since there is, to date, no practical way to clean up an oil spill that has "landed", it would take only one such incident to destroy an entire summer season, perhaps more than one summer season. What the visitors to this region want are pristine beaches and unbroken horizons, not oil rigs and refineries.

I strongly urge you to establish an oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone covering state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Don Snyder
P.O. Box 207
Comptche, CA 95427
The California State Lands Commission
Sanctuary Meeting
1807-13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Sirs,

I am submitting the following written testimony about the consideration of whether to establish an oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone covering state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt counties:

(1) Ecological and environmental risks:

(a) Oilspills: The possibility of an oilspill, such as occurred in the Santa Barbara Channel in 1969, the "puerto Rican" tanker spill in San Francisco Bay in 1981, and the classic lesson from the "Torrey Canyon" tanker disaster of 1967, this possibility alone, is by itself enough to contraindicate such hazardous and irreversibly damaging operations.

(b) Air pollution: Offshore drilling within state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties would be a major source of onshore air pollution due to the prevailing winds in these areas.

(c) Toxic Discharges: Poisonous compounds found in drilling muds and regular periodic discharges of small quantities of oil affect the marine life they invade for miles around as a result of dispersal by diffusion and prevailing ocean currents.

(2) Economic and industrial implications:

(a) Commercial fishing: The entire fishing industry depends upon a clean and balanced marine environment in order to maintain a healthy catch. If the inshore or offshore marine plant communities which are the spawning grounds of the fish which inhabit the area (sole, cod, haddock, herring, etc.) are poisoned, the toll will be extended to include reductions in the respective adult fish populations. Even the physical presence of drilling rigs and their attendant anchors and cables present hazards and prevent access to fishing areas. Shock waves
from seismic exploration cause additional damage to fish eggs and larvae.

(b) **Tourism and the coastal community:** Many of the coastal communities affected by oil and gas leasing on state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties are economically tourist oriented. Since there is, to date, no practical way to clean up an oil spill that has "landed", it would take only one such incident to destroy an entire summer season, perhaps more than one summer season. What the visitors to this region want are pristine beaches and unbroken horizons, not oil rigs and refineries.

I strongly urge you to establish an **oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone** covering state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ed Davies
P.O. Box 193
Mendocino, CA 95460
The California State Lands Commission
Sanctuary Meeting
1807-13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

October 26, 1988

Dear Sirs,

I am submitting the following written testimony about the consideration of whether to establish an oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone covering state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt counties:

(1) Ecological and environmental risks:

(a) Oilspills: The possibility of an oilspill, such as occurred in the Santa Barbara Channel in 1969, the "puerto rican" tanker spill in San Francisco Bay in 1981, and the classic lesson from the "Torrey Canyon" tanker disaster of 1967, this possibility alone, is by itself enough to contraindicate such hazardous and irreversibly damaging operations.

(b) Air pollution: Offshore drilling within state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties would be a major source of onshore air pollution due to the prevailing winds in these areas.

(c) Toxic Discharges: Poisonous compounds found in drilling muds and regular periodic discharges of small quantities of oil affect the marine life they invade for miles around as a result of dispersal by diffusion and prevailing ocean currents.

(2) Economic and industrial implications:

(a) Commercial fishing: The entire fishing industry depends upon a clean and balanced marine environment in order to maintain a healthy catch. If the inshore or offshore marine plant communities which are the spawning grounds of the fish which inhabit the area (sole, cod, haddock, herring, etc.) are poisoned, the toll will be extended to include reductions in the respective adult fish populations. Even the physical presence of drilling rigs and their attendant anchors and cables present hazards and prevent access to fishing areas. Shock waves
from seismic exploration cause additional damage to fish eggs and larvae.

(b) **Tourism and the coastal community:** Many of the coastal communities affected by oil and gas leasing on state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties are economically tourist oriented. Since there is, to date, no practical way to clean up an oil spill that has "landed," it would take only one such incident to destroy an entire summer season, perhaps more than one summer season. What the visitors to this region want are pristine beaches and unbroken horizons, not oil rigs and refineries.

I strongly urge you to establish an oil and gas leasing sanctuary zone covering state-owned tide and submerged lands within Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

Sincerely,

Rebecca Reynolds
Orchard Park, K-3
Davis, CA 95616
California State Lands Commission
Sanctuary Meeting, Mendocino
1807 Thirteenth Street
Sacramento, Ca. 95814

Chairman Gray Davis and Members of the Commission:

I write to urge, with strong feelings about the matter, unanimous approval of the proposal to create an ocean sanctuary within all State waters along the Mendocino and Humboldt counties coastline.

I became a Californian in the mid-50's when my late husband and I moved to San Francisco from Phoenix, Arizona; soon thereafter visited the coastlines of northern California. The ocean sanctuary approval and enforcement could save for future generations the natural wonder and awesomeness of that Pacific coastline that we experienced.

The ocean sanctuary proposal was briefly discussed as a coming-event at San Mateo County's Regional/Committee's recent meeting.

And the local newspaper, the San Mateo Times (Page D2, Monday October 24, 1988) carried a brief story headed "Mendocino hearing on ocean sanctuary." The page-placement of the story was certainly not the best, but I shall thank them for running your story.

Thank you for the opportunity to again say, please save our coastline.

Sincerely,

Leola K. Maxwell

October 25, 1988
October 18, 1988

State of California
State Lands Commission/Sanctuary Meeting
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, Ca. 95814

Hearing Officer

Dear sir,

The Ventura County Audubon Society, a conservation group with 650 family members in Ventura County, strongly supports the establishment of a oil and gas lease free marine sanctuary zone in the state tidal lands of Mendicino and Humboldt Counties.

We believe that the sanctuary is necessary to preserve marine avian and wildlife habitat. We hope that similar proposals will be forthcoming to protect the already endangered coastal areas of Ventura and adjacent counties.

We wish our comments to become part of the formal record of the meeting.

Sincerely yours,

Melvin Greenblatt MD
Conservation Chair
Ventura County Audubon Society
Leo McCarthy,

I want ocean sanctuary

No Drilling

Oil spills can and will kill thousands of animals that live in the sea.

I live close enough to the beach to walk to it. I go and play and swim around in the ocean all the time. If it were dirty and full of oil I wouldn't even want to look at the ocean.

Tons of tourists come to Mendocino to see the beautiful ocean. Soon if there was a spill tourists wouldn't come. Mendocino would lose money and Mendocino might turn into a ghost town. I hope you vote against offshore oil drilling.

Mimi Harris
Dear California State Lands Commissioner,

The ocean is beautiful and it is a wonderful place to play, swim, and fish. However, our coast is just about the worst place to drill for oil. The very idea is silly and thoughtless.

I'm a resident of the Mendocino coast. I happen to know that the tourists trade would be severely affected. I think that we should use alternate energy sources. Solar power and water-powered magnetick motors could be developed. This will relieve the demand for crude oil.

Sincerely yours,

Christopher Collins

Christopher Collins, 12 years old
Dear Lt. Governor

Leo McCarthy

My name is Aza. I am 12 years old. I live in Albion and I often go to the beach. I enjoy the birds, the sand and the water. I don't think that any one has the right to drill off our coast. It is the fishes home. It wouldn't be fair to the fish and the people.

Aza McNeal
Dear California State Lands Commission,

Here is a poem I wrote about ocean sanctuary.

Why are people hungry for money
That is all it is
We can help the Ocean
We don't need to destroy it
We don't need the money
We need the Ocean.
The fish, the whales,
The sea under the Ocean.
We can get current
Oil from the land
Let's not ruin the sand.

vote for Ocean sanctuary

Thank you,

[Signature]
To Leo McCarthy
Gray Davis

PLEASE VOTE
Ocean Sanctuary

Oct 25, 1988
October 22, 1988

State Land Commission
1807 13th St.
Sacramento, Ca. 95814

Dear Sirs,

I vigorously support the establishment of an oil and gas hunting sanctuary zone, prohibiting oil and gas leasing or development of state-owned title and restricted lands within Placer, Sacramento, and Yolo Counties. (A2; S2)

I am concerned on many fronts: environmental damage to fish and sea life within the zones if drilling is permitted;
Economic: loss of jobs & North Coast fisherman, etc; tourism business; loss of coastal beauty, area; potential chemical & other contaminants; and loss of beauty in one of the great scenic areas of the United States.

Let's save this Sanctuary Zone!

Sincerely,

Elaine Borgeson
925 Shirley Blvd.
Oceanside, CA 92052
California State Parks Commission
Sanctuary Academy

Crown Hall
1901 Upish Street
Medocino, CA 95460
To the California State Lands Commission/Sanctuary Meeting

I am strongly in favor of establishing an oil & gas sanctuary zone prohibiting oil & gas leasing or development in the Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

RANDI FAIRBROTHER
7632 ARMSHON RD.
COLETA, CA. 93117
To the California State Senate
Commission/Sanctuary Meeting

I am strongly in favor of establishing an air & gas sanctuary zone prohibiting air & gas leasing or development in the Mendocino and Humboldt Counties.

Sincerely,

Randi Fairbrother
7992 Armstrong Rd.
Glenhaven, CA 95437
This never reached you before the meeting in Mendocino. Do you need it for the records?

10-29-88

EB
Elaine Boyeem
925 Shirley Blvd.
Orofino, CA. 95521

California State Lands Commission
1807 13th St.
Sacramento, California 95814

Sanctuary Meeting
Cal St. Lands Commission for Ocean Sanctuary
1807 13th St.
Sacramento, Calif
95814
Cal St. Lands Commission -

We really need an Ocean Sanctuary. What are we going to leave for future generations? Sunsets of oil wells and gooey beaches? Let us be the generation that looked at what is going on and did something positive to stop it. If we foul the oceans the planet
will die. Please listen to what the people who live up here are saying and create an Ocean Sanctuary now.

Thank you —

Susan Alban Steff
Boy 368
Redway, Ca 95560
Cal St. Lands Comission -

We really need an Ocean Sanctuary. What are we going to leave for future generations? Sunsets of oil wells and gooey beaches? Let us be the generation that looked at what is going on and did something positive to stop it. If we foul the oceans the planet...
The California State Lands Commission
Sanitary Meeting
1807 - 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

RE: AB884
CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION:

DEARS SIRS:

I AM WRITING IN FAVOR OF YOU
ESTABLISHING AN OIL AND GAS LEASING
SANCTUARY ZONE AND PROHIBITING OIL AND
GAS LEASING OR DEVELOPMENT, "COVERING
STATE-OWNED TIDE AND SUBMERGED LANDS
WITHIN MENDOCINO & HUMBOLDT COUNTIES."
I RECOMMEND THAT ALL FURTHER
APPLICATIONS FOR OIL & GAS LEASING OR
DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE PROPOSED
SANCTUARY ZONE BE DENIED. I WITNESS
THE SANTA BARBARA OIL "SPILL" AND
AM APPALLED THAT THE STATE MIGHT
CHASE THE SAME ON OUR BEAUTIFUL,
SHORES AND WATERS. PLEASE HELP TO
BEGIN RECLAIMING THE EARTH AS SANCTUARY,
BEGINNING WITH OUR COAST.

THANK YOU,

[Signature]

ANGELE R. PERING
P.O. BOX 710
BAYSIDE, CA 95524
HUMBOLDT COUNTY
October 27, 1988

To: Claire Dedrick
California State Land Commission
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Dedrick:

Congratulations on your ruling regarding offshore drilling. The enclosed may be of aid in the future to fight the misguided efforts to override this decision—until about 2025.

The six pages from Val Hansen of the Fort Bragg Mendocino Coast Chamber of Commerce make all the argument you need. Combined with my authored piece of Feb 1988, a vision of the oil future quite different from that arrived by established wisdom emerges. See also the October 8 1982 article on me; not only has much in it come to pass, some is still unfolding.

The key to the future of oil is what Saudi Arabia will do, has to do, and risks having done to it by competitors. This requires the proven ability to forecast what, in the past, the Saudis have done, and the ramifications on them and the world. Essentially, almost NO "establishment" entity—the oil companies, the Department of Energy, the California Energy Commission, even the Saudis themselves—correctly forecast a decade ago what has come to pass since. I have.

What the Saudis do not yet comprehend is that the loss of over $200 billion is a direct consequence—albeit completely unintended—of specific prior strategies and tactics they implemented. Not only are some still in place; the Saudis will not most effectively survive the next two decades' permanent restructuring of the economics of oil until they understand this—and change to avoid a repeat in the future. They have yet to do so.

Thus, all other entities in oil will be affected, for better or worse—for the worse, so far as 90% are concerned. Which is why we should not even THINK of drilling off the CA. coast—until we see who survives and are able to judge whether they can competently—and respecting our environment—then explore for oil. Using—yet to be developed—efficient, environmentally-benign procedures and technologies, a a condition of permits TO explore.

Use anything enclosed with attribution. If I may be of service, on a professional basis, I may be reached at the hand written address on the 1982 letter from William Clark of the National Security Council.

Cordially,

Norman P. Kirby, Jr.

Enclosures as cited
Governor Deukmejian recently vetoed A.B. 284 authored by Dan Fauser to protect the Mendocino and Humbolt County coasts from the impacts of offshore oil development. Mr. Deukmejian cited economic factors and the benefits to the economy as well as reducing dependence on "imported oil." I believe the governor is in error.

In the Coast Chamber's letter of March 8, 1988, we outlined many reasons against drilling and asked that our state and the federal government require -- PRIOR TO ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION ON OFF-SHORE DRILLING -- that the U.S. oil industry pay the correct level of taxes due on unreported profits from prior purchases of Saudi Arabian and OPEC oil. As you know, the IRS has assessed Texaco, Inc. $6.5 billion for such taxes. This sum may be but a fraction of the total due to taxpayers through our national and state governments.

Then an oil industry that supposedly will benefit the state economy does not even pay its correct taxes, how can the state benefit. Or how does the federal government, so concerned with reduction of massive federal deficits, gain.

As part of the national discussion of probable tax increases to reduce the federal deficit, Prescott, Ball & Turben noted in its "Investment Overview" newsletter this summer that "No matter who is elected (president), he will face the same problems of inflation, deficits and oversensitized world financial markets that are currently overwhelming the political and economic decisions of politicians.... As the financial markets pressure the new president, he will be forced to raise taxes (emphasis added).... Both candidates seem likely to raise indirect taxes, which cover a wide spectrum: a gasoline tax at the pump or an oil import tax (emphasis added). Closing loopholes in the current tax laws will be another move in the perennial hunt for new revenues."
I believe collecting taxes due is a better choice than raising taxes and collecting the unpaid oil taxes would also help protect our California coasts.

If these taxes cannot be or are not collected, let’s stop debating "Does America need a domestic oil industry?" In that case, the real question is "Does America need a domestic oil industry so badly that the loss of billions in unreported taxes and the risk of coastal destruction are acceptable tradeoffs?"

From the simplest economic perspective, we need an oil industry that pays its taxes -- the same as other citizens and corporations are required to do. Why should California risk the future of our priceless environment to an industry that is less than a model citizen taxwise. If it cannot, or will not, even pay its full taxes, how can it afford the safeguards it says would protect our coasts.

In the suits over unreported profits made with Saudi oil, it is important to understand that the key is not what the oil companies did, but what the Saudi Arabian government did. The unreported profits would not have been the rule unless Saudi government pricing policies were in reality something other than what they were said to be by either that government or the oil industry buyers, such as Exxon U.S.A., Mobil Oil Corp., Chevron U.S.A., and Texaco, Inc.

To correctly calculate the full taxes due requires proven performance in correctly forecasting the true actions of what the Saudi government has done and what the industry future has been during the period. It is not a "Republican" or "Democratic" issue, but one (as one current presidential candidate phrases it) of "competence."

Norman P. Higby, Jr., an oil industry forecaster and author of The Post OPEC Petroleum Age (1981) is widely acknowledged to have described the world oil markets we have today at both the national and California state levels. He forecast in October 1981 that Saudi Arabia would soon lose "75-80%" of its oil revenues, partly as the direct, if unintended, result of specific marketing policies and practices. His accuracy was acknowledged by William Clark of the National Security Council in September 1982. (See Enclosure A.) Also, the Dec. 31, 1987, Wall Street Journal reported that King Fahd of Saudi Arabia conceded in a speech that the oil revenues of Saudi Arabia had declined "...to one fifth of 1981 levels...." That is an 80% decline.
In a Wall Street Journal article by Thomas Petzenger, January 22, 1986, Mr. Rigby not only correctly forecast the subsequent huge declines in gasoline prices, but forecast Saudi Arabia and OPEC would be forced to engage not only in crude oil price cutting, but in giving rebates to oil buyers. This was also covered in the Washington Times that February and in an April 1986 Washington Post article by Holart Rowen.

The Wall Street Journal, May 6, 1986, on page 4 notes that the U.S. Aramco partners -- Exxon, Chevron, Mobil, and Texaco -- were demanding, and getting, both price cuts and rebates from Saudi Arabia. (One does not criticise them for what makes economic sense, but these are the same oil firms which demand that all of us, through the U.S. government, subsidize exploration and development of their U.S. oil leases because of "low oil prices, prices that are unprofitable for the firms to continue without such government aid.")

The real cost of such subsidies must be calculated not only in terms of the costs to our coastlines (And, as anyone who read the Minerals Management Service final draft Environmental Impact Report on Lease Sale 91 can see, the costs to the coasts have only begun to be calculated.) but also in the length of time they will be requested. "Low oil prices" are not a thing of the past. Associated Press stories in the Press Democrat tell of West Texas Intermediate at $14.18 a barrel Sept. 10 and $13.37 a barrel Sept. 30. I suspect we will be asked to subsidize the oil industry until the global supply/demand ratio reverses itself. That brings up another issue of the continuation of such subsidies: The issue of just whose aid we are really rushing to. The Wall Street Journal, June 17, 1988, noted on page 2 that Mr. Rigby had forecast the just-completed Texaco, Inc.-Saudi Arabia deal for the sale by Texaco to the Saudis of 50% of some U.S. refineries owned by Texaco. The story told of the sale of Texaco assets in 23 states. (See Enclosure B) Do we even have a "domestic" oil industry?

Mr. Rigby developed, and recently provided the Internal Revenue Service with, methodology and formula to enable the identification of the true levels of profit (by identifying the correct cost) the oil firms have made on their purchase since 1981 of Saudi crude oil. The California Franchise Tax Board has yet to avail itself of this methodology and formula, which was supplied to the IRS under a compensation agreement. Mr. Rigby notes that the earliest stages of this methodology enabled him to identify and forecast the 75-80% decline in Saudi oil revenues in 1981.
I may have belabored the use of citations in this letter, but I felt it crucial to establish the credibility of Mr. Higby's arguments because of what I am about to ask: Would you press the Internal Revenue Service and California Franchise Tax Board to use the formula supplied by Mr. Higby to calculate, and to collect, the true unreported, unpaid taxes due from the four U.S. Aramco partners' purchases of Saudi oil. By doing so, I believe we can save our coasts and, at the same time, force infrastructural changes on the oil firms that might enable them to learn how to survive a future they did not correctly see -- and also permit them the timeframe required to pay the REAL taxes due.

In an election year filled with rhetoric about "deficits," the potential billions to be gained cannot be ignored. Hopefully, any public official who does could find himself replaced by the voters with one who will seek to recover these unpaid taxes.

Once this is done, the U.S. might actually have an oil industry capable of adequately protecting the California coastline. And the economic benefits so devoutly sought by government officials might even come to pass.

Sincerely,

Valerie Hansen
Executive Director

Enclosures
THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

September 29, 1982

Dear Mr. Higby:

We very much appreciate your letter and enclosures of September 20 relating to likely oncoming OPEC political and production problems. We are, of course, following closely the dramatic changes in OPEC prices and interrelationships of member nations. Your perceptive analyses have been given serious staff study and are very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

William P. Clark

Mr. Norman P. Higby, Jr.
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Homogenized Fuels Corporation
845 Oak Grove Avenue, Suite 220
Menlo Park, California 94025

Correct address a/o 10/4/88
966 Fremont St.
Menlo Park, CA 94025
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Ennaa B

Gasoline Pact

Kingdom to Pay $1 Billion

Become a Major Retailer

Through Firm's Stations

by Thomas Prestlow

Texaco Discloses

In a major development in the Middle East, oil to buy as much as $200 million worth of gasoline for its refineries in the kingdom.

The deal, announced by Texaco, would make that nation one of the largest

Retailers in the Eastern U.S., and the kingdom will acquire

including one of the largest gasoline

pumps in the world.

The agreement provides for the kingdom to purchase the

tion and complexity of

the assets. It is absolutely

ensures that the kingdom will acquire

185,000 barrels a day, would amount to about 1.5

million barrels a day, would amount to about 1.5

percent of the total

Then, the

of the

offering in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Includes one of the largest

refineries in the world.

The proposed agreement would also

benefit consumers in the United States by

pricings rather than under the

market prices.
Offshore oil: For whose sake?

WE SPENT THE WEEK of Feb. 1 hearing from the U.S. Department of Interior why we should lease oil rights off the California coast. Those of us who oppose such sales have, by default, left the terms of the argument to the proponents of drilling. We have let ghosts determine our future.

Ninety five percent of the current domestic oil industry will not be in existence by 2020. Even the term “domestic oil industry” cannot be defined using present reference points. We are in a two-decade-long total restructuring of the economics of world oil. Using the past, you cannot even guess which companies will survive, and which will not.

The Internal Revenue Service recently sought from Texaco Inc. $8.5 billion in unpaid taxes for unreported profits. Using far more sophisticated methodology than the IRS, I calculated that were such levies applied to the current domestic oil industry, the figure would rise above $80 billion. We as Californians and taxpayers should demand of our elected representatives that this sum be collected first, then perhaps we can discuss permitting offshore drilling.

We can easily collect $20 billion — and should, while the culprits are still around to pay it. Paying it will also force them to adjust to a future economic environment they never foresaw, and do not correctly understand. Such forced adjustment might enable some to survive.

ONE OF THE PRIMARY arguments of the Interior Department and the oil industry is that we need the offshore oil as supply to reduce the need for OPEC imports. “We’re telling OPEC we’re not defending ourselves,” as Interior Secretary Donald Hodel put it. Of those who hold Alaska’s North Slope leases, the largest are California’s Chevron U.S.A. and ARCO — and Ohio’s Standard Oil. This lease is owned 100% by British Petroleum — and 19 percent of British Petroleum is owned by the London-based investment office of the OPEC nation of Kuwait.

That’s right, roughly 6 percent of the North Slope is now owned by Kuwait. Kuwait, for all intents and purposes, is just as much a U.S. oil company as Chevron. Just as Honda, making cars in America, is now an American auto manufacturer.

This is all part of the restructuring, but one parameter will be a constant, one our government, and our domestic oil industry, have not a prayer of correctly anticipating the ramifications of.

Saudi Arabia is the Mexico of the U.S. Saudi Arabia’s cannot get any combination of oil sales and oil revenues that can, or will reverse this fact.

A rather bold statement? King Fahd of Saudi Arabia, in a Dec. 30 speech, conceded Saudi oil revenues were one fifth those of 1981. Thus, an 80 percent drop already has resulted. Current Saudi oil revenues are running some $46 million per day or roughly $17 billion annually. The most recent Saudi national budget, from the King’s speech: $37.7 billion. If Saudi Arabia cannot get enough oil sales to meet its budget needs, the last thing it, or fellow OPEC members want, is more supplies of oil in competition while they try to boost their hold on the U.S. market.

WE CALIFORNIANS cannot sacrifice our priceless national heritage to an industry that is already a ghost, partly owned by the forces it wants to “protect” us from, which owes billions in unpaid taxes that it may never be able to pay. Since oil companies cannot get the oil at a viable cost related to what it could sell it for (in a future it does not comprehend), we in California cannot afford (in all meanings of the word) to even consider discussing the Interior Department’s Lease Sale 81 or any other sale until we see who survives and determine whether they are capable of doing what the present oil industry cannot.

Let’s also get the $20 billion first. Otherwise, the consequences will make the loss of a mere $22 billion scenario (the consequences for Saudi Arabia in lost gross revenues) seem mild in comparison.

The year 2020 may, or may not, bring an oil industry competent to protect our coast, but at least we’ll be discussing it with the survivors from an era that couldn’t.

Norman Higby Jr. is an independent oil-industry analyst based in Mexico City.
How the collapse of OPEC will directly affect California

This is the second of two columns on a local study of the world oil market. Today: After OPEC.

IF NORM HIGBY'S predictions prove correct, California's oil refining industry will soon disappear, the state's environment will improve, taxes will increase, and the state will become a national distribution center for pre-refined imported oil.

Higby is the co-author of a report that concludes the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) is collapsing and the world is embarking on the Post-OPEC Petroleum Age.

Higby and associate Karim Pakravan argue Saudi Arabia, OPEC's dominant member, caused the collapse by trying to develop its deserts into an industrial nation too quickly, and by overestimating how much money it would make in the 1980s from oil exports. The Saudis began running huge budget deficits and sold off the state to recoup by grabbing market share from other OPEC members. The Saudi policy split OPEC. Gradual, permanent declines in Western demand for OPEC oil sped the breakup.

Today, they argue, OPEC members can no longer afford to act as a group because they must compete among themselves for a dwindling share of the world oil market.

In an interview at his Menlo Park apartment, Higby discussed the probable implications of OPEC's collapse on the world oil market, on world politics, and on the California economy.

The first and most certain conclusion, Higby said, is that OPEC will divide into a series of smaller, less-influential oilproducing countries. Each group would likely consist of the central Arab oil producers: Saudi Arabia, the Arab Emirates, Bahrain, Qatar and Kuwait.

• CURRENTLY Oil producers must maintain wide fluctuations in the price they get on the wholesale market for a barrel of oil. Oil producers could avoid these fluctuations, and improve profit margins, by refining the oil themselves and then exporting it.

• Higby at least is convinced this shift is inevitable. California already is moving in that direction, he said.

• A shift to producing a finished product would affect no part of the U.S. economy more than California, which derives millions each year from refining imported oil.

• Reforms in California gradually will close. By the end of the century, the refining industry in the state will have shrunk to an almost insignificant level.

• The change will mean the loss of millions in revenues to the state now coming from taxes on refineries and crude oil. To make up the losses, the state could levy more taxes on retail petroleum goods.

• If the state1 wanted, Higby said, it could replace its lost refining industry by becoming the center for distributing this refined oil. The state is a natural port for many of the new oil producers, including China.

Among Higby's other predictions:

• Retail gas prices will rise because of new taxes.

• Oil consumption patterns will hold. Most of the changes, such as fuel-efficient cars, are permanent.

• The environment will improve as refineries disappear.

• California's agricultural industry will have fewer worries about energy.

• The development of alternative energy sources will be delayed because of instability in the price and availability of oil.

• Higby said many of his predictions are speculative. But the breakup of OPEC is certain, he said. All that is left is figuring how the pieces will fit back together.
Ms. Claire Bedrick
California State Lands Commission
1807 13th Street
Sacramento, CA. 95814
THE NEXT DOCUMENTS ARE POOR ORIGINAWS MICROFILMING SERVICES WILL NOT ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE IMAGE QUALITY
To State Lands Commission

Gray Davis, State Controller, Chairman
Lio J. McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor, Commissioner
Jesse M. Unruh, Director of Finance, Commissioner

We wish to inform the State Lands Commission that we are opposed to establishment of a Sanctuary Zone that will cover state tidelands and submerged lands in Mendocino and Humboldt Counties where oil and gas leasing is not presently prohibited under the Public Resource Code.

We also wish to appeal that we would appreciate your continued support in fighting against the Federal Government's Measure 91.

We understand that you are supporting the proposed federal legislation H.R. 920 by Representative Bener and Levine and S. 884 by Senator Cranston which would establish a Sanctuary Zone beyond the 3 mile limit. This support is very much appreciated by those of us who love the beauty of our North Coast.

Sincerely,
Ellis and Mary Davenport
44423 Little River Road
P.O. Box 323
Little River, Lake Co. 95452
State Lands Commission
1807-13th St
Sacramento, CA 95814-9990
RECEIVED
OCT 31 1988

Bob Brighten
9727 129th St. Ct. N.W.
Gig Harbor, WA 98335-7033
Oct. 27, 1988

The California State Lands Commission
Sanctuary Meeting
1807 Thirteenth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Re: Ocean Sanctuary within Humboldt and Mendocino Coastlines

Dear Sir or Mam,

I meant to write to you sooner, but job and family activities leave little time. As a former California resident (and a native Californian) concerned about the safety of oil extraction along the California Coast.

I have enclosed an article regarding fishing in seas occupied by the oil extraction activities, which raises many questions about the safety and the intelligence of allowing the oil companies to drill along the California Coast.

Some of the points not covered in the article are:

1. The oil companies claim we have to let them immediately after the oil because there is a national energy crisis. If this is the case, then why has congress and Regan (or deferred) the MPG minimum on new cars produced by U.S. Automakers? If there is a national crisis, the MPG on new cars should be dramatically increased.

2. If there is an energy crisis, why has the Federal Income Tax Credit for solar energy devices on homes and the credit for conservation measures on old homes been eliminated or allowed to elapse?

3. If there is an energy crisis, why has the tax credit for wind power been eliminated or allowed to elapse?

4. If there is an energy crisis, then why has the proposed standard for higher energy efficient appliances been eliminated?

5. U.S. has a plan to buy oil from foreign countries and to pump the oil into the ground in the U.S., so that we have national oil emergency reserve. Why not just leave the oil in the ground along the Calif. coast and other ecological sensitive areas until the Arabs cut us off or until they raise the price of oil out of sight?

6. Per Washington Senator Dan Evans inquiry, the oil companies want the right to ship oil out of the Alaska Artic Refuge to Japan or other foreign countries, because there is an oil glut on the West Coast of the U.S. If there is an energy crisis, why should the oil companies be allowed to ship our oil (U.S. peoples' oil) to foreign countries?

7. Eventually, oil prices will go up to $100 per barrel (in pre inflation 1973 'dollars). Wall Street financial advisors always say it is
intelligent to sell your assets when they are at a high price. So why should the U.S. people be stupid and sell their rights to their oil when oil is at a relative low price? Will the energy crisis be any less of a problem when the World Market price for oil hits a $100 per barrel? If the State and Federal government sell at the higher market price, then maybe they will have excess money to pay off our national debt or not increase income taxes. Also, when we start paying foreign countries $100 a barrel when oil becomes extremely scarce, our trade imbalance will be even worse. So why take the oil out of the ground when the World Market price is low and there seems to be an oil glut?

Thus the oil should be left in the ground in ecological sensitive areas (or where the oil industry will interfere with other industries such as fishing and tourism) for a period of 30-85 years. Why threaten established and growing industries until we absolutely have to?

8. As the years go by, the technology improvements in ecological control and oil removal will continue to advance; thus, there will be a higher margin of safety in future years. So common sense dictates that a marine sanctuary be created along the Northern California Coast for a period of many years.

Furthermore, the oil companies say that it would cost them $30 a barrel to remove the oil if all the ecological safety measure were implemented as proposed by various conservation groups. Thus, the oil should not be removed until the price goes way up, so that the oil companies will not have an excuse for not using ecological sound practices in the extraction of the oil.

Please forgive my writing errors for I am not a professional writer.

Sincerely,

Bob Brighten
I've been fishing out of Santa Barbara for 22 years and out of San Pedro (Los Angeles) for eight years before that. Fishing is all right around here: you know, if a fellow keeps moving, changing from this fish to that, he can make a decent living. There are probably about the same number of boats around here that there has always been.

The oil industry has been no friend to the fishermen around here though. The problem is that we are both licensed to use the same area.

Anywhere there are fish, there's oil. The best shrimp and prawn area around here used to be up north off Gaviota. But did you see that rig and tanker sitting up there when you came by? They found oil right there and there is no way these guys can get at those shrimp anymore, not with that tanker and rig there. You know these oil guys paid millions of dollars for these leases; they have to go after that oil when they find it.

They set up a liaison office to work between the oil and fishing people. They figure there was a one-and-a-half million dollar loss to the fishing industry due to oil in the Santa Barbara Channel last year. The liaison office is insufficient, but there are still problems. They've got pipes that run over to careless facilities and guys are always getting their nets ripped and torn by stuff the oil people have down there on the bottom. I know: they were supposed to have cleaned that all up, but it doesn't seem to have happened.

The oil people are supposed to reimburse you for gear that gets damaged and for any time you've lost, but it doesn't always work out that way. It takes 90 days to get the money and what are you going to do in the meantime? What you have to do is have two nets. If you rip one, then you can use the other while you're waiting to be reimbursed. But then if you snag your second net the next day, you're screwed. I'm not sure it makes much difference though: both the oil companies and the local shops are trying to scrap the reimbursements anyway.

Hey, I had a friend who got so mad when his net got stuck in 20 feet of water that he dove down to see what it was snagged on. It had gotten wrapped around a pipeline buoy they had never taken off. So he had to cut his net off the buoy with his knife. But when he went to the oil people they said, "Oh no, we don't have any of those buoys over there." So my buddy says, "Oh yes there is, and I've got witnesses." "Well, what witnesses?", they said, "Oh well I guess we better have a look." And the next day they were out there with their blow torches cutting that thing off. But, you know, there's still lots of stuff down there. Draggers have lost 40% of their fishing area to the rigs and all the supply boats and pipelines and such.

The worst though is these seismic boats. They are the ones that really do the damage. Once there is oil development the oil companies will have seismic boats out there all the time, sounding the bottom, trying to figure out where the oil is. These guys are pulling a two-and-a-half-mile cable along behind them. They are continuously pounding out sound waves that completely disburse the fish and cause them not to bite. These boats are in a constant process of charting the bottom in fifty foot grids. The oil companies won't share that information, either. They're paying lots of money for these leases, and if they get a little more information here or there than the other guy, then they want it. So there are at least two of these boats out there all the time making their own maps.

You know I was up in Eureka last year for some hearings, and they had us on one of the TV talk shows. All of these people called in, talking about the jobs and the boost that oil would be to the economy.

That's a bunch of baloney. Nobody around here gets jobs out on these rigs. They fly crews in from Spain, Denmark, all over the place, but they don't hire anybody from around here. And with the unemployment situation the oil guys are going to get a lot of money around here. It was just a crock on working on the oil rig. It won't happen.

They've got this attitude "We're going to do it on you."

There's all the waste the crude hose and such. You know what happens? It gets into the marine supply out here and out wind that they're going to. Northern California or wherever the workers up shop, and since he's going before, and knows when you know him, he automatically puts The local shops might get some but they don't count on much.

If you ask me, all the oil people do is
FISHING OILY WATERS

and sour up the economy. Their people are all getting paid a lot of money. They jack up the
prices, take the best, everything, and then leave.

Then of course there is always the pollution,
too. You know they had the blowout in 1969 and
it's still leaking. To get rid of the spilled oil they
sink it to the bottom, and it's still down there.

Here's a great story for you: I caught some crabs
out there once that I brought back and threw into
clean water, and for Christ's sake those things
were pumping out black oil from inside them-

The oil industry is always saying what great
disasters their rigs are for marine life, but you go
down to the bottom of those rigs and there's
nothing but death. Even though they say the
shells inside and castings aren't poisonous, they
use kill everything down there. They even
smother those crabs that lived through the heavy
oil. But, you know, there's more pollution out in
this channel than in oil. At least five towns
dump their sewage into this water. It's the oddest
thing, but ever since they started doing that, there
aren't any white sea bass around. I don't know
what happened, they're just gone. Of course,
down in Santa Monica Bay, people won't even eat
dogfish from there because there's so much pol-
dable. One place that sells fish down there has big
signs that say "We don't sell local fish."

But the oil companies, they don't do much for
the fisherman. EXXON is the worst. They've
got this attitude of, "We're going to do it, so piss
on you." Somewhere they figure they'll get
something out of it. Other guys, like people from
ARCO, are okay. They come around and they
want to do something out there and they say,
"Okay, we need to do this out here, and we'll do
this when you're over there, and then you can do
that", and it all works out.

Actually, in all this oil stuff the Coastal Com-
misson is the only one that has been any help to
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