1	MEETING	
2	STATE LANDS COMMISSION	
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10	ROOM 2117	
11	STATE CAPITOL	
12	SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA	
13		
4		
15		
16		
7		
8		
9		
20		
21	MONDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1975	
22	10:00 A.M.	
23		
24		

Ļ

## <u>I</u> <u>N</u> <u>D</u> <u>E</u> <u>X</u>

2		Page
3	Members Present	iv
4	Proceedings	1
5	Call to Order	1
6	Confirmation of the minutes of the regular meeting of October 29, 1975.	1
8	Report of the Executive Officer	1
9	Calendar Icem Number 4(A)	27
	Calendar Item Number 5	28
10	Calendar Item Number 6(A)	31
1	Calendar Item Number 6 (B)	31
12	Calendar Item Number 6(C)	32
13	Calendar Item Number 6(D)	32
14	Calendar Item Number 6(E)	32
15	Report of the Executive Officer	45
16	Calendar Item Number 6(F)	55
17	Calendar Item Number 6(G)	55
18	Calendar Item Number 6(H)	56
19	Calendar Item Number 6(I)	56
20	Calendar Item Number 6(J)	56
21	Calendar Item Number 7(A)	57
22	Calendar Ttem Number 7(B)	61
23	Calendar Item Number 7(C)	62
24	Calendar Item Number 8(A)	62
25		

	The state of the s			
. 1	Index (continued)			Page
2	Calendar Item Nur	ber 8(B)		63
3	Calendar Item Nur	ber 9(A)		63
4	Calendar Item Num	ber 9(B)		63
5	Calendar Item Num	ber 9(C)		73
6	Calendar Item Nur	ber 9(D)		73
7	Calendar Item Nur	ber 9(E)		73
8	Calendar Item Num	ber 9(F)		74
9	Calendar Item Num	ber 10(A)		86
10	Calendar Item Nur	ber 10(B)		87
11	Calendar Item Num	ber 10(C)		87
12	Calendar Item Nur	ber 10(D)		88
<b>33</b>	Calendar Item Num	ber 10(E)		88
14				
15				egitatea (f. 1907). Gyddatea
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21			$\label{eq:constraints} \mathcal{L}(x,y) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \sum$	
22				
23				
24				
25				

MEMBERS PRESENT Hon. Kenneth Cory, Controller, Chairman 2 Hon. Mervyn M. Dymally, Lieutenant Governor 3 MEMBERS ABSENT 5 Hon. Roy M. Bell, Director of Finance 6 7 8 ALSO PRESENT Mr. William F. Northrop, Executive Officer, State Lands 9 Commission 10 Mr. R. S. Golden, Assistant Executive Officer, State Lands Commission 11 Mr. D. J. Everitts, Manager, Energy and Mineral 12 Resources Development 13 Mr. James F. Trout, Manager, Land Operations, State Lands Commission 14 Mr. N. Gregory Taylor, Deputy Attorney General 15 Mr. Robert C. Hight, Staff Counsel, State Lands 16 Commission 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24

25

## PROCEEDINGS

--000--

CHAIRMAN CORY: Let's call the meeting to order.

The Secretary will note the presence of Governor Dymally and myself. Mr. Bell is involved in other things today so we're going to have to proceed without him.

The first item is the confirmation of minutes of the regular meeting of October 29, 1975. Any corrections or additions to that hearing?

Hearing none, we will confirm them as presented.

Item 3, the report of the Executive Officer.

MR. NORTHROP: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Governor.

A royalty oil sales contract between the State and U.S. Oil and Refining Company was issued in late 1973, covering the royalty oil produced from the ARCO lease in Tract 2 of the Long Beach Unit. This contract was awarded to the successful bidder at 74 cents above the posted price.

Deliveries were started on May 1, 1974. However, the Federal Energy Administration issued new regulations in January of 1974 and the next month repealed the State's exemption from crude oil price controls. FEA also ruled that removal of the State's exemption was retroactive to October of 1973 and that the supplier/purchaser relationship in effect between ARCO and the State December 1, 1973,

გ

could not be terminated. ARCO, therefore, could not be required to meet U.S. oil's bid offer.

On November 6, 1975, we received a Remedial Order from FEA requiring the State to resume deliveries of royalty oil from Tract 2 to ARCO. Appropriate notices were served, and the delivery to ARCO was effected on November 7th. The FEA order also provided that the State could file an appeal on any of the issues. An appeal was filed by the State on November 12, 1975.

The FEA Remedial Order pertains only to the injunctive aspect and specifically defers any ruling on the damages aspect until additional data is received from both ARCO and the State. Such information is currently being prepared by the staff.

Mr. Gregory Taylor from the Attorney General's Office will amplify this problem.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman and Governor Dymally, since that time, virtually all the information required on the question of damages has been submitted to the FEA together with the briefs of their State's position appealing the order. ARCO has filed its papers and is seeking \$500,000 damages from the State which it alleges that it has suffered as a result of this action. The State is contesting and denying that ARCO is entitled to any damages whatsoever. The briefs have been filed and they will be

schedul()d for argument in Washington shortly.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: No problem.

MR. NORTHROP: The next item is the completion of a contract. The resources appraisal which the State Lands Division has been conducting regarding the federal OCS Lease Sale 35 offshore Southern California for the Office of Planning and Research has been completed and was forwarded to them.

The next item is the school land sale applications.

The Division has on file four pending applications for the purchase of about 5,223 acres of vacant school lands. These applications have been on file since the late 1960's, and are from public agencies and political subdivisions. Attempts to process these applications through to a completed sale have not been successful.

In fact, it appears that the sales will never be completed.

The Commission has directed staff to prepare, and diligently follow a management plan for the vacant school lands. The significant acreage now pending on these incomplete applications is inconsistent with this directive.

If you have no objection, it is staff's intent to submit a recommendation to the Commission at its next meeting to cancel these applications and restore the lands to unencumbered status.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Just so we clarify, these four applications are from public agencies and political subdivisions who want to buy the property that we have as school lands.

MR. NCRTHROP: Right. And for one reason or another, we have been unable to complete it, not because of anything that the State Lands has done, but because either the entities have changed their minds or situations are different now than when the applications were made or for several reasons these sales cannot be completed. We would like to pull these applications out, advise the applicants that we're canceling them and move on putting them into our blocking program.

CHAIRMAN CORY: And the applicants will have a chance to appear before us here if they have some reason why we should not go ahead?

MR. NORTHROP: That's correct. It just makes this thing a little neater.

U.S. Department of Interior OCS Lease Sale
No. 35, Southern California:

Immediately upon the U.S. Department of Interior's release of final tract maps for the proposed Southern

California OCS Lease Sale No. 35, I instructed F. D. Uzes, the Supervising Boundary Determination Officer for the Divisions, to check the tract maps to insure that offshore

areas claimed by California were not included in the tract sale. The check revealed that the Department of Interior had included in the proposed sale approximately 428 acres of lands to which California asserts ownership. Determination of the ownership of this acreage, together with several other offshore areas, is one of the issues remaining in the case of <u>U.S.</u> versus <u>California</u>, which is pending before the United States Supreme Court.

On November the 18th, I wrote Secretary of
Interior Kleppe a letter informing him of the situation
and strongly demanding that the disputed acreage be withdrawn from the proposed sale. Simultaneously, I asked
the Office of the Attorney General to prepare to obtain
an injunction from the United States Supreme Court to stop
any lease of the acreage claimed by California. The
necessary papers are prepared and are ready for filing.

Last Wednesday evening, the Department of
Interior informed us that the disputed acreage is being
withdrawn from the proposed sale. A notice to this effect
will appear in the December 2nd Federal Register. The
Division staff has checked the descriptions of the parcels
to be withdrawn, and finds that all areas claimed by
California have been withdrawn and a buffer zone of 800
to 2000 feet beyond those areas has also been deleted.

We do have calendar item number 28 on the calendar

which will give us the authority in case the Register does not appear.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Why should we not proceed anyway given the fact that the Federal Government, I think, consistently showed any failure to cooperate all the way through on this procedure, and I would hate -- frankly, I think the Federal Government, Department of Interior is totally capable of lying. They've engaged in the whole situation in a form of deceipt, deception and I do not want us to jeopardize any of our legal rights.

So I think at the appropriate time on the agenda, we should take all steps of the Attorney General and do whatever necessary to make sure that people who have not lived up to their word do, in fact, live up to their word in this regard and not lease property owned by the State of California on behalf of the Federal Government.

MR. NORTHROP: Fine. We will, at the appropriate time in the calendar, insert the language we have prepared.

The last two items are instructional items.

The Governor had asked that an Alaskan natural gas line ceport be prepared. Mr. Don Everitts, Manager of our Energy and Mineral Resources for the Division, will give you a progress report at this time.

Mr. Everitts?

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Mr. Chairman, at

1.8

the completion of this report, I intend to ask you for an oral report on the Zarb rip-off.

MR. NORTHROP: Good point.

MR. EVERITTS: As Bill has indicated, this is just a preliminary progress report on the investigation that you have requested the staff to make on the possible impact which the arrival of Alaskan natural gas from Prudhoe Bay might have on California.

Approved gas and oil reserves in the Prudhoe
Bay on the north slope of Alaska are really very significant.
You notice the Prudhoe Bay area up there. They actually
represent approximately 27 percent of the total approved
U.S. domestic reserves of crude oil and approximately
10 percent of the approved U.S. domestic gas reserves.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Don, what figures are you using to come to those -- what is the date of that information?

MR. EVERITTS: The data that I'm using is from a report put out by SOHIO in October, which they estimated 9.5 billion barrels of recoverable oil in the crude reserves, in the approved areas of the field, and 26 trillion feet of gas.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Do you know when the data base was prepared? The reason I'm asking, I had information from a friend of mine who lives in Alaska who says that according to his contentions, there is a new well on the

east edge doing a step out from the area which they had previously drilled, and that came in, he said, in late September or October which they indicated the production is 32 thousand barrels a day.

There were several people all from Alaska there who were saying that the output is far greater than they are putting into the system, and I'm just trying to ascertain those figures whether --

MR. EVERITTS: As I say, they were the letter of effect; the first time I saw those figures were in May, 1975 letter from SOHIO, so they would not have the September data in it.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Okay.

MR. EVERITTS: For the reason that much of the oil, whatever it may be, may be coming through California — it just about has to. The full report will also include our findings on any impact which could be generated by the construction and installation of deepwater ports.

Nationwide, the United States consumes 22 trillion cubic feet of natural gas per year, over 8 percent of that is consumed by California, and only 14 1/2 percent of what California consumes is supplied by California production; the rest is imported.

That consumption has been steadily increasing since about 1945, and at the same time, production within

the State has been decreasing. To meet the demand, out of state imports have been required.

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As California production decreases and present sources of outside gas are withdrawn, imports from Alaska and foreign countries will be necessary to satisfy the State's energy requirements.

Now, I indicated that this curve here I took from a report recently put together by PG&E and Southern California Gas by the PUC. They predicted total requirements over here in MCF in equivalent barrels of oil. California's production steadily declining; firm commitments basically home heating, industrial and the electrical utility. As you can see, available gas -- no new supplies continue to decline; very moderate growth, I think approximately 6 percent. The difference between this black curve, this curve here, and this curve, has got to be supplied by crude oil or oil. We're talking about -there is an equivalent of graphs, 170,000,000 barrels and 470,000,000, so some 300,000,000 barrels of oil will be needed if we get no new supplies of gas. Now, assuming that you get gas from Alaska by one of the many proposals, we can minimize that to some extent. Another reason, of course, why we think that the report should discuss crude oil from Alaska as well as gas, because we're going to be handling a lot of oil for our own purposes.

companies competing for natural gas reserves expected to 1 be available for delivery to the United States, has 2 proposed various routes and methods of transportation, 3 and have filed applications to the Federal Power Commission. The Alaskan Natural Gas Transmission System has proposed 5 6 installing a 48-inch buried line from Prudhoe Bay through 7 That's this line here, through Canada. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Who proposed that? 8 MR. EVERITTS: This is the Alaskan Natural Gas 9 Transmission System. 10 CHAIRMAN CORY: Who are they? 11 MR. EVERITTS: That's basically El Paso -- well, 12 it's not now really; it's a consortion of the companies. 13 14 CHAIRMAN CORY: But are they composed of utility distribution companies, or are they composed of gas 15 transmission companies? 16 17 MR. EVERITTS: I guess the answer is "Yes." really the consortion of transmission companies and 18 19 utility companies, consumer oriented companies. CHAIRMAN CORY: 20 Okay. MR. EVERITTS: The El Paso Gas Company specifically 21 22 has proposed laying a 42-inch pipeline from Prudhoe Bay to Valdez. We're talking about the red one, paralleling 23 the 48-inch crude oil line that's currently under 24

construction. Under this proposal, the gas would be

25

liquefied near Valdez and transported to California in LNG vessels. It would then be regasified and distributed to various points within the state.

The importation of oil and gas from new sources would have, or probably would have, additional impact in California's environment. So, our review of that impact may be summarized by pointing out that number one, we feel underground high pressure natural gas pipelines are common in California. Systems similar to those proposed are transporting natural gas from Alaska have been successfully installed and are presently in use with a minimal effect on the environment.

The worldwide movement of LNG currently exceeds 500 billion cubic feet annually and is expected to reach 2 trillion cubic feet by 1980. There are actually additional plants with a total capacity of 14 trillion cubic feet per day are in the planning or construction stage. So, we feel the viability of liquefaction, ocean transport, revaporization of LNG has been thoroughly demonstrated.

It is possible, however, that liquefied natural gas could produce some adverse impacts. There would be increased tankership activity in certain areas. There would certainly be the visual impact of piers, storage tanks and buildings. We feel those could be minimized

or mitigated perhaps, by locating the loading facilities further out to sea, perhaps locating the facilities further back into the hinderlands. It is not an impossible dream.

Currently in Maryland, the Columbia Gas System is constructing a LNG System that has 6,000 feet of buried underground water lines, so there's no reason why you couldn't do it at 12,000 feet or more. You could get the plants out of sight.

If you go to the Los Angeles or Port. Hueneme areas for a plant, it's possible that certain portions of the seacoast be made unavailable to the public. We suggest as one possibility, would be the Point Conception area which is at least isolated and generally not available to the public. Some of the problems in the cooling of sea water through extraction of heat for revaporization could adversely affect some marine life. Maybe we could go into the Alaskan King Crab business or something. But, you can difuse the discharge of that cold water, so it wouldn't be all that troublesome. There are other ways to vaporize, we've discussed that -- waste heat, solar heat. Those things can and probably are being considered.

Finally, the transfer and handling of LNG is potentially hazardous and could cause fires and explosions. The FPC has made calculations that indicate that if one of the tanks in an LNG transport should rupture, that it's

possible that the explosive plume could form as far as three miles downwind from the source. I suppose that is true, all the more reason to get out in an isolated area where the public probably wouldn't be near it.

13.

As far as the status of the applications, the Federal Power Commission is currently considering the applications of both the oil line and the LNG program, or gas line LNG program. Hearing have been going on throughout the year. A 17-volume Draft EIS was issued by the U.S. Department of Interior in June of 1975. The document, however, deals mostly with the natural gas line and just barely touches on the LNG proposal. El Paso has not filed an application with the Interior for the right-of-way permits on the LNG. It's possible that the FPC might grant permits to both companies.

As I stated, this has been a summary of the investigation, and we'll have a, I think, a complete report soon.

I might just point out one thing on this map over here.

This PG 74, this network of blue lines is essentially California's source of gas -- PG&E which provided about 40 percent of California's consumption coming in from the north of Canada, Southern California, Southern California Gas for the Southern part. California

Southern Gas Company asserts that they have not been able to get any new supplies or any new contracts since 1969 on gas. So they are probably hurting more than PG&E, but it could be that the government is supposedly going b do something about it and probably cut us off, too. So the problem is pretty serious.

You also throw this line in here. This is the proposed line that SOHIO wants to convert. It is a gas line now, proposed to convert to a crude oil line to handle the crude oil in conjunction with the gas. We will have some comments on that in the final reports.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: We take the crude oil from one of the similar port locations, you are speculating now?

MR. EVERITTS: Based on the May '75 data of nine and a half billion barrels of oil, SCHIO asserts that their share is approximately a half million barrels per day, at a million barrel per day rate. They say that the rate probably could be raised to a million and a half barrels per day. But any higher than that, under the reserves that they are reporting, would be unable to handle. This facility basically would be a 42-inch line, probably would handle a million, maybe handle two million barrels a day of crude if you could get tankers and line and pump just as fast as you could get in there. Practically,

I think it would handle about three-quarter million barrels a day. They have said that --2 CHAIRMAN CORY: This is the line? 3 MR. EVERITTS: The red line. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: That's an old 5 gas line. 6 MR. EVERITTS: That's the old gas line. 7 dotted line, as you look at this later on, those are 8 sections that they may have to build. But, the basic 9 line is the existing gas line. They can parallel that 10 line, there is a 30-inch line, they can parallel another 11 30-inch line and essentially double the capacity. Of 12 course the 48-inch line here will handle perhaps two 13 million barrels a day, too. It is designed right now 14 for a million barrels a day, if they can up the pump 15 capacity. 16 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So take the crude 17 from the lease and bring it down to California and ship 18 it into Texas. 19 MR. EVERITTS: If there exists a surplus --20 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: When it gets to 21 Texas will they refine it? 22 CHAIRMAN CORY: There are other pipelines. 23 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Okay, yes. It's 24 25 shipped. That's different from the gas. You are talking

about crude not gas?

2.2

MR. EVERITTS. Right. But you get the gas from the crude; you can't produce one without the other. So it's really a combined, it's a total problem.

CHAIRMAN CORY: I keep getting confused about SOHIO and the other people, there seems to be so many proposals for ports along the California coast. How do the volumes of each of those proposals add together?

MR. EVERITTS: This is, of course, part of the -what we would like to do. The thing is, you got three
people up there that own the nine and a half billion barrels
of oil. SOHIO owns 55 percent of it, something like
that; Exxon and ARCO own the rest of it.

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, the other locations of it, Port Hueneme and the Southern California Gas people inform me that unofficially, that they plan on bringing Indonesian gas.

MR. EVERITTS: Now, you are talking about gas or oil?

CHAIRMAN CORY: Well, I think it's incumbent upon us to contact all local governments and get all of the various proposals on the drawing board to see how those figures of importation capacity compare with the figures that they say they have up there. I mean, I just get puzzled by the Port of Long Beach using one set of

figures, L.A. Port seems to be feuding over something, then I hear talk about the central coast with Stan Cal wanting some facilities there. I just get very confused. I think we need to take both oil and gas and compare what they're telling the people out in the boondocks and see if they add up, because something is very confusing about all of these various proposals. It would seem to me that there should be a finite number if we're in such short supply situation. Maybe we aren't in such a short supply situation and they're unwilling to tell us.

MR. EVERITTS: I thought I was narrowing it down to a finite number until they told me about a 32,000 barrel a day well.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Yes. So, maybe these indications which are just at this point rumors and so forth, but from people who are in a relatively small community, Alaska isn't too large and these are people that are supplying and working in those areas talking to the workers up there, and they say they've got gas and oil far beyond what they are telling us about. And if in fact we find empirical evidence that they are talking to various local entities about various plans, and their capacity exceeds that which they have. I begin to want to put a little more stock in the rumors, assuming they are prudent people and don't waste money.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: When you talk 1 about SOHIO, you are talking about SOHIO B and P, right? 2 MR. EVERITTS: Right. 3 CHAIRMAN CORY: Their interest is a combined 4 interest? 5 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: BP has bought into 6 SOHIO. 7 MR. EVERITTS: Right. 8 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: BP-SOHIO has taken 9 over some of their marketing divisions, so there's a 10 consortium between BP and SOHIO. 17 So as of now, the FTC is considering both 12 applications, the Valdez and other blue line applications. 13 Who is proposing Valdez, the Valdez line? 14 MR. EVERITTS: That is El Paso. 15 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Are they also 16 involved in the blue line, too? 17 MR. EVERITTS: They're involved in it. 18 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So they can't 19 lose, can they? 20 MR. EVERITTS: Not really. 21 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Okay, thank you. 22 MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, the Governor asked 23 me to comment on Zarb's ruling of the crude oil differential. 24 The week of November 17th, I was advised that 25

we were turned down on our appeal for a comparitive price for crude oil that would bring the old crude oil price, or at least the crude produced on State property as an average of approximately \$4.20 a barrel, in line with the \$5.25 generally considered old oil price. Mr. Zarb turned this down because the reading was because it would cost money to the consumer. But yet, we're in a position where we're going to have to start shutting oils back and replace it with \$14 oil. I really don't understand his judge's calculations. So along that line, we have contacted Congressman Hannaford's office and he has arranged a meeting with the State and the City of Long Beach and some independent producers who are likely to -who have the same problem of shutting and production. We are scheduled to meet with him on Thursday to ask him to reconsider his appeal.

1

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, that's where we are on that, Governor.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: If he turns us down again, do we have any further plan?

MR. NORTHROP: I would have to refer that to our counsel. I think we have taken all of our administrative remedies. Mr. Taylor, would you care to comment?

MR. TAYLOR: If we have exhausted our administrative remedies, we would be in a position to do that, to go to court and get a ruling.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: What about some form of Congressional harring or appeal in that matter?

Ł

5.

MR. NORTHROP: It has been suggested, Governor, by yourself and others in other areas but it might be well to -- at least the Commission to memorialize Congress to investigate the entire crude oil pricing in the FEA as it applies to discrimination in California's consumption.

move, Mr. Chairman, so we are on record instructing the staff to explore the Congressional delegation --

CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection, that will be the order.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: -- and we can take through the Congress in the form of amendments to legislation in the form of hearings, Congressional remedy through negotiation.

CHAIRMAN CORY: That is the intent, as I understand it, the Governor's motion is not just to pass a resolution memorializing them. We're willing to go to work and see what needed piece of legislation this could be tacked onto.

MR. NORTHROP: Fine.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Now, so we can go back to -our situation is such that we are sometime in the next
coming six to eight months going to be faced with actually

stopping oil production, curtailing oil production in specific wells which our cost exceed our income.

MR. NORTHROP: Right. We are very close to that point now, and its average, it keeps some of them alive right now but, if we were to look at specifics, we could well start shutting --

CHAIRMAN CORY: So, we have individual wells which currently are costing us more money to pull out of the ground then they are currently receiving for whem.

Where are we, vis a vis, the question of gift of public funds on those specific wells, Counsel?

MR. TAYLOR: We are researching that in connection with another problem. I couldn't give you an answer now, but we're looking into it.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Since they have told us this, I don't want to have to repay the people of California that money.

MR. TAYLOR: I don't think we have that problem, but we'll look into it.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: I want my motion to be construed as liberally and broadly as politically and humanly possible, so that the staff will use every bit of energy and genius in pursuing that problem so we can see some solutions.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Can the staff confer with some of

your staff so we can get some of their genius to working on these plans?

(Laughter.)

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Whichever. If it's necessary for the Commissioners to go back to Washington, I think our budget was amended slightly to permit us to travel.

MR. NORTHROP: The presentation on Thursday,

I think it would be well if the Federal Government understood
that the State of California is of one mind on this thing
and the Commissioners as well as the Governor's representative, or at least a letter from the Governor accompany
this.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: I want to, not necessarily for the motion, but for you to consider a possible meeting with the Chairman of the Lands Commission and the California delegation, or in his absence, I'd be prepared to accompany or make that trip myself to dramatize the significance of that early in January, or when they reconvene, possibly after the Christmas holidays.

MR. NORTHROP: I will pave the way this time to start setting it up.

MR. NORTHROP: The last item on my report is

a report or informational section on some of the trespass areas of Bethel Island. Jim Trout from our Land Program, will make that presentation.

i

Incidentally, Senator Nejedly had asked to appear before the Commission. He said he would be here around 11:00 o'clock.

MR. TROUT: To kind of put this in perspective, our review of the total data situation including most of the natural waterways in that area, indicates to us that there are between 1,200 and 1,400 trespassers occupying state types of submerged lands without a lease. There are 372 at Bethel Island, and we've been able through ceveral visits down there to contact 61 of these people.

With the slides, we would like to quickly give you a kind of an overview of the situation of what we're talking about.

(Thereupon a slide presentation was made.)

MR. TROUT: This is an example of some of the kinds of facilities that are occupying the State Lands. These slides are actually of Bethel Island. You can see that that's no small structure housing several large vessels. These are not small boats. But particularly, look at the two on the far right.

Slide number two, here's another structure out over the levee with a finger slip there.

MR. NORTHROP: How many boats does that accommodate in that finger slip, Mr. Trout?

MR. TROUT: Four, I believe, with a little fishing boat besides.

Slide number three, here's another structure out over the water with a landing float in front of it and a covered boat shed alongside of it. Here again you can see that this is certainly not a small boat, that's a significant thing. You can also see just by the stern of the other vessels in there what we're talking about.

I don't mean to indicate necessarily that all of these are trespass; some of these may be lease. But these are pictures taken by our own agents in the delta.

Again, you can see the sliding glass doors, the fiberglass covering over the boat slip. These are not just huts, these are significant structures.

Here's another one, two boat sheds there with a house and a patio extending out over the water. You can see another structure on the left, a long ramp coming out over the water.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Is the house an intrusion into State property?

MR. TROUT: That we are not entirely certain of.

For example, in this particular case, I can't answer it.

In some areas, the waterways have been widened; but under

the interpretation of recent court decisions, as they have been explained to us by the Attorney General, the Commission does have the authority to control the incursion into the waterway, even if it had been artificially created, if in fact it is part of the public waterway. The Commission has the authority to control structures in that area, whether we own the bid at that particular point or not.

All of these are natural waterways, either as they are or as they have been altered slightly by dredging.

And this is a little smaller structure, but it does show the kind of things that we're talking about.

Again, obviously, not a small boat, a large boat and covered boat shed beside it.

More of the same, here. I think it's -- these are pretty typical of the situation we're talking about. This happens to be just Bethel Island, and I have here -- in addition, I might just pass up to the Commissioners for a quick look some aerial photographs to give you an example of the kinds of intrusions into the waterways that exist. You can see just solid lines all along these waterways in the delta.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Now, this was the piece of legislation carried by Senator Ayala that had to do with this?

MR. TROUT: Mr. Moory and Senator Ayala had to do basically with single family residences, and some of these are larger and would be noncommercial leases.

But again, it would affect this kind of thing, right?

Ž

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: I don't know if we can reintroduce a bill, but if we can, I would like to have these slides there for presentation so that some of my colleagues can see what we're talking about.

MR. TROUT: We have these slides printed; I have them over there. We have them printed on fairly large illustration board.

Basically, that's the situation. It's, of course, of concern to the property owners down there who have occupied public lands without any payments for a substantial period of years. But, as the Chairman said, in a press release some time ago, it is in effect ripping off the public. They are using public land without paying for it.

That's basically the summary of the situation in the Delta. The slides illustrate Bethel Island, but it's entirely typical of the entire Delta.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: I can't tell you how incense I am about that. When one looks at someone jaywalking having to pay a ticket, and then look at other people who are supposed to know better, they take over, in effect, State lands without payment of bill,

structurally, I just think it's incredible that we're 1 permitting this to go without some legislative remedy or 2 some legal remedy. It is incredible. 3 MR. TROUT: As a result of the augmentation of the budget, we've had as many as four land agents down 5 in the Delta for periods of time, knocking on doors, 6 contacting people and over the next few months, we will make an effort to contact every property owner that we 8 can find of record. 9 MR. NORTHROP: That concludes my report, 10 Mr. Chairman. 11 CHAIRMAN CORY: We will go ahead and proceed 12 with the agenda. 13 Senator Nejedly is due here at --14 MR. NORTHROP: I have a note here that he will 15 be here at 11:00 o'clock. 16 CHAIRMAN CORY: We'll go back to the last item 17 18 on the report --MR. NORTHROP: As I understand, that's what 19 he wants to discuss. 20 CHAIRMAN CORY: -- when he comes in at 11:00 21 o'clock. 22 Item 4, Boundary Line Agreement and Recreational 23 Lease for item (A) Jack Wynn, Albert J. LaTorre, et al. 24 MR. NORTHROP: This is a boundary line agreement 25

up near Humboldt Bay, Mr. Chairman and Governor, in which some land immediately adjacent to our land is being set in a boundary line agreement.

CHAIRMAN CORY: And the terms and conditions are satisfactory to both the Attorney General and our staff. We are in essence, getting what we think is ours.

MR. NORTHROP: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection --

MR. TAYLOR: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. The quitchaim by the applicants will be both to the district and to the State, because the State has reserved interests and retained interests in the area. To that extent, the calendar items on page 2 should indicate that it's a quit claim to the district and state and the appropriate recommendations would be changed similar. Both the State and district will get it, and the Commission should authorize our acceptance of that written agreement which will be implicit in your approval.

CHAIRMAN CORY: This is on page 2 not in the summary, but in the --

MR. TAYLOR: No, in the regular --

CHAIRMAN CORY: With that understanding, Item 4(A) will be approved with the agreement going both to the district and to the State.

Without objection, such will be the order.

Item <sup>r</sup>

ĭ

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, this is an initial attempt by State Lands to set up a new bidding procedure and declare an area a known geothermal area. There is a 130 acres up in the Geysers completely surrounded by geothermal leases and producing geothermal properties. The staff is requesting the Commission to declare this a known geothermal area; and secondly, authorize the offering for public bid these lands based on a net profits factor in the operation of this geothermal field.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Second. Motion and second before us.

Mr. Hight.

MR. HIGHT: Unfortunately, we didn't get the appropriate language in to declare this a known geothermal area, so with your permission, I would like to read that into the record.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Okay. Would you please read that?

MR. HIGHT: Mr. Chairman, we will make this 4(A), and the existing 4, 4(B).

"Determine that Section 46, Township 11 North" --

CHAIRMAN CORY: This is 5 or 4?

MR. HIGHT: What I'm reading will become 4(A)

and the existing 4 will become 4(B). This is on page î 7, Resolution number 4. CHAIRMAN CORY: Just so we can clarify what 3 we're talking about --MR. HIGHT: 4 now reads "Declare that a parcel 5 described herein". 6 CHAIRMAN CORY: You are talking about -- the 7 reference is not to the Calendar Summary Item 4, but 8 instead a subsection of Calendar item 5, Arabic number four. 9 So everybody understands what slight of hand we pull. 10 (Laughter.) 11 MR, HIGHT: "Determine that Section 46, 12 Township 11 North, Range 8 West, MDM, contains a well 13 capable of producing geothermal resources in commercial 14 quantities and classify such area as being a known 15 geothermal resource area." 16 This will become 4(A) and the existing 4 will 17 become 4(B). 18 CHAIRMAN CORY: Is there anyone here who wishes 19 to speak on Calendar item 5, subparagraph 4(A)? 20 Don't let their inability to organize their 21 work confuse you. 22 (Laughter.) 23

MR. NORTHROP: This is the result of the new

calendar reorganizational committee.

24

25

s [)

CHAIRMAN CORY: Hopefully, our next calendar will avoid some of these problems, because I'm having the same problem you are having, Mr. Taylor.

Nobody wishes to speak on that. Without objection we declare it passed as read.

4(B) is now before us. Without objection, Governor Dymally moves; without objection, such will be the order.

We will go on to Classification 6(A).

MR, GOLDEN: The 6(A) is a permit for a 5-year use permit for a recreational boating budy. The rates are set forth there as in our regulations.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Moved.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection, such will be the order.

MR. GOLDEN: 6(B) is the extension for 6 months of a permit for a temporary maintenance of a pipeline for fire protection purposes at Donner Lake. The last 6-month permit was given with the understanding that there would be action taken to establish a district or in some way provide permanent fire protection. Such action has been taken, and we recommend a 6-month extension.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection, such will be the order.

6(C)?

MR. GOLDEN: 6(C) is an Amendment to Right of ١ Way for a telephone line, submarine telephone line, crossing 2 3 several of the Islands in the Mokelumne River, and it's exempt by law. CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection, such will 5 6 be the order. 7 6(D)? MR. GOLDEN: 6(D) is a 49-year Industrial Lease 3 to the California and Hawaiian Sugar Company for a 42-inch 9 diameter outfall line. 10 The rates there are as set in our regulations 11 and the 10¢ per cubic yard of material dredged is for 12 dispersion of the items back into the river at that place. 13 CHAIRMAN CORY: This is for a storm drain? 14 MR. GOLDEN: It's an outfall line for their 15 industrial waste, and it has been cleared by the Water 16 17 Quality Board. CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection, such will 18 19 be the order. 20 6(E)? MR. NORTHROP: 6(E) is a former trespass 21 22 who is coming into lease. MRS. PERRY: I'm here. If you're talking about 23 6(E), that's me. And I don't like to be called a trespasser 24 CHAIRMAN CORY: Would you identify yourself? 25

MRS. PERRY: Mrs. Anona Dunbar Perry.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Let's have Mr. Northrop try to minimize his editorializing and tell us what the item is about and then we'll hear from you.

MR. NORTHROP: This is a Commercial Lease on 1.38 acres of tide and submerged land for the maintenance of an existing boating factory. This is the initial lease.

The amendment handles the insurance as prescribed. The consideration is \$345 a year. And we have fixed the right to set a different rental as of December 30, 1975.

CHAIRMAN CORY: This is for an annual --

MR. NORTHROP: This is on the maintenance of an existing marine boating facility.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Okay.

Mrs. Perry?

MRS. PERRY: This lease isn't on the marine boating facility at all. It's on the gas dock and we lease 15 acres out from our property line. Therefore, the price is rather high.

I don't exactly know what I'm insuring for this State. I already carry insurance from the gas company on everything I own. It's very confusing to me to know exactly what I'm guaranteeing.

CHAIRMAN CORY: The insurance is a liability

insurance.

MRS. PERRY: That's true.

CHAIRMAN CORY: So that if somebody somehow runs into the dock and gets injured and decides that they're going to sue the State because we permitted you to have that dock there, that there is an insurance company protecting the taxpayers of California.

MRS. PERRY: Well, in effect, that's a very unlikely situation. Everybody is going to sue me, and they are not going to even know about you, as far as that goes.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Well, unfortunately being the Controller, I get sued several times a day.

Mr. Taylor of the Attorney General's Office perhaps can explain that.

MR. TAYLOR: If she has existing liability insurance in this amount, she can name the State as the co-insurer.

MRS. PERRY: That's what I was doing, but I don't understand why. And the amount, the amount is far too high.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Mrs. Perry, the amount relates to the liability, and the liability is to the injured party. If a person ran into the dock and was injured, they would sue for the damages to them, not to your dock.

They really wouldn't care about your dock. They would be concerned about what happened to their multi-million dollar cabin cruiser and their children and the major wage earner in the family who was injured. And that is very possible for a relatively inexpensive dock to create a rather large liability in terms of property damage and bodily injury. And that is the purpose for the large limits. The large limits concept for the State of California derives from a general historical problem that the State is a target risk. If anybody can find liability against the State, juries tend to award large amounts of damages.

MRS. PERRY: I don't know, it seems like you are picking on little people with all your rules and regulations. Mr. Dymally doesn't know why people, as he calls it, trespass on the river. It is because we pioneered the river, we worked and struggled and we pay high taxes because we have water on our property and we can't stick our toe in it because it belongs to the State of California. You might as well tell us we can't breathe our air. You also have your own harbors in competition with us and you do nothing for us. You take our gas money and you say if we happen to build a little dock out in the water, we're truspassing.

MRS. PERRY: No. We have a right. We have a right

to be in peace. We pioneered all of that kind of business 1 and I don't think now it belongs to the State of California. 2 No, I believe there should be some control on what you 3 build on it. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: To whom does it 5 belong? 6 MRS. PERRY: Well, I think we have riparian 7 rights. 8 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: When you say "we" 9 who are you talking about? 10 MRS. PERRY: The people that own the property 11 have riparian rights to use it for what they had it for. 12 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: To come all the 12 way down to the river? 14 MRS. PERRY: To build a dock out in the water, 15 a little innocent dock out in the water. There's a little 16 lady up there who can hardly walk and the State's been 17 interviewing her and getting her all excited. She's 18 got a little dock out there, a little fishing dock. 19 think this is too much. I don't think that our government 20 is meant for. 21 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: I'm with you. 22 I just want to get the logic. You are saying if you have 23 a piece of property on the riverbed, then you have a right 24

.

25

to build --

MRS. PERRY: Use if for a certain amount. I don't think you have a right to go way out in the river, 2 no. But a reasonable thing --3 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Even if that 5 property doesn't belong to you? 6 MRS. PERRY: Well, you can go out in the street and that doesn't belong to me. I'm paying for taxes 7 on a levee that doesn't belong to me. Everybody else 9 in the world has a right. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: But everybody 10 17 has use of the street, though. 12 MRS. PERRY: That's right. 13 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: But we can't 14 build in the street. 15 MRS. PERRY: Well, I don't know. There are a lot of things on the street. People sit down there and 16 17 sell pictures and whatnot. There is a reasonable right. I hate to say it, but I think the State Land has just 18 19 gone overboard. 20 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Okay, fine. MRS. PERRY: And I'm 70 years old, and I better 21 22 say it right now. 23 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Well, we will 24 probably never settle this matter, but just one more

point. You are saying that those who build and who have

25

pioneered that area have a right to build to the riverbed, right?

MRS. PERRY: Right.

\$

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: What about someone who didn't build but felt that they have a right to build next to you without State permission. Do you think they have that same right?

MRS. PERRY: Well, if they are building on the property --

no property. If you took a little piece of State riverbed and I have the same right as a citizen to build whatever, do you think they have a right to?

MRS. PERRY: No, not if they don't own anything.

I think my taxes entitle me some right for me to use my
land what it was meant for.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: But you are assuming that the riverbed belongs to you?

MRS. PERRY: I'm not on the bed, I'm just on the edge of it. If you go out far, you should have to pay, you should be under control.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: I just want to let you know that a number of my colleagues agree with you; I disagree with you. I just want you to know that you are ahead of me because the bill failed, so you are

probably right and I'm wrong. But I believe that people shouldn't be permitted to do something, use State land without paying at some measure.

MRS. PERRY: There's just too many departments in this thing -- 44 agencies to go through to get a permit is rather ridiculous.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: I'm introducing legislation to cut that down.

MRS. PERRY: And also a threat as the one such as the Land Commission threatening to go to court, when it takes 44 departments --

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Of course, all of that bureaucracy, but I have a feeling that some people have abused their privilege by using State land and others don't have the right to do so. If everybody had a right to build on a riverbed, it would be all right with me; but I just don't believe that some people can and others shouldn't.

As I said, you are ahead of me because the Legislature killed a bill both in the Assembly and the Senate and you'll probably win again next year.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Thank you, Mrs. Perry. We have this before you. I'm prepared to vote for the lease subject to those conditions, but if you find those conditions intolerable or unacceptable, then we probably

should not go ahead with an idle act. I don't see how we could legally issue the lease unless the State is adequately protected in terms of liability. I don't know what your insurance agent is saying what that's going to cost you. It would seem to me --

MRS. PERRY: He said he wouldn't write it. He said it was something he never heard of. And that is Travelers, and when Travelers says that, that's malpractice.

CHAIRMAN CORY: The Travelers, they've got some serious financial difficulties of their own which may be predicating that statement.

MRS. PERRY: I just get insurance like any individual would get, and when they say they won't write it, I can't help that.

CHAIRMAN CORY: I do not want you to leave here if we approve this with you having any thoughts that it's been approved without the requirement. Because as I understand the law and our responsibility, you are going to have to have the insurance if you are going to have a valid lease. Now, is that where we are, Mr. Taylor, in terms of --

MR. TAYLOR: It's the policy of the Commission and also the position of the Department.

MRS. PERRY: I agree with you. You are going to be on my lease, but I still don't think it's right.

That's the way I'm leaving.

S

MR. HIGHT: Mr. Chairman, at the October 24th '75 Commission meeting, the Commission approved liability insurance for Mrs. Dunbar (sic) in the amounts of 300,000 and 6,000,000. She found that amount unable to obtain and part of this calendar item authorizes reduction of that to 100,000 for property damage and 300,000 for a single injury. These limits are in conformance with General Services.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: This \$345 per annum does not include the insurance premium?

MR. HIGHT: No.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: She has to go get that on her own?

MR. HIGHT: Yes.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Is she disputing the \$345?

MR. HIGHT: I don't believe so.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Do you find the \$345 reasonable or unreasonable?

MRS. PERRY: I prefer to not go into that because that's a matter of a ten year's lawsuit and settlement with the Lands Commission. I feel that they should leave me alone. They have ruined my life long enough. I've told that many times. First time I've got to tell the

heads of it, though.

Anyone that's gone ten years and ten months through the court, the Supreme Court, has suffered plenty. And our settlement was with this lease for 45 years, before it's up, 20 years, it's now changing it and they are making it entirely different. And it isn't a lease; anything that can be changed every two seconds is not a lease, that's just a convenience for your Commission.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Mrs. Perry, you are telling us some things that people are confused about.

MR. HIGHT: I'm unaware of the Lands Commission having a suit against you. Can you tell me something about that?

MRS. PERRY: For ten years and ten months, I went through the courts proving title to my land. In the settlement, I was to have my land. I gave up part of my slough, my waterway; I gave you \$1,000 more or less to leave me alone. You gave me a lease, and I hoped I would live the rest of my life without ever seeing any of you again.

MR. HIGHT: Was the Lands Commission party to that suit?

MRS. PERRY: A very strong party. I was the first test case in this grabbing business.

MR. TROUT: I think it's probably the State

Reclamation Board. MRS. PERRY: No. The State Land Commission --2 Mr. Joseph was the attorney. I'm of record in all the 3 books. CHAIRMAN CORY: But the lawsuit has been settled. 5 MRS. PERRY: And I settled. And one of the 6 7 conditions --MR. HIGHT: How long ago was this lawsuit settled? 8 9 MRS. PERRY: Eighteen years. MR. HIGHT: No. How long ago? 10 MRS. PERRY: Eighteen years. 11 MR. HIGHT: Ago? The lawsuit was settled? 12 MRS. PERRY: Well, now you've got me confused. 13 CHAIRMAN CORY: But, the thing that's worrying 14 me is that she said she settled a lawsuit, and one of 15 the conditions of the settlement was a lease. 16 17 MRS. PERRY: Right. 18 CHAIRMAN CORY: And we're changing the terms 19 and conditions of that lease. MRS. PERRY: First they told me it would be 20 90 years, and then they said they could only write it 21 for 45 years. 22 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Mr. Chairman, 23 may I make a suggestion? Mrs. Perry, is it inconvenient 24 25 for you to come up here for another meeting?

MRS. PERRY: No.

ï

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: You and I have a slight disagreement philosophically, but personally, I am sympathetic. And I don't want to be a party of any harassment of any person who expects to spend the rest of the year with the State harassing them.

I'd like, if you don't mind, to move to put this matter over for another month, so I can get your side of the story.

MRS. PERRY: Well, you'll have me worried for another month.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: We're not going to bite you, I promise you.

I understand the facts at this point, unless there is a radical change in those, you got at least approval of this calendar item. I think maybe that if you have an 18 year old court order that we might be violating by the terms of this; I don't want to be a party to that. And your statement seems to imply that there was some litigation that the staff is apparently unaware of that we want to look at. Because if you settle and there are written terms and conditions of that settlement that you were supposed to have something at a given rate, then I would be very reluctant to overturn the deal, and we'd

go back to what you thought your deal was if it was 1 supported by the fact that you were parties to this suit. 2 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Why don't we 3 have the staff brief us. MRS. PERRY: I don't know. If you are saying 5 there is not a suit, I can't imagine why they'd say that 6 for. 7 CHAIRMAN CORY: Well, 18 years ago, Bob Hight 8 was in diapers. 9 (Laughter.) 10 CHAIRMAN CORY: Okay. We'll put Item 6(E) over 11 for the next meeting, and the staff will be in touch with 12 Mrs. Ferry as to whether or not she needs to be at the 13 next meeting, because it's likely to just go through the 14 former or make you better in terms of your conditions. 15 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Mrs. Perry, this 16 is a friendly staff. 17 MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, Senator Nejedly is 18 19 here. CHAIRMAN CORY: Yes. Senator Nejedly? 20 We'll go back to the last item on the Executive 21 Officer's Report, which I think the question of Bethel 22 Island Senator Nejedly would like to speak to. 23

SENATOR NEJEDLY: If I could just take a moment

of your time, I don't expect any response to the suggestion.

24 25

We're dealing with the problems in the Delta in the State Lands Commission on a case-by-case basis, and we don't have any general statement of intention by the Commission as to the lands that they feel are within their jurisdiction; what their policies are with reference to them, and what in general the landowners can expect as those policies are applied to each particular situation. I think it would be extremely helpful for us if the Commission could take the time to outline in general the lands that are felt to be within the jurisdiction of the Commission itself, and what the general procedures and policies are with reference to the utilization of those lands particularly by the landowners. And if in the development of the policy, we could arrange a meeting in the Delta somewhere at your convenience both timewise and insofar as location is concerned, for all of the people who might be potentially affected by the decisions to be present, and at least have their views heard. It would be extremely helpful to me, because otherwise, we are just repeating ourselves case by case, instance by instance. And we are taking more time with your staff and certainly the time of the Commission ultimately, in this kind of a broad relationship with the landowners in particular.

1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So if that suggestion has any merit, I would --

CHAIRMAN CORY: The Commission meeting after fire in identification of the policies potential landowners is that specifically feasible?

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, we had a bill SB 469 by Senator Dills last year, that gave us the legislative mandate to do this by 1981, and we're in the process now, as the Senator mentioned, of putting this Objecther. The first thing we'll do will be to handle the Delta and to set those boundary lines. Because again, where is the boundary line?

CHAIRMAN CORY: But the question the Senator is bringing up, rather than having him deal with the individual landowner who is apprised of his difficulties on an individual basis, is it possible for us to outline the principles by which we are proceeding to define those boundaries? And can we, in fact, get a list of where those areas of trespass are, so that we could in essence allow all of them to have their shot, rather than the Senator spending, I would imagine, a significant portion of his staff's time responding to each individual landowner as they get notice.

Is that a fair summary?

SENATOR NEJEDLY: That's pretty generally -- I'm aware it's going to take some time to implement it. I am only pointing out that this is an area of immediate

concern of many of the property owners throughout there who are being affected differently in what they consider to be similar circumstances by differing staff interpretations and particularly, the lands in which the Commission feels that they have an interest. These lands are shifting currently by new staff or Commission determinations, if that is in fact the case, and people who have previously had decisions rendered in their case are finding that they are now being affected by new decisions and new policies and new rules. It's a very confused situation. I would hope that in some fashion we could implement the Act or the intentions of the Commission by delineating the areas in which the Commission feels the State has an interest, and what are the general rules applicable to those areas. And if we could have at least that, then I think we would be in a position to request a specific meeting on this with some more intelligence than what we're dealing with at this level today.

I can only suggest that it's very confusing even to me, who has at least contact with a number of cases in which the decisions aren't reconcilable.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, it has certainly been customary to have meetings with groups of people to explain the legal principles involved in determining the boundaries. I think the only change that Senator Nejedly

24 25

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

could be referring to is the high water situation where a court has indicated and the title industry has indicated and this Commission has asked us to reexamine the question where the boundary runs, whether it's the high or low water. That may be creating some confusion that could be explained easily, in a meeting.

The basic problem, though, is that in areas such as the Delta where there's been extensive man-made works, where there have been changes, where the precise boundary is may be the subject of considerable difficulty and actually go to litigation before you can say "This is the boundary."

The effect of changes is subject to expert interpretation. We can explain how that's done. And as for areas, it may be better to take areas and determine the boundary within an area. In other words, take six or seven lots that have a common problem and take those at one time or a slough that seems to have a common problem. But sometimes, these can radically change. For instance, a person may have been in an inlet or a little cup and they filled that and their position may be completely different than the neighbor on either side who have always been next to a very stable line.

So, it is a very complicated problem. We can explain it, and I think in the past in other areas, the

degree of understanding could be worked out between the parties. This is the ballgame. But it still may take either an agreement after everyone contributes their input as to what they have for boundary lines and locations. Maybe it will be possible to reach an agreement; if it's not possible to reach an agreement, all that information will have to be submitted to a judge for ruling on which line is controlling.

CHAIRMAN CORY: I have found in the past that the Senator has asked for these kinds of meetings and they have been very beneficial to me.

Now, are we currently in the position where we can relatively quickly establish a meeting to discuss the general principles and find out through some of the people particularly what it is we are trying to accomplish?

MR. NORTHROP: Yes, we can do that without any wait at all.

MR. TAYLOR: . We can also indicate to them the kind of information that we're searching for and seek their assistance, and also ask them to have our technical people -- our technical people that work to see if a common understanding can be reached as to some controlling principles. The biggest problem is the facts, and the facts can go back to such a long period of time.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Senator Nejedly, would that be

a sufficient first step?

SENATOR NEJEDLY: I would certainly -- if that is a direction to staff to arrange a meeting, that certainly would be helpful to us if at that meeting we could also have some more precise statements by the staff in the areas in which they feel the Commission has an interest; if in some point in time it seems to me that the State has a responsibility to determine what it thinks it owns in the line where that ownership is determined. And I would like to be more specific if we can be rather than just develop the rules which will be helpful, as to where these areas are that they are going to be applied.

CHAIRMAN CORY: It is my understanding that we are starting in the Delta some of the areas of Donner Lake, and we will in essence move throughout the State to clear up the title and asc. tain the inventory of all State property. Unfortunately, there is not an inventory of State property. We've been unable to convince the Department of Finance under any Governor to sufficiently fund the project in establishing an inventory.

So, Senator, I'm not sure of giving a list, you know, these are the items, it's something we're going to have to do a little bit each year.

MR. NORTHROP: We can certainly give the areas. We cannot show a line of demarcation.

MR. TAYLOR: It is possible to show the areas where problems exist. And in that context, we work with a group of people or with the specific landowner involved. What is impossible to do is give a precise line as to what is the actual controlling boundary. I don't think that the research has been completed to that degree to satisfy anyone on that. But we can tell an owner if he's got a problem or not, and we can set out a program to work out the problem, and hopefully we will resolve it by negotiations. Pending that, we can expedite a trial if the parties will cooperate with the development of a common understanding of facts; and in some areas that's worked very well.

SENATOR NEJEDLY: In the budget, I certainly want to espouse the cause if that's the issue as to the appropriation of sufficient monies to at least advise the public what the line is that the State feels it has an interest in. I think ultimately, it would be a lot cheaper to do it in that fashion than to do it in either the litigation route or the expense and time consuming route that we are undergoing now administratively in this case by case bit.

That's where we are.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: When we go to Senate Finance and Assembly Ways and Means, I'd like to

get a copy of this transcript so I can use your testimony here.

(Laughter.)

9.

SENATOR NEJEDLY: You tell me when it's going to be and we'll have the people there. I think we can make a very clear case.

CHAIRMAN CORY: We've always gotien the Legislature to appropriate the money, we've never been able to get the Governor to leave it in the budget.

SENATOR NEJEDLY: Maybe we ought to invite him for a little trip down the Delta.

CHAIRMAN CORY: We will proceed and also renew our efforts to try to get the money allocated to delineating these things so we can be more precise with the people.

But we can start with the staff meetings and get those under way, and somebody from our shop will be in touch with you as to how we can get those set up.

SENATOR NEJEDLY: I don't want to impose on your time, you've been generous to this point. I'd like to if I may, though, because this issue involves our county, the Dowrelio Boat Works for the Commission has made a determination with reference to the amount to be paid. I would appreciate it if you would set that for some hearing at your convenience. If we could put the case to you a little more illusively, I don't think the

Commission is aware of the circumstances.

1

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What we have here, very briefly, is a case in which a boat owner is an operator and attempting to operate privately the very small facility. He now has an annual fee of \$2,000 to the State. In order to pay that \$2,000, he's trying to dredge the harbor to accommodate the small drab boats, and the State is now saying to him that he has to pay a royalty for the removal of the dredges, which is presenting a financial situation to him which may mean closing of the harbor entirely because he simply isn't making it. I've gone over his books. I spent two days with his people down there and I can tell you very quickly that he's not making it. The only way he survives at all is by contributing his own time at no expense to the business. And that what the State is going to do if they impose this charge is to lose the \$2,000, the public lose the convenience, and we have nothing and the county loses the assessed valuation of the facility because it's going to rapidly deteriorate if he goes out of business.

So, I think we got to a point where the Commission really doesn't understand what is the fact of the situation.

CHAIRMAN CORY: So it's a question of a request from the Senator on a hearing on this matter.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So move.

John, I wasn't here last month; I don't know 1 what the facts are. 2 CHAIRMAN CORY: Okay. Thank you, Senator. 3 Item 6(F) on our calendar, Commercial Lease of June Greening for nine tenths of an acre of tide and 5 submerged land in Sacramento; \$250 per annum with the State reserving the right to fix a different rental on 7 April 28th and on each fifth anniversary of the lease 8 9 thereafter. Is there any controversy on this item? 10 Anyone here wish to speak on this item? 11 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So move. 12 CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection, this will 13 be the order. 14 Item 6(G), Assignment from John H. Pietz of 15 a Commercial Lease to Western Water Ways, Inc.; normal 16 insurance requirements; consideration 857.50 per annum, 17 reserving the right to alter or determine the lease by 18 April 27, '76. 19 Is there anyone here who wishes to address 20 themselves to this item? 21 Any controversy on this item? 22 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So move. 23

CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection, Item 6(G)

24

25

is approved as presented.

6(H); Assignment and Amendment of Commercial Lease of Lawrence H. Kerns, Sacramento River near Oak Hall 2 Bend, Yolo County; consideration of \$3,120 per annum. 3 Anyone wishes to address the Commission on this 5 item? LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So move. 6 7 CHAIRMAN CORY: Item 6(H) is approved as presented. 6(I), Huntington Harbour, Assignment of Noncommer-8 cial Lease from the Huntington Harbour Corporation, the 9 developer, to the Sea Harbour State Channel Slip Owners 10 Association. 11 MR. NORTHROP: A homeowner group in the harbor. 12 CHAIRMAN CORY: Consideration \$4,875.67 per 13 annum. 14 Is there anyone who wishes to address themselves? 15 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So move. 16 17 CHAIRMAN CORY: No objection, Item 6(I) will be 18 approved as presented. Item 6(J), Recreational Pier Permits in Contra 19 Costa, Placer and Sacramento Counties. 20 Is there anyone here who wishes to address 21 themselves? 22 I think that Calvin L. Schmidt is a judge from 23 Orange County who is a friend of mine. 24 25 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Move to postpone.

CHAIRMAN CORY: I mean, I know the guy, but I've Ĺ never talked about this with him. 2 Okay. I'm making a disclosure of the awareness. 3 But if it is the same Cal Schmidt, he's never mentioned this to me, and it's standard procedure --5 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So moved. 6 CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection, Item 6(J) 7 will be approved as presented. 8 7(A), Burmah Oil and Gas. These are for six 9 wells --10 MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, these are for four 11 wells. 12 CHAIRMAN CORY: Four new wells, and two injection? 13 MR. NORTHROP: Two injection, right. 14 CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection. 15 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So move. 16 CHAIRMAN CORY: 7(A) is --17 MR. FINK: Mr. Chairman, what is the procedure 18 for a member of the public -- I regret that I was late 19 on arriving here -- to be heard on an item such as 7(A)? 20 CHAIRMAN CORY: Come forward and identify 21 yourself and tell us what you want to tell us. It's very 22 easy. 23 My name is Jim Fink, F-i-n-k. MR. FINK: 24 My mailing address is Post Office Box 28759, Sacramento, 25

California 95828.

With regard to the oil situation, Mr. Chairman, I wish to let it be known that I feel that it is important that these applications be approved, particularly in view of the situation which I realize the State of California has no direct control over, mainly the nationwide energy crunch.

I feel that we have a situation here that warrants the interests of all Californians inasmuch as we're all paying high prices at the gas pumps to keep our cars in operation, and until such time as RT has statewide services, I think we are still going to need our cars.

One of the situations developed unfortunately, was the 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill. However, I have information in front of me that indicates that this was blown way out of proportion by the mass media. I am quoting now from the report conducted by the University of Southern California marine biologists under the chairmanship of Dr. Dale T. Straughan. And to spell that for the record it is S-t-r-a-u-g-h-a-n.

And his report states, quote: "That no ill effects on animal and vegetable plankton were observed.

No damage from the oil spill could be found on sandy beaches. The channel fish catch was actually found to have

been greater for the six month period following the oil spill than in a comparable period before. Nor has the spill defamated the bird population. Of the 12,000 birds in the channel at the time of the spill, 3,500 died from all causes. Yet by May, the bird population has risen to 85,000 because of seasonal migrations."

Ø.

The conclusions of Dr. Straughan and his team unfortunately became one of the best kept secrets since the disappearance of June Crater.

Now, one other point that was made in this same \$250,000 study which by the way ran some 900 pages.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Who paid the \$250,000?

MR. FINK: The University of Southern California, as I have it.

CHAIRMAN CORY: What is their source of money?

MR. TAYLOR: The industry paid for the report
as a result of the litigation that was arising or in
connection with it. Whether it was directly a part of
the litigation or not, it was used in the litigation by
the industry.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Okay.

MR. FINK: This same report also states quote, "Not only had overall damage by the spill been greatly overestimated, but where damage had been done, nature had returned it to normal."

1 2

Now, the fact of the matter is that for centuries, there have been crude oil influxes even before man ever thought of drilling.

You have a situation here where there is natural seats of a place known as Coal Oil Point, down there on the Santa Barbara Coast.

CHAIRMAN CORY: The item we have before us relates to Orange County, Huntington Beach.

MR. FINK: I realize this.

CHAIRMAN CORY: And we're willing to give you substantial latitude, but if you could focus in on whether or not we should put in these wells. We're probably going to approve them, but if there is some specific information to help us in that area, we'll be glad to take it.

But, go ahead and proceed.

MR. FINK: Let me explain my reasoning for bringing up the Santa Barbara issue. It was the result of the Santa Barbara issue that offshore oil drilling was indefinitely banned in the State of California, and so that is the tie-in.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Mr. Fink, there might be a more appropriate time for you to focus on that particular issue, when the question of new applications comes up. I think it probably will next year. Standard will probably reapply to drill in the channel, and there

will be some public hearings. At that time, it seems to 1 be more appropriate for you to focus on that issue and 2 your testimony will be more relevant. Right now, we are 3 probably about to approve what is a routine application. But, I think next year that you might be a very valuable 5 witness for the oil companies and other people who believe that we should continue to drill in the Santa Barbara channel. MR. FINK: Thank you very much. 9 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: I would instruct 10 the staff to so inform the industry, so that you could 1 1 testify in their behalf. 12 MR. NORTHROF: That's correct. 13 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: And Standard is 14 going to renew the application next year, as I understand it? 15 MR. NORTHROP: Yes, they will. 16 MR. FINK: I would appreciate notification of 17 when the hearings are occurring. 18 MR. NORTHROP: As you leave, we will be sure 19 to get your name and address. 20 CHAIRMAN CORY: Okay. Item 7(A), any further 21 discussion? 22 Without objection, 7(A) will be approved as 23 presented. 24

7(B), a royalty adjustment from Atlantic Richfield.

25

MR. NORTHROP: According to the lease, they 1 are allowed to deduct. 2 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Mr. Chairman, we 3 have no other choices on this matter but to vote for it. MR. NORTHROP: It's according to the lease, 5 they have the right to it. 6 CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection Item 7(B) 7 will be approved pursuant to the terms of the lease. 8 7(C), Marin County wants to do some dredging. 9 MR. NORTHROP: Yes. The dredging has already 10 been done. 11 CHAIRMAN CORY: We're adjusting the price because 12 they didn't put them where they said they were going to 13 put them. 14 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So moved. 15 CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection, Item 7(C) 16 approved as presented. 17 8(A). 18 MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, this is the First 19 Amendment to the Stretford Process which is part of the 20 budget program. 21 CHAIRMAN CORY: This is just to handle the 22 details of the accounting procedure for the cost of 23 operating the Stretford plan? 24 MR. NORTHROP: Right. 25

CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection? 1 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So moved. 2 CHAIRMAN CORY: 8(A) will be approved as presented. 3 8(B) is a review of the tideland project in 4 Long Beach, and this is the final --5 MR. NORTHROP: This is the final closing on that. 6 CHAIRMAN CORY: \$6,086.86 Long Beach wants, and 7 that is bound to be owing due to the Subsidence costs. 8 Without objection, it will be approved as 9 presented. 10 Item 9(A). 11 MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, this is a delegation 12 of authority to attorneys to enforce the nonpayment of 13 rent through unlawful detainer actions. 14 CHAIRMAN CORY: These are the people who stopped 15 paying rent, to allow us to go ahead and get money back? 16 MR. HIGHT: That's correct. 17 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So moved. 18 CHAIRMAN CORY: Item 9(A) will be approved. 19 9(B). 20 MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, 9(B) is a report 21 that was asked for by the Legislature and prepared by 22 Mr. Trout's unit, and I'd like to have Mr. Trout discuss 23 it with you. 24 MR. TROUT: I think the Commission is fully aware 25

that their jurisdiction extends over something like 4 1/2 million acres of land. In effect, the Legislature said that the Commission should inventory this entire round of land and determine originally which portions of the land were environmentally unique.

For a year, there was a very difficult problem between your staff, the Office of Planning and Research and the Resources Agency about what was unique. The following year, the Legislature changed the word "unique" to "significant," so we were then asked on your behalf to inventory State owned lands under the jurisdiction of the Commission which were environmentally significant.

So this calendar item is the final step in a significant project. And it seems appropriate to kind of summarize the steps that were taken.

The Commission was required to inventory and identify the lands under its jurisdiction. This task was completed last December, and a draft report was circulated state-wide. Comments were received and will be incorporated into a final inventory.

Each of the Commissioners has been furnished the mock-up of the final report which has a yellow cover on it. It is the successor to a draft report which had a similar cover that was bright orange.

As can be expected, the staff was unable to

investigate each individual parcel of land under the Commission's jurisdiction. Therefore, nominations were solicited from other governmental agencies as well as organizations out of the more than 100 organizations and agencies contacted, over 50 responded. In addition, some 100 reports were reviewed with 19 determined by the staff to have direct value on the inventory.

As a result, we feel the inventory is comprehensive as well as an exhaustive report.

A substantial percentage of the lands were determined to possess --

CHAIRMAN CORY: Pardon me. How does that follow?

Pardon me, maybe this isn't the place to do this. You

just stated that we weren't able to do an actual physical

inventory ourselves, so we have asked other governmental

agencies to do it by invitation. Half of those that

you requested to responded, and then another value

determination was made with 19 that you thought significant.

If that is the premise of the work, how can you come to the conclusion that that's comprehensive?

MR. TROUT: 19 were in addition to the 50. There were 19 additional reports out of 100 reports that were reviewed.

We feel that it's comprehensive because the agencies that responded, such as the Department of Fish and

Game and other agencies that have broad based field personnel, the Sierra Club, the Nature Conservancy, and other people who have the ability and interest to cover the state state-wide were the agencies that responded.

CHAIRMAN CORY: The question in my mind is that we're doing this the best pobwe can given the resources we have available, but I personally don't believe that that is a comprehensive way to inventory property. It seems to me that we are stating our limitations, and we should make that explicit and not get too wound up with where we are. I don't know what the Governor's views are. I'm hesitant because I can see where a significant parcel has very probably been left out just due to the financial limitations on the study. And if we discovered that and started to say defend title on another piece someplace else, somebody else can come back and say well your own records, your own comprehensive study of such and such show that it wasn't there.

MR. TROUT: I accept the change in language.
The report itself does not --

CHAIRMAN CORY: Okay. I just --

MR. TROUT: The word "comprehensive" is the staff feeling. It is not indicated in the report. We've indicated the limitations and as you will see later in our presentation here, we feel that it is extremely

important to keep the doors open so that additional parcels may be added as it becomes apparent that they were overlocked.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Fine. I think it's important that we keep restating that, so that the report not be taken out of context.

Pardon me for jumping to it, but it just seems to be fraught with peril, but we have to start somewhere. And I appreciate what the staff has done. It's a good, excellent job given the limitations. But, let's not get wound up by thinking we've really solved the problem. We've got a lot of unanswered questions starting from -- it seemed to me that there would be a better way to inventory this if someone would come up with the bread for us.

MR. TROUT: The Chairman is entirely correct.

But even with these limitations, a substantial percentage of the lands were determined to possess significant value. Approximately 70 percent of the sovereign lands or the tide and submerged lands, 38 percent of the school lands are so listed in the report.

To show the magnitude of this, over 2 1/2 million of the 4.3 million acres under the Commission's jurisdiction has been identified as possessing some significant environmental values.

Today, two requirements remain for the Commission:
The adoption of regulations to protect the identified
lands; and recommendations for additional action.

£

At the July meeting, the Commission authorized the Division to hold hearings on the regulations. The proposed regulations were circulated and public hearings were held in September. These regulations which require your approval today established several procedures for the protection of the lands.

First, the Division may augment information in the inventory whenever additional information is received.

Two, the Division will classify all environmentally significant lands into one of three use classifications.

Three, the staff shall continually review environmental documents to determine if additional lands should be classified as having significant environmental value.

And four, the Commission would determine that it shall not allow the sale, lease or other use of significant lands without finding that adequate provisions have been made to assure the permanent protection of the prescribed values or that granting of the application will have no significant effect upon the values.

The only additional requirement for the final report is to recommend additional action. We have proposed

in the report several areas.

First, that you direct the staff to investigate the establishment of funds to be used to preserve the significant values when in danger.

Second, that an advisory committee be established to recommend solutions when significant values are in danger.

And third, the proposals be developed through the budgetary process to finance periodic inspections of the significant lands and identification of potential threat.

The findings of all these investigations if approved, would be reported back to you. With the adoption of the calendar item, the Commission is certifying that all requirements have been met.

We feel that this is the beginning of our planning process and will be a valuable tool for future use.

We therefore recommend that you approve this item, given the limitations recognized by the Chairman.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, during one of your comments to Mr. Trout, you indicated that this might have an effect on boundaries or State title claims. It's specifically provided in the statute that this does not effect title problems. It stated in the report and in the

regulations that are before you for adoption, it also states that this is only an environmental inventory, and it does not determine boundaries nor are boundaries really defined in this report. There is, as Mr. Trout pointed out, a flexibility of the Commission, if we've overlooked an area which turns out in the process of considering an item for action by the Commission which should be listed as environmentally unique; someone applies for a parcel of property to lease it or do something else to it, under these regulations that you are adopting today, they are given a copy of our criteria. And also we checked the inventories that tend to exist, and if it is on the inventory, he must meet the two requirements. If it is not on the inventory, the party must provide a statement description of the area so that the staff can review whether that should be given some environmental classification.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, this process will continue to go on, and this is the beginning of that work.

CHAIRMAN CORY: In terms of a basic definition that was used in terms of significant, are all waterways and access to waterways dealt with as environmentally significant or not?

MR. TROUT: Not necessarily.

The legislation as amended gave to the Office of

Planning and Research the duty to establish the criteria, the definition of what is environmentally significant. In general, as you can tell from the 70 percent of tide and submerged lands, most fell within this category. Another consideration was that the Delta Master Recreation Plan and the Wild and Scenic Rivers Plan or proposal was to have been considered and was in the development of this area.

So that basically, it's the deep ocean that probably has the 30 percent, although it is possible for some waterways to not be environmentally significant.

Our Fish and Game found significance in nearly all of them, as an example.

CHAIRMAN CORY: The dispute that we have going is someplace in the Delta with a duck club, you know, is that waterway inventory in here, for example, as environmentally significant?

MR. TROUT: I'm not certain whether that particular one is or not.

The limitation, of course, has been that if someone did not nominate it or was not identified in any report, it is not included in this first version that we're turning out.

CHAIRMAN CORY: That's the question. It seems to me with the pressure on waterways generally, I would be

hard pressed not to find all waterways owned by the State to be environmentally significant. There may be one you can show me that isn't, but I would not leave an implication in this draft or by the adoption of that that something else is going to turn around and bite us in the back of the head on one of those other situations where they say it's obviously not environmentally significant. That's the kind of deletion that I'm worried about. Something that could be relatively small in terms of an overall thing, but very significant in terms of the pressures that we have upon us.

There was a time when upper Newport Bay was not considered very significant to the people of Orange County, and then it became very significant.

MR. NORTHROP: Your example happens to be in here, but your point is well taken.

CHAIRMAN CORY: So, if in the draft we are nebulous enough to include some of those smaller places -- that's all I'm worried about.

MR. TAYLOR: There could be a statement included amended to your approval today of this report, that there be a paragraph added that the failure to include an item, a particular area, does not necessarily mean that it does not have environmental significance. Would that satisfy?

CHAIRMAN CORY: I would prefer to have that 2 explicit statement. MR. TROUT: Certainly, that is the reason we 3 brought it before you; it can be added or amended, and in following your wishes today would then be --5 CHAIRMAN CORY: To be placed fairly early so 7 that anybody starting to skim would pick that up; this 8 is the first step and this is the first inventory, and we expect there to be revisions. 10 Can we proceed with that amendment being added 11 to the document? Without objection, 9(B) approved as amended. 12 9(C), authorization to conduct public information 13 sessions on various areas including the Truckee area, 14 concerning the findings of the Earth Satellite Corporation 15 into submerged areas of Donner. 16 Any questions or debate on this item? 17 18 Any questions from anybody in the audience? Without objection, 9(C) will be approved as 19 20 presented. 9(D). 21 22 MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, 9(D), (E) and (F) deal with the same subject matter, and Bob Hight from 23 our counsel is going to address the Commission on this. 24

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Mr. Chairman, may

25

I suggest that we separate Item (F) from (D) and (E). 1 CHAIRMAN CORY: Okay. 2 MR. HIGHT: If we could take Item (D) and (E) 3 as together. CHAIRMAN CORY: Is there anyone in the audience 5 who wishes to address the Items (D) or (E)? 6 MR. HIGHT: The Government Code provided that 7 the State Lands Commission has to approve any boundaries 8 of any area of which it is going to incorporate, and the incorporated area will include tide and submerged lands. 10 The Commission staff has reviewed the boundaries and 11 found that Items (D) and (E) are in conformance. 12 Is there any opposition? 13 CHAIRMAN CORY: No objection, Item 9(D) and (E) 14 will be approved as presented. 15 Without objection, that's the order. 16 9 (F). 17 MR. HIGHT: 9(F) is the incorporation of the 18 City of Truckee. It includes Donner Lake. 19 It is the recommendation of the staff that 20 based upon the problems with the boundary of Donner Lake, 21 that it would not be in the best interests of the State 22 for the Commission to approve this incorporation as 23 described. 24 This relates back to Item 9(C) on CHAIRMAN CORY:

25

the agenda?

MR. NORTHROP: Yes.

MR. HIGHT: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Is there anyone who wishes to address themselves to Item 9(F)?

MR. PORTER: My name is Jim Porter, P-o-r-t-e-r.

And I would just like to question the staff's recommendation on this matter. We have begun proceedings for the incorporation of Truckee, and they -- the first step is to make application to LAFCO, the Local Agency Formation Commission, and then you go on from there on to an election. They cannot accept our application until the State Lands Commission approves our boundaries. So therefore, we are on a very tight calendar schedule trying to have our election next November, and we won't make it. I feel that it's almost impossible if we're put off at this point.

CHAIRMAN CORY: I think what is being suggested here is not that you be put off but that you be turned down.

MR. PORTER: I've read the ordinance. I have it here, and it states you shall approve or disapprove all portions of the boundaries of the proposed city.

Well, the boundaries of the proposed city go around Donner Lake, not close to the center. None of the boundaries go

through Donner Lake. From my reading this ordinance, this Government Code Section, the considerations that the Board, the staff is to review, talk about right angles and how the city lines goes through the State Lands; and this doesn't affect us at all. I don't know what the intent is here.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: What county is Truckee?

MR. PORTER: This is Nevada County.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: You haven't been to LAFCO, yet?

MR. PORTER: We have been to LAFCO, but they will not accept our application. They say under this Government Code Section 34302.3, this is the section that gives you the power to review our boundaries. It says "We cannot make any application for incorporation until we have received approval of the State Lands Commission."

What I'm asking is you are saying let's wait until we determine the boundary problems of Donner Lake. Well, in my opinion, this is going to be several years down the line. There are some people who are very hot about what's happening at Donner Lake, and I won't make a decision on that. So, we are going to be waiting three or four years while you decide whether or not we should incorporate Truckee or not. I don't think that was the

intent of this ordinance.

ì

CHAIRMAN CORY: The alternative, though, is for the incorporation not to include the disputed lands.

MR. PORTER: We could do that, but I would like to know -- we are not taking title to this property, of course. We aren't making any statement as to whether your moves or the new survey -- what effect that's going to have on the land. What is that going to have to do with you? This will just unnecessarily complicate things.

For example, under the ordinance, if we do have to exclude it, we will have to have a legal description excluding the boundary of Donner Lake. We'll have the incorporation boundaries and then the specific exclusion of Donner Lake. Well, I'm not even sure that there is a legal description, yet. Conceivably, we would have to wait three or four years to even get a description.

MR. HIGHT: We can describe the bed of Donner Lake with sufficient adequacy.

MR. PORTER: It has to be in the best interest of the State Lands Commission. What is the best interest of the State Lands Commission to refuse it --

CHAIRMAN CORY: To maximize our claims.

MR. PORTER: Well, how are your claims going to be affected adversely by having the City of Truckee incorporated?

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Can we then have an amendment in the application before LAFCO which would separate Donner Lake pending the resolve of the problems, because there are some obviously legal squatters.

MR. PORTER: There obviously are, but I don't see how --

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: If you take away the lake from the State, it is conceivable that we may never solve this problem.

MR. PORTER: No, we are not taking the lake away. We are taking it from the County, the State owns it.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Let me back up, trying to get you on track. If your goal and objective is to expedite the process of LAFCO and all, for Truckee, I for one Commissioner, unprepared to vote for an incorporation boundary which includes the bed of Donner Lake.

It is my judgment that that interferes with our claims, vis a vis, the ownership of that property.

Now, I may be incorrect in that. Unfortunately, I am sitting here where I'm not going to defend that position, because I think it might tend to jeopardize the State's position in terms of its various legal battles.

Now, to the extent that you want to proceed, if you're willing to delete the thing from Donner, the

Donner Lake Bed, I'm willing to vote for it, because that leaves the thing neutral. But, I am not prepared to get into a defense of my judgmental factors on something that may later be litigated. I'm willing to state my position. If that helps you, we can proceed; if not, I'm afraid that there really isn't a quorum at which we can -- at least as far as my vote is concerned -- that we can help you.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Let me ask both counsels a question. Is it possible to proceed with the application before LAFCO, deleting the lake bed out of the area of incorporation?

MR. PORTER: And proceed and at some later time make a determination that it may be included.

Well, it certainly would be -- well, no, it probably would not. We go to LAFCO, have a public hearing, then we pass a petition of Notice of Intention to Pass a Petition and pass a petition, then all the time stating what the boundaries are in all of them. So, we have to pass a petition to do it, with duplicate copies, this will take us up to the election which will be next November. I see no way that these people here, that the State Lands is going to have any resolution on this matter for '76.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Could you not

exclude the land to your application?

MR. PORTER: Yes, we could exclude the land in the application.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: I mean the bed of the lake.

MR. PORTER: Right.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: And you could proceed on your incorporation, and then when we resolve this with the parties and with the Attorney General's Office or whomever, then the city can come back, assuming that you will incorporate, come back and negotiate with us.

MR. PORTER: Then, if we had a city, I suppose that would leave us an exit. Then, we would have to have another election and on and on, and cost the taxpayers more money.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: You can negotiate with the Lands Commission.

MR. PORTER: The Lands Commission changed -well, they haven't made a decision. Well, later on
they make the decision that they would not be opposed to
the city taking in the bed of Donner Lake, then I suppose
we can have another petition and another election and
annex the bed of Donner Lake.

CHAIRMAN CORY: I don't think you have to have an

election, it would be an uninhabited territory.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Well, let's assume

you do.

CHAIRMAN CORY: It would be pretty hard for annexation of uninhabited territory without an election. I don't think we've got anybody living on it.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: My point is -CHAIRMAN CORY: But if you do have people living
on it --

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: That's the issue, here. If you do then, at some subsequent election, you could tie in with the School Board election or general election and put it on the ballot.

MR. PORTER: I appreciate your decision, but I still question the logic behind it. I see no logic behind it. We are not making a land grab, we are just changing the background government from the county to the city.

not with you and the petitioners. The problem is with some other people who don't even live in Donner Lake; they live in New York, for that matter. That's the problem we have here. We are not opposing your application. As a matter of fact, I am supportive of what you're doing.

MR. PORTER: That's the problem we have, is

people who live in New York and Chicago, right.

ı

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So, if you want to expedite this application, I would be prepared to vote for it if you would exclude that portion.

MR. MRER: Are any of you not prepared at this time to state why you prefer to have it?

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Oh, because of the problems we have with the squatters. It's an unresolved legal problem.

MR. PORTER: Perhaps you do not understand incorporation, that the problems you have with squatters and the water going out Donner Lake and all of this, the staff has recommended -- suggested to me that those are the problems. And they don't want to have a growth inducing impact, and maybe Dart Industries or Tahoe-Donner may be taking more water out. Those districts will probably not be taken over by the city. So I can assure you that there will be no affect of the corporation on the people of Donner Lake.

If that's your position, I would accept the acceptance of our application.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Can we approve it?

MR. HIGHT: Subject to the exclusion of Donner Lake, yes.

MR. PORTER: Then you don't approve it, then?

1 CHAIRMAN CORY: We'll approve it. LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Without amendment, 2 3 you don't get it. MR. PORTER: You are saying that you are denying 5 our request to include State Lands within proposed 6 boundaries of the city, then there are no state lands and 7 we don't have to apply to you. So, you denied it, and there's no way --8 MR. TAYLOR: Are there any other State Lands 9 10 in the Donner thing? MR. TROUT: No fee lands as far as we know within 11 the city boundary. 12 MR. PORTER: So you deny it. 13 CHAIRMAN CORY: Failure to act positively could 14 15 be taken as a denial. MR. PORTER: One question I have, does the staff 16 have the date as to when we made application for the 17 approval of the State Lands Commission? 18 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: I'm going to offer 19 a motion so we can resolve it. 20 I move that the application be approved with 21 the exception of Donner Lake, and the staff would put 22 the appropriate language to describe the exclusion. 23 CHAIRMAN CORY: I would second that motion with 24 the understanding that that means we will approve it if 25

Donner Lake bed is not included in the city limits.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: And the staff will put into legal language all of the observations.

MR. PORTER: Then, what are you approving?

MR. HIGHT: We are approving the boundaries of the incorporation but excluding from the area the area bed of Donner Lake.

CHAIRMAN CORY: If your position is correct, our act has no force and effect, you can proceed without it. But, in case there is something else, you've got approval of it.

So without objection --

MR. PORTER: Could the staff answer this one question, when we made application, because failure to make a denial or approval within 45 days is automatically an approval. And there are some questions in my mind as to whether our application -- when it came in.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: This is a legal question, that if the application was made longer than 45 days, that in effect, we have approved it.

MR. HIGHT: The application -- we are within the 45 days. We have the authority to approve or disapprove.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Okay. We have taken action and the staff clearly understands that the approval is only a conditional approval, if the lake bed of Donner Lake

is excluded from the application.

MR. PORTER: And if there is no other State

lands within the proposed city, you've just denied our -
MR. NORTHROP: Disapproved.

MR. FINK: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN CORY: Yes.

MR. FINK: I respectfully request permission to make a point of information in case further controversies of this nature develop.

The question came up annexing unincorporated lands into a city if they were uninhabited.

A precedent for this kind of situation was established in the city of Napa in 1974, along a ranch hassle. I don't know if you are aware of that. This involved several thousand acres of land to the rest of the Silverado Country Club where the famous Kaiser Golf Tournament is played each year.

The proposal was to put in a tennis club and condominium unit and incorporate it into the city of Napa. The citizens of Napa formed an organization known as Citizens Against Urban Sprawl and demanded, and took it to court, elections as to whether or not this could be annexed. The city had annexed it under the uninhabited lands provision, because in fact there were no residences whatsoever on the property. It was pretty vacant land,

the only residences thereon having been burned to the ground.

The court ruled that an election had to be held, and in the subsequent election, the entire city of Napa voted on it and overwhelmingly nixed the annexation.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Okay. The staff is aware of that?

MR. NORTHROP: We made notes on that.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: Thank you very much.

Item 10(A).

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, 10(2) is a piece of property known as the Hazard Unit which the State Lands has under lease to Imperial Thermal.

Fish and Game own the surface rights of the property and was administering it, and it contracted the work out for the Federal Government, the Department of Interior. The Department of Interior asked for a longer lease time; rather than give them a longer lease time, the Department of Fish and Game through General Services gave them the property.

Now, we have a problem with this property in the fact that we have a Lessee on the property which had been given away.

So, we asked for authorization to file declaratory relief and instruct the Attorney General --

CHAIRMAN CORY: Looks like the Attorney General 3 has a problem. 2 MR. NORTHROP: In effect, the Fish and Game 3 had given away lands which we had a lease. MR. TAYLOR: We don't feel that all of the 5 requirements for such a conveyance had been met and there 6 may be some defects in that; and that's what our problem 7 is. 8 CHAIRMAN CORY: Okay. They're saying they've 9 got it all. 10 MR. NORTHROP: They've got it all and they've 11 got a quitclaim deed on it. 12 CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection, 10(A) will 13 be authorized as presented. 14 10(B)? 15 MR. HIGHT: 10(B), Mr. Chairman, is the authoriza-16 tion for the staff and the office of the Attorney General 17 to perfect title at Oak Hall Bend. This relates to Calendar 18 item 6(H). The Lessee there is apparently leasing the 19 upland from a private party, and it is the contention 20 of the staff that the land is in fact State owned. 21 CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection. 22

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So moved.

CHAIRMAN CORY: 10(B) authorized as presented.

10(C). Do you want to do this?

23

24

25

MR. NORTHROP: 10(C). We'd like to go into

Executive Session on part of that.

CHAIRMAN CORY: We will pass 10(C).

10(D)?

MR. HIGHT: 10(D), Mr. Chairman, is the authorization to prevent a party in San Mateo County from filling any further land. We have received a letter from them this morning indicating that they will so stop filling the land. However, we feel that in the event that they default on their letter, we would like this authorization anyway.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: So moved.

CHAIRMAN CORY: Without objection, 10(D) will be authorized as presented.

(E)?

MR. NORTHROP: Mr. Chairman, this is the authorization of counsel to proceed against the Department of Interior on the acreage under question in the Executive Officer's Report.

CHAIRMAN CORY: This is the disputed lands which they say they are taking out, but we don't know for sure.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, we have the pleadings in galley form. Anything to the Supreme Court has to be filed in printed form. We have held the final printings. If you like us to go ahead, we will have them printed in

final form. But I don't think we can file it until they 1 go through with their actions. 2 CHAIRMAN CORY: Hold it, if for some reason 3 that's not printed in the Registry when it's supposed to be, I suggest that you have to go ahead and have it 5 printed and proceed, so we don't end up losing anything. 6 So 10(E) will be approved as presented; authoriza-7 tion is granted on those items. 8 Without objection, such will be the order. 9 The confirmation of date, time and place of 10 next meeting of the Commission, we had January 14th in 11 Sacramento. 12 Is there any other item to come before --13 LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR DYMALLY: 10:00 a.m.? 14 CHAIRMAN CORY: 10:00 a.m. 15 Is there any further item to come before us? 16 Is there anyone in the audience that has anything? 17 If not, we will adjourn the public session to 18 go into Executive Session to discuss litigation with 19 counsel. 20

(Thereupon the meeting of the State Lands Commission held on December 1, 1975 was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.)

--000--

24

21

22

23

25

I, DIANE WALTON, a Shorthand Reporter for the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing State Lands Commission Meeting was reported in shorthand by me, Diane Walton, a Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

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

Dated this 7th day of January, 1975.

Mane Walton

DIANE WALTON Shorthand Reporter