

JANUARY 31, 1957 IN ORDER TO OBTAIN GEOLOGICAL INFORMATION INVOLVING DEPTHS IN EXCESS OF 500 FEET BELOW THE SURFACE OF THE OCEAN FLOOR IN THOSE TIDE AND SUBMERGED LANDS UNDER THE JURISDICTION OF THE COMMISSION BEING SOUTHERLY AND EASTERLY OF A LINE DRAWN DUE WEST FROM PT. CONCEPTION, SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, AND NORTHERLY AND WESTERLY OF THE EXTENSION SEAWARD OF THE VENTURA-LOS ANGELES COUNTY LINE. THE PERMITTEE IS TO REIMBURSE THE STATE LANDS COMMISSION FOR ALL OF ITS INSPECTION COSTS.

6. (INSPECTION OF SUBMARINE GEOLOGICAL EXPLORATION DRILLING - GEN. DATA.)  
The following report was presented to the Commission:

"The Division of Oil and Gas has reported that pursuant to Division 3, Public Resources Code, certain operations precedent to drilling and abandonment of geologic exploration holes should be inspected and approved to assure compliance with code requirements. In consideration of the State Lands Commission permit requirement for an inspector during all drilling operations below 500 feet beneath the ocean floor, it has been suggested by the Division of Oil and Gas that its inspection requirements on geological exploration holes in tide and submerged lands be delegated to the State Lands Division for performance, thereby eliminating duplication of inspection personnel. The costs to the State Lands Division of such inspections performed for the Division of Oil and Gas would be reimbursed under an interagency agreement to cover the services to be performed. Inspections of the type required would be performed by employees with a civil service classification no lower than Junior Oil and Gas Engineer."

UPON MOTION DULY MADE AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, IT WAS RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER IS AUTHORIZED TO NEGOTIATE AND EXECUTE AN INTERAGENCY SERVICE AGREEMENT WITH THE DIVISION OF OIL AND GAS TO PERFORM REQUIRED INSPECTIONS OF SUBMARINE GEOLOGIC EXPLORATION DRILLING PURSUANT TO DIVISION 3, PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE, UNDER A DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY FROM THE DIVISION OF OIL AND GAS. THE COSTS TO THE STATE LANDS DIVISION OF SUCH INSPECTIONS ARE TO BE REIMBURSED BY THE DIVISION OF OIL AND GAS UNDER THE INTERAGENCY CONTRACT.

7. (REMOVAL OF ISLAND IN CHANNEL OF EEL RIVER, HUMBOLDT COUNTY - W. O. 2145.)  
The following report was presented to the Commission:

"At the meeting of the State Lands Commission on August 15, 1956, the following resolution was adopted (Minute page 2772):

'THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER IS AUTHORIZED TO NEGOTIATE AN INTERAGENCY CONTRACT WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES COVERING THE ENGINEERING PHASES INVOLVED IN THE NECESSITY OF THE REMOVAL OF THE ISLAND IN THE EEL RIVER, AND TO CONSULT THE STATE PUBLIC WORKS BOARD ON BEHALF OF THE STATE LANDS COMMISSION FOR THE APPROVAL OF SUCH AN INTERAGENCY CONTRACT.'

"Pursuant to the foregoing action, the Executive Officer corresponded with the Department of Water Resources with respect to the negotiation of an interagency contract, and in response to the request to that agency the following report, dated September 11, 1956, was received from the Division of Design and Construction of that department:

'Reference is made to your Inter-Departmental Communication of August 21, 1956, concerning the removal of an island in Eel River near Fernbridge.

'This office concurs with the opinion of the Division of Highways that removal of all or a portion of the island would be of no immediate benefit to the State Highway system. Removal of the island would increase the cross-sectional area of the channel and could result in localized reduction of velocities which presently cause erosion along the right bank of the river at and upstream from the bridge.

'It has been the experience of this office that, in meandering streams, a channel change often results in transferring the energy to another section of river where equal or greater difficulty may develop. There are and have been a number of serious erosion areas downstream from the bridge and historically Eel River has had many channels through its alluvial plane downstream from Fernbridge. While the possibility of a major channel change resulting from work on the island is remote, it should not be overlooked in considering the project.

'It is believed that the erosion along the right bank of the river upstream from the bridge could most successfully be controlled by the installation of rock revetment or a series of permeable wing dams. While this type of construction would be costly, if properly constructed, it should provide a permanent solution to the erosion problem at this location.

'This office had occasion to discuss the allocation of \$20,000 to your office under Chapter 1691, Statutes of 1935, with Senator Arthur Way of Humboldt County. It was our understanding that the amount of the allocation was predicated upon cutting a pilot channel through or adjacent to the south side of the island in order to encourage erosion through that area.

'On the basis of your surveys and the fact that the floods of December 1955 caused additional accretion and subsequent enlargement of the island, this office would seriously question the effectiveness of cutting of a pilot channel along the south side of the island in accomplishing the planned purpose. The funds available for the work would not be adequate to cut even a minimum channel with a 25-foot

bottom width to low water elevation. Furthermore, the problem of spoil disposal would be costly.

'In view of these considerations, this office would recommend to the Public Works Board that no action be taken to remove this island. It is not believed that further engineering investigations are necessary.

HARVEY O. BANKS  
Director of Water Resources

By (Signed) M. J. Shelton  
M. J. Shelton  
Deputy Director'

"It would appear that since the Division of Highways is of the opinion that the removal of all or a portion of the island would be of no benefit to the State highway system, and that the Department of Water Resources feels that the appropriation would be entirely inadequate with respect to the alleviation of flood control problems, and that as the researches of the staff of the Commission have arrived at the same conclusion, no report can properly be made to the State Public Works Board with reference to the determination of need as set forth in Item 442.2 of the Budget Act of 1956."

UPON MOTION DULY MADE AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, IT WAS RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

THE LEGISLATURE WILL BE ADVISED AT ITS NEXT REGULAR SESSION TO THE EFFECT THAT IN THE OPINION OF THE STATE LANDS COMMISSION THE REMOVAL OF THE ISLAND IN THE EEL RIVER, AS APPROPRIATED FOR UNDER ITEM 442.2 OF THE BUDGET ACT OF 1956 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$20,000, CANNOT BE ACCOMPLISHED WITH EFFICACY FOR LESS THAN THE SUM OF \$100,000.

8. (1957 SESSION LEGISLATION - W. O. 2115.) The following report was presented to the Commission:

"In furtherance of the idea presented at the meeting of August 15, 1956, to give the Commission time to consider legislation for the 1957 session that is in the interest of the State and pertinent to the jurisdiction and duties of the State Lands Commission, the following additional items to those presented on August 15, 1956 (Item 29, Minute pages 2766-67), are presented for consideration:"

UPON MOTION DULY MADE AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED, IT WAS RESOLVED AS FOLLOWS:

THE COMMISSION AUTHORIZES THE STAFF, ON ITS BEHALF, TO DO THE FOLLOWING:

(W. O. 2115.4) - HAVE INTRODUCED A BILL TO CORRECT AN APPARENT TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR IN THE DESCRIPTION IN THE LEGISLATIVE GRANT OF TIDE AND SUBMERGED LANDS TO THE CITY OF VALLEJO UNDER CHAPTER 483 OF THE STATUTES OF 1947, WHEREBY IN