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PROCEEDINGS

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: I'd like to call the meeting to order.

Welcome everyone to the State Lands Commission meeting. My name is Ed Manning. I am the environmental counsel to Lieutenant Governor McCarthy, who is on his way and should be here momentarily.

On my left is Stan Stancell from the Department of Finance, and on my right is Jim Tucker from the Controller's Office.

At this time I'd to move the minutes from the last meeting.

ACTING COMMISSIONER STANCELL: So moved.

ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay. The minutes from the last meeting are adopted.

If any of you want to speak on an item, there are slips that can be filled out that should be in the back of the room, and if you would fill them out and bring them forward, we will make sure you have an opportunity to speak.

At this time I'd like to ask Mr. Warren if there are any items that have been taken off the calendar for today's meeting.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
On the Consent Calendar, Item Number 1, Number 2, 7, 8, 22 and 23 have been removed.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: On the regular calendar Items 28 and 30 have been removed.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay. Thank you.

CHIEF COUNSEL HIGHT: Mr. Chairman.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Yes.

CHIEF COUNSEL HIGHT: For the record, it is my understanding that until the arrival of the Lieutenant Governor, you will be sitting in a non-voting capacity for the Lieutenant Governor.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: That is correct.

Okay. If there is anyone here to speak on those items we will not be taking them up today. So you are free to leave or stay and listen to the rest of the meeting if you would like.

Calling the Consent Calendar, does anyone move the Consent Calendar items?

ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: I move it.

ACTING COMMISSIONER STANCELL: Second.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay. The Consent Calendar has been moved and seconded and is adopted.

Moving on to the regular calendar.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: The first item on the
regular calendar, Mr. Chairman, is Item 24.

This item would authorize the Executive Officer to execute a Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Port Hueneme. Before proceeding with this item, I understand that a representative of the City wishes to make a statement, and for that purpose I would request that you recognize Mr. Thomas Figg, the Director of Community Development.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Mr. Figg, would you come forward, please?

MR. FIGG: Yes, Commissioners, there has been a good deal of speculation about the environmental consequences of the proposed recreational vehicle park. In fact, a fundamental part of the Memorandum of Understanding that is before you today was to allow the City to proceed into the environmental phase.

The speculation became quite evident at the workshop that was conducted a week ago, Monday, and because of some of the discomfort that has been created by the fact that there is environmental concerns, although speculative at this point, we feel it is prudent that the matter be taken off of calendar so that the City would be able to proceed into the environmental phase of the project by way of preparing an Environmental Impact Report.
I might point out that we do this reluctantly. We thought it was good, prudent business sense to gain the consent of the State Lands Commission in advance of expending a considerable amount of staff time and public dollars in preparing an environmental document before we proceeded into the approval process. However, because we feel that there is discomfort in the community regarding the environmental issues, we feel it necessary to proceed into that phase at this point.

So we would ask that the Memorandum of Understanding be withdrawn from the calendar at this time.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: We have no objection, Mr. Chairman.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Yes.

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Figg, and that item will be taken off calendar.

I do have a number of requests of people who have come to speak on this item. At this time the item is not on calendar anymore, and my understanding is that the City will be preparing an environmental document, and at some point in the future, then, this item could come back before the State Lands Commission.

I think that should be satisfactory to those on both sides. If there are people who would still like to speak, I would like to give you the ability to do that
because a lot of folks have traveled quite a distance to get up here.

Let me just go through the list, and if I call your name and you'd like to speak, we will give you the opportunity to speak for three minutes.

Homer Willard.

Mr. Willard.

MR. WILLARD: I will pass.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: I'm sorry?

CHIEF COUNSEL HIGHT: He will pass.

MR. WILLARD: I will pass.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Oh, he will pass.

Chris Pulos.

MR. PULOS: I will pass until the next hearing.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Pulos.

Ernest M. Brown.

MR. BROWN: I will pass also.

Will we be advised if it comes back on the agenda at some future date?

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Absolutely, yes.

MR. BROWN: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: You are welcome.

David B. Shea.

MR. SHEA: I will speak.
ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay.

MR. SHEA: My name is David Shea. I represent the Surfside III Homeowners' Association.

I am an attorney and I am very happy to hear that the Memorandum of Understanding will not be executed at this time.

One point that I would like to bring up briefly is that I have heard through scuttlebutt of the Chambers, that we are not a party to this agreement, we being Surfside III.

The agreement, which is a 1972 lease agreement -- excuse me, a boundary line agreement, involves several parties, the State of California, the City of Port Hueneme, Santa Clara Lemon Association and Leisuretime Lovers, a Limited Partnership.

Surfside III Homeowners' Association is a successor in interest to Leisuretime Lovers. Therefore, for the record, I want to make sure that we should be included in any negotiations of the 1972 boundary agreement, and we will take further steps to make sure that we are included in any subsequent conversations.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Thank you, Mr. Shea.

I think that those are all the requests to speak that I have on this item.
Is there anyone else who wanted to speak on this item before we move on?

Hearing none, we will move on to Item Number 25.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Mr. Trout will present Item 25, Mr. Chairman.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: Mr. Chairman, Item 25, involves an application to construct 30 berths, two access ramps, piers and related facilities in the Sacramento River at Walnut Grove.

This project has been around for approximately five years and has involved preparation of a Negative Declaration, permits to the Corps of Engineers and others.

During this time, the Department of Fish and Game has consistently raised objections to this project, in their opinion saying it would significantly interfere with striped bass fishing. However, in spite of that, the Corps of Engineers issued a permit in 1987 for the construction of this project. That permit is valid through the end of June in 1992.

After review of the arguments on both sides, staff is supporting the Department of Fish and Game and recommends denial of this application. Representatives of the Applicant are present and would like to make a presentation. They are headed by Mr. Dennis Vollman.

Following their presentation, representatives of
the Department of Fish and Game are here to explain to you their concerns.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Okay.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: If Mr. Vollman wants to come up and make his presentation?

MR. VOLLMAN: Mr. LaBrie is our representative and he will start off. I will follow him after his presentation is over if that's all right.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Please come forward.

Before your testimony, will you please state your name for the record, please, and spell it.

Thank you.

MR. LaBRIE: My name is Gilbert LaBrie. I am an architect.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Could you spell your name, please?

MR. LaBRIE: Yes. It is L-a-B-r-i-e, just like the waterbed.

ACTING CHAIRMAN MANNING: Thank you.

MR. LaBRIE: I am an architect. I live in the Delta. In fact, I have lived in the Walnut Grove area where this project is being proposed, for 21 years. And I have worked in the area for over 25 years.

I have worked as a professional consultant for 17 years and I have worked on probably hundreds of marina
projects throughout the entire Delta.

I have been heavily involved in planning for Sacramento County in the Delta starting back in 1977, at which time a long-range look was taken at the needs for recreation, conservation and growth in the Delta.

Yesterday I delivered a packet of information to each of the Commissioners which was intended to bring your attention to, I think, the planning effort and the land use decisions that have preceded this project.

This process sought to meet the future needs of the Delta for preservation as well as to accommodate some of the growth and to provide for a viable economy. The point I was trying to make in that document was that this type of project in this location was encouraged by that process as a way of meeting the need for commercial growth, yet controlling it.

And I mean encourage because it was, and I included in that document some excerpts from the Delta Community Plan which give you some indication of the statements that were made and things that were said to indicate what the focus of that Plan was and how it was put together, the subsequent zoning, the Delta waterway zone as well as the speed and wake control ordinance that was adopted, all were done to facilitate that long-range plan for limited growth in the Delta.
And the focus of that Plan, as I pointed out in that packet, was to limit Marina development to specific areas, those specific areas being within the confines of existing communities and down in the lower Andrus Island area, where there is a considerable amount of recreation development. And then some growth at existing marinas.

So that whole community Plan that Sacramento County put together was put together to limit marina development. The speed and wake control ordinance was put into effect to do some of the same things, providing restricted speed zones.

This project came about after that planning was done and when we started this project, it was totally consistent with that effort to focus marina development to the extent it occurs in existing communities and in specific areas. The area where this project is proposed is a speed controlled zone. It is adjacent to a commercially zoned area and it is obviously in one of those communities.

You need the commercial zone adjacent in order to provide for parking, which is an essential part of the County's requirement for marinas. So it's not like there are a lot of locations in the Delta for projects like this.

There are other marinas in this area and that
again goes to the planning idea which was originally to cluster the marinas, and so there are three or four other small marinas in the same vicinity as this project.

And so what we have happening in the Delta Plan is the same thing that you got recommended to you in your carrying capacity study of the upper Sacramento area from Freeport on up, which was the two options of either clustering marina development within, I think, Reach 5, which was the heavily impacted Reach, or you allow a few to come within the whole length of that study area.

Well, the Delta Plan's idea was to cluster, to limit the impact by clustering.

And, of course, in terms of Walnut Grove and marina density, here it's nowhere near the same as to what we are talking about up here in Sacramento. With this project there would be a hundred and ten berths in this community. So there's approximately 70 now.

And this project was reduced from 45 down to 39 as a mitigation effort, early on, when the concerns were raised, some concerns were raised.

Now, let's talk a minute about the project. I have got some pictures here to show you in relationship to the vicinity.

But first of all, it's not a full service marina. We will be providing a pump-out as required by
the Coast Guard, but there is no refueling, there is no
large public guest dock, there is no launching ramp, there
is no Harbor Master's office. It's a storage marina,
which means that the amount of activity in and out of it
is considerably less than what it would be if it was a
fully used marina.

In fact, it's considerably less than the public
guest dock that is across the river, immediately across
the river from this project, which provides for commercial
access to that side of the river.

So remember, this is a private marina. It is
not a public parking garage. You will not have 30 boats
going in and out all day long. And it's my
understanding, from working in this field for as long as I
have, that on a peak holiday weekend like the Fourth of
July or Memorial Day, the maximum you might expect is 30
percent use, ten boats out of a 30-boat marina.

And we do have someone here that operates a
large marina, or is going to be here, operates a large
marina in Walnut Grove that can really verify what kind of
traffic you get out of the storage marina.

This brings us to the issue, I think, that has
been presented to you, and that issue is, will this marina
significantly interfere with the existing fishing use of
this area?
Now, it is my understanding that what we are
talking about here is the boat traffic associated with the
marina, not the dock itself. But the physical location of
the dock at that site is not the problem. But it's about
boat traffic and it's about impacting trolling for
stripers. At least that's where this thing started. And
there has never been any data produced showing that this
project will have a significant impact.

Now, when this issue first came up, and it's
true as Mr. Trout indicated, it came up a long time ago, I
sought the advice of someone knowledgeable and experienced
in fishing activities in the Delta and had them take a
look at it, and they concluded that they felt that this
project would not be detrimental to striped bass fishing.

And in fact that individual, Mr. Bruns, is here
to further amplify on that. And it was based on that, I
think a great deal, that information, that helped
Sacramento County, the Reclamation Board, the Corps of
Engineers, conclude that this project would not have a
significant impact on the fishing activities in the area.

And I also have someone here who has got 23
years of experience in working for the Department of Fish
and Game as a warden and who has watched that area for
longer than that, that can also give you his own
observations. We have some long-time personal residents
of the area who can also give you their observations, which is what I was coming from when we first got on this project, because I have watched that area myself for 21 years.

So, in summary, I think this project represents a good faith effort to work within good planning guidelines and government regulations to provide some alternative income to a farming family, because the owners of the property on the upland are the ones that are proposing this project. It provides for the needs of an important recreational resource and industry in the Delta and it does meet the need for diversification of industry within our Delta and to help the community.

It is a project that is compatible with its surroundings. As I indicated, it has been reduced to mitigate the concerns, so we have made every effort to bring this project in line and we have worked diligently on it. And it has taken a long time.

Part of the reason it took a long time is because we went back and redesigned it and reduced it. I do not believe it will significantly affect recreational fishing in the Walnut Grove area, and just to give you a little indication of what, based on the information that I have been able to gather, this is the project as it is proposed.
(Thereupon maps were shown to the Commissioners.)

MR. LABRIE: North is up. This is the Sacramento River. This is Georgiana splitting off here. This is commercial along here and this is zoned commercial and has been for a long time. This is a good riparian growth that is along the riverbank and one of the stipulations that all along was that any project in this waterway, but what we were doing is we were not impacting that riparian growth. So it's also not a very good site for fishing, bank fishing, because it is a very rich riparian growth. There is no way you can fish from that bank.

The bulk of the fishing, as I understand it, and other people can talk about it, and as I have seen it, occurs down here at the mouth of Georgiana and downstream of this project, on downstream.

There is a sandbar, and in the packet that I gave you there are different profiles, and there is a sandbar that begins to start down here and goes out down here, which, as I understand it, is a better place for striped bass trolling. It's deep out here. This is 30 feet deep and then it drops down fast to this channel depth and that shows up in what I gave you.

And also you will note, just of interest, this
picture was taken in June, the 24th, just a couple of years ago, and there is some boating activity in June.

This picture over here illustrates this project in relationship to the rest of the Delta, the Walnut Grove area. Again, here is the project downstream of the Walnut Grove bridge, and the speed and wake control zone comes all the way down into the Sacramento, down Georgiana to this location here, where Thornton Road takes off, and goes all the way up north of the Boat House Marina. This is the Boat House Marina, 59 slips, Landing 63 with 13 slips, the Deck Hands with approximately 8 slips, which is 1100 feet north of this project, and here is the Boondocks commercial guest dock.

So those are the facilities that are in this reach of the river, and I worked and was involved in all but this one over the years.

That's all I have. We have other people here to give you their position on it. I hope you will see your way clear to granting my clients a lease on this project.

MR. VOLLMAN: Good afternoon. My name is Dennis Vollman. I am associated with the owners of the property. I'd like to sort of expand upon Mr. LaBrie's comments for a moment.

We have been in the process of seeking the approval of this project for something better than five
years. We have gone diligently through all of the
different departments and received approvals from every
single one of them, including State Lands. For your
refreshment, on September 26th, we were Consent Item
Number 23 on the agenda.

As it turns out, the afternoon before, about
3:00 o'clock on the 25th, and I may have the dates wrong a
day or so, the point is really that Fish and Game
recognized that the project was again ready for approval
and ready to go final, and they sent a telefax to State
Lands stating something to the effect that the winter run
of the Chinook Salmon had been designated an endangered
item and that they requested strongly that this item be
pulled from the agenda. Properly, it was.

It took some time for us to get responses,
however, after working with State Lands, and Mr. LaBrie.
We did get a request of jeopardy or no jeopardy and
finally we got that request back from Fish and Game, and
son of a gun, no jeopardy.

During this time period, our Corps of Engineers
permit expired, so we sought an extension, and since we
had previously extended, that was not available to us. So
we resubmitted. Fish and Game again came up and said that
they feel that this will impact the trolling for the
striped bass. The Corps of Engineers again said, "Gee, we
think that is probably a conflicting use and go ahead and
build your marina."

I don't have a problem with the Fish and Game
folk. I understand the need to conserve. But I think it
is a relative need.

Our family has been in this property for over a
hundred years. We don't have the alternative of finding
another site. We own this one and it has been a struggle
to keep it. You may know that agricultural has not been a
substantially productive and profitable business in the
last 20 years. We are working very hard to try and
maintain this holding for the family. We intend to try
and do so for as long as we have to.

We have been fortunate to have local people who
have been in the community for several decades be willing
to come and testify to their visual experiences regarding
the amount of trolling being done in front of this
property in the follow of the bridge that goes across the
river.

As an aside, and I am not suggesting anything
other than just a comment, if the Fish and Game people are
supposed to have a right of disapproval, then they should
be in the disapproval process. It seems that had we known
in 1985 or 1986 that Fish and Game would disapprove the
project and that the approving authority, the Corps of
Engineers, would not, in fact, act over their heads, then we probably would have saved ourselves several thousand dollars and several years of time and effort. And if those folks that deem that the checklists are made out and the approving authorities are designated, are listening, then they maybe ought to look at this.

I am followed by at least two or three other individuals.

Are there any questions for me?

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: No, and we appreciate what you have said and the previous witness. If you have other witnesses, if they have something specifically new to add, we'd be happy to hear from them. Otherwise we would like to hear from the other side.

MR. VOLLMAN: I think that each of the three people that are here to testify are here to testify directly to their experience with regard to the amount of trolling and probably would not take more than a minute or two each.

ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Is there somebody that can address the issue of need?

MR. VOLLMAN: Mr. LaBrie may be able to address the issue of need. You mean in the relative number of slips?

ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Yes.
MR. VOLLMAN: Mr. Schmiedeh is the operator of the upstream marina at the Boat House. Mr. Schmiedeh probably is more attuned with the number of people that are on his waiting list than anyone else.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Mr. Vollman, let me suggest that if the witnesses that want to give some testimony on whether it is good fishing where you want to build your marina is the case or not, why don't they just indicate their names and we will accept their names as testifying to that point and consider it cumulative. I think the Commission will have some questions on some other points, and after the proponent has finished, we do want to hear from the Fish and Game side of this so we can start to weigh in our minds what we have been hearing here.

You will have a crack at this if you want to bat cleanup at the end of it or Mr. LaBrie, for your side.

MR. VOLLMAN: Okay, great. Thank you.

Those people who are testifying, announce your names, please.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Do you want to give us your names, please, and we will put it in the record?

Yes, sir?

MR. SLAWSON: My name is Bill Slawson. I am a retired Fish and Game Warden with 40 years' duty. I'd like to testify.
CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Is that S-l-a-w-s-o-n?

MR. SLAWSON: S-l-a-w-s-o-n.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Okay.

Mr. Slawson, was your testimony to the point of whether it is good fishing at this point in the river or not?

MR. SLAWSON: I would just testify to the fact that this would have no effect on the fishermen in the Delta and will not hurt it.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Okay. All right. With your permission, we will put that in the record as your statement.

MR. SLAWSON: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: All right.

Other witnesses on this point?

Yes, sir.

MR. WILCOX: Mark Wilcox --

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: W-i-l-c-o-x?

MR. WILCOX: Correct.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: All right.

MR. WILCOX: I am a farmer in the area. I farm adjacent parcels to the project. And I have witnessed for the last 20 years, because that is where I have been farming, that to say that there is any significance at all to trolling where this marina is, I mean I don't see it
and I go by there every day.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Do you fish there?

MR. WILCOX: No, I don't. I farm in that area right adjacent to that. I have three parcels that I farm right adjacent --

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: And you are saying you don't see others fishing there?

MR. WILCOX: Right, I don't see other people fishing.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: All right.

Thank you.

Any others?

Yes, sir.

MR. BRUNS: George Bruns, B-r-u-n-s.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Yes, sir.

MR. BRUNS: And I was asked to write a written report a few years back on this project. I believe you have that.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: All right. And your testimony is on the same point, Mr. Bruns?

MR. BRUNS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: That this is not a particularly exciting fishing area?

MR. BRUNS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Especially for those of us
that may need it more than others?

MR. BRUNS: Right. It doesn't offer a lot in that particular area.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: It will be so noted in the record.

MR. BRUNS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Now may we hear from the other side?

MR. CLARK: Yes, sir. My name is Wally Clark.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Is this is on the proponent's side?

MR. CLARK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: All right. Would you identify yourself?

MR. CLARK: My name is Wally Clark.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: First name?

MR. CLARK: Wally.

The last name is Clark.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: W-a-l-l-y?

MR. CLARK: W-a-l-l-y. Clark, C-l-a-r-k.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Oh, all right.

MR. CLARK: And I'd like to speak on behalf of my mother who is one of the owners of the property, and I will speak after Fish and Game, if it's all right.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: No. If you would come up
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now, sir? We are hearing from the proponents first.

MR. CLARK: I always like to see what can be shot at.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: We all like that last punch. If you hear something that is really outrageous, then we will give you a chance to refire. Why don't you give us your testimony now?

MR. CLARK: I am speaking on behalf of my mom who is back there is a wheelchair. And she grew up down in the Delta. She is one of the third generation owners of the property.

My cousin and family is fourth generation. I will be fourth generation. This gentleman asked about need. I think need can be defined in two separate things. One, we have a need as a family to make income to keep our property. We have had it a long time. We want to keep it. We want to keep paying taxes, hiring people, keep people employed, have people like Marx Wilcox be able to farm the land there and not turn it into something else. So there is a need.

A need is in ourselves, being good Californians, being good business people. We'd like to use our property for something we deem responsible and fitting the guidelines with which the County has decided it should be used down there.
Now, whether or not X number of boats have or do not have berths in Sacramento, I couldn’t give you a count, but I think anybody that would ever go to any one of the boat docks anywhere in the County on a Saturday afternoon and have to wait in line to try to get their boat in the water, would surely agree that there is a need for a marina. I think it’s an economic need.

Other than that, thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Clark.

Anyone else on the proponent’s side of this issue?

May we hear from the opposition, please?

MR. MENSCH: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. I am Jerry Mensch with the Department of Fish and Game, M-e-n-s-c-h, 1701 Nimbus Road, Rancho Cordova.

The Department of Fish and Game has long been involved in Delta planning and protection. We have been involved in the various versions of the Delta Recreation Master Plan, involved in planning for providing for both recreational use, boating use and resource protection.

None of these plans anticipated that every area within the Delta would be appropriate or usable for any particular use, and that identified that areas within certain designations had a higher opportunity for use.
while other areas were going to be specifically precluded.

Our position is that this will, in fact,

interfere with the recreational use of the area. We grant

that it is not the highest value on the very specific

site. The trolling occurs throughout this area. There

are marinas across the river or docking facilities and

marinas upstream which currently restrict certain uses.

The capability to troll or turn through this type of an

area, when boats are anchored fishing at the mouth of

Georgiana and at the center of the Slough, causes

additional interference.

At times of the year the area currently becomes

pretty much, if you want to say, restricted by anchored

boats and the current level of use.

I also believe that there are alternatives to

this location and alternative methods of providing such

facilities for boating storage, and they can be placed in

areas where they will not interfere with the established

recreational use.

That's basically all we have for our position on

it. We have some of our people, one of our people, that

can testify on the specifics if you would like.

Otherwise, we would be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Let me see if I can

understand. Fish and Games' is an overall Delta approach,
that you don't think motor driven boats are an appropriate use too frequently in the general sense and specifically at this point.

MR. MENSCH: No, I don't think we are talking about any particular kind of boat. What we are saying is, as you are well aware, the Commission approves many types of marinas and many marinas within the Delta. The Department of Fish and Game does not object to -- well, I am not sure of the exact number, but within the last ten years as far as I have been involved in this area, I think we have objected to two marinas. Most of them we have no objection. There are no interferences with the established recreation use or protecti: of habitat.

In this case, we believe there is. The specific recommendations are not because of motor-driven or non-motor-driven boats.

Maybe, if I could just use the applicant's charts --

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Yes, if they don't mind.

MR. MENSCH: What happens is the trolling occurs primarily in an upstream, downstream and the main portion of the Sacramento, boating coming up, generally turning within this area, and going back down. When there are boats anchored, which they do, within these holes or the deeper water areas that were alluded to, boats will
anchor.

The only way that trolling can occur is if it either stops here or it has to troll closer to the shoreline. This shoreline is obstructed. There is boat use. The bridge basically calls for turning in this area. This, in our opinion, will interfere with the continuation of that use and basically require that trolling stop somewhere further downstream.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: So it's not that there is a lot of fish in this specific point where the marina would be, you are saying, it's the whole traffic pattern that would be interfered with?

MR. MENSCH: That's correct. As indicated, we recognize probably there are some better areas on some of the shoals downstream. However, you can't just stop at the good part when you are trolling. It takes a period or it takes a space to operate your boat and turn within that area.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Now, the points that you say would make suitable locations for berth areas, are any of those property owners interested? Have they applied to develop their areas?

MR. MENSCH: Well, we review such proposals all the time. I know there has been some upstream that we have reviewed within the last couple of months. Maybe not
this specific site, but --

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Well, I don't mean this
specific site. Is there anything proximate to this that
would meet the convenience of people who find themselves
in this general area for fishing?

MR. MENSCH: I couldn't speak to the specifics
on it. I believe it is a number of miles, maybe two or
three miles upstream. That would be my best estimate on
the very most recent proposal, and it was a renewal of a
State Lands lease that we concurred in with no impacts.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: I am puzzled by one thing,
shifting gears now to a different point.

MR. MENSCH: Okay.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: There was a Negative
Declaration issued on this --

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: -- proposed development. I
don't remember any objection coming from Fish and Game
when that was issued.

MR. MENSCH: Fish and Game, going back to 1985,
has consistently recommended against the project on the
very same basis.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: It must have been just an
administrative oversight or something?

MR. MENSCH: Yes. Understand, we see hundreds
of them. If we missed one, that is something that has happened, although I believe our comments and our opposition has been on record throughout that period.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Always on the same basis.

MR. MENSCH: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Any questions of the Members of the Commission?

ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Do you have any opinion as to what the need in this particular area is for a marina, an additional marina?

MR. MENSCH: No. That's out of our area of expertise. We restrict our comments and our knowledge and information is basically restricted to fish and wildlife resources.

ACTING COMMISSIONER STANCELL: Excuse me. Do you have any data that would indicate how many boats on an average day would be trolling in that area?

MR. MENSCH: No, we don't. However, we do have Captain Jim Dixon, who was in charge of wildlife protection for the entire Delta for approximately 15 years, and who lives in Walnut Grove, is here and may be able to answer some of those specifics. He is intimately familiar with the area.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Okay.

MR. MENSCH: Jim, would you come up, please?
Identify yourself, please.

MR. DIXON: My name is James Dixon. I am with the Fish and Game --

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: Is that spelled D-i-x-o-n?

MR. DIXON: Yes. My name is James Dixon. I am with the Fish and Game Department. I have lived in Walnut Grove since 1973.

I do not have a daily count of the number of boats that fish in that area but I think we were commenting, too, when I was asked to comment on it, is the area used by sport anglers? And the area is used. And there may be better areas upstream and downstream, but this will impact the fishing in that particular area simply because of the restriction in the area where the marina is going to be built.

There is an existing dock across the river. The Walnut Grove bridge restricts it for access upstream of it, but it is an area that is used spring and fall by sport anglers, and the construction of the marina, in our opinion, will restrict that fishing effort.

ACTING COMMISSIONER STANCELL: So when the first marina went in, which is across the river from what is being proposed, you folks reviewed that marina?

MR. DIXON: That marina was in existence when I moved into Walnut Grove, and perhaps Mr. Mensch can
respond to that. I have no idea what was reviewed back then.

ACTING COMMISSIONER STANCELL: Were there any complaints about that marina and how it impacted the recreational use of that area?

MR. MENSCH: No. Again, that was in there long before I came on the scene, working for the Department in this area. I think --

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: That was installed before there was a Fish and Game Department.

(Laughter.)

MR. MENSCH: Well, not quite that long ago. However, it was before we were involved in many of the project review activities that we are now.

The other thing that we are seeing here, again, is that we are seeing cumulative impacts. Obviously, the first one has little impact, but as you get more and more within an area, you get to a point where it starts a significant restriction.

Again, there are many areas in the Delta where marinas are still appropriate without any conflicts with fish and wildlife resources. We have no objections to them. We have no objections to marinas, per se. We do see conflicts within this particular area.

ACTING COMMISSIONER STANCELL: So it doesn't
matter how many berths are involved. If it's one berth, it's still, in your opinion, interfering?

MR. MENSCH: Well, if you had one, the cumulative impact, well, we probably wouldn't hassle one, but when you start getting a commercial marina where you are going to have a significant number of boats, and 30 or 40 boats, it starts getting significant within the area.

At some point, and I couldn't say whether it is two or 29 or something, somewhere in there, it gets to the point where it does. And probably if you were at other than just a couple, it really would interfere, and if you had those small boats tied up close to the dock or close to the shore.

ACTING COMMISSIONER STANCELL: Well, one of the points that was made by Mr. LaBrie, I think it was, indicated that this is a storage area and that only ten percent of the boats would probably be used at one time and was it ten percent or 30 percent of the boats?

CHIEF COUNSEL HIGHT: Thirty.

ACTING COMMISSIONER STANCELL: Thirty percent of the boats. Does that at all have any difference?

MR. MENSCH: Well, that has something in it there is already significant boat use at times of the year. During the time that the striped bass, when the population of the striped bass were better, and which we
hope to have better in the future again, restore them, you would find it difficult to troll through some of this area because of the number of boats trolling. There are days, and I personally have seen that, where it was difficult to navigate a boat through the area.

So it's all, again, part of the total package. The boats being there, extending out into the waterway, reduces that available area, the movement of boats. It's not one or the other, it's a combination of the marina and the boat use that will occur with it.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Do we have any standards of any kind against which we lay applications like this as to when they are permissible and when they are not? If this river were 30 feet or 40 feet wider at this point, is that something we consider to make a difference? How do we judge these things. Is it ad hoc with each situation?

MR. MENSCH: That is correct. The way it is now, and getting back to the seventies, I personally worked on one version of the Delta Recreation Master Plan. That was the idea, to try to provide some width criteria, some fish and wildlife habitat criteria and some development criteria. That type of a plan on a delta-wide basis is an absolute necessity. More and more conflicts of this type will be coming forth as there is more and more demand for limited resources.
I believe that the Commission staff is currently working on types of plans. We have met and discussed with them.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: That's what they tell us.

MR. MENSCH: And I would sure urge that that type of planning activity is absolutely necessary.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: So, if an applicant like this came forward, at least you'd know what the rules were and whether or not they could visit this.

Really, there is something rankling here. I am sympathetic to Fish and Game's view not to interfere with one of the nicest uses, Delta fishing. And on the other hand, we don't seem to have a set of rules here that we are operating within. The fact that these folks have gone through this for five years now has taken up an awful of time, I would say, and probably cost the taxpayers and the people working for State Government. There is something the matter with that.

MR. MENSCH: That is correct. And I agree with that. The one thing, again, I would like to reiterate is that the Department has made its position known and the applicant has known or been aware of that position, and that is of opposition, since early on in the planning stages of the project, and has made that choice to proceed in the light of that known opposition.
CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: You know the Corps of Engineers is not with you on this one, huh?

MR. MENSCH: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Aren't they pretty tough on this same subject, fishing?

MR. MENSCH: Well --

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Recreational uses?

MR. MENSCH: I'd like to leave the Corps to speak for themselves.

(Laughter.)

MR. MENSCH: They support us on many where we have the same issues, and on others they don't.

ACTING COMMISSIONER STANCELL: Well, what is the county's interest since they seem to be in agreement with the plan?

MR. MENSCH: The County, I think, may be more concerned, and maybe I should let them speak for themselves. They are, again, not in the fish and wildlife resource protection field.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: On the other hand, they just entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the State Lands Commission to try to assemble parcels of land along the Sacramento River stretching for 31 miles.

MR. MENSCH: That is correct. And Sacramento County is --
CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: The River Parkway System.

MR. MENSCH: Sacramento County is also very involved with the Department and other agencies, and I believe with State Lands, at Beach Lakes, Stone Lakes Reserve.

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: When are we possibly going to have that set of rules? This is only one aspect, I know, of an overall plan --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: On the Delta?

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: Yes.

August 15th?

(Laughter.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: I am sorry.

MR. MENSCH: What year might be the question.

ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Well, we have done the river study for part of the river and I think that the difficulty is that you can't -- it's hard to come up with a rule that says, okay, if you do the following four things, it will be approved, because, as Fish and Game indicates, you are talking about a cumulative impact and deciding when that last layer is added that makes the whole thing too heavy, I think, is difficult to judge in this matter.

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: Well, I think that's a good point you are raising, Commissioner Tucker, but I haven't
heard from the Fish and Game folks that they think that
that is a major consideration here, too much, is it?
It's sort of the cumulative effect is kind of tossed in
there.

MR. MENSCH: Well, again, if this project or if
a project of this size was proposed upstream of the
bridge, we wouldn't be here. The same uses don't occur in
the upstream area. This size in the upstream area would
have no impact. In the downstream area --

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: I guess what I am aiming at
here is that Commissioner Stancell asked about that little
dock across the river. You didn't raise in your
affirmative testimony a concern about the cumulative
impact of at least this part of the river, that's all. I
just trying to fish around here and find out about
this.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: So to speak.

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: At least to find out what
your main points are.

ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: In the
environmental study that was done back in 1987, the
environmental study that was done, Fish and Game
indicated, according to this document, that exactly what
he testified to here, that it isn't the impact on the fish
in that area, but it's the impact on the boat traffic that
they were concerned about.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Well, I think that that's a clear point that they have made.

MR. MENSCH: Yes, that's basically it. There are appropriate areas, and at this time, in our opinion, this is not an appropriate place.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Well, is there any reasonable guess as to when we can have a set of rules, so that if we don't go with these applicants, that they won't have to wait five years to get an answer based on some reasonable set of guidelines?

I agree with Commissioner Tucker, you can't predict ahead of time some nice clean set of rules to judge every one of these applications, but we ought to have some clearer guidelines than we have right now.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: We did have the marina capacity study for the 31-mile stretch of the Sacramento River, which is now the stretch involved in the Riparian Parkway planning. Looking ahead, that is the only marina capacity. We have no plans. We are not engaged in a specific planning process for marina capacity outside that area and specifically in the Delta.

To deal with that subject in the Delta, we anticipate will require a Delta planning process which the Commission may well consider sponsoring, together with the
other agencies. And this is a long way of saying that I
cannot give you a specific estimate of when, for the Delta
as a whole, capacity studies will be available.

I think that I have to be somewhat -- well, I
just cannot give you with any degree of precision at all.
I would say it is probably two to four to five years away.

But I think that these are, as Fish and Game
indicates, we are taking a very essential first step, and
as you undoubtedly fully appreciate, there are political
sensitivities involved in such an approach because they
have been attempted in the past unsuccessfully. And we
would like to take advantage of the errors of the past and
perhaps improve our chances of success in this instance.
But it will be tricky and difficult, but worth doing.

MR. MENSCH: Mr. Chairman, I might make a
comment on that. It is also that such uses as the boating
use become very intertwined with other programs such as
the levee subvention program and the special flood control
projects programs, which provide for fish and wildlife
protection and levee protection. All of these programs
have to be tied together, and I think that's what Mr.
Warren was alluding to.

It's a very complex situation, and just to say
what kind of allocations for boating or for marina needs,
without taking into consideration these other programs and
the other activities, the need for local flood control, all of those have to be integrated into a planning program. It's a fairly large planning program, but one that is extremely in need for long-term protection and use of the Delta.

And that's not speaking for the Department, and a little off to the side here just from having worked in the Delta working on and being in charge of the Fish and Game portion of the levee subvention program. It is extremely complex, especially in light of the water use and water diversion in the Delta as well.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: You testified that there are several other places nearby that would be more appropriate places for such berths. Do you have those identified by the Department?

MR. MENSCH: Well, areas where the Department -- as a hypothetical example, the Department would not object to a marina being constructed on either side of the river upstream of this location, say, within, to the best of my knowledge, a mile on either side upstream. On the left bank or the east bank is the Delta Cross Canal, but within those areas, the use is very different. It doesn't receive the kind of trolling use. It uses anchored boat use to the best of my knowledge, but it's just not the same kind of use. And so a project of this type wouldn't
interfere within that area. It's just very specific locations.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Okay.

So one final question for me. There were a double row of berths, as I looked at the applicant's map, right? There are two rows of berths?

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: One row.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: One row?

What was the intrusion into the river, how many feet?

MR. LaBRIE: Sixty feet. About sixty feet, total.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: What is the width of the river at that point?

MR. LaBRIE: It varies from 450 to 480.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Okay. Any other questions of Commissioners?

ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Yes. I wanted to ask, on the vegetation that is on the shore bank that was referred to earlier, does it really have any impact on the fish use of that vegetation?

MR. Mensch: No, it won’t have any impact on the fishery's use. However, well -- I take that back. Under any marina, you always have in the boat storage area, you have the potential for accidental fuel spills. There
could be some kind of an effect under an accidental circumstance. Fishery's impacts related to the habitat are basically that of an accidental type nature.

There could be some disturbance factors on the wildlife use in the area. Obviously there are certain types of bird use that are the primary species of concern that could be impacted, could be reduced, depending, again, on the type of boating use. If the people are out there at midnight having parties on their boat, yes, there is going to be some disturbance factors maybe for the neighbors. However, there could be some and probably would be some level of impact to the wildlife species.

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: Okay. Let me understand the partnership arrangement here again. It's the landowner, that's Ms. Clark and her son Wally, all right, and then Mr. Vollman --

MR. VOLLMAN: Mrs. Clark's maiden name is Vollman and she is my father's sister. It's been in the Vollman name for a long time.

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: So this is a proposal by the owners of this land period.

MR. VOLLMAN: No outside parties.

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: Okay. That shoots what I was going to propose. I was hoping you folks might be interested in looking at some of the upstream locations
MR. VOLLMAN: I think Mr. LaBrie and myself would have just a brief thing to say in rebuttal to Mr. Mensch.

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: All right. Take your shot.

MR. VOLLMAN: A lot of the conversation that we witnessed has to do with future plans and future rules and regulations, and they are clearly in need. And I would do whatever I could to assist in the development of those.

There might be a couple of items that the Commission may not be intimately aware of. Items that would possibly be more acceptable to Fish and Game that are upstream also are not zoned commercial, do not have utilities or access to them to be able to provide services, and the power that is required to run the pump house, do not have areas to park on and, in fact, aren't within the zoned property for the County of Sacramento.

So, I mean, there is a number of reasons why we selected this. It's not just the fact that it's ours. If it wasn't zoned properly, we wouldn't be messing with it. We can't afford to go through a rezoning action.

Consequently, or along that same thought process, those folks that are upstream but are in the same agricultural boat as we are, probably are not going to go through the zoning action to try and get their property rezoned from Ag-80 or Ag-160, permanent agriculture, to
some kind of commercial zoning to allow a marina on it.

The facts that have been brought up about
trolling are very interesting, and, of course, it is very
fortunate that we have the photographs because we can
really get a good handle on how large this is. This is a
rather large boat that is here in the middle of the river.
This is the marina, as big as it would ever be. This is
the existing boat dock and two other boats that are parked
at it, and this is the time of year when this heavy
trolling is going on.

I mean, we have several people that have been
here for a long time. I am nearly 50 and I have fished
down there since I was knee-high to whatever. And I have
seen some boats trolling down there but I have never seen
it congested, ever, in this area.

There are a couple of really good reasons. This
time of year, when we do have water, the high water brings
down a lot of garbage, trees and tree trunks, and they
catch on these pilings and fenders from the bridge. There
is also a fire dock that would be attached to that that
has been there for about sixty years that collects odds
and ends also.

One of the reasons that I wouldn't park my boat
out here and try to troll is because this stuff breaks
loose from time to time, and if you have a fishing boat
that is maybe ten or fifteen feet long, and you are
watching the pole out of the back of the boat, and you
have a twelve to fifteen-foot log hit you, it could be a
little bit of a surprise.

But this boat ought to give you a relative
significance of how much impact that these, sitting here
and parked in the way, might actually have a little bit of
confusion with the trolling if there was a lot of
trolling. And everybody that has testified, has testified
that the best fishing is down this way and down in
Georgiana. I think that anyone that is here would
probably agree to that.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Is that it?

MR. VOLLMAN: I think it is, except thank you
for the time. We do hope that you will have a favorable
thought for us, and Mr. LaBrie has a short word, and I do
heartily endorse future guidelines. They should be
consistent with the zoning documents of the County.

MR. LaBRIE: Mr. Chairman --

MR. VOLLMAN: Take a seat up front.

MR. LaBRIE: Oh, I'm sorry.

I wanted to address a couple of things.

Alternate locations, I think, is one of them, because one
of the reasons why I took great pains and I took your time
to explain to you on how much involvement I have had in
planning in the Delta is because I have watched that over the years.

I was involved in the Sacramento County planning effort to set up the Delta Community Plan. I am Chairman of the Delta Advisory Council and have been since 1977. And we were charged with coming up with that community plan which covers from Freeport all the way down to Antioch, just about to Antioch.

So we looked at the Delta and all of that area in terms of all kinds of uses and in terms of developmental uses and potentials as part of that planning effort. And I have been involved with a number of projects down there. I have people calling me, not recently, but from time to time, asking about locations. And there aren't many locations. There just are not.

Now, the upstream of the Walnut Grove Bridge on the east side, which is the community of East Walnut Grove, which they call East Walnut Grove, there is a dock permitted for there. It is a 750-foot-long community guest dock. I got the permits for that because the community homeowners' association, which is the homeowners' and merchants' association, which is the property owners, could not get a funding source to put in that community guest dock there, and I think the permits are going to start lapsing if they haven't lapsed pretty
soon. And they began discussions with Commission staff but never concluded it.

There is no landside parking to support a marina, if you were to put a berthing marina there. There isn't the landside parking. In fact, one of the conditions of the use permit that Sacramento County imposed on it when they granted the use permit for this project, which was basically County sponsored, the condition was that there be no overnight berthing. And it has to do with that parking limitation plus they agreed with the fact that there probably is a need for commercial access to the community from that kind of a dock similar to what is downstream to facilitate the growth of the commercial area in that community.

On the opposite side, you have got two marinas where you could have them. One of them is an existing, Number 63, is existing. It was upgraded. The other one, which is called Deck Hands, I got permits for a number of years ago. It is as big as it can be because of, again, parking and availability of parking, and the fact that between there and downstream to the bridge is residential, and upstream of that is residential.

So it takes a hand-in-hand situation to, in terms of zoning, to make these things work.

The last project I worked on upstream at
Courtland on the Steamboat Slough, where the owner of that property, who has provided her property so generously for people to tie up to for years and years with sailboats and everything else in that beautiful slough, wanted to put in a marina to, in effect, control what was going on out there, and the problem she ran into was that the property on the other side of the levee is zoned agricultural. And she had to seek a rezone to provide parking, so she couldn't do it.

So the provision of services, access and parking becomes a very important factor of controlling where you can put these marinas, and rightly so.

So in terms of alternate locations, there aren't that many alternate locations in Walnut Grove readily available, and what you have got is probably a marina going in in one of the last locations in Walnut Grove that is zoned and set up to allow that kind of thing to happen, and was done back in 1983. So, I mean, it's going in at a location that was set up to facilitate it.

You can see what we have got here. The issue is differing opinions about the impact at this particular project that that location is going to have on fishing use in the area, and that's what it is. It is a difference of opinion. We have got people here, some of whom didn't really spell it out in long terms, who have watched it,
who disagree with Mr. Mensch. And it is because there are others who disagreed in other agencies that this project got approved with all those others, because, you know, that's the nature of things, that it is compromised and everybody doesn't always get satisfied or everybody doesn't always win.

And he voiced his objections. It was reviewed and it was determined that it was not a significant impact.

And I think that's a key. I mean that's a key word, how significant is that impact? So it went through the process.

Lastly, I agree with the guidelines. I mean, I have been in this process for years. There is a bad need for guidelines. I told Dwight Sanders that. He and I used to work in the Analyst's Office together years ago.

One of the things that bothers me is that State Lands in the lease is the end of the process. You ask for and you insist upon seeing all the other approvals before it gets to you. We need some guidelines to know going into this thing.

I mean I think the State Lands ought to be the beginning of the process, become the lead agency, get on the cutting edge of it. If that's how you want to approach this thing, then you don't have this. Because I
think we have been through a fair process of give and take, over all of these years to come up with something that was a compromise.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Thank you.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: Mr. Chairman, reluctantly staff has to admit that we have presented you with the need to act today because, under the Permit Streamlining Act, the Commission must act by the 16th of April. It seems to me that the Commission basically has two options.

If you believe that the project would significantly interfere with fishing and agree with the Department of Fish and Game, the Commission should approve the staff recommendation.

If you believe that it will not significantly interfere with fishing, then you need to either deny the application without prejudice, with the understanding that we would negotiate a lease and guarantee that this would be back on calendar for the May 1st meeting, or, if the applicant would prefer not to have a denial, then we would suggest that the applicant on the record withdraw the project this afternoon, we would consider it resubmitted this afternoon, and again come back to you with a lease ready for approval at the May 1st meeting.
But the Commission must take either some action to deny or we must have a withdrawal from the applicant so that we can move forward, because we have not negotiated and you do not have before you the terms of a lease that would fit this location, although I guarantee that we can do that by the May 1st meeting.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Does the applicant understand the options?

MR. VOLLMAN: I understand the options. There have been one or two items that have taken place in the recent past, and now there is a $10,000 reapplication fee which we would certainly not want to have to bear.

(Laughter.)

MR. VOLLMAN: And in fact the lease has been negotiated, is accepted and is in --

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: We need the income.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: We are $9 billion -- no, that's close but we just got a new press statement from the Department of Finance, we are $18 billion in the hole.

ACTING COMMISSIONER STANCELL: $18 billion.

(Laughter.)

ACTING COMMISSIONER STANCELL: Let the record show that that's not true.

(Laughter.)
ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: We would be interested in selling you the whole river, though. (Laughter..)

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Do you understand the options just laid out by Mr. Trout?

MR. VOLLMAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Let's assume that you don't have to pay another $10,000 fee.

MR. VOLLMAN: Let me restate them to ensure, in fact, that I do understand them. If I understand what is said, if I understand what I heard, it is that the options are to deny, to deny without prejudice, which would allow us to come back at a later date, or we could withdraw and be guaranteed, I guess, for lack of another word, that we would not have to suffer the new application fee and that we would be able to present a lease on the May 1st meeting. Is that it?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: That's assuming we can negotiate a lease by then.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: Yes, we are assuming that we can negotiate a lease, and my understanding from talking to Mr. Kiley, is that we were very close to summary on the lease as we tried to work out the differences with the Department of Fish and Game. We'd like the opportunity to make sure that that is in
final form and bring it back to you.

The option, then, would be to deny without prejudice, and that takes care of the Permit Streamlining Act requirements. The other option is not to have a denial but have the applicant withdraw and consider it immediately resubmitted, and again come back to you with a negotiated lease on the May 1st meeting.

MR. VOLLMAN: We would like to withdraw and be immediately resubmitted and come back for the lease on May 1.

CHAIRMAN McCarthy: Is that agreeable to the Members of the Committee?

ACTING COMMISSIONER STANCELL: That is fine.

CHAIRMAN McCarthy: Mr. Tucker.

ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Could I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN McCarthy: Mr. Tucker.

ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: One thing is that I am not sure that I agree with the, if I understand it correctly, with the characterization issue by Mr. Trout. I didn’t think that we had to make a finding that there would be significant negative impact on the river to deny a lease.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: I misspoke, if that’s the interpretation you had.
ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: It seems to me that what we need to focus on, and I'll certainly be looking to the staff for its recommendation on this, is whether or not it's in the public interest to lease public property. And that's what, I think, we have to return the focus to is that. And I am sympathetic to the landowners here, but these are adjacent landowners. They are adjacent to State property. They don't have a right to conduct business on State property.

That doesn't mean that, you know, it may be a good idea, and if the staff comes up with a recommendation, I would certainly be interested in hearing what the reasons are that staff feels that we should conduct this lease, but I think it should be clear that they are not entitled to this simply because they live next door to public property to conduct business on that public property.

And I think our obligation is to make a decision as to whether or not this is the best use of public property. And we will look to the staff for their recommendation as to whether or not this property should be leased for this or any purpose.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: I think that fairly states the attitude of staff towards matters of this kind.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Okay. That will be the
action of the Commission.

Twenty-six.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: Item 26 is
the approval of a ten-year General Lease for water wells
and rights of way on 640 acres of school land in eastern
San Bernardino County.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Anybody want to testify on
Item 26?

If not, the staff recommendation is approved.

Twenty-seven.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Item 27, Mr. Chairman
and Members, is the approval requiring collateral access
from the California Coastal Commission.

Peter Douglas, who is the Executive Director of
the California Coastal Commission, is here and would like
to address the Commission for a short period of time
inasmuch as this will be the first of many such
acquisitions.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Okay.

MR. DOUGLAS: Mr. Chairman and Members of the
Commission, on behalf of the California Coastal Commission
I would like to express our deepest appreciation to your
staff in working with us to reach this point. We strongly
support the staff recommendation that is before you today.
We believe that approval of this recommendation will
represent a significant step forward toward increasing
public access opportunities along the California coast.

I am here to answer any questions you may have.

I think I believe you have a staff report before you and,
again, Mr. Chairman, we strongly support the staff
recommendation.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Any questions by Members of
the Commission?

ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Will this get the
Sacramento Bee off your back?

(Laughter.)

MR. DOUGLAS: I didn't realize that they had
been on our back.

ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: They had some
comments on access and the lack of it.

MR. DOUGLAS: Yes. Unfortunately, there was a
bit of inaccuracy in the article. We have been in contact
with the reporter. Unfortunately, corrections never get
the attention that the original article does.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Are there any collateral
easements that run from Sacramento to the coast?

MR. DOUGLAS: No, we checked that before we came
here today.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Any other questions?

All right. Thank you.
Accepted gratefully.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: We will try to find one, though, Mr. Chairman, if you would like.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: I'd appreciate that very much.

Twenty-eight.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: I think Item 28 is off the calendar.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Twenty-nine.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: Item 29, the City of Del Mar, is approval of a public agency permit to remove interferences placed by upland owners pursuant to a court decision in the City of Del Mar on the beach.

Staff recommends approval.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Any questions? If not, it is unanimously approved.

Thirty-one.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: Item 31 is a denial of an application for use of State-owned property on the Russian River near Jenner. Facilities have been placed without a Commission permit and without a Coastal Commission permit, and since the time is running on this item, we recommend that it be denied and we will deal with the applicant.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Questions?
ACTING COMMISSIONER STANCELL: Move approval.

ACTING COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Second.

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: Approved as recommended.

Thirty-two.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: Item 32 is the tenth modification of the plan and budget for the Long Beach unit, transferring within budget, $1,200,000 to increase the Injection Well Workover Account.

We recommend approval.

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: Any questions?

We approve the tenth modification and look forward eagerly to the eleventh modification.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MCCARTHY: Thirty-three.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: Item 33 is requesting your approval to notify the Legislature of the Commission's intent to increase the amount of money required to do some hazard removal work on the coast. This would provide for capping of a number of seeping wells in the Summerland area of Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties.

We had expected this project to cost $500,000. We went out to bid. We only received one bid. It was for $397,000. We reviewed the bid and feel that our estimate was incorrect, and this would use money that is available.
to the Commission for this project.

We recommend approval.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Questions?

The recommendation is approved.

That's the conclusion of this Commission meeting.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

(Thereupon the April 2nd, 1991 meeting of the State Lands Commission was concluded at 3:20 p.m.)
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