

3435 AMÉRICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95925 TELERHONE (918) 972-8894

		and the second second
		iii
, ,		
. 6		
1	I N D I X	(h. 8)
O 0		D
o 2		ু∜ <u>Page</u> ∘
6.	Proceedings	• 1
3	Procedulings	<i>.</i> #
4	Agenda Item 1 - Anza Shareholders' Liquidating Trust	
S .	(Assignor); Kwok Hung Szeto and Nikki Szeto (Assignee);	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
5	approve assignment of Lease PRC 4687.1; acceptance of	
1	lease quitclaim deed on lease PRC 4684.1; and approval of amendment to State/Anza option to lease 4686.1	。
5	of amendment to State Anza option to lease 4000.1	- (C)
70	Staff comments - James Trout	° 81
. . .		
8	Commission action	2
>		
9	Agenda Item 2 - Anza Shareholders' Liquidating Trust	
	(Sublessor); Chamber of Commerce of the United States (Sublessee); approved by endorsement, five year	O _O
10	subjected for installation of Earth Station receiving	
	antenna	2
4)		
12.0	Commission action	· 3
, yo.	Agenda Item 3 - Staff report on hearing investigating	10 0
ូ13	number of moorings at Santa Catalina Island and	
14	consideration of Bid Solicitation PRC 3639	3
್ವಿ		
15	Staff comments - Jack Rump	4 ** 1
	Discussion	ָרָר י
្ទាទ	DISCUSSION OF THE PROPERTY OF	,
17	Public comments:	
1.4		9 0
18	Harrison Hertzberg representing CATMAR	0 11
	🌓 ကမ္းမွာ နည်းသည်။ အတွင်းမေသည်။ အတွင်းသည် မည်းသည် သည် သည်။ အတွင်းမေသည်။ 🚱 မြောင်းမှု မွှင့်သည်။ မွှေသည်။ မြောင်းမေသည်။	√ 1 <u>4</u>
19	Rosemary Woodlock, Catalina Manine Services	° ′′.
2.2	Discussion	ور 16
20		, <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>
21	Jim Radcliffe, Island Navigation Company and	1 0 0
	Seaway Company of Catalina	22
22		29
0.0	Discussion	
23	Charles Greenberg representing Santa Catalina	U u
24	Island Company	31° [
- T		<i>(</i> b⊃
2.5	Discussion	33

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A SACREMENTO, DALIFORNIA 95825 TELEPHONE (910) 972-2994 - **3** - _ ∞ CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. We'll call the meeting to order except we're supposed to proceed without Susie.

She's en route and will be here.

. .

The first item on the agenda is the Anza Shareholders' Liquidating Trust, and you want to change the name.

an association and in lieu of Szeto, we would like the

calendar approval to be to Burlingame Bay Associates. In

Finding Number 2, on page 5 of the calendar, we would like

approval of the assignment of lease PRC 4687 (Sic.) from Anza

it to read in the first couple of sentences: "Authorize

Shareholders Liquidating Trust to Burlingame-Bay

Associates, effective November 23rd

and" the balance remaining the same.

Yes, Mr. Chairman. They ve formed

್ಷ

10

19

11

13

14

15

16

. . .

18

20

22

24

25

23

approval, by the Executive Officer, of evidence of the

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: 23rd or 28th?

assigneeds ability to perform under the terms of said lease,

CHAIRPERSON CORY: And you read 14687" and it's

MR. TROUT: Yes, .1. I'm sorry. That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: So we've got the number correct,

say the 28th.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes. I think that was the change.

MR. TROUT: It was from October 28th to November

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. All right. & I wanted to make sure we knew what we were approving as opposed to what we do normally.

Anybody in the audience who has questions on this

Questions from Commissioners?

Without objection, the proposed authorization as amended will be grand.

Item Number 2 is Anza Shareholders' Liquidating
Trust and the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

That's an august group. This is an endorsement of a
five-year sublease for an Earth Station.

MR. TROUT: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is -CHAIRPERSON CORY: Next to your restaurant?

MR. TROUT: It's a very small area. You'll never

25

10

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

notice that you're being fried.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICKS Only the little kids.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: It's an Earth Station; right?"

MR. TROUT: Yes: It's a satellite for receiving wavelengths from a satellite, and the problem with it is that the Chamber of Commerce is in a building that on the site that they lease is in the shadow of the satellite. So they have to get found on the other side of the building which means it would have to be on their property. Claire has tried several ways to figure out an alternative and

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Anybody in the audience on Item 2?

So we're back.

Without objection, approval of Trout's Earth Station will be approved.

[Laughter.

it just doesn't work.

.10

12

13

14

15

16

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Item 3, report by staff on hearing investigating the number of mornings at Santa Catalina Island.

you recall the last time we discussed Catalina, the issue of how many moorings were actually in use or available for lease came up rather strenuously, and the Commission directed us to investigate the charges and report back to the Commission. The staff has held 30-od hours of hearings

under oath and are satisfied they've investigated adequately

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Is that under oath or after oath? Go ahead.

- 3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: A little of both.

Anyway, so Jack is prepared to report to you today on their findings. With your permission, I'll leave Jack to do the dirty work, the hard work.

MR. RUMP: All right. I think you have in front of you and have had a chance to review the report of the staff. It's a fairly lengthy report followed by quite a few attachments at the back.

As the Executive Officer has stated, we had a hearings in Los Angeles on October 25, 26, 28, November 1st and 2nd. During the course of the hearings a number of witnesses were called.

First of all, Jon Hardy, a diver for CATMAR;

Joseph Steele of B.O.A.T.; Doug Bombard of the Island

Company/Conservancy; Randy Bombard also and Michael LeVac,

a diver for the Island Company/Conservancy; and then Lynn

Stokes, who presented a count on behalf of Island Navigation

Company.

The report in front of you lays out I think with references to the various transcripts many of the topics which were discussed. I think one of the points as the

hearings progressed is that it is very difficult to get the same count if you do it on a different day or if you're counting on different objects in the water.

Basically three primary counts or surveys were done on the lease premises. The first one by Jon Hardy, the CATMAR diver. His report and declaration are attached to the report as Appendix E. He made approximately 63 dives in all coves outside the City of Avalon from approximately January to April, 1982.

The second count or inventory done on the premises was done by Doug Bombard Enterprises, essentially upon areas which were indicated on the area photographs submitted to the Commission by CATMAR. Their report and dive slips are attached to this report as Appendix F.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

23

25

Also then, and finally, the third count was done by Lynn Stokes on behalf of Island Navigation, I believe, on June 19th, 1982, which is the same date as of a computer list of all sublessees inder the lease that was submitted to the Commission.

Additionally, the hearings centered on some other topics that had to do with the lease operation, particularly focusing on stringlines as well, particularly those at the Isthmus and the use of waiting lists for the assignment of vacant moorings. Additionally, on November 10th, subsequent to the hearings, some of our auditing staff flew to Catalina

to check some of the books and records of the present lessee to see if they could check on certain items that came up during the hearings. Their report is also attached to this as, let's see, Exhibit H.

I think the best way to focus on the results of the hearing are to see what differences there potentially were in the count. The conclusions which start at page 19, talk about the determination of the number of moorings on the lease premises. The present lessee testified under path that in their count there was 720 revenue producing moorings on the lease premises. If one takes that information and combines that with the count or survey by Mr. Stokes by Island Navigation, and one focuses on the number of camp-type moorings I believe is his terminology, that count closely approximates the Island Company's count.

The diver of CATMAR testified that there were surface moorings of a tally of 741 plus or minus two. I believe it boils down to he felt that there were 25 extra buoys and 71 extra weights. Additionally, it was found out that due to some inaccuracy of the placement of the orange triangles or rectangles —

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: You need to pull the microphone closer to you.

MR. RUMP: All right. Sorry. Is that a little bit better?

The two diving surveys of the Island Company and Conservancy and of CATMAR were found to be at possibly different locations because it was eventually discovered that the placement of the orange rectangles were not necessarily in the same locations in which weights were found So I think we've got some figures in here which give you an idea of the -- CATMAR's diver estimated that approximately 90 percent of the weights that he found could be used.

Further testimony centered on the fact that it would take additional tackle to make them useful. Primarily what was found was the concrete weight and a short length of chain. The moorings at Catalina are hooked up with two weights and in between tackle. So estimates were given that it would take approximately two hours to put that into operation.

The testimony by, I think, Mr. Steele indicated that it was probably just as easy to throw in the additional tackle and moorings and weights from off a barge or onshore. That trying to retrieve these underwater would be a little more difficult to use than actually trying to place them from the surface.

Maybe if we can turn to the recommendations, trying to boil this down because it's quite a bit of material.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: What page?

MR. RUMP: This would be page 22?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: Starting with 22:

MR RUMP: 22 is the recommendations and then we have some proposed findings.

The first subject being the Mooring Identification and Number. I think staff is convinced from the testimony that to eliminate the problem of the confusion of what is on the surface and what constitutes a revenue mooring, that we would recommend the Commission to either remove from this lease all camp moorings or to somehow identify them in such a fashion that they would be known immediately. I think our preference would be I think, to separate confusion, to remove any nonrevenue moorings from the lease.

8

10

ំ ។

12

13

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

is that there was testimony that the charts that had been submitted to the Commission were out of date by about two years and that some of the locations were not entirely accurate. We would recommend adding to the lease provision a requirement that the lessee submit annually accurate charts showing the locations of all moorings on the lease premises. The present lessee has begun to eventually number all of the present revenue moorings, and that exhibit is shown as Appendix I, which is attached.

The third recommendation we would have in the area of moorings would be to expressly require the lessee to patrol and inspect the lease premises and to send to the

Commission quarterly and during high season monthly, reports on what surface floats are in use in the coves. This I think would eliminate some confusion that is incurred with regard to testimony regarding lobster pots or whatever. If you know what else is floating in the water in the cove, then we have something to compare it against.

5

· 10

° 11

12

13

14

15

16

۵° 17

18

20

ŽŤ

22

23

24

The fourth final area of number of moorings has to do with whether or not to hook up any of the weights which were found on the ocean floor. Staff would recommend that since testimony was that none were shown during the course of the hearing can actually be hooked up and used as revenue moorings, that the Commission use the 7250 figure. It's an identifiable one, I think. It's demonstrated by the charts of Appendix I attached plus the computer printout.

We would also include in the lease as authorized improvements, two stringlines at the Isthmus, either side of the Isthmus pier. There is some confusion, apparently, with the present lessee as to whether or not that's a mooring, but I think it's definitely in place. They're deriving revenue from it. So specifically the lease should be cleaned up to specify two stringlines as authorized structures.

There was some discussion concerning assigned ties or rafting during the meeting. There already is an informational letter attached to the bid package as Exhibit D, which talks about the policy of charging on that.

Then finally in the area of recommendations would be that of Waiting Lists. During the course of the hearing it was found that there are public lists maintained per cove and per length. In addition, there are 13 moorings which are called Addendum Moorings, in which there are waiting lists exclusively for yacht club members. Staff feels that to eliminate any potential discrimination, that these two lists would be merged so that there would only be one list for each cove and length of the boat, and we would recommend that that be done by chronological order.

ø 8

So then on page 26, we've incorporated those suggestions into specific findings. There are one or two items that I would like to point out. Say, for instance, on page 27, (3)(a), is a recommendation that the revenue moorings we marked with individual serial number and must be painted with a color which distinguishes them from non-revenue moorings. The color suggestion might not be entirely accomplished depending on what the Coast Guard regulations are. It might be that the Coast Guard would require that the surface top of the buoy be painted white, but it could be color coding in the numbering that is placed on them that would identify them as distinct from camp moorings.

I think that's basically all we have in terms of our presentation at this time.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Any questions?

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

4

6

7

. 9.

CATMAR.

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

20

22

23³

∄ 25 COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: Not at this point.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Is there anybody in the audience who wish to comment on the staff recommendations?

MR. HERTZBERG: 1'11 be very brief.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Please identify yourself.

MR. HERTZBERG: Yes. Harrison W. Hertzberg for

wasn't brief during the hearings, but I'11 be brief now.

[Laughter.]

MR. HERTZBERG: We are asked to bid competitively against a company that has had the benefit of the experience since 1950 found out, if I didn't find out anything during these hearings, I found out one thing. That side typing is a big business. On a busy weekend there's more than one boat on a mooring. I would percentagewise, I think during the hearings it came out something like in excess of 50 or 60 percent or 75 percent side ties.

MR. RUMP: I thought that figure had to do with the nonuse by the sublessee of the mooring.

MR. HERTZBERG: All right. Nonuse by the sublessee But it's a big factor. There is no way that any bidder other than the existing lessee knows the extent of side tying and

can intelligently bid because they ve got the figures, we don't. It is for that reason, gentlemen, that I unge you in order to try to even out the competition here, to have the bidding on a percentage against a guaranteed minimum which we have urged when we filed the petition herein originally. That was part of our original petition. It's the only way that we can competitively come into this thing.

Now, on the alternative recommendation I would urge the Commission — our diver testified, and he's an independent diver. We use an independent company. Our competitor used their own employees to do the diving. There were 844 above the water or below the water mooring weights or buoys in total. Now, that included the camp moorings that he thought were camp moorings. In his opinion there were 57 moorings that belonged to the camp which left 787 as opposed to 720 rentable, moneymaking moorings. That includes weights under the water which are ready to be hooked up.

Incidentally, he said it would take between an hour and two hours to do the hooking up.

MR. RUMP: That's correct.

MR. HERTZBERG: I suggest that since it does not affect the environment, that the bid be for 787 and that they be hooked up. Whoever wirs will have that many more to rent.

11

12

13

14

150

16

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

. -

90

11

10

12

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

Additionally, the only other comment I have to make is on page 27, paragraph 4, the alternative bid conclusions, says that: "No additional charge shall be imposed where such multiple use is made by actual named sublessees and registered vessels for the particular mooring in question."

In other words, if more than one person owns a mooring, two, three, or four, the proposal is that the two or the three or the four of them can hook up to that one mooring without paying the additional charge. I don't think I think they should pay like anybody else. it's fair. you got four people that own a mooring and you permit the four people to hook up to that one mooring, each owning 25 percent, that's equivalent to four moorings and I think the three of them should pay the same as if the lessee doesn't appear and you rent it out and then somebody else side ties. I cannot stress too strenuously the factor of the percentage bid against a fixed amount as the only way that we can sincerely and competitively and honestly bid in this proceeding.

Thank you, gentlemen.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Questions?

Anybody in the audience? Anybody else?

wants to comment on the evidence to some extent.

MS. WOODLOCK: My name is Rosemary Woodlock. I'm representing Catalina Marine Services.

I have just two points I'd like to make. One is that there be a definition of "camp." I'm still not clear as to whether yacht clubs are included in camps or not. We did find evidence that there were several moorings, one in White's Landing, where Mr. Hardy found a weight and that was hooked up in the summer, and then secondly a stringline in Fourth of July Cove, which is used by Fourth of July Yacht Club which were pheviously not discussed or acknowledged. Mr. Bombard states that they are not revenue producing; however, Mr. Bombard is only the agent of the lessees and there's no evidence whatsoever as to whether the lessees are charging a factor in their land lease to take into account water use. I don't think that anyone else could feel comfortable competing on that issue unless it's clear that such yacht club usage is either in or outside of the lease.

as the youth educational oriented institutions there. We would like to have it clear that that is what camp means and that the private and discriminatory yacht clubs are not to be included in this and the moorings that they have installed either should be removed totally or they should be permitted a negotiated rental by any subsequent lessee.

Secondly, --

10

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21.

22

23

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: Maybe we could have a response from Jack?

MR. NUMP: Perhaps one point to clarify. In general our recommendation, we recognize the problem of defining what a camp is and what clubs are. As you know, we're in the process of individually handling each of the leases for the upland campsites or the clubs for their piers it's appropriate. Precommendation tied to 720 moorings to those which are shown in Appendix I which are specifically revenue moorings. So I recognize that there would be uncertainty unless we got down to it very specifically which moorings we're talking about. So I think that problem has been splved.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: She raised the question about

MS. WOODLOCK: Well, in two covers there is evidence that there are existing operations with -CHAIRPERSON CORY: How is that resolved in

Appendix I?

in two toves

10

11

12

13

14

15°

16

17

18

A9

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. RUMP. It is not by Appendix I because the only thing which is really before the Commission today is the lease up for the revenue moorings. I think I agree from what we've heard. Staff would like to do fur her study in terms of I think we might have a potential trespass. I believe during the course of the hearings there is apparently an

unpermitted buoy by the Balboa Yacht Club, for example, but I think those are separate and apart from the leasing of the revenue moorings under this lease here. That's something extra and outside.

There was not during the course of the hearing any connection between this lease operation and those buoys.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: You recall that in the master lease, the proposed bid lease, the conrevenue uses by the onshore user are not currently under lease to the company and are not contemplated to be under lease by this bidding system.

8

10

12

°13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON CORY: And the definition of the 720 that are for lease, does that deal with the question that she raises as to whether they are or are not part of the lease?

MR. RUMP: I don't believe that any of the ones which she has mentioned would be in the 720 which are -[Thereupon a short recess was taken.]

MS. WOODLOCK: Yes, I agree that that is the case. The point I'm trying to make is that if they are going to be permitted on future leases negotiated with the upland sublessees, that that does put the lessees at a bargaining dvantage that other bidders do not have. That permitting a yacht club -- and it's my understanding that none of the yacht clubs have asked for separately negotiated leases --

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 TELEPHONE (8:16) 972-8894

ges

6

8

10

]] ∵>

12 13

14

§15 16

ς **1**,7°

180

19

20 21

22°

23

24

25

is that correct? -- or was not true during the hearings.

MR. RUMP: I think certain yacht clubs have piers which have been applied for. I think there might be the question of why there's stringlines, for instance, at the Fourth of July Cove and why there might be two buoys out there. But we will bring each one of those particular clubs or camps or whatever before the Commission so that you can see exactly what you're permitting and what sorts of uses would be made of those sorts of facilities.

MS. WOODLOCK: The current lease does permit the lessee to negotiate with the upland lessees on certain moorings that sometimes are referred to as camp and sometimes are not. Again, that is somewhat of an advantage in terms of looking at a potential pidder as subsidizing an operation from other revenue sources.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: In any event, that sublessee camp owner, if you will, would have to comply with a lease with us --

MR. RUMP: Exactly.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: -- as an independent, without any other unilateral or bilateral between them and us without any other lessee being involved.

MR. RUMP: Yes.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: So if they're paying somebody

else to boot, they're at risk, whether or not they can afford the final transaction by the time you see the paper.

MS. WOODLOCK: What we're asking for is, we're trying to decide if we can afford the final transaction, is that we have certainty on this point.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The certainty we can give you is that we're leasing 720 moorings that are specified in Appendix I.

MS. WOODLOCK: Would it be possible for the Commission to define "camp" as --

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Well, the camp doesn't have anything to do with the leases, as I understand it.

MR. RUMP: Right. The focus of the lease is on the revenue moorings and regardless of what upland facility of operation is, it's a separate issue from this lease. So we've defined only the revenue moorings.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: So these other moorings are going to be dealt with by the Lands Commission and those people, by lateral agreement in the future, and I do not know that the definition would protect you from the fear that the upland lease could help subsidize the operation because that could go on anyway.

But the actual nonrevenue moorings will be dealt with by standards adopted in the general sense as to their public purpose as to what fee they're going to be paying.

Q₁

10

11

12

If they are nonpublic in the definition of the Commission and nonuniversally available, they're likely to pay a penalty. If somebody wants to run the biggest boat club, they're going to pay dearly for it. I would guess the implication of one of your comments is to try and put the questions on the table. I guess that's about where we're headed, but I don't think we can protect you. It's one of the givens and one of the inequities in that there are upland owners who have rights.

THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TRANSPORT OF THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TRANSPORT NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TRANSPORT NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TRANSPORT NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TRANSPORT NAMED IN COLUMN TWO IS NOT THE PERSON NAMED IN COLUMN TRANSPORT NAMED IN COLUMN TRANSPORT

₹ઢ 🕏

10

11

12

13

14

15.

17

16

20

21

22

23

c. 24

25

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: I understand that the Chairman's comments really to say that nothing is going to be done in any of the coves without a lease from the Commission, whether it be revenue or nonrevenue or any kind of activity, be it a separate lease or whatever. So I think the insurance is that, no, nothing else is going to be allowed. That's why it's trying to be written as tight as it is.

MS. WOODLOCK: Well, on the issue of the biggest boat club or something like that, apparently the Coastal Commission is concerned about the public access through these particular coves where yacht clubs are located. So it is more than just a theoretical problem.

The second point is somewhat related to this, and that's whether a waiting list is needed at all right now.

Mr. Bombard testified that everyone on the waiting list had been offered a mooring this year and that there were in fact

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

several moorings at Catalina Harbor that have never been leased in addition to the 12 public moorings set aside. We questioned whether any bidder should be burdened with this waiting list at all and whether it might not be in the better interest of the public just staply to try to expand this beyond the rather small group of people who have had access to this area and access to a waiting list prior to this subsequent issuing of the lease.

. 13

I think that should be seriously considered as to just disregard the waiting list and possibly take names on a totally new basis in the future.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Jack, can you respond to the concept, if there is inherent in the concept of a waiting list, that there is something that people are waiting for?

If there is a list which people have been offered that which they are waiting for and they decline, why is there a waiting list?

MR. NUMP: That's a reasonable question. As best as came out during the hearing -- is that within the certain coves some of the moorings are more desirable than others due to weather conditions, due to access to shore or what have you. So apparently there have been a process of going down the waiting list and offering it to the parties in number on the list. I guess the Commission could require that they take the next available mooring or, if you add

4

) } •

8

10

11

13

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

on additional people to the end of the waiting list, eventually somebody will take the available mooning, it seems to me.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: But is the question that which they were offered was not sufficient, the third tier at the opera wasn't good enough given the quality of the eyes of the recipient, that they wanted orchestra or nothing?

[Laughter.]

MR. RUMP: That would be a fair --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's pretty common practice in boating marinas or anywhere else. There are more desirable berths than others and you'll take any berth to get a boat in and then you immediately get on a list for the berth that you really want. I think that's the common --

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: Do I take that to mean that a significant number on the waiting list currently have moorings at Catalina and they want to get a better spot?

MR. RUMP: I don't necessarily think that it means that they already have moorings.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: They have not yet found a mooring that is worth the price that they have to pay.

MR. EUMP: That might be a quite true statement.

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: Is there any problem with still having a waiting list and just go in after the Public once you've exhausted the waiting list?

* EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I don't see any. COMMISSIONER ACCERMAN: Isn't that what's really being done now? Correct. During the course of the MR. RUMP: hearings it was brought out, that since several of the goves were having difficulty filling the vacancies, they actually " advertised in the papers and tried to solicit takers in that fashion. CHAIRPERSON CORY: See what happens, Dave? When we started this thing there wasn't Reaganomics and people had lots of money and they didn't have places to park their 11 12 yachts. COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: Next year we won't have 13 14 any problem. [Laughter.] CHAIRPERSON CORY: 16 That's all, thank you. 17 MS. WOODLOCK: CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Is there anyone else? 18 MR. RADCLIFFE: Jim Radcliffe is my name. I 19 represent Island Navigation Company and Seaway Company of · 20 We will be joint bidders for the lease premises. 21 I might add at the outset that regardless of the 22 outcome of the investigative hearing, the staff report or 23

the proceedings today, Island Navigation Company and Seaway

Company of Catalina propose to tender a bid.

·24

25

In the investigative hearing that we have beard so much about we were neither the petitioner nor the respondent, but participated as a bidder in attempting to ferret out certain facts which we felt were necessary in the bidding process. The hearing was rather remarkable in character, I thought, and if there is any conclusion that I could draw from it, it is that we ended up defining what we do not know more than what we found out during the hearing CHAIRPERSON CORY: Does that mean that progress

MR. RADCLIFFE: Progress was made. As a matter of fact, like the Panama Canad, we seem to be proceeding westerly in an easterly direction insofar as what we know about the bidding process in this matter.

was made?

10

11

12

G)13

15

16

20

7,1

22°

23

24

The one thing we did find out is that over the course of the last year it has been difficult, if not impossible, for two of the three bidders to figure out how many moorings we're talking about. Within the coves, individually or the total number of moorings, the change over the last year was in the total number probably as many as 35. In one individual cove we started out in October, 1981, with information provided by the Commission indicating 33 moorings. It went to 34. It went to 35 and as of the hearing process which we just went through, it's now 39.

I'm satisfied, however, an behalf of the company that I

2.

.23

represent, that if the Commission determines that 720 moorings is what we're talking about, then 720 moorings we'll bid on. That's not the problem.

The things we do not know are really the problem. For example, we do not know who owns the moorings and who does not own the moorings. Now, there was allowed during the period or during this investigative hearing, some evidence to be introduced or some questions to be asked as to, first of all, how many moorings were owned by individuals, how many moorings were claimed to be owned by the present lessee. However, we were reminded from time to time and justifiably so, I think, that the constraints imposed by the Commission on that investigation was to determine the number of revenue producing moorings. However, from a bidder's point of view, it's important, first of all, to know what claim of ownership anybody has to the moorings that rest on the submerged lands on the lease premises.

Curiously enough, the testimony at the hearing was that nobody or at least the president of the present managing agency did not have any document in his possession, nor has he had since 1964, which indicates to him either that the Catalina Island Company, the Conservancy or the so-called individual owners actually own those moorings.

So consequently, as I sit here right now, I don't know,

I don't know whether the State Lands Commission knows, but it's important to a bidder. Another thing we do not know—it's paragraph 13, I think, in the present lease, which gives to the State the option to retain any of the facilities on the lease premises. Now, after recessing and the president of the Catalina Cove and Camp Company checking with his office, it was determined that their figures at least indicate, even though they have no basis for claiming it, that there are 299 owned moorings by individual owners. There are 421 leased moorings presumably owned by the present lessee, even though neither ownership is documented in his office nor has it ever been.

10

12

13

15

"16

17

18

o19

20

21

· 22

23

25

However, paragraph 13 of the present lease gives the State of California the option of retaining any and all facilities on the lease premises at the termination of dis lease and of preceding leases. I think it's important for each bidder to know does the State of California intend to retain those moorings or does it not? We were not allowed any testimony in the investigative hearing as to the cost of installing a mooring, but in previous hearings in this Commission, I think all parties have represented that at least the 40-foot and deeper water moorings run about \$400 to be installed.

Now, if we're talking about a new bidder to install 400 moorings at \$1500, we're talking \$600,000. If

90 30 U

the State of California is going to exercise its option upon termination of the present lease, then presumably the bidder will not have that expense or at least some other expense.

We do not know that.

The only bidder who sits in a position to be able to say with any clarity or with any definity what the cost of the moorings is going to be is the present lessee who claims that they own them, if they do, and who has been operating for a number of years with these moorings. But I think the Commission will certainly see that it makes a world of difference to either of the other two whether or not the State intends to exercise its option or whether it doesn't.

₹/3

I think the idea of the camp moorings has been discussed by those who have preceded me. But during the investigative hearing; the testimony varied from zero to 16 to 111 possible camp moorings. That has been pointed out that the present lease provides that the successful bidder and successful lesses will have the opportunity to enter into an arrangement with those parties who have the so-called camp moorings.

In the investigative process there was testiminy to the fact that certain moorings have since this bidding process began been transferred from the Santa Catalina Island Company, if they own them, to the Conservancy. We do not &

know what, if any, have been transferred by whom and for how much. That is tied in I think with the exercise of the State if the State intends to do so of its options to retain these moorings. One of the other areas that we do not know as a result of this hearing or otherwise is whether the individually negotiated camp leases, the State intends to provide that these camp lessees may not in fact, must not compete in a commercial basis with the subject lease premises as far as renting on a daily basis or otherwise There is nothing I know of presently which prohibits the camp lessee or sublessee as the case may go from tenting out there mooring in direct competition to one of the successful bidders here. If we're talking about a 111 choice moorings, that could make a substantial difference in the bidding process and in the kind of mathematics that it takes to come up with a successful bid, but a reasonable and practical, presumably profitable bid of the bidder.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The question of course is who knows the answer to these things? Well, I think it's clear that two out of three of the bidders do not know, and insofar as the questions of the State and what the State's intentions are, perhaps all three bidders do not know. I would suggest that to the Commission that these questions, particularly those raised about what are the State's intentions, are crucially important to a successful bid. I do not personally understand how

any bidder could underkid without knowing the answer to those three questions and particularly the one involving the moorings and \$600,000 worth of expenses.

2

. 8

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In a way, and it's perhaps an inaccurate analysis. but I've always been amused that a professional or any kind of a football game where the referee throws a ball. indiscriminately for three downs and on the fourth down with calliber like precision they get down and examine whether there has been a first down. There are rumors around, and A would hope the Commission would resist the urge, to hurry to a decision in this matter without having determined all of the issues that have to be determined so that a successful bid can be made by any of the three parties. is understood so that the State and the successful bidder both know where they stand. In that regard, and I would suggest to the Commission and join with Catalina Marine Services, that it seems to me that a fixed dollar bid is singularly inappropriate at this kind of an oleration. Personally on behalf of the people I represent, I felt that the minimum, 125,000 in percentage of the growth was an ideal way to handle it. With the unknowns and with the variables that are bid into this bidding process, I do not see how a fair bidding procedure can be obtained on a fixed basis. So I would strenuously urge the Commission to advise one way or another the bidders before the bidding process is

3

5

7

10

: 12

13

14

16

17

18

19 20

21

2© 23

24° 25 concluded as to what the State of California intends to do in these three areas that I mentioned.

I'd like at this time to thank this Commission and particularly the staff with the Attorney General's Office and the State Lands Commission for their patience during what started out as a one-day hearing and ended up at least five. It seemed like seven.

Thank you very much

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: Question to the staff.

Is there any prohibition in the lease or inherent in other

State law that would prohibit a camp who's nonlicensed or

does not have a lease for revenue producing purposes to lease
a mooring buoy for a charge?

MR RUMP: I think the answer to that might be relatively simple. We're dealing with the lease of the revenue moorings. The lease is for the individual upland camps or whatever could specify the ases or purposes of that lase.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: So is it appropriate for us to warrant in this bid package that those future leases will so limit? I think that is the comfort --

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: They're asking for protection.

MR. RUMP: Some sort of protection. I guess it can be done, although you don't have before you at this

very moment those leases. So --

10

11

. 12

13

14

15

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

MR. HIGHT: It's a matter which would be within your discretion.

MR. RUMP: The lease applications that we have front of us are not for any competitive activity but related to the activities within the camp or the club.

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: Are any camps operating revenue producing mornings at this point?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: No.

MR. RUMP: Not that we know of.

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: Then there's no problem in specifically prohibiting that, is there?

CHAIRPERSON CORY: That was the impression from all the various people who testified that the camps, part of their hue and cry as I recall it, was, we're just standing here not in any business and that's the purpose of excluding them, but I wanted to make sure that we could in essence make that representation, that it was legally proper for us to do so. Because if it is, I am inclined to include such representation. So they will know that they are not going to be having competitors.

MR R R MP: I think there's only one thing. I don't

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The nature of that warranty

I would guess is something the lawyers ought to look at,

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

but some stipulation to let them out of the thing if we're going to demand a payment and then them not have the only hame in town.

MR. RUMP: There's only one point of clarification in terms of lease applicants we have for the camps. I believe one is technically a nonprofit institution, but their use in producing revenue I don't think would be competitive as a mooring service, but it would be related to the operation of the camp. I don't think that changes our warranty, but that's just for information.

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

leases with the amps.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. You would like that -COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: You would like that -CHAIRPERSON CORY: There's two of us -COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: -- part of our direction.
CHAIRPERSON CORY: -- that would like that included.
COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: When negotiating the other

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Is there anybody else who wants to say something?

MR. GREENBERG: Charles Greenberg representing your present lessees. We would just like to say that we'll be very happy to bid whatever decisions the Commission makes on what are the proper conditions or the proper parameters under which that bidding should take place. It might be helpful to the Commission if we did just for information

purposes discuss a couple of the things that have been brought forth today.

, 4

that neither we nor anyone else apparently know who owns the marinas and who doesn't own them and, as a result, there's some sort of a problem as he perceives it in bidding refers to the fact that the owned moorings on Catalina were put in the twenties and thirties and forties and fifties before my clients really administered the submerged lands activities there. A fellow just came own with some mooring equipment and he dropped it in the sea and he had a mooring. It was before the State of California had established that it owned the submerged lands out there.

When we took over the direction of the premises, we did not like the policy implications of having owned moorings. We preferred the policy, because we did want to make the moorings as available to the public as possible. So what we did is that we certainly didn't try to kick any of these old guys off the premises. But from that point on, when new moorings went in, we put them in and we leased the moorings rather than have owned moorings.

Now, I think it is true that, as Mr. Radcliffe was able to establish in the hearings, that we can't go back to 1920, '30, '40, or '50 and have a document, a deed, something from the Title Insurance Company that says that"

the fellow who's been out there with his boat all that time or is a successor-in-title, paid money to get out there somewhere during that time is a person who actually owns the mooring, but we have treated him that way. It should be clear to the two other bidders which are the so-called "owned moorings" and which are the leased moorings because they have available to them the computer printouts that we have been furnishing the Commission of each of the 720 revenue moorings. On those computer printouts —

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Question:

MR. GREENBERG: Yes

10

o

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: Is it true that there are 299 owned moorings and 429 leased?

MR. GREENBERG: That's my Yes, it is. That's right.

MR. RUMP: That was the testimony at the hearing under oath.

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: And everyone agrees to that?

MR. GREENBERG: Yes. And there are computer printouts available to the two bidders which will show them which 299 moorings are owned and which are not, which are the leased moorings.

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: The question is not your ability to indicate but the ability to prove documentation.

MR. GREENBERG: That's the question. Can we go prove documentation that we perhaps in our commercial ineptitude have been allowing bargain rates to people for umpteen years without demanding proof they really own the mooring. I think that's the issue.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: But the mooring is personalty is the hardware, the tackle?

MR. GREENBERG: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: In the general sense there is not proof of ownership of water tanks filled with concrete

MR. GREENBERG: That's our view, yes.

the question is we've always talked about a differentiated fee schedule between leased and owned moorings. So it's important to have a definitive number so that the bidders know whether they're dealing with a certain number of leased moorings or owned moorings.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: But it is not only definitive as to number but it is definitive as to which they are.

MR. GREENBERG: That's correct.

MR RUMP: That's right. The computer printout of does specify and adjacent to each mooring whether it's leased or owned.

MR. GREENBERG: The final aspect of this as

25

23

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

anyway.

mentioned by Mr. Radcliffe is the question of the relevancy of whether or not this Commission wishes to exercise its right at the end of the lease period to acquire the personalty, so to speak, the attached personalty of the mooring systems. I fail to see the relevance of that question since the lease which you've entered into, no matter who is your successful bidder, will stay in existence for another 13 years or so. We're not talking about bringing the old lease to an end. As I understand it, the question is whether you wish to exercise your right that you preserved under the present lease of about 14 years' duration that's left on it to at the end of that period exercise your right to acquire the owned, so-called owned moorings.

"10

. 11

12

13

£ 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 .

25

So I don't see how that affects how much money a bidder will bid because he's just going — if he obtains the bid, he steps into our shoes and he is going to have to certainly I would suspect replace the moorings that are our property, that are the lease property. I don't think the State has any right under the existing leasehold to take that property until the end of the lease period.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: You were suggesting that the prior lease did not have that, when that expired and you mose to leave the personalty there, you no longer had title to it?

MR. GREENBERG: That we no longer had title to

I don't believe that's right. it? CHAIRPERSON CORY: I'm asking you. MR. GREENBERG: I don't believe that's right. First. I don't think the prior lease ever expired. it was superseded by a new lease which was entered into before the prior lease came to an end. But I think that Mr. Radcliffe was addressing himself to an option that this Commission and the State of California has at the end of the lease period if it wishes to exercise it, similar to any landlord lease, to take the personalty. My point is 10 only that I don't see how that affects a potential billder 11 attempting to figure out what he's going to bid. 12 CHAIRPERSON CORY: I think the fact that you have 13 blaced on the record what your view of those facts would 14 be should be helpful to the other bidders without us comment. 15 on what we believe the law and the facts to be. "I think 16 that should be useful 17 MR. GREENBERG: Commissioner Cory, that's one of 18 the most lawyer-like statements I've ever heard. 19 [Laughter.] 20 CHAIRPERSON CORY: Is that okay, Greg? 21 [Laughter.] MR. GREENBERG: Finally, I'd just like to say this. 23 You got him off the hook, great: MR. HIGHT: 24 GREENBERG: I think we, too, are very grateful 25

that this investigation took place. I'm a little surprised by the turn it took in today's hearing, but I think it's a useful turn. The original investigation took place because 3 there was an very serious allegation made that there were 5 850 potential revenue producing moorings on the lease " premises, and I don't think anybody believes that any more. I think the evidence was clear and convincing in the hearing 70 that we have not reached our lease obligations to you and there are 720 revenue producing moorings. You might argue about a stray mooring here or there as to what it means, 14 but pretty clearly that's so. What we are talking about today is not any of those original motivations that started 12 13 the hearing process. What we are talking about today is further education, so to speak, for the benefit of the 14 15 bidders, of facts that were uncovered in the hearings which now the other bidders want to know more about before they 16 17 bid.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think that's legitimate, too, that they should know enough to bid about. I think it's important to point out that those facts have nothing to do with the original reason the hearing was called. As I've listened to Mr. Radcliffe, I really don't believe that there are any facts that are germane, that he needs to know now before he can make an intelligent bid. We would like to go forward with the bidding process

2

5

7

8

9

and we would like to do it under any terms and conditions that this Commission sees fit.

· Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Questions?

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: None.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Ckay. Staff, do you want to --

MR. TAYLOR: I have a comment with regard to Mr.

Graenberg's last statement and also to the question of Mr.

Radcliffe in regard to what is the State's intent about the improvements.

11

12

13

14

15

16

10

You have to look at the history of the preceding lease and this lease, and one of the issues that was addressed the last time was the ownership of the improvements. Under the previous lease there was a specific provision that all of the improvements were retained by the lessee. That provision was stricken from the previous lease and we have the standards for paragraph 13 which I need strong glasses on a magnifying —

17

19

CHAIRPERSON CORY: When you talk about "previous lease," could you give us some time frame?

20 21

MR. TAYLOR: The previous lease was the lease which the Island Company had immediately preceding the one which is currently in existence.

22

MR. RUMP: Started January 1st of this year.
MR. TAYLOR: In other words, the one that was

24

25

prior to January 1 of this year had a provision in it that provided that the improvements remain the property of the lessee and that they could remove them. The State had no interest in them. There was some discussion on that in the course of the hearings that we held last year on that point, and it was decided to change the lease to go to the standard provision which allows the commission to elect whether to keep improvements on the property. These are anchored to the property.

It would seem that the issue with regard to the owned moorings which the staff has treated as those designated as owned on the computer printout, would be somewhat moot because those people will hang on through the period of time until the end of this lease under whatever operator there is. So the question remains as to the status of the equipment owned by the current lessee.

10

11

12

13

14

8 15

12

18

a 19

20

22

23

。 **24**

25

Under paragraph 13 the Commission would have the option of ordering the existing lessee in the event of termination to leave the improvements there. I think there will be a difference of opinion if the Island Company and Conservancy are not the winning bidder as to termination, but it would appear that termination as far as the current lessee, the Island Company and Conservancy is conceined, means when they're terminated out and not at the end of the lease. However, I think that, Mr. Chairman, your remark

was that Mr. Greenberg had stated his position and the commission has stated its.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: We did not state one.

MR. TAYLOR: That's very judicious.

I'd like to leave all the CHAIRPERSON CORY: doors open as possible. But I think the bidders should be aware of a potential conflict or argument about what the I den't think we can candy-cout that I think we might come to our decision, but what I'm concerned about making a conclusion -- I know where David is. But I would not want to attempt to candy-coat saying that we were warrantying in any way the outcome of that question given what Mr. Greenberg has chosen to carve out as his position. That's my only concern that there is some implied warranty to that effect. I wouldn't be surprised if you're not right in the eventual position. But in terms of a business person wanting to enter into a bid, I think they ve got to go into # wide open --

MR. HIGHT: Understanding --

41

12

913

14

16

18

20

22

23

24

25

are and making their best business judgment as to what they want to do with those facts. I do not want to make that business judgment for them or imply that in some way I can or will make them whole when I cannot I mean, that's sort of where I come down. If you think we can make them whole

Ĭ

.14

or should warranty, I'm willing to listen to that argument.

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: I have no comments.

MR. TAYLOR: There is a provision in here in the bid package which I don't seem to have which talks about the fact that there's possibility of litigation and that the possibility of litigation will not entitle the party to the recovery of any lamages from the State and I don't know where that is in the bid package. But I think we can read it into the record just so you can be clear on it.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. That would be sort of -MR. TAYLOR: It's on an unnumbered page, but it's
Section 2, Special Provisions of the Proposed Amended
Lease Form, and under paragraph one, Terms, subparagraph
B, Time of Possession of the Lease Premises by Substituted
Lessee.

"The substituted lessee shall take possession of the lease premises on January 1 following the year during which the substituted lessee has notified lessor that it has obtained all permits and equipment that may be required to fullfill its obligations under this lease and that it is ready and able to take possession of the lease premises. The substituted lessee shall notify lessor of its ability to take possession by September 30th of the year prior to the year it expects to take actual possession.

And then it goes on. That isn't quite it; is it?

ÿ **2**° 3

5

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

25

No, that isn't it. That isn't the paragraph. That's the one with regard to the substituted lessen's rights. But there's another one, there's another paragraph we talk in --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Would you like to recess for just a second?

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Why don't we, rather than have you read that into the record and her fingers are getting tired, why don't we just sit in place while you try to locate that before we come back.

[Thereupon a recess was taken.]

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Let's get back to work.

Mr. Taylor.

MR. TAYLOR: All right, Mr. Chairman. In the bid package it is the Supplemental Agreement to PRC Number 3639.1 in the bid package and it is the second page which has Section I, Basic Provisions. And under paragraph one, Authorized Improvements, it inserts a new paragraph to the standard form of authorized improvements which states:

"Authorized Improvements: Improvements described in section 2, paragraph 4 of the lease 3639.1 as hereby amended are authorized. Lessee shall accept any improvement on the leased premises in their existing condition. No representation of warranty express or implied has been made by or on behalf of lessor as to such condition or their availability to the substitute lessee. In the event that

1 2

3

5

7

6

9-

R

10

12

13

14 15

16

17

19

20

Zİ

22

23 24

25

any authorized improvements have been removed, replacement of those improvements is authorized."

CHAIRPERSON CORY: So that seems to define what the State's role in that matter is and leaves to the bidders the business judgment of how they wish to factor it.

The other paragraph that I was referring to talks about if we cannot deliver possession of the premises at the time specified in the lease, the lease shall not be wided, nor shall the lessor be liable to lessee for any damage resulting therefrom. But in that event, lessee shall not be liable for rent until such time as lessor can deliver possession. The term of the lease shall not be extended by reason of any such delay in the delivery of possession. There I'm reading from paragraph 10 in the same Supplemental Agreement to the Lease.

I think that that makes the State's position clear as to the risk being assumed by any bidder in this proceeding.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Go ahead with the other point you wanted to make, Greg.

MR. TAYLOR; I think that was it.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. Does anybody else wish to comment?

Yes, sir.

MR. STEELE: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ackerman, I'm Joe

Steele, President of Boat Owners Associated Together.

I'd like to comment on three items that were brough up today that as far as I know were not addressed very much in the past. One of the potential bidders urged you to increase the number of moorings to something in the order of 780 in effect to allow the successful bidder to attach the remainder of moorings to a number of weights that are on the bottom There's been argument forever over the number But I think that there has been no proof that of moorings! more than 720 or approximately 720 have ever beer and as revenue producing moorings. Consequently, the public has not had an opportunity to discuss the matter of increasing the number of moorings. I would urge you to accept the staff recommendation and define, the number of moorings as 720 and you already have what I think is sufficient in the way of performance bond in the lease to ensure that the successful lessee holds it to 720. I assure you that if you do this and if he increases it to 780 or something of that sort, you'll hear many screams from the boaters because we really don't want any more.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I tend to agree with you, but I think it's a fascinating concept that in our society every ten years we can go around and count 200 million plus people and every 15 years we can't count 720.

[Laughter.]

6

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON CORY: There's something bizarre about our capabilities. But go ahead with what you have to say.

MR. STEELE: But if we had the staff that, the bidders have, I guess we'd be dut there counting them too, but I've got better things to do

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I'm so glad to hear We'd of had another number.

MR. STEELE: Yes, I'm sure we'd have had another number.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Go ahead with the important points

MR. STEELE: The next issue is @matter of waiting I think you should realize that there really isn't one waiting list. There may be 20 or 30 waiting lists because there are a number of coves and there are waiting lists for each cove, and in almost each of these coves there are different sized moorings. So it's as if, you had parking lots all over the city with parking places for ten-ton trucks and Volkswagens and the man who comes up top on the list might not have the right size vehicle to be in the right I would certainly hope that you would not abolish the waiting list. The public has had plenty of opportunity to get on the waiting list. I think you'll find people on that waiting list that have been on there for years, and it would be basically unfair to throw them, off,

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 TELEPHONE (918) 972-8094 🐉

10 11

12

13

14

17

18

19

20

21, 22

23

24

25

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Another matter that was brought up has to do with the payment by the contractor to the State, and the State had estalished sometime back a fixed payment. That was what was in the bid package that was published. There has been adequate time for comment on that. It was our understanding this meeting was to establish the number of moobings. I think to make any change there would simply not be quite fair to many other people who might wish to testify. It's our feeling that that eventually is going to have an effect on the cost to the boaters of the moorings. I'm not quite sure whether I want to argue for or against it on such short notice.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: You can tell me the answer to that. It would make my vote a lot easier, whether I'm going to get more money or less maney.

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: Joe, as a former admiral, could you comment on the markings of the buoys, what the Coast Guard's position might be on that?

requires the mooring buoys be white with a blue line around them. I believe the Coast Guard some years ago permitted the Island Company to put the blue line around the buoys on the perimeter of a mooring area rather than each buoy because they're rather small buoys and that's been the

· 10

11 12

13 14

15 16

19

20

22

Žł

23

pattern in the past. I think the Coast Guard would object very much, and I believe you would be in violation of federal regulations if you should decide to paint them purple or green or red or some other color. I think you're stuck with white now.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I was thinking puce Sort of reminds me of all the hearings we've had.

MR. STEELE: You could put that color bottom paint on them. There's a lot of different colors of bottom paint which you can see on those buoys.

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: But we have to come up with one marking system that would work.

I think so and I think if you want MR STEELE: to identify them, you've got them identified by numbers now and you could identify them by some sort of letter. . I believe that issue has been settled with the Coast Guard. Generally speaking, mooring buoys do not carry numbers, but I don't think there's any problem on that.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Is there anybody else in the audience who wishes to say something? Okay. Staff.

MR. RDMP: Maybe just on that last comment J think Mr. Taylor might have a modification of some language that would solve the color coding problem.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: You're talking about (3)(A).

MR. TAYLOR: (3)(A), strike, in the second line
of (3)(A), "Must be painted with" and in the next line
"a color" and insert after the word "and" back up on the
second line "and in a manner" and then it flows from there.
So it would now read: "All revenue producing moorings must
be marked with an individual serial number, and in a manner
which distinguishes them from nonrevenue meorings."

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Can you tell us what that just
cost?

[Laughter.]

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Ever watchful of the current budget crisis. Go ahead. I'm sorry.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's it.

MR. TAYLOR: I think you need, if you're going to accept the staff's recommendation, you need to strike the lines on page 26, the last two lines, and on page 27, the other -- the first two lines.

CHAIEPERSON CORY: Okay.

MR. TAYLOR: "Or, in the alternative," you need to strike the first part of the paragraph.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I have had trouble with paragraph (2) just following it through in terms of the syntax of that sentence. Has somebody checked to make sure it is accurate or correct?

The numbers are accurate. The English might not be the best in the world. CHAIRPERSON CORY: Does the Commission find or does the Commission finds. There's a whole let of other dependent clauses, and I'm not sure EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: The Commission is a singular noun. Therefore, the verb should agree with that It should be the Commission finds. CHAIRPERSON CORY: That's what my mind seems to be saying, but I ---10 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: You were correct, sir. 11 CHAIRPERSON CORY: Now, that shows how nit-picky 12 we've been on this project. [Laughter,] EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: It also shows how 15 proofreading is not up to the standard that I would like. CHAIRPERSON CORY: Being an old patent agent you . 17 pick up little things like that. I would like to thank the staff for enduring what 19 the Commission has inflicted upon them in this process. 20 done an admirable job under difficult circumstances. So 21 what we do with it from here you know is what we do and you 22 should not be offended as we destroy your baby. 23 [Laughter.] 24

25

MR. RUMP: Maybe if I can help in that, let me

note in paragraph (1) one option that has been recommended
that we really have to largy. At the end of that paragraph
it says that Toyon and Gallagher's beach will be removed
from the lease premises. You would have if you desire an
option to leave them remaining in the lease but prohibiting
any revenue buoys in there. There are only camp or nonrevenue
uoys.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: It seems like it is simpler to remove from the lease and follow that suggestion. If there are nonrevenue, let's try to simplify the variables for the lessees, the bidders, that they can exclude that from their mind rather than worrying about definitions. I think it is more consistent to tidy up and limit the universe as much as possible is sort of my thinking.

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: That's fine.

"1 1

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRPERSON CORY: All right. I am prepared to go along with the staff recommendations as outlined on page 26, 27 and 28 with those changes. Are you, David?

COMMISSIONER ACKERMAN: 2 Yes.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Okay. The question would be do we proceed at that point, what length of time and how do we proceed?

MR. HIGHT: I thank, Mr. Chairman, at that point we would need an instruction on whether or not we would go back and renew the bidding process and what time frame the

bids should be received back to #s.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I would like for you to do that and do it as soon as possible. I don't know how much more time since it is, as I bee those changes, not a great substantive change. I realize that there are other ways that this could be bid, but given the length of time, the variables and the interest of the media in the gross terms, of this, what is happening, I/think not making it any more complex than possible so that everybody can see there is an amount that is the variable in the bid. The thing that we attempted to do with percentages, you get into terrible problems with percentages of what elements and then guessing how many bubble gum packages are going to be sold versus something else. This puts it clear enough so that everybody can discern what in fact is happening and that's why I prefer to go ahead with this and do it as quickly as the staff and the bidders can reasonably do it and get it done. Now, I don't know whether that is a week, ten days, or what.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Commissioner, the staff tells me that they could get these corrections out tomorrow. They would then be received by the bidders on the 18th. One week from that day is Thanksgiving. So I would think, there is one working day between Thanksgiving and the weekend, and if they were received by the 26th -
CHAIRPERSON CORY: Glad to know you're going to

be working that day Go ahead.

5

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

^G22

23

24

25

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Well, we've got a Commossion meeting on the 29th. So I think I will be.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: The 26th I think, is the time they should be returned.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The 26th is what day?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's a Friday.

Today is the 16th.

MR. HIGHT: Okay. Yes.

a day to get them ready. They'll get them out by Express
Mail tymorrow afternoon. They'll be received by the bidders
on the 18th which is Thursday. So the 26th then gives eight
days which ought to be enough, I would think.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Fine with me.

EXECUTIVE OF ICER DEDRICK: It's not a substantial change.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Somebody is moving forward in their seat.

MR. PADCLIFFE: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to invite the Commission's attention that within that eight days is one weekend and a Thanksgiving holiday. I'm inclined to speed up as much as possible. It seems to be the following Monday would be rather than come in and sandwich it

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

j

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

(3

19

20

21

22

in that period.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: The following Monday. The following Monday --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: The 27th then of MR. TAYLOR: It will be opened following the Commission meeting then?

CHAIRPERSON CORY: Open them --

MR. GREENBERG: Just one technical question, Mr. Chairman. The present wording of the bidding package calls for financials to be brought up to date I think within 90 days of the bid or something like that.

CHAIRPERSON CORY: I would be willing to amen't that to the prior cutoff date. I don't think that is necessary, unless the staff thinks otherwise, but whatever the financial was in the bid that had been prepared previously, that should be the cutoff. Can the staff make that change in the soliditation?

MR. RUMP: Okay: Plus staff will have that warranty of noncompetition by the camp leases as well that you mentioned.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: And we will then receive and open the bids on the 29th.

CHATRPERSON CORY: What time of day and what time of day is the Commission meeting?

MR. HIGHT: The Commission meeting is at 10:00

43

24

o'clock MR. RUMP: 10:00 o'clock. The previous bid pening was scheduled for 2:00 o'chock in the offices of the Commission. You want it at 2:00 or at 9:00? CHAIRPERSON CORY: MR. RUMP: 2:00, L would think. EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK Oh, 2:00, Some people have to travel. MR. RUMP: This time of year And there is a December meeting? CHAIRPERSON CORY: 10 MR. RUMP: Yes. 11 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: There is one scheduled 12 and you always have the option of ten days' notice for 13 anything. 14 If there's no further business, we will 15 stand adjourned. 16 [Thereupon the State Lands Commission 17 Meeting was adjourned at 5:40 p.m. I 18 19 20 21 22

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, CATHLEEN SLOCUM, a Certified Shorthand

1 5

>

-

8

10

110

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

43

13

25

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing State Lands Commission meeting was reported in shorthand by me. Cathleen Slocum, and thereafter

Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

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 November, 1982.

CATHLEEN SLOCUM

Certified Shorthand Reporter License No. 2822

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION