1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
26	
17	
18	
19	
20	41
21	
22	

25

MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

STATE LANDS COMMISSION

ORIGINAL

744 P STREET

ROOM 217

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, PEBRUARY 17, 1987

2:15 P.M.

Eileen Jennings, C.S.R. License No. 5122

1	
	COMMISSIONERS TREEST
	Leo T. McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor, Chairman
	Gray Davis, State Controller
	Nancy Ordway, Commission Alternate for Jesse R. Huff, Director of Finance
	STAFF PRESENT
	Claire T. Dedrick, Executive Officer
	James Trout, Assistant Executive Officer
	Robert Hight, Chief Counsel
	Curtis Fossum, Staff Counsel
	Jane Smith, Commission Secretary
	STAFF OF STATE CONTROLLER'S OFFICE
	Jim Tucker, Deputy State Controller
	ALSO PRESENT
	Jan Stevens, Supervising Deputy Attorney General
	Dennis Eagan, Deputy Attorney General

PROCEEDINGS

--000--

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: The meeting of the State Lands
Commission will begin. We welcome all the members of the
public who are here and the parties to items before the
Commission.

COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion on the minutes of January 22nd.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Motion on the minutes from Commissioner Ordway. Any objection to the minutes?

Any objections from the audience?

If not, the minutes will be approved as submitted to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion on the Consent Calendar Cl through 11.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Items 1 through 11 are on the Consent Calendar. Does anyone in the audience wish to ask any different action other than the Commission approving those first eleven items?

If not, the Commission is unanimous in acting on the Consent Calendar.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Item No. 12. Do you want to hear 20 first?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes. If we could, Commissioner, I'd appreciate it.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: We may move out of order. Let's do Item 20 first, because there's going to be special action requested on this; a statement by the Attorney General's Office.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Dennis Eagan of the Attorney General's Office would like to make a statement.

MR. EAGAN: On Friday staff received a request for a continuance of this item from the Applicant and the staff — the basis of the request was an alleged lack of adequate notice. Staff is of the view that the notice was adequate. But, nonetheless, as an accommodation to the Applicant, the staff has pulled this item and suggests that it be put over to the next meeting of the Commission.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Is anybody in the audience seriously inconvenienced by that action on Item No. 20, putting it over?

No one has appeared here that wishes to be heard?

Is it agreeable to the members of the Commission?

COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Uh-huh.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Unanimously we put Item 20 over until the next regularly scheduled meeting of this Commission.

Now let's go back to Item No. 12.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Mr. Chairman, this item is a consideration of an amendment to a lease for the

Riverbank Holding Company. Since the calendar item was written and in discussion with the Applicant, we've come to a somewhat changed agreement if the Commission --

Excuse me, I'm sorry. I didn't see Commissioner Davis come in. I apologize.

Commissioners, Item 12 is a consideration of an amendment to the lease of the Riverbank Holding Company for a marina on the Sacramento River.

Since the calendar item was written, staff has come to a slightly different agreement with the Applicant and if it meets the Commission's approval, we would like to recommend that rather than charging a number that results in a payment of both penalty and interest on the original items, that there be some amendment to that allowing the principal to be paid over a period of -- or at \$500 a month until it's paid back at the pooled money investment rate.

The principal number is \$38,112. That is based on the full rental received by Riverbank for the unleased portion of six berths and the full difference in the money collected by Riverbank from their sublessees, the difference being the three percent of the sublease they collected and the three percent of that which they paid the state.

Riverbank has also agreed to comply with the state's requirements on the actual sublease conditions. I would like Mr. Hight to put those legal details into the record, if I

1 that we find acceptable, used it in other leases that we've 2 negotiated. 3 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Just to note --CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: The Commission --5 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: -- Mr. Gojkovich was a former 6 elected official. Like to recognize those people. 7 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: The Commission unanimously approves the terms of the compromise just described to us. 8.-9 That's the decision. 10 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Item 13. 12 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 13 is a certification of a final EIR and consideration of a 25-year 13 14 general lease for the San Joaquin Valley dipeline Company's 15 proposed common carrier pipeline from Kern County into 16 Martinez, California. 17 COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion. 18 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Any questions on the part of the 19 Commission? 20 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Recommendation approved. 21 Item 14. 22 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 14 is a request to authorize staff to file State Indemnity Selection on 7,500 23 24 acres of federal land in Inyo and San Bernardino Counties at 25 the request of the State Department of Health Services.

1 COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion. 2 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Motion. 3 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Second. CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Unanimously approved. Item 15. 6 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 15 is the approval 7 of a settlement for previous unauthorized use and the 8 approval of a ten-year recreational pier permit for the 9 Wilcoxsons in Napa County. 10 COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion. 11 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Motion. 12 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Second 13 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Second. **14** Unanimously approved. 15 Item 16. 16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 16, U.S. Telecom. This is to deny without prejudice an application for the use 17 18 of state school lands for the purpose of a fiber cotic cable. 19 The reason we're asking for denial here is because 20 we're getting no response from the Applicant on our request 21 for information for their application. 22 COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion. 23 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Motion. 24 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Second. 25 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Staff recommendation for this

approval is accepted.

Seventeen.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: This is the Exxon Corporation. Again, a denial without prejudice of their application for the use of tidelands off Los Flores Canyon, Santa Barbara County for a marine terminal.

The reason for this denial without prejudice is that we're in the process of doing a supplemental EIR.

COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Where's the county on this issue?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: The county is neutral to my knowledge. We're in the EIR process.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: This is the issue where we brought suit against the county on the inadequacy of the EIR and we're in the settlement process with the county on that.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Commissioner Davis.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Just a point of information.

How would any ultimate decision on this project relate to the pending Arco project in that same general vicinity?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: It's in the same general area, as you know, Commissioner. Exxon is a federal lessee at the Hondo Project outside of state waters. The Los Flores

Canyon facility is supposed to be their on-shore operation.

They're currently in a real state of disagreement with the county as to whether or not to go forward on that. As you know, they're before the Department of Commerce in an appeal.

What this would do would be to allow us to bring before you a potential offshore terminal there. Staff is not committed in any way to that terminal. At least we'll be able to process their application, which we can't do now absent more information from the EJR.

So, it doesn't answer your question, because they're only peripherally associated with each other. Although it's possible that if a terminal goes in at Los Flores if the Commission approves one, that could, for example, replace the Ellwood Terminal, which is Arco's terminal. It's that kind of a connection.

So, it's a bunch of ifs. They're both oil facilities and they're both within ten miles of each other. That's always a connection in Santa Barbara County. But there's no direct connection.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Thank you.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Recommendation approved.

Eighteen.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Eighteen is an agreement with the Department of Corrections to allow them a two-year

•	1	right of entry for a sewer Time through a parcel of school
	2	lands in Norco, which we are in the process of trying to
	3	decide how to handle it. It's a very valuable piece of land,
).	4^	but it's an amicable agreement.
	5	COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion.
	6	CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Motion.
•	7	COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Second.
	8	CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Approved as recommended.
	9	Nineteen.
•	10	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 19 is approval of a
	11	Non-Exclusive Geological Survey Permit, Commissioners. These
	12	are not geophysical survey permits. They're the sort where
)	13	they go out in small vessels and do grab samples such as
	14	biological samples. To my knowledge they're not in dispute
	15	by anyone.
1	16	COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion.
	17	CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Motion.
	18	COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Second.
i	19	CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Second.
	20	Approved as recommended.
	21	Item 20.
•	22	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 21 is the Eight
	23	Modification of the oh, I'm sorry. Did you say 20?
	24	CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: We did
!	25	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I'm sorry, I went right

by you. I apologize.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Item 21.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 21 is the Eighth Modification of the 86-87 plan and budget of the Long Beach unit of the Wilmington field. This is an internal money transfer.

COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Motion.

COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Second.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Second.

Approved as recommended.

Twenty-two.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 22, if I may, I'll have Mr. Trout handle.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: This has to do with the payback provisions for an equity adjustment in which the state shares increases and the local town lot property royalty interest owners share decreases.

Assemblyman Elder got a bill passed that allowed for an extension of the payback provisions and we've been working with the oil companies in an effort to figure out how to implement that provision so that it can be effective with the next adjustment in equity. We will be meeting with the oil companies tomorrow to continue that process.

COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: We don't have to take any

• 1	action?
2	ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: No action
3	necessary. It should have been an informational item. I
• 4	forgot to put it in.
5	CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Any questions?
6	Report received. Thank you.
• 7	Item 23.
8	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 23 is a request for
9	a reduction in the Amount of Letter of Credit for the Anchor
• 10	Refining Company.
11	To make a long story short, the amount of money they
12	now owe us is less than the \$10,000 the Letter of Credit
• 13	would the reduction would allow.
14	COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion.
15	CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Motion.
• 16	COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Second.
18	Unanimously accepted.
• 19	Twenty-four.
20	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 24 is a Bolsa Chica
21	item and Mr. Trout has been handling this. If he will, I'd
• 22	like him to report to you.
23	CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Mr. Trout.
24	ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: This relates
25	back to a 1973 property settlement over the ownership between

Signal and the State Lands Commission in which the state got 320-some acres of land along Pacific Coast Highway with the possibility of getting an additional 230 acres if a navigable ocean entrance system was built from the Pacific Ocean to a specified piece of location within the property.

The state is not committed to that at this point.

One of the basic questions that needs to be answered not only for the Commission to make an informed decision, but for the county, the Coastal Commission and others is the feasibility of building such an ocean entrance system.

The Corps of Engineers and the federal administration is no longer funding these kinds of studies with federal funds and, therefore, there's been a need for a local sponsor.

Signal Landmark has approached the Lands Commission with the idea that the Commission would be the local sponsor. However, Signal would in turn reimburse the state for all of its costs related to that and as the sponsor them, the Commission would contract with the Corps of Engineers and complete this feasibility study.

The Commission as a result of entering into this reimbursement agreement is not committed in any way to come up with any additional funds other than whatever agreement is now existent in the '73 agreement.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Help us remember. What is the

cost of doing this work? Not the study, but the work. Do we have a range?

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: Yes. It's probably going to be in the neighborhood of \$80 million to put in the offshore breakwater, the ocean entrance system and dredge a channel that has to be, I think, 400 feet wide. It requires the relocation of a portion of Pacific Coast Highway and a number of other things that would have to be done.

signal is investigating the possibility of setting up a local improvement district of one kind or another or joint powers agency with the county or with the state and the county to develop a marina commercial area that would provide sufficient income to repay any costs that would be incurred in building the ocean entrance system.

The Corps of Engineers has authority to loan money to be reimbursed by local government. However, the decision is clearly up to the Commission with regard to the state's participation in whether they want to build an ocean entrance system or not.

The present point is that the county, the Coastal Commission and even the City of Huntington Beach need to have some basic information about an ocean entrance system before they're ready to make those decisions. So, this is a device to move that process ahead and get the study done by the Corps.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Do we have any descriptive material on the last session we had with local community elected officials and community leaders on this whole issue?

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: We can get you

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: We can get you something.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: How recently was that?

COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: We met Thursday night. Some of our staff met with the county, the city and others on Thursday right.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Was there a good representative audience there?

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: It was a study session hosted by the City of Huntington Beach. If I may, Curt Foseum was our representative there. Maybe he can give you an overall view of how many people were there.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Well. I'm just mainly interested in knowing whether there was a good representative in participating groups there. This is a major thing and a sensitive issue. I want to know how much we're involving the local people in the discussion.

MR. FOSSUM: Commissioners, my name is Curtis Fossum. I'm a staff counsel.

I would say there was approximately 50 to 60 people present in the city council chambers. There were representatives of Signal, community groups including the

Amigos de Bolsa Chica were there. There were presentations made by certain Signal consultants on environmental and economic matters relating to a bill that has not been submitted yet, but that is with the Legislative Counsel's Office right now on a proposed special district that Mr. Trout mentioned.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Whose bill?

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: Marian
Bergeson's bill. It's Signal's bill. It's being introduced
by Senator Bergeson. It does not have necessarily agreement
by the county or by the City of Huntington Beach.

I can tell you, though, that there have been a series of town hall meetings in the area. There have been several a month to talk about — they've focused on individual aspects of the project — taxation, the ocean entrance, traffic and a whole list of things. There's may've been a dozen over the last six months to a year of local town hall meetings to discuss the ramifications of the project.

This is the next logical step to move ahead with the feasibility of the ocean entrance system to determine what kind of plan would go back before the Coastal Commission for confirmation of the county's LCP, the local coastal plan, that was submitted by the county.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: What is the cost of the further study we're talking about?

ì

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: This study would cost about \$650,000 to be fully reimbursed by Signal Landmark. That is their contribution. There is no provision for reimbursement by the state subsequently. It's just -- CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: I appreciate that generosity.

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: It's very self-interest.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Could you tell us why they're going to donate that to us? Is there somebody here from Signal that could tell us?

ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: I don't know that there's anyone here from Signal.

Signal proposes to develop about 1,200 acres of undeveloped property in the Bolsa area basically for residential housing. They have to donate 600 and some acres to the state as part of the tentative agreement that was approved by the Coastal Commission after several years of activity.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's wildlife habitat.

MR. FOSSUM: This particular study is part of something necessary for the local coastal plan to be adopted. The Coastal Commission when they reviewed the last LCP for the area made it a conditional LCP and that further studies be made to show the feasibility of the project.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: All right:

1 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Mr. Chairman, the value 2 of the land will be greatly increased if in fact a harbor is adjacent to it. 3 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: The picture clarifies. 5 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I thought it would. COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion. CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Any questions by Commissioners? R COMMISSIONER DAVIS: No. 9 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: For purposes of our file, why don't you please obtain for us statements from the city and 10 the county as to how they view this whole project right now. 11 12 We can act on this today. 13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Okay. 14 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: How long is this study supposed 15 to take? 16 ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: I expect it's 17 going to take almost a year. 18 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: You know, this process 19 is about 15 years old now. 20 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: In another couple of months, if 21 it's ripe, I'd like to get some statements in the file. 22 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: We'll be sure that 23 happens. 24 The last three items are legal items and Mr. Hight 25 will handle those.

	ŧ	
	1	MR. HIGHT: Mr. Chairman, No. 25 is the
	2	Authorization to File Disclaimer of Enterest in a federal
	3	condemnation action for New Melones Lake, which the
	4	Commission has no interest in.
	. 5	COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion.
	6	CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Motion.
	7	COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Second.
	8	CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Second.
	9	Unanimous.
	10	MR. HIGHT: Item 26 is the approval for a compromise
	11	settlement in South San Francisco. The Commission will also
	12	be acting as Land Bank Commissioners and will receive
	13	\$250,000 in the Kapiloff Land Bank Fund in settlement of the
	14	Commission's claims in this area.
	15	COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion.
8	16	COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Second,
	· 17	CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Unanimously accepted.
	18	MR. HIGHT: Item 27 is the Authorization for
0	19	Settlement in the City of San Francisco and the Commission
	20	will receive \$125,000 in the Kapiloff Fund and you will also
	21	be acting as Land Bank Commissioners again.
•	22	COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Motion.
	23	COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Second.
	24	CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: Unanimously accepted.
•	25	Is that it?

1 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's it. 2 COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Unless you have any other 3 business. EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Unless you have other 5 business. COMMISSIONER D. Is: I'd like to make a maken 7 that -- and I discussed this with Leo and with Nancy -- that 8 we rotate the chairmanship of this Commission between the 9 Lieutenant Governor and the Controller, with the Lientenant 10 Governor serving in calendar years '87 and '89 and the 11 Controller in '86 and '90 and starting in the ensuing years 12 that the chairmanship transfer on the first meeting after 13 January 1st of those respective years. 14 CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: A motion is before the 15 Commission. 16 COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: You don't need a second 17 because we operate on Senate Rules. 18 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Senate Rules. 19 I vote aye. 20 COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: I abstain. CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: I won't make any promises, but 21 22 I'll try to do the best I can with this awesome burden that 23 you've just given me. 24 (Laughter.) 25 COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Well, we just hit 25 minutes.

In the absence of further business, I'll move to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN McCARTHY: See the efficiency with which this meeting was conducted? A promise of good things to come.

Thank you all, ladies and gentlemen.

(Thereupon the meeting of the State Lands
Commission was adjourned at 2:37 p.m.)

--000--

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, EILEEN JENNINGS, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the roregoing meeting was reported in shorthand by me, Eileen Jennings, a Certified 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 meeting nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 22nd day of February, 1987.

Eileen Jennings

Certified Shorthand Reporter License No. 5122