STATE LANDS COMMISSION STATE CAP TO 3 ROOM 44 .10 EACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 11 G^{-1} 12 13 QRIGINAL 14 15) | |} THURSDAY COCTOBER 28, 17 18 10:00 A.M @19 **20**° 21 22 23 Nadine J. Parks 24 Shorthand Reporter 25 PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION 3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 TELEPHONE (918) 972-8894

12 13 914 15 16 ં?7 18

<u>a^d P P E à R A N C E S</u>

--000--

KENNETH CORY, State Controller, Chairman

Director of Finance, Commissioner

DAVID ACKERMAN, representing MIKE CURB, Lieutenant Governor, Commissioner,

STAFF

Claire Dedrick, Executive Officer

R. C. Hight, Counsel

Greg Taylor

Dan Stevens

James F. Trout

June Smitir Secretary

Michael Valentine

W. M. Thompson

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 35825
TELEPHONE (916) 972-889

0 %		fii
2		
1	Company of the compan	
2		age
		,ı °
3	Proceedings	0 5
4	Consent Calendar, Items C-1 through C-21 Cels and Items C-17 through through C-21	The of
. 0	Colly and 'Itemia C-1' trilonda' contact	
5		. 860.00
6	Item 22 (Off calendar)	
. 7	ltem 23	. 2
۵_//		16
	Item 24	
9	Item 25 (Off calendar)	500
10	Item 26 (Off calendar)	0
		16
° 116	Item 27	
12	Item 28	16
F 13	Item 29	16 //
		17
14	Item 30	o o
15	Item 31	18
° 16	Item 32	19
17		. 19
* L /*		
្ច រ ន	Item 34	19 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
× 19	Trem 35	20 %
		. 20.
° 20 21	Item 36	6 C C
21	Item 37	° (71
22	Item 38	°22 " °
23°		22 ° Z
	Item 39	o
24	Item 40	22
25		23
О	Item-41	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
7 · · · · · ·	D. C.	

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION 9435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 PELEPHONE (9/8) 972-8894

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUÍTE A SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 TELEPHONE (918) 972-8894 CHAIRFERSON CORY: "Call the meeting to order."

Any corrections or additions to the minutes of the meetings of the 23rd and the 8th? Without objection, the minutes will be confirmed as presented.

Executive Officer has a report.

We have a report. Briefly, we're still working on the federal land exchange and there's an agenda item further on that asks that you authorize the expenditure of \$250,000 by the Executive Critical for the purpose of getting federal lands. Other than that, everything is pretty much the same.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Questions from the

MR. ACKERMAN: No.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Or any suggestions?
The next item is the staff report on coastal matters.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICE: No report.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: No report. Okay. We have the consent calendar. These are the items in the yellow pages of the calendar that have the letter "C" prefix going C-1 through 17, with the exception of C-16, Subitem

12

୍ୟୁ

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: 1 through 21.

ME. TROUT: Ol Through 21. There's a hole punched right through the C on that.

me. It goes C-1 through --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: 21.

3

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20.

21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON CORY: -- 21, with the exception being 16-B, which has been removed.

If there is anybody in the audience that has any problem with the proposed staff report, they should let us know now, because these items are going to be taken up in one motion unless there is some objection to any of them. Is there any objection?

Without objection, said calendar is approved as presented.

Item 22 is off calendar.

Item 23 is the request to exercise a public trust easement over 206 acres at Albany Baylands. Is there anybody in the audience in opposition to this proposed exercising of the public trust?

MR. SMITH: Yes, Mr. Chairman

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Come up and identify yourself.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, my name is Clay Smith.

I'm an attorney appearing on behalf of the Santa Fe Land

Improvement Company, the owner of the fee of the parcel

e e

A KINDON TO SERVICE OF THE SERVICE O

3

4

. 7

8

10

11

ं ॰13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21 //

23

24 25 over which the proposed exercise of the public trust is to

We received the report of the Commission staff only a few days ago. I think at this point what we would like to do is have an opportunity to present proposed alternative findings and conclusions, and also to present our objections to the Commission's report — the staff's report in writing.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Did Santa Fe testify at the hearing on this matter?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: No. they did not.

MR. CLAY: I believe written testimony was submitted by Mr. Hall.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: No testimony was submitted. We gave them every opportunity. In fact, we requested testimony from Santa Fe. The record shows Santa Fe refused to testify.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Given that record, why should we wait?

MR. CLAY: Well, I may be confused, but it seems to me, aren't you quoting in here from written testimony submitted from Mr. Hall? I think your finding of fact -- proposed finding of fact --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I'm sorry. Mike, would you --

hearing and Santa Fe chose not to testify.

MR, VALENTINE: Mr. Chairman, the representative was present and chose not to. Mr. Hall, who's president of Santa Fe Realty Company --

MR. SMITH: Santa Fe Land Improvement.

MR. VALENTINE: — submitted what he walled written testimony, which was a two-page letter after the public hearing.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's correct.

I didn't see his testimony, I guess that's why I missed it.

It was a letter which you have.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: He proposed a meeting on August 10th. And we sent back saying, "Yes, let's meet. And we never heard from Santa Fe. Why should we wait?

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, I can't speak to that letter. I'm not aware of it. I suppose what we're asking to do at this time is that regardless of the outcome of the hearing, we're now proposing specific resolutions. We believe that those resolutions, first of all are not entirely equitable. To be more blunt about it, we believe they're unfair.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Well, I think you're being unfair or your client is that we hold hearings; we have correspondence. They say they're going to meet and then we

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

don't hear from you. And then you walk in and say, "Hey hold up. You're not being fair."

Now, the question --

MR. SMITH: Well, okay --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Well, the arrogance of that is beyond belief, sir.

MR. SMITH: Excuse me. Mr. Chairman. You don't need to call me arrogant. I'm not attempting to be arrogant.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The arrogance of the action speaks for itself. It is arrogant.

MR. SMITH: And I don't mean -- I did not mean to suggest now that the procedure has been unfair.

My statement was, and I will stand by it, is the proposed resolutions and conclusions and findings we believe to be unfair to the fee owner of the property.

I think all we're asking for at this point is an opportunity to present alternative resolutions for the Commission's consideration.

and you rejected it. You chose not to testify when specifically asked to at (e hearing.

MR. SMITH: We did --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: You write a letter asking to meet with us. We send you a letter back saying, "Come in

MR. SMITH: May I ask to whom that letter was directed? Because I have not been made aware of the letter.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Mr. Hall, I believe.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEBRICK: That's correct.

MR. SMITH: Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, that you would agree that this is the first opportunity that we have had to respond to these specific proposed resolutions.

10

11

13

14

15

16

170

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

7 25

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Here's a copy of my letter to Mr. Hall. Mr. Chairman, the report has been distributed to the public, including the Santa Fe Company, for ten days. We have received no communication whatsoever from Santa Fe since that time.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Does the report deviate from the subject matter and the general direction you were headed at the hearing?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: O No.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: David?

MR. ACKERMAN: Were the staff recommendations or suggestions for use of that property available at the time of the public hearing so that the witnesses at least would have a point of reference for comments?

`**`**

Akcerman. All of the testimony, without exception, at the hearing of some 30 odd people was all directed to the point that public trust needs of that area were strongest to preserve the water as open water and to go toward the foundation of the East Bay Shoreline Park. There was no exception to that. There were very strong statements from other communities requesting that the Commission go on to the other two communities — Barkeley and Emeryville — to hearings there. But there was nothing — the entire tenor of all of the testimony was toward the results of this report.

MR. SMITH: I'm sorry. Maybe I'm confused. Are you saying this report was available at the time of the public hearing?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: No. The report is the result of the public hearing and the testimony received by the staff.

MR. SMITH: Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: The Commissioner's question was --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: See what bothers me about this -- I get sick and tired of the business community beating me about the head and should be because I happen to be in government because we're always delaying things. We've

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

24

25

gone to public expense to hold hearings. The purpose of it was for your client to be there and present his views.

And i Read, your client chose not .

MR. SMITH: Well, excuse me. Mr. Chairman, excuse me again for interrupting you. You'd said that a number of times and it appears to be incorrect. Mr. Hall was there, I believe, and he submitted his testimony in writing.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: You're incorrect.

MR SMITH: And it was accepted.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That was not correct.

CHAIRPERSON COLY: That's not what happened.

That's not what the record shows. He was there. He specifically was requested to make his comments and he chose not to

He submitted a letter which, in essence, requests a meeting with the staff. That meeting -- that letter was responded to by letter from the Lands Commission saying, "Yes, let's meet." That letter was never answered.

And now you come in and say, "Hey, let's wait."

MR. SMITH: No. We're not foot-dragging. We're

not asking you to wait for the purpose of delay.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: What's the wish of the

4.

် 6

8

10

11

area; am I correct?

12

13°

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 24

25

Commision? You want to hear more testimony? Do you want to exercise the trust or do you want to put it over?

MR. ACKERMAN: May I ask --

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, may I make one more brief --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: No. Go ahead, David.

MR. ACKERMAN: I'd just like to ask a question.

This is the first step in what will involve several other parcels of property running south along from Albany to Berkeley and Emeryville, through that

Commissioner. It does not necessarily follow that if the Commission takes action today, that you would then go forward and take action on the other two areas. The public — the people who have been supporting the establishment of an East Bay Shoreline Park, I'm sure, would like us to continue on. You're not committing yourself to that by taking this action. It's a logical thing to do.

MR. ACKERMAN: I share the Chairman's concern that we have been criticized for delaying items or prolonging problems. Fut, on the other hand, for a staff report to be available for just a period of ten days, I'm just concerned there might be a possible precedent-setting

5

_

8

10

° 1 1

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

- 23 24°

25

action in this that will find other properties that the public along that area and the property owners may not have had adequate time to respond directly to the staff's recommendations, having never seen those before.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I think we need counsel's opinion. I'm a pretty good backroom barristy, but not like --

MR. ACKERMAN: You want to comment?

MR. HIGHT: The ten days, Mr. Chairman, we felt was adequate given the time frame involved. You know, naturally --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Adequate in what way? Because it was basically what the original hearing was about, and the thrust of the hearing? There were no surprises or changes?

MR. HIGHT: Correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMITH: For the record, we were certainly surprised:

MR. ACKERMAN: One other question. I read the staff's report last night. I noticed in the appendix — there was one appendix in the report that indicated an entire list of all those agencies and officials who supported the project. Is there a similar list of opposition.

MR. TROUT: There was no opposition except

Santa Fe.

MR ACKERMAN: Was the Santa Fe Company the only one that expressed opposition?

MR. TROUT: The only opposition is the -- we have construed as such is the letter from Mr. Hall from Santa Fe.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Mr. Chairman, in addition to that — I had forgotten — we sent out a special notice of this hearing today on October 12th which contained the general conclusions of the report. Let me give you a copy. That's more than ten days' notice on the conclusions of the report.

MS. MORGAN: It seems to me that there's been adequate time for input from Santa Fe as well as anyone else who wanted to raise questions bout the proposed recommendations from the staff. And I think we ought to take the next step and move this along. It's unfortunate that they never raised any substantive issues in form that could be discussed and considered, but they've had ample opportunity to do that.

And I think it's time to go.

MR. ACKERMAN: May I ask one other question?

It involves the legal standpoint from you. If we take action this morning on this item, does it set any precedent for how the Commission acts on the other parcels of property along San Francisco Bay? Because I believe --

-

À

..5

7

0

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

iff I'm correct -- that Sanfa Fe is also the fee owner of those parcels as well. Am I correct?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: It would be a case by — the determination of an exercise of trust is on a case by case basis. This is the third example since Marks vs. Whitney where this Commission has exercised the trust. The first was in Hayward. The second was at Morro Bay. And this is the third.

And you're exercising your authority pursuant to a procedure outlined by the Supreme Court in Marks vs. Whitney that you have a retained title interest in this property.

And also, in accordance with the decision of the California Supreme Court in the 1930's, Newcom vs. the City of Newport Beach --

MR. TROUT: Santa He was part of it.

MR. ACKERMAN: Does that mean that there's no precedent-settling action?

MR. TAYLOR: Yes,

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I was afraid to ask that

MR. ACKERMAN: I was impressed.

(Laughter.)

MR. TAYLOR: The answer to that is that this

Commission has acted twice defore on the exercise of the trust in other areas. In each instance in whether you exercise the trust has been dependent upon an evaluation of the facts and circumstances presented in that area.

So, one this is not a new action for the Commission to take. You've taken it twice before in the term of this Commission.

6

10

11

124

13

14

°15

16

17

18,

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, secondly, what is done in other areas would depend upon the results of public hearings and the desires of the community, and the affected public agencies and private parties, and the vote of this Commission.

MR. AGKERMAN: You re saying each one is a separate issue?

MR. TAYLOR: That is correct. Right. And we need a record for each one.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: And what we do from here in terms of the exercising of the public trust is putting people on notice that we believe it's needed for public purposes and use. And any specific authorization to do a project would be a project that would have other action by this Commission or other governmental agencies; is that not correct? So, this is not the end of it. It is just making a strong statement?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, any action at this time -

deals with its property interests in subsequent meetings.

You could either reconsider that or it could change it,
or you could qualify it more. All you're doing in this
action is to freeze the use of this property as it is
currently. It's not to prohibit anything that is going
on there now. It's just saying that it is important for the
purposes listed in the report and in the calendar item,
and which were the subjects of the hearing, that it's
important that it remain — that this area remains that way.

MR. ACKERMAN: Okay,

MS! MORGAN: I want to ask counsel, Mr. Smith, if he had knowledge of the letter that was sent to the staff?

MR. SMITH: You're talking about Mr. Hall's letter?

MS. MORGAN: 1 That's right.

Mr. Hall's letter from Santa Fe Realty, Inc.

And I have noticed in this particular paragraph that says,

"I would propose a meeting between the State Lands

Commission and Santa Fe to discuss potential uses of the

wetlands property. To ensure that such a meeting is

productive, it ought to be arranged before either the

Lands Commission -- "This is relating to the planning

process.

MR. SMITH: Yes, I was aware of the letter.

MS, MORGAN; Do you have any knowledge as to why a meeting did not occur?

MR. SMITH: No. I don't. I don't have knowle ge.

I have an understanding, an idea. My understanding is

because Mr. Hall d.d not believe that it would be

productive to meet with the Commission until they had

formalized their proposed conclusions and resolutions.

And we did not receive those proposed findings and resolutions until a few days ago.

And, for the record, we do not believe we had an adequate opportunity to suggest alternative proposed conclusions and resolutions.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I guess for the record I should point out that the notice we have before you is dated October 12th and sets forth the conclusions.

MS. MORGAN: Okay. This letter was in August. What Mr. Smith says is very nice, but it's surprising the me that there was no followup to communicate his further concerns the meeting would not be productive. And I move the staff recommendation on this matter.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: All in favor signify by saying

_MS MORGAN: Aye.

MR. ACKERMAN: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON CORY Opposed? That's disposed of.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

.

5

3

.

9

10

631 12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

21

23

24

Item 24, approval of a 30-year general lease, industrial, in Yolo County for Aminoil Terminals.

Anybody in the audience on this item? Questions from the Commissioners? Without objection, Item 24 1s proved as presented.

Item 25 is off calendar.

Item 27 is a request to authorize solicitation of bids on the Tidelands property at Anza Airport Park, Lurlingame. Anybody in the audience on this item?

Questions from the Commissioners?

MŠ. MORGAN: No.

MR. ACKERMAN: No.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Without objection, Item 27 is approved as presented.

Item 28, authorizes the Department of General
Services to include Mineral Estate in its Farmers Fair of
Riverside County, 46th Agricultural District Association.
Is there anybody in the audience on this item?

Questions of the Commissioners? Without objection, Item 28 is approved as presented.

Item 29, approval of termination of six leases and combining it into a new general lease for Southern Cal Edison.

Anybody in the audience on this item? Questions

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

without objection, Item 29 is approved as presented.

Item of, proposed sale of coyalty crude oil on PRC 3120 and PRC 3242. It's a royalty sell-off. And my question, I guess, is whether we should sell it off and if we do sell it off, should we put a minimum bid on it.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Questions from the

Commissioners?

8

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ACKERMAN: I still like the minimum bid.

MS. MORGAN: I. do, too.

in?

MR. ACKERMAN: 25 cents? 35?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: 35 sounds good.

are the oil men?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: The oil men are in the third row.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: There you are.

MR. THOMPSON: Well, if somebody doesn't think it's worth 35 cents, then you'll get zero.

MR. ACKERMAN: Well, this one went for what, a dollar thirty?

3

5 6

7

10 11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

staff?

20

21

22

23 24

25

MR. THOMPSON: Crude.

MS. MORGAN: I'm not sure we ought to take --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: You could get 25 cents more than you're getting?

MS. MORGAN: Who's playing this card game?

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I'd rather have a quarter than I'd rather have 35 than nothing, but -- I mean, nothing. I'm not --

MR. THOMPSON: Normally the processing fee is somewhere around five to ten cents a barrel. And you're getting into some risk taking less than that. You do have some exposure, but you have a bond to cover for most of the exposure.

> CHAIRPERSON CORY: What's the minimum you want? MS. MORGAN: 35.

MR. ACKERMAN: Let's try 35.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The Commissioners say 35. Is there anybody in the audience on this item other than the

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Without objection, we'll go ahead with the proposed sale at a minimum bid of 35 cents.

> MR. HIGHT: Do we hear 40?

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: 35. Item 31, award of royalty

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

1	oil sales contract. The high bidder was Sunland Refining.		
2	Is there anybody in the audience on this item?		
3	Questions from the Commissioners? Without		
4	objection, Item 31 will be approved as presented.		
5	MR. ACKERMAN: Do we have a minimum on Item 31?		
6	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes. The miniumum was		
7	25 and the low bid was 25.5.		
8	MR. ACKERMAN: But this was better oil though?		
9	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes. The range of		
10	this was large. There were nine bidders ranging from there,		
11	and the winning bid was a dollar and 3.7 cents.		
12	CHAIRPERSON CORY; Okay. Item 32, award of		
13	a compensatory gas agreement with TXO Production Corporation		
14	Anybody in the audience on this item? Any		
15	questions from the Commissioners?		
16	Without objection, Item 32 will be approved as		
17	presented.		
18	Item 33, award of a negotiated oil and gas		
19	lease in Grizzly Island Wildlife Management Area. Is there		
20	anyone in the audience on this item.		
21	Questions of Commissioners? Without objection,		
22	Item 33 is approved as presented.		
23	Item 34, Chevron's request seeking deferment for		
24	six months on drilling to do some exploratory work. Is that		

point correct in reference to that item?

25

item?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on this

Questions from the Commissioners?

Without objection, Item 34 is approved as presented.

Item 35, deferment of drilling operations for
Texaco in Santa Barbara County. They likewise want to -EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: They're in the
process of getting a permit.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: So they've got an ARB permit problem. We've got to get the guy over there to get that permit. So, we've got to get his extension. Is there any questions from anybody in the audience? Without objection, Item 35 is approved as presented. Good luck.

Item 36, an amendment --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Mr. Chairman, on

Item 36, as you remember, is the agreement to help the

University of Southern California out and amend their

geophysical permit. The document has not been signed by the

University people as yet. And I just wanted you to know

that. As far as I can see, there's no urgency to get this

out today. If you prefer to put it over, I'm sure there

will be no problem.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: All I can say is they've dealt

with me very honorably everytime they threw me out of school.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: So, what can I say?
Anybody in the audience on this item?

MR. ACKERMAN: It could be approved conditionally upon their signature?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: We could hold it and it wouldn't cause any problem.

MR. ACKERMAN: I mean, since we've got it, why don't we approve it conditionally? If you've got problems, we can always --

MS. MORGAN: We've seen it on the calendar time after time and staff always refers to this as Morgan's share of the ocean.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. We'll conditionally approve Item 36.

Item 37, the termination of preferential application of mineral prospecting permit of surface owners for failure to complete the application, the unfilled application of George H. Rodda, Jr. Anybody in the audience on this item?

Questions from Commissioners? Without objection,

Item 37 to terminate the application is approved as

presented.

zĝ.

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

Item 38, approval of well abandonment for Phillips in Santa Barbara County, Molino Offshore Field. Is there anybody in the audience on this item?

Questions from the Commissioners? Without objection, Item 38 is approved as presented.

Item 39 is an authorization for a dredging permit of 680,000 cubic yards for Atkinson Marine and this is

MR. TROUT: San Diego Bay.

A STANDARD AND A

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Is there anybody in the audience on this item? Questions of Commissioners?

Without objection, Item 3 is approved as presented.

Item 40, we have an informative report of -- you're submitting a report to the Legislature; is that right?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: We're required by the Legislature to submit quarterly reports on the activities in the Point Conception lease sale proposed program.

CHAIRPERSON CORY; Okay.

does not require your approval at this point. What we did want to do was to let you know where things stand today.

Basically, we've spent about \$150,000 of the 425,000 that

4.00

22

23

24

25

was allocated in this year's budget. That money was spent primarily for followup biological studies following the public testimony both at hearings that I held and the hearing that you held.

whe proposal is if you decide that you do want to go forward with the leasing, is to do some more exploratory work in areas which in the future could be available for leasing.

CHAIRPERSON CORY; Any questions from the Commissioners?

MS. MORGAN: I think we should authorize staff to file the report.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: All right. Proceed

Okay. Item 41 is the fourth modification of the plan of development and operations in Long Beach, Have any questions from the Commissioners on that one?

MS MORGAN: That's fine.

MR. ACKERMAN: No.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: We'll approve the fourth modification. The fifth modification is back to the drawing board as I understand it?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Correct.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Somehow my sense of numerical sequence is offended. Should we not change Item 42 to be the fifth modification?

MR. THOMPSON: It would upset the paperwork flow and the consequences would be on your back. I'm sorry.

(Laughter.)

MS. MORGAN: You've been an accountant too long.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I'm really having trouble
with having just approved the fourth. Now we have to
approve the sixth when there is no fifth. From what I've
observed of the oil industry it's in trouble when it doesn't
have a fifth.

(Laughter.)

MR. ACKEYMAN: We accept that one.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Any questions on the

MS. MORGAN: Move it

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Without objection, Item 42 is approved as presented.

Item 43 is approval of boundary line agreement and authorization to settle a lawsuit; Humboldt with Louisiana Pacific on Samoa Peninsula. Anybody in the audience on this item?

Questions of Commissioners? Without objection, Item 43 is approved as presented.

44 is ---

MR. HIGHT: That's off.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Item 45. I cannot believe

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SÚITE A SACRAMENTO, CALIFÓRNIA 95825 o CTELEPHONE (916) 972-8894

25

19

20

21

22

23

We re going to file a cross-complaint; is that --MR. HIGHT: Correct, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRPERSON CORY: Over the mineral rights under the sewer plant. MR. TROUT: Private parties are contending that they have some mineral rights in that area. It's to assert 6 the State's interests. CHAIRPERSON CORY: How much did the last lawsuit 8 in Eureka cost us? I mean, it's like Vietnam. MR. TAYLOR: It was a bargain. (Laughter.) CHAIRPERSON CORY: I'm sure. MR. TAYLOR: For what we got for the settlement, 13 it was a bargain. 14 CHAIRPERSON CORY: I will have to admit there was 15 a bargain after we got Greg involved. It was not too great 16 a bargain before when we had outside counsel on that. But I'll have to give the Attorney General his --18 MS. MORGAN How was that? Was that Les Grimes! 19 career project? 20 MR. ACKERMAN: It still is. 21 22 (Laughter.) CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on 23 Item 45? Questions from Commissioners? Without objection, 24 we authorize you to do aerial bombardment. Don't go to the 25

mainland.

Item 45 is approved.

Tem 46, authorize settlement of litigation

with Anne L. Salmen, aka Houk on the Verona property.

Anybody in the audience of this? Questions from the Commissioners?

Without objection, Item 46 is approved as presented

Item 47, requesting authorization for acceptance and recordation of a grant deed in Menlo Park. This deals with World College West and the East Bay. Regional Park District on some property there. Questions from the audience on this item?

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, in addition to the recommended action, any action of the Commission should also be subject to the approval of the condition of title. There's a couple of matters in the title reports that haven't been resolved yet. And we think we have to resolve those so we're in conformity with Section 6307 which requires that we obtain the minerals as part of such an exchange.

With that proviso --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: We'll amend the staff recommendation to have -- subject to -- satisfactory title approval by staff.

MR. TAYLOR: That's correct.

25

10

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON CORY: We will then approve Item 470 with that change in condition. Without objection, that shall be the order.

Ltem 48, authorization to contract for public hearings on cession of jurisdiction on what, three different-Lava Beds National Monument, Whiskeytown Unit and Point Reves National Seashore, and Pinnacles National Monument.

Anybody in the audience on this item?
Without objection, the authorization to contract the hearings is granted.

Item 49, this is a request by California Geothermal Inc. for issuance of a prospecting permit. And, Mr. Brady.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, with regard to his item, we wish to advise you that the time for reconsideration of this matter has expired. The matter has been calendared as an accommodation to Mr. Brady, a longtime associate, member of the staff, and other prominent positions in other agencies in the State. But we would respectfully state that it's too late to reconsider this matter. And whatever Mr. Brady has to say to you is a matter of the Commission's courtesy to allow him to make a statement.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Mr. Brady, exercise your courtesy with alacrity.

R

10

11

17

13

14

16

170

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. BRADY: Mr. Chairman, I'd first like to thank you for the opportunity to appear here.

One of my first items was a concern about something in the calendar items, specifically this meeting. My presentation here has been recommended to you by the staff to mean nothing.

And the basic reason is that apparently my time for reconsideration has elapsed. Well, the problem we have with that position is a very simple one. We were never notified that we had any rights that were going to be taken And we wouldn't be here today at all Mr. away from us. Chairman, if the staff would have told us at any time that they had, in fact, notified Alaskan Geothermal, as they're now called; they changed their name recently, that their rights were going to be affected by this Commission several years ago.

In fact, there are memos within the Commission's own records indicating that they did not communicate any of this information to Alaskan, even though Alaskan was having communications on a sporadic, but nevertheless, having communications with Commission staff.

.We're asking you to right a wrong that was done to Alaskan several years ago.

As A ve outlined in my letter of April 15th, 1982, which I understand has been made part of the record; is

that correct?

24"

MR. HIGHT: Correct. 9

MR. BRADY: Simply, the points we've outlined there I won't belabor the point. The classification of certain lands in a known geothermal resources area was done in direct violation, in my opinion. And I have not heard any direct response to my letter. In fact, the staff's said they're not even going to respond to my letter, the April 15th letter. It's, in fact, in direct violation or the due process rights for lack of any notice as compared to some of the notices given to S.P. A lack of any notice that, in fact, rights were going to be affected. by this Commission at any time.

What we would like from the Commission first and foremost is an order requiring the staff to respond to our April 15th, 1982 letter. The letter is very simple. It oulines the legal position. It would be the legal position that would be followed presumably if this matter was ever taken to litigation. I don't want to have to do that. I've said that numerous times to Mr. Hight. I would just like an answer to the letter. It appears the only way to get an answer from the staff, though — unless you order them to do it, would be to have to sue you. I don't want to do that. You're concerned about the Eureka litigation. I am, too. That was expensive. I watched

that one myself.

We would like a response to our April 15th letter.

We think it outlines a legal position which clearly allows

you to issue a -- either a noncompetitive lease or

prospecting permit. The essence of our position has been

set forth in the April 15th letter.

I also have -- in case there's any question about notification from this Commission -- I have copies of a memo written to your file by Mr. Don Hoagland indicating exactly what I've outlined in my letter. I received this after I wrote my letter and it supports entirely every point that I've outlined in it.

And I'd like to just quote one or two sections from it for your consideration or I can just hand it to you so you can incorporate it into the record at your discretion. It has been compared to your file company and they are accurate.

Your guidance on that one at all?

MR. TAYLOR: Whatever you want to do.

MR. BRADY: I would ask that it be incorporated in the record. It's a memo to the file dated October 13th, 1981, file reference W-9649

CHATRPERSON CORY: How did you come by a copy

o) %it?

MR. BRADY: Public records.

24 25

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRPERSON CORY: So you requested the copy? MR, BRADY: Copy of the original file. I received a copy of the original file for Alaskan. At that time they were known as California Geothermal. It didn't look like I had everything, so I went in and was handed a copy of the complete original file and I found this memo after I had requested -- they had requested a complete copy of the file. MS. MORGAN: // How big was the complete file? MR. BRADY: An inch and a half, maybe an inch. 10 MS. MORGAN: And you got this one document 11 That's lot more than that, but this MR. BRADY: 12 document summarizes the essence of the problem. 13 14 MS. MORGAN: Okay. MR? BRADY: If you want to incorporate the 15 entire record into the file -- or the whole file into this 16 record, that's Mine. 17 I think the file is the record. MS. MORGAN: 18 I don't know # it's been MR. GRADY: 19 incorporated, but I would like to be considered. 20 CHAIRPERSON CORY: Can anybody tell us if that ∍ **21** is a copy of something that's in our file? 22 MR. HIGHT: "It appears to be, yes. 23

24

25

the thing here

CHAIRPERSON CORY; Okay. So we have a copy of

of the record --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The record of what? This hearing?

MR. TAYLOR: This conversation.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: This is an informational item, there is no record -- I mean --

MR. BRADY: Well, I believe I stated earlier the point of contention is that it's rather odd to ask a matter to be brought to the Commission and that the staff recommended to the Commission -- if I can quote it from the last paragraph of the calendar item, "... that any Commission decision to allow oral or written presentations on this matter does not constitute a waiver of any rights of the State of California acting by and through the State Lands Commission, nor does it constitute a review, opinion, reconsideration of the permit application, admission of fact, or (even) consideration of the merits of the claims put forth by California Geothermal, Inc."

I would simply ask that the matter be brought to your attention and that you do consider what has, in fact, occurred to Alaska. They've been done dirty by your sta That's the position that we'd like you to rectify by (a), a response to the letter that have and that I have in

in front of us -- all those facts and circumstances -- which haven't been responded to except with bravado and some stonewalling.

And all I want is an answer to that letter to decide whether we should go forward -- whether you need to go forward and change what the staff told you to do several years ago which, in our opinion, was wrong.

MR. TAYLOR: Mr. Chairman, there are several points which perhaps should be brought up. The first is that when a person applies for a prospecting permit, the statute in effect at the time of the application provided that it was subject to the fact that the State at any time prior to the issuance of the lease could classify the property as KGRA, known geothermal resources, and that would terminate their permit — or their permit application if it hadn to been completed.

9

10

П

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

27

22

23

25

The Commission, pursuant to that authority, in 1978, exercised that interest. There was no activity of or response from the people who are now asking to take some action or to reconsider this matter from '78 until '81 when the Commission contacted somebody about to whom to return the money.

I think there was a question of diligence on behalf of these people. I don't think that we heard from them for some years prior to 1978. But that will be a

question that will be derived from the files.

2

10

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22°

23

25

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The question before us, as I understand it, is that we are beyond any time that the law contemplates of us having the ability to deal with the request. That's the way you started the

MR. TAYLOR: I believe that's it:

CHAIRPERSON CORY: So there's not a whole lot that we can do at this point in time from what you're stelling us.

MR. TAYLOR: That s correct;

MR. BRADY: Before we go on --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: And we are listening to Mr. Brady's tale that something less than meritorious activity on the part of the staff has occurred apparently sometime when Mr. Brady was on the staff, but he wasn't associated with it.

MR. BRADY: That is correct.

CHAT PERSON CORY: So we are aware of that, but our lawyers inform us that there's really not a whole lot, if the allegation were true, we can do about that without going back and unwinding, conduct hearings, go back through and unwind the known geothermal --

MR. TAYLOR: -- Lesources determination,

CHAIRPERSON CORY: And that was all publicly

noticed and done?

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

MR. TAYLOR: It was.

3°

. **7**

10

1.1

12

13

3

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BRADY: And that is the position that the staff has. I have on numerous times asked them, "Did you notify these people?" And the answer's come back, "No," everytime.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: But the question is we have statutory requirements to comply with of notification; there were published notices. And if you had an interest in the subject matter as a lessee, you should be watching what the Commission's doing. We don't really meet behind closed doors.

MR. BRADY: The point is that that superseded your statutory obligations and constitutionally required direct notification rather than reading the mail. And that's the problem. It does require direct notification. Counsel's not responded to that assertion. They're saying mail notice is fine, or general publication notice is fine, but I don't think that's what the law says. But he hasn't even responded to that.

MR. TAYLOR: I don't know if there was any requirement to notice. Under the circumstances the person took subject to a right of the State to terminate that interest by finding a KGRA problem. If this Commission reconsiders this matter, you may be faced with a group of people who are potential bidders on this parcel of property because it

is one of the few parcels of property where the State of owns the surface as well as the minerals and the geysers.

3

10

11

12

,13

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

And so the Commission is presented with some sort of --

MS. MORGAN: Well, this is noticed as an informational item for the Commission. You told us that we are without jurisdiction to act in this matter. It seems to me, Mr. Brady, if you expect the Commission to take some action, you have to overcome that hurdle.

MR. ERADY: I don't know the basis for his jurisdictional assertion. I really do not. &'ve never been told that, that I have something to respond to.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The burden of proof is upon you, Mr. Brady. I wish you well on it.

MR. TAYLOR: There are two problems. One of them is that the determination of the Commission was made on November the 27th, 1978. This is 1982. Even assuming when he first made the letter back to us at that time — The time to reconsider that determination — the time to set it aside in an action by this Commission has expired under any of the applicable statutes some time ago.

MR. BRADY: That's your position, Counsel, even though there was no notification --

MR. TAYLOR: That's one of a number. I'm not conceding that no notice was provided you or how. I don't

know on that question.

10

្ធារា

12

13°

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. ACKERMAN: What can we do?

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The lawyers tell us we can't do anything. We're aware of the information. It seems to me Mr. Brady has a client that has a problem. And if we want to reconcile it, we'd have to start conducting hearings to set aside the known geothermal. And, as I recall that, the facts will not very well support that.

MR. BRADY: That's a question that we have raised also, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: It's my opinion it was a valid decision. And there were hearings held on that subject. If we're going to come to another conclusion to get out of the dilemma we're in given where we are, I don't think there's much more to o. We're aware of the problem and in the process that's where we are.

I don't see what we can do, Mr. Brady. We appreciate having the information brought to our attention and --

MR. BRADY: You won't even direct the staff to respond to the letter in hopes we can find out what the basis of the staff's position is in response to my letter, so at least I'd have a preliminary step to figure out --

on what the lawyers have told us. And it makes sense to me. I understand it. I don't think anything else needs to

2

4

6

•

· 9

10

12

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

be done at this point in time. So, I thank you, Mr. Brady.

MR. BRADY: Thank you, members of the Commission.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Item 50. This is authority to execute a contract for consultant services on the proposed exchange of property with the Federal Government. You're not going to execute this unless you get some indication that's an option for us.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on this item? Questions from Commissioners? Without objection, tem 50 is approved as presented.

Item 51, amendment to an existing lease with Owen Company, Burlingame, change of the term of the lease from 49 years to to \$5 years. What happens to the amount of money? It's paid over a shorter period of time or it is decreased?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: It's the same annual rental. This piece of property is a public access parcel. Jim Trout is personally knowledgeable on that.

MR. TROUT: Yes. The money remains the same except that we have an opportunity to increase it at an earlier point in time. And I think there's an inconsistency between the summary and the calendar item. It should be 49 years to 24 years rather than 25 years.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: 24. Okay. Any questions from

anybody in the audience? Questions from the Commissioners?

MS. MORGAN: I had a question to ask of the staff as to why we didn't when we were in the midst of negotiations, apply the normal standard to the rent?

option package and agreement that were put together. And this is to allow the development of a piece of privately owned property. And this piece of land that's involved here is a right-of-way along the canal and Sanchez Lagoon in Burlingame. The applicant, or the lessee, has agreed to pry the rent and maintain the property. And for -- due to tax reasons, and I don't know what they are, the applicant just wants the term of the lease reduced. That a benefit to the State in that we get a 25-year earlier shot at the revised rent. It was done on the basis of standard.

MS. MORGAN: Thank you.

10

13

14

15

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: This is not something they're making money on. This is a strip of public access which they are renting as part of their lease on another parcel, paying us rent on it and maintaining it for public access purposes.

MS. MORGAN: Why are they doing it?

MR. TROUT: Well, it's -

MS. MORGAN: It was probably a condition --

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

MR, TROUT: Yes. BCDG is part of it. And this access is part of an exchange agreement from the Anza We acquired this -shareholders Liquidating Trust. CHAIRPERSON CORY: You're talking about the Morgan Ocean Seas Act. Let's talk about the Trout Special Memorial. MR. TROUT: I'll keep doing it till I get it CHAIRPERSON CORY: "Liquidating Trust, you'll be the absolute world's leading expert on the Anza 10 Liquidating -- whatever it is. Your question's a- 11 resolved. I just 12 MS. MORGAN: It sounds like the staff is happy: 13 CHAIRPERSON CORY: We Want to make sure you're ည့် (4) 150 happy Ms. MORGAN: Not entirely. It seems to me that 16 the leaseholder would not have asked to renegotiate if he 7 dign't get some benefit from it. And in The midst of 18 negotiations we should have applied the current standards 19 for the lease than the old standards, getting paid faster 20 MR. TROUT: It s only been in effect three months. .21" I mean, it is current. 220 ong. Morgan: The five-year rent review. 23 MR. TROUTS No, Thot on this one. Part of the negotiated deal win the option was there would be a fixed 25 ·

term. The rent is foxed for timee separate periods (

CHAIRPERSON CORY; And his benefit, though,

whatever his cost is, he can write that cost over 24

years rather than — write 1t off for 24 years rather than

49.

10

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. ACKERMAN: Accelerated write-off.

MR. TROUT: But there is an accompanying advantage to the State in that the deal we entered into in July is now better because instead of having a fixed rent that goes out for 49 years, we now have a fixed rent that only goes 24 years.

MS. MORGAN: I guess the question I should have asked in July was why we were actting fixed rent without a five year annual review.

MR. TROUT: Well, because that has been consistent with the Commission's policy. This area they cannot use. They can't make money out of it. I mean, it's a public access, as Miss Dedrick said, a public access.

MS. MORGAN: Wkay. You win.
CHAIRPERSON CORY. Never concede that to the

MS. MORGAN: Those were good answers, Jim.

MR. TROUT: Thope they're right.

MS, MORGAN; Waiz a minute.

2

_3. //

> **6** ∂₀

: 8° €∂

10

]2 [3

15

18

17

18

19

20

°22

23

47

CHAIRPERSON CORY: is there any further guestions on this lease? Without objection, approved as presented.

Agnes Mulhern, Catalina Conservancy, Santa Catalina Island Company wishes an opportunity to speak.

My God, why?

MS. MULHERN: As you haven't heard enough already. Just merely to ask the Commission whether or not the decilion has been made with respect to what the timetable is that we can look forward to.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: No. There's a Rearing going

MS. MULHERN: " I'm aware of that.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: -- and to my knowledge, we're note in a position to deal with that question. We'll deal with it with as much speed as possible. If there is some smoking gun that comes out of that hearing, that might alter the time frame. But I think it's inappropriate to try to guess or prejudge the outcome of those hearings. We're trying to make sure that everybody has exhausted themselves on this project. It appears to be coming close to a conclusion. I certainly hope so.

MS. MULHERN: All right.

CHAIRPERSON CORY; And we would hope to deal with it rather quickly. I had hoped to have it behind us by now.

MS. MULHERN: May I ask a question? CHAIRPERSON CORY: Sure: " " MS, MULHERN: Is there a hope of completing it 0 before the end of the year? CHAIRPERSON CORY: Hope springs eternal. MS. MULHERN: Okay. MS. MORGAN: That was last year. MS. MULHERN: Yes. That's the point. Thank you. CHAIRPIRSON CORY: We're trying. But I think it would be inappropriate to say at this point before those 10 hearings are concluded. If somebody discovered some merit 11 in those hearings, then we're going to have to respond 12 to that discovery. 13 MS MULHERN: Thank you MR. TAYLOP: We may. 15 MS. MULHERN: Thank you. 16 Okay. CHAIRPERSON CORY: 17. MR. HIGHT: DeLorean cars at the bottom of the 18 ocean. 19 CHAIRPERSON CORY: Filled with what? Water 20° I think. 21 soluble, Is there anything else to come before the 22 We stand adjourned until -- what's Commission? All right. 23 the date? 24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: The next regular 25

We have a meeting scheduled meeting, scheduled meeting. We may ask you to schedule one earlier for the 29th. if something changes. 8 0 CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Whire adjourned. (Thereupon the hearing was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.) 10 13 14 a 16 18 ୍ 19 20 21 23 A 24

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95826, TELEPHONE (916, 972-8894

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Nadine J. Parks, a shorthand reporter of the State of California, do hereby cartify;

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing hearing before the State Lands Commission of the State of California was reported in short and by me, Nadine J. Parks, 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.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereun to set my hand this 25th day of November, 1982.

Nadine J. Parks
Shorthand Reporter

7

10

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25