

10

°11.

12

13

14 15

16

17

19

20

22

23

24 25

Leo T. McCarthy, Lt. Governor, Acting Chairperson John Jervis representing Kenneth Cory, Controlle

Nancy Crd Prepresenting Michael Franchetti, Director

MEMBERS ABSENT

NONE

STAFF PRESENT

Claire Dedrick, Executive Officer

James Trout, Assistant Executive Officer

Robert Hight

Dwight Sanders

Jane Smith, Secretary

ALSO PRESENT

N. Gregory Taylor, Deputy Attorney General Richard Frank, Deputy Attorney General

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95826 TELEPHONE (918) 072-8804 (\$

Win Swint, President, California Abalone Association

19

20

22

23

24

Mr. Michael Cox

100

108

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 88825 TELEPHONE (918) 972-8894

PROCEEDINGS

--000--

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: I'd like to apologize to everyone who has waited patiently for this meeting to begin at 10:00 (.m. Now having reached the bour of 10:00 I am, I would like to begin the meeting.

I wanted first to make sure that anyone in the audience who was interested had a couple of documents in front of them. One was the calendar summary document which has the item before us on the approval of the amended lease conditions regarding the lease sale between Arguello and Conception. Second was the item entitled, "Proposed Amendment to Special Operating Requirement 5(d) Version 1." The first one is about 30 pages. This one is four pages. You will need both of those to follow the discussion that's about to commence. You may need other things to follow the discussion that's about to commence, too. You'll need to start with those.

We gave those out at shortly after 10:00 and I hope that a number of you have had an opportunity to read those so that you can participate with us in this discussion.

Nancy Ordway on my right is representing the Director of Finance Franchetti, and John Jervis on my left is representing our missing chair, Controller Ken Cory.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Mr. Chairman, in case

W &

.9

10

11

12

∘ .13

14

o 15

16

17

-18

19

ं 20∮

21

22

23

24

25

3

<u>\$</u>9

· 7 - 8

9

° 60 10

12

%13

14

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25 we have run short of copies, we just brought in another 30.

ACTING CHAIRTERSON McCARTHY: All right. We just brought in another 30 copies I'm informed in case anybody is missing those.

A brief recap. I think most people remember the history that the State Lands Commission took action December 23rd on proposed lease sale and set of conditions. Coastal Commission met on May 25th and didn't accept the lease sale in that condition or really didn't come to an ultimate vote on it, I believe. They wanted the discussions that were leading to proposed written in annotations to that lease sale at that May 25th meeting to be clarified. So they didn't want to proceed to yote on the issue. Since that time the two commissions made contact and I think as all or most of you know two Coastal Commissioners, Chairman Mel Nutter and Commissioner McMurray for the Coastal Commission along with Mr. Tobin who has been the prime staff person responsible for this subject area, and from the State Lands Commission, myself, as designated by the members of this Commission and Mr. Jim Trout. We had three meetings. Those meetings lasted about nine hours. They ranged over a number of subjects. They led to the proposed changes in the lease sale conditions that are in this packet;

I tried to disseminate this to people to involve people in that discussion. We certainly don't for a moment.

suggest to you that any part of this should not be challenged in any appropriate way by any interest that may be sitting in this audience today. We'll get to that in a minute and I'm going to ask the staff to take us through that.

That's the result of discussions this week. I should mention that Nancy Ordway representing Director Franchetti asked us to pass out a brief statement that was a summary of the discussions that occurred during those three meetings that took nine hours. You should have that also. That's a briefer about eight-page ricce here. We're providing you all kinds of materials this morning.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

್ಲ20

21

22

23

. 24

25

Now, getting back to the other Proposed Amendments to Special Operating Requirement 5(d), I want to explain to you where this came from. This developed this week.

The first two amendments were essentially from oil industry representatives. They're asking that those amendments be put into any lease sale agreement and the considerations behind the jackup rigs issue we will get into at that point. The second — well, we didn't even, and 2 is numbered. 3 is not numbered. It was put in a separate page. They came from environmental organizations. They are also proposed as amendments to the lease sale and they deal with the scope of the studies that are going to be conducted on marine life. We'll get to those at the

appropriate time.

packet because I'm going to ask Claire Dedrick, our CEO, to begin to take us through that with the aid of other staff point by point. I'll mention in passing that what is listed as Exhibit 2 is a technical amendment that will be explained to you. That was not a part of the nine hours of discussions that the representatives described to you had on this. When we get into Exhibit 3, listed at the bottom as C-1, that represents the beginning of the recommendation for the public's consideration and for possible action by this Commission that came out of those hearings. I'm going to ask Claire Dedrick to join us at this point.

two packages you have clearly described. At the July meeting of the State Lands Commission, we presented to you for permission to distribute the proposed amendments that were the outgrowth of your negotiations. At that time we set a meeting for today in order to give the Coastal commission ten days to review a final document and you asked us to get back to you with the results of public comment which were due in Monday and Tuesday of this week

The thick part, the calendar item itself, describes those comments and makes some recommendations sometimes and other times we don't make any recommendations on what

the public wanted. We got comments from nine individuals or organizations including environmentalists, governmental bodies, and the oil industry.

You've summarized the most important of those proposed amendments in the four-page document and I think that the actual content of the proposal that is now before you reflects accurately the input of the public and there are, as you noted, some areas where the staff has made no recommendations but we have presented to you the arguments on both sides:

Jim Trout, since he was the guy that did all the work on this, I think I would like to ask Jim to just go through the major issues.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Mr. Trout.

MR. TROUT: Probably the first portion of the calendar item is the pages numbered C on Exhibit 3 which are the Special Operating Requirements to the lease. The changes in strikeout and underlining are the changes from the original Special Operating Requirements adopted by the Commission on December 23rd. So you can see what the final change would look like from the original document. We've made changes in the transportation of hydrocarbons, particularly making it clear that there will be a requirement for the use of an onshore pipeline if such is built or that there have to be a significant solid demonstration that

25 ... 1/

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the use of an enshore pireline cannot be done, that it is infeasible. It is also made clear that, at the request of the Coastal Commission, that no marire terminal is authorized under these leases within the lease area. There is also a requirement regarding the use of barges in case of marine terminal at some other location does turn out to be required.

10

11.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

⁰20

23

22

23

24

25

In Special Operating Requirement 4, it has been amended to include the mapping of significant biologic areas. Again, this was part of the original Coastal Commession staff recommendation in May. It has been adopted; it has been proposed for adoption by the Commission and that map is shown on Exhibit 5 on page 40 of the calendar items shows an area where it is recommended that a probabition of of all activities on the opean floor be made and that that would be from the shoreline out to the 15 fathom or onehalf mile limit, whichever is further from shore. map would also show the sensitive biologic freas which at the present time on the map are halibut trawling areas and the rocky bottom areas which are defined as those areas of bedrock which protrude above the sea floor. Other significant or sensitive biologic areas in the agreement, are the kelp beds if there are any outside of the prohibited area and rubble or cobble areas

A There are some minor changes made at the request

of Fish and Came and public interest groups and the industry in some of the other areas.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

<u>4</u>7

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I think that the next significant change is in Special Operating Requirement 10 where the use of two vessels one te is made possible rather than a one-vessel and a shore-based equivalent of the Coast Guard's strike force. The amount of money involved in carrying out the oil spill endeavor has not been reduced.

Then lastly, a section has been added at the end Special Operating Requirement Number 15, establishing Scientific Advisory Committees to assist the State in the development of both the scope of studies required in these requirements, under these requirements, and in the review of reports generated pursuant to the requirements and the Commission has agreed to fund those Scientific Advisory Committees

The other thing that is new in this package then, as I mentioned, is Exhibit 5, the sensitive biologic areas, and Exhibit 6, a draft interagency agreement which we believe staff believes, reflects the understanding arrived at by the representatives of the Coastal Commission and your Commission as you referred to, Mr. Chairman.

Lastly, several people commented that they needed a time schedule or would like to see a time schedule of the biologic and other studies required in the Special

Operating Requirements. That is Exhibit 7 and is shown on the last three pages. We have a bar chart and then we have a discussion of who the lead agency would be and some other numeric outline. This is all based on a zero point of the award of any lease sale.

I think that probably covers it, Mr. Chairman. ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: All right. Thank you, Mr. Trout.

Do you have anything more to add at this point? EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: No.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Any questions by either member of the Commission?

COMMISSIONER JERVIS: No

9-10

11

°12

13

14

15

16

17

18

.19

20

21

23

24

25

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: We're prepared to take testimony from anybody in the audience. We have so far the following people have indicated they wish to testify. Let me read off all these names and then others who may wish to testify can so indicate.

Mr. Earl Stout, Miss Diane Guzman, and Naida West. Those are the only three we have indicated so far. All right. Thank you.

Dr. Corwin, Rachel Saunders, Martha Davis. All right.

I'd like to first in the order in which they were handed to me ask Mr. Earl Stout, the Manager of the Alaska

Pacific Division Exploration of the Exxon Company.

10

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24°

MR. STOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Yes, sir.

MH. STOUT: My name is Earl Stout. As Manager of the Alaska Pacific Exploration Division of Exxon Company, U.S.A., I am directly responsible for Exxon's decisions concerning oil and gas exploration operations on California submerged lands and the OCS offshore California

Today I would like to comment on those lease terms and operating requirements for the proposed sale that we consider to be the most troublesome. My remarks will supplement previous written comments submitted by letter to the staff on July 15 and August 5 of this year. Oil and gas exploration is an inherently risky business. and other companies in the oil and gas exploration and production industry readily undertake these risks because we are in the risk-taking business and are accustomed to evaluating the situations. Although I have had extensive experience in evaluating potential prospects and proposed lease terms. both within the United State's and abroad, the terms and Special Operating conditions proposed for the Point Conception Point Arguello lease sale are in my opinion unprecedented in the degree of risk that the lessees are required to assume. Simply stated, there are no satisfactory means to determine when, if ever, the lessees will be able to satisfy all of

the government restrictions required to operate these leases or to analyze the cost that might be incurred to satisfy the conditions.

Although in the past several months Exxon and I think other petroleum companies and organizations have had numerous conferences with your staff as to how to alleviate some of the troublesome terms of the proposed sale, none of our concerns were addressed in this latest revision of the lease provisions. A serious question arises as to whether or not these terms create more risk and uncertainty than our shareholders can be reasonably expected to bear. In our opinion the full proposals that I would like to discuss today are most objectionable because we think that they go far beyond what is necessary of what is reasonable to protect the environment and the other These terms create a competing uses of the lease area. substantial risk we think that the lessees will never be able to drill these leases or produce any of the resources that they might discover if, in fact, exploratory drilling is allowed to take place.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

Exxon has not made a final decision as to whether or not to participate in this sale. However, if we decide to not come to the sale, our decision will not be lased on the geologic risk involved but rather on the risk that we see related to the lease provisions and the Special

Operating Conditions contained in the proposal before the Commission.

Now I would like to turn specifically to the four provisions that I would like to discuss today. We take a strong exception to the Special Operating Requirement 4 by which the State after taking our money may completely nullify the rights to explore and produce the leases. This provision specifies that before any drilling or the placement of any structures including pipeline on the lease area, the lessee must fund site-specific biological and marine mammal surveys to be conducted by the State. Where adverse effects of special biological resources cannot be mitigated to the satisfaction of the State, the State may prohibit development. This prohibition will not be based or cannot be the basis for a claim by the lessee.

Let's take a little closer look at this requirement if we could. The term "special biological resource" is not defined. The term "adverse effect" is not defined. Mitigation measures are described only as those required to satisfy the State. Without definitions and without some objective standard, there is no way to quantify the lessee's risk. There is not even an express provision for a hearing to give the lessees a chance to voice their views about these matters. Conceivably, a lessee could invest hundreds of millions of dollars in exploration and development and

then be prohibited by the State from going forward with production without any compensation due from the State.

These concerns should also be shared by the Commission because they might preclibe or at least severely curtail any net profit revenues that the State might otherwise receive from the leases.

Operating Requirement 1 which provides that the State may require the use of subsea completions rather than fixed production platforms. The factors to be considered in making such determinations are broadly stated and provide the lesses no real means in which to evaluate what type decisions the State will make when these questions arise. Exxon objects to this what we think is an unnecessary requirement because subsea completion are so substantially more expensive than fixed platforms and they might render uneconomic almost any potential prospects in the sale area to the detriment of all concerned, the lessee's shareholder and also to the State.

Let me elaborate on that particular point. The subset completion systems are basically designed for use in deep water areas that are beyond the limits of platform type developments. This is an extremely expensive technology that is not appropriate for use in the shallow waters such as those in the sale area. In shallow waters, the high cost

of subsea development systems would discourage, if not preclude, development of many discoveries and would force early abandonment of other reservoirs, thereby reducing again, the income to the dessee and also to the State.

3

712°

13-

14

15

170

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thirdly. Exxon objects to the arbitrary well spacin specifications that were determined prior to drilling and analyzing data from the reservoir characteristics of any loans that might underlie the eight parcels producible in the lease area. The proposed spacing requirements apparently reflect an erroneous assumption that closer spacing will necessarily lead to higher recovery of petroleum resources. Arbitrary decisions about particular well spacing patterns without specific evidence that more wells will best gerve conservation purposes and will be economically Justified by increased hydrocarbon recovery. reflect inflexible decimion-making contrary to the interest of all parties. "Drilling and operating additional unnecessary wells will increase the cost for the lessee and lower the return to the State to the net profits payment. arbitrary and inflexible spacing requirements in paragraph 3 of Exhibit B should be deleted. If they were deleted, the Commission would retain its discretion to make a case by-case decision based on conservation principles and information that the would have in hand about the reservoirs to be regulated.

The fourth matter that I would like to discuss is the six months' exploratory drilling restriction for areas identified as halibut trawling ground. Exxon objects to this requirement because no total ban of exploratory drilling activity is necessary. Exploratory drilling vessels occupy only very limited areas. Commercial fishing has been and may continue to be conducted successfully on deases where only small portions of those leases are occupied by drilling vessels. Considering the fact that it would take about 90 days to drill and test an exploratory well in the sale area, in order to complete and test a well in the specified drilling season, the actual period during which drilling must be started is rather limited. drilling to be completed by October 1, prudence dictates that operations be commenced no later than the third month of the sanctioned drilling period. Problems caused by this curtailed drilling period will be aggravated by difficulties in ensuring that suitable drilling vessels are available on location at the times for which they were scheduled.

10

12

(13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ଟ ୍ଲୀର୍ଟ

Wells that cannot be completed within the authorized period would have to be suspended and reentered at significantly greater cost. The effect of the limited drilling season may be to force the lessee to pay substantial standby time to ensure rig availability during the early part of the drilling season. These costs, again, will be borne by both

the lessee and the State. Again, we think the imposition of these costs is unnecessary because a ban on drilling cannot in our judgment be justified.

I will also note that Exxon is extremely concerned about the implication of the six month exploratory drilling ban and how it might affect the placement of permanent facilities in the area in the event of a commercial discovery is made.

Let me mention one final concern about the proposed lease terms and operating requirements. If such provisions are adopted, we believe that the operating experience on the leases will force the lessee, whomever they hight be, to ask for modification of these unworkable requirements. We would suggest, however, that any such post-sale modification of the lease condition could open the door to challenges as to the lease title. For this reason and others mentioned earlier, we strongly suggest that the Commission carefully evaluate and perhaps revise the proposed lease terms and the operating requirements prior to the term of the sale.

fû

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

24

In summary, Exxon recognizes that there clearly are competing uses for state coastal waters and submerged lands. The oil and gas industry and other parties make legitimate uses of these areas. For instance, the fishing and the petroleum industry are both important to the State.

and to the nation. They provide employment to revenue for the State in addition to providing a very vital service. In order that these and other groups co-exist, there must be a balancing between the uses of the offshore areas that is fair to all parties. In our opinion the proposed lease terms and operating requirements for this lease sale clearly reflect that equitable balancing has not been achieved. The four provisions that I discussed today are the ones that we mink are totally unacceptable. Our comments on other objectionable, albeit less objectionable provisions, have already been submitted by written comments.

Our fundamental objections to the requirements that I've discussed today are addressed and have addressed in written comment is that the provisions are either unreasonable or unnecessary or they're without objective criteria. They substintially increase the risk that the lessee will not be permitted to explore and develop the leases. If permitted to proceed, they would be allowed to proceed only in a manner that might not yield a meaningful economic return either to the lessee or to the State of California.

If the Commission cannot develop a reasonable balance between competing interests and reflect that balance in the lease terms and conditions that provide some certainty about what operations could be permitted, when

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

undoubtedly need to reevaluate whether or not we can afford to divent our financial and human resources to this sale area.

Those are the prepared comments that I have. I want to thank you for the opportunity for allowing me to present them and urge you to give careful consideration to our concerns.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Stout.

Is would like to ask the staff to comment on one thing Mr. Stout said, and none of the other commissioners had questions. Mr. Stout said there wash't any process for a hearing to object to whatever experience they had that might be important to take public notice of. Could you comment on that?

10

11

≒J2

13

14

15

16

17

18

.19

20

21

24

25

To make any development decision, that is to say, to get a permit or anything like that, that decision is made by the body sitting here. That requires public action on a public agenda with hearing, and it has always been the tradition of the State Lands Commission to hear anyone who wishes to speak. That is as far as the State Lands Commission goes. Any EIR, any decision to explore, all of those things are public decisions at which the companies have every right and are expected to be involved. The same

is true of the other regulatery decisions, the other decisions by regulatory agencies such as the local air district, the local water district, the local government and the Coastal Commission. All of those decisions are made in an open hearing process. ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Mr. Stout, are you

Sitisfied with that response? Do you have some additional concerns?

The way the terms now read, Mrs. Dedrick, is the fact that othe State Lands Commission can cancel the There is no mention in the text

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Mr. Stout, let me have one of the attorneys reply to that. We cannot unilaterally cancel the lease.

MR. HIGHT: In order for the Commission to take any action, it has to have a public hearing and at that point you would have an opportunity to be heard. At would not be unilateral in the sense that you wouldn't have an opportunity to be heard.

MR. STOUT: Okay. That's not the way we had read

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICKE It really is how the system works.

> MR. STOUT: I'm sorry.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: It really is how the ..

24

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

system works.

8

ĴÕ

19

12

13

14

15

17

18

79

20

21

22

23

24

25/

MR. STOUT: I would prefer it to be a little more emphatic in the way that --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: It's by statute, Mr. Stout. There is no way this Commission could take that without a public hearing.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: I think if there's some clarification that needs to be made on that, to cite the existing statutes which would require that public, hearing process, we should do that and give that information to Mr. Stout.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: We'll be glad to do that, Mr. Stout.

MR. STOUT: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Do either of the commissioners have a question at this point of Mr. Stout?

COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: No, thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you very much, Mr. Stout.

Diane Guzman, Director of Resource Management, o Santa Barbara County, who was born into this world to deal with the subject of offshore oil leases.

follows Exxon.

MS. GUZMAN: I even agreed with some of the things

D

that Exxon said.

ु6

8

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

ે24

25

Yes, Mr. Chairman, Members of the State Lands
Commission, I am biane Guzman. I am here representing
Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors. I have brought
with me ten copies for the record of the letter that I am
going to summarize.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Staff, hand those to the commissioners.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Certainly.

MS. GUZMAN: In the interest of time and also to emphasize certain points, I will not read the entire letter. I will instead just summarize certain point.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Go ahead, please.

MS. GUZMAN: First of all, I want to say that we are ver encouraged with the progress being made on this lease sale and I'm very happy to see several of the changes that have been made. We are objecting to the short notice regarding your decision hearing today and instead felt that it should have been a 60-day notice and a hearing in Santa Barbara. We'd like to summarize our position before the court and the California Coastal Commission.

First, we think that the lease sale itself should be delayed for several reasons. One, because of the current glut and low price of crude oil. Secondly, because of the substantial decline in the amount of monies recently bill

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

for several federal lease sales. Third, because of the inability of this sensitive environment to accommodate additional development at this time. We already have intensive leased areas and developing areas in close proximity. We also feel that a drilling prohibition should be completed before the lease sale takes place. We also feel that a panel of agency representatives should define the scope and methodology of the regional studies and evaluate their results. We also feel the drilling prohibition map which will identify areas that are too sensitive to drill appear relatively insensitive to drilling and development.

.23

Next, we feel that the insensitive areas would hen be available for platform construction pipeline and support facilities. We note that the staff in their analysis and in the changed conditions has taken several steps to reach such goal. Our letter was written prior to the more detailed letter today and it does not include all of the more recent changes. I would however, like to point out a few differences that we still have.

First, the County has not been included in the designation of the sensitive areas. We feel that the County should play a major role in determining the sensitive areas as well as the areas which would be precluded from drilling.

Next, we are concerned with the scale of these biological surveys. The changed stipulation indicates site

regional, biological, cultural and geohazard surveys. I feel at this point we differ still on the scope, the timing, and the kind of parties that will review the sensitive area or drilling prohibition maps.

will be used. The approach outlined here is that the maps would be used after the lease sale rather than before. We feel quite strongly that it's important to determine these prohibition areas prior to leasing. Otherwise, your commission will find itself in a position of having to deny exploration and potential development on areas after they have been leased. In fact, I believe that was the point also made by the gentleman from Exxon Corporation.

In conclusion, the County of Santa Barbara would like to be a planning partner with the State Lands Commission and the Coastal Commission on this lease sale and that we feel the determination of the sensitive areas and the prohibition areas should be made prior to the lease rather than after the lease.

I thank you for the opportunity to comment and I would be available for questions.

ACTING CHAIRPÉRSON McCARTHY: I would like our staff to comment on how Santa Barbara County would participate in the ongoing development of the studies to

oidentify) sensitive areas.

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

2Ö.

21

22

23

24

25

That is part of the interagency agreement. Jim, perhaps you could highlight the portion of the agreement that brings Santa Barbara County into the entire process.

MR. TROUT: As soon as I find it.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Have you read that agreement, Miss Guzman?

MS. GUZMAN: Yes, I have.

I believe there is mention that the County would be included in the selection of the Scientific Review Panel or would nominate people for the Scientific Review Panel.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Why don't we find the language.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK; I think if we can take the language itself --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Page 43.

MR. TROUT: Unfortunately I've got a version that was produced before the girls got a chance to put the page numbers on. I think, starting on page 42, Mr. Chairman, comprehensive planning and mapping, purpose and objectives. It starts out with an agreement between your commission and the Coastal Commission should this be adopted that you pledge to work with other governmental bodies such as the County of Santa Barbara in the comprehensive planning

process which we'll use to cover a number of things including the direction and guidance of the various studies the reasonable consolidation support facility, areas of unitization and pooling, what additional information. necessary to assist in getting out to the public information that is received, to assist in determining again in advance, in other words, to make these decisions, to help in making the decision to resolve the location of platforms, pipelines and facilities and to resolve confifets regarding seismic survey activities and the timing of Second, the Commission would pledge to set up exploration. advisory committees in which portions of the various members of the committees would be taken from dists supplied by the Coastal Commission and the County of Santa Barbara. think that the spirit of cooperation that exists would make this possible ander the terms of this interagency agreement.

12

13

u 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ACTING CHAIRPERSON MCCARTHY: Do you have any comment on the language that's in there? Is that any different than you already understood before you made your statement? It was our intent to try to involve the County which is the County's right in exsignificant way in a number of decisions.

MS. GUZMAN: I did not have this language, nor did our Board of Supervisors have that language when they approved the statement which I submitted to you today. I

believe that this is certainly moving in the appropriate direction. I don't think I'm at a point to, say, conclude whether we feel it's a full grough sole for the County to play.

ACTING SHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Second question.

I would ask you. Miss Guzman, during the nine hours of hearings, there were three, nine hours at the three meetings that we had. The third meeting almost totally involved discussions with marine biologists from the Fish and Game Department. It is rather clear that there really have been spaces studies off this coastal area or, for that matter, any area of the coast. The only significant study that was done was the Chamber study commissioned by the States Lands Commission, as you know. The comments I've head about that study generally are positive. It was a professionally done study and that it covered well what it was intended to cover.

The thing that came out of that discussion with the marine biologists there who obviously are dedicated to the ecosystems and the marine habitat and life, was that except in the rocky outcropping areas and rubble areas that might be fairly stable and have an aspect of permanence, it was difficult to identify the life systems of the marine life that lived out there because most of them were sand associated. They were sand habitats and the tidal action

11 12

13

15

16

17

- 18

19 20

21

23

24

25

kept moving the formation of the sand a great fight of that discussion to us, I was trying to understand how you felt about just how much you could identify in a permanent sense so that you could come to a definition of sensitive areas. Could you expand on that and tell us what vou had in mind?

Well, I believe that our position MS. GUZMAN: is that there needs to be more study. We have, in discussions with experts in the field, been led to believe that there are perhaps new and rare species out there that were really unknown before.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: By whom?

GUZMAM: We have had Dr. Corwin who is also here today provide information to us. I at the moment don't have the names of the other people. We have had a number of experts in talking to the County relative to offshore development in marine biology, but I could provide a list of those names to your commission. o

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: All right. I know you're aware that part of the conditions in this proposal of course would commission the first thorough, far-reaching studies of the offshore habitat that have ever been conducted beyond the Chamber's eight-day study. Those are ongoing studies. They will reveal different kinds of information ... as we go along. I personally think that's launching something that's rather very significant. A number of those studies could last several years in order to give us, let s say, virtually all of the information there is offshore in this area on marine life.

Are you suggesting that we try to -- Let me ask you. What is the expanse of information that's appropriate for us to gather on this before we attempt to identify any sensitive area?

a 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. GUZMAN: Well, first of all, I am not an expert in marine biology. The County's position is that there needs to be more, and that is not defined, study prior to the time of leasing so that there's a clear picture or as clear as possible pacture to the companies that are considering leases in this area of the areas where clearly there should be a prohibition. I am a are that extensive studies could take many, many years. I don't believe it is the position of the County at this time -- I know the matter has not been approved by the Board -- to ask for a multiple-year delay on the part of your commission in this lease sale. But rather that there is adequate evaluation prior to leasing to determine areas that should clearly be prohibited. So I don't believe I can give you a specific time frame. I think it's rather a question of something that port is a number of experts along the line of the committees that your staff has suggested be set up,

that committees of experts make a determination what's an appropriate amount and then based upon that kind of advice, we then proceed with the lease sale,

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: The point I was trying to get at in my question was not whether or not we agreed of their significance gathering the information.

I clearly agree --

MS. GUZMAN: I agree, too.

10

Ŷ,

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: -- that we must have a good deal of information to identify the sensitive areas. The point is that this is the first time we've ever seriously launched an effort and funded an effort and involved hopefully the best scientists in these areas to help us go about the studies we're going to pursue and, in effect, define the studies we're going to pursue. first time we've undertaken that. My only point was we all appreciate there's an endless kind of information we can gather up about those systems out there. is, it reasonable to say: Well, we now have a good chunk of information on which we can make some sensible judgment sensitive to state law that says we have to protect those marine systems and also responding to that part of Qublic opinion that says we should proceed with the drilling for what revenue benefits there are. I appreciate they re two somewhat clashing public values at stake here. Not the

only two. So what is reasonable in terms of the amount of study and the period for study after which we take some action to define sensitive areas? That's what I'm trying to get at.

MS. GUZMAN: Well, I think in trying to --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: I appreciate the point of view that says you can't study this enough and besides that we don't want any oil drilling anyway. So I fully appreciate that and I'm not in any sense saying that that's not a correct point of view for many to hold. There's a clash of fundamental viewpoints here. We'll try to figure out what is the sensitive and rational thing to do in terms of the kind of studies that are undertaken, the dates by which we gather information and before we make some kinds, there's a sequence of judgment to be made here, isn't there, before any action could ever be taken finally? That's what I'm trying to get at.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

*-*23

24

MS. GUZMAN: I think that's really what I'm speaking to is the sequence and we would like to see, Santa Barbara County would like to see, further work prior to leasing, particularly in the determination of the sensitive areas and the prohibition areas rather than having that take place after the leasing.

at Sant() Barbara had an opportunity to look at the -- I

don't know why I always have trouble with the name of this Geoctbic MR. TROUT: Both Geocubic and McClellan. ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: McClellan. Have your folks had an opportunity to look at those studies that were taken in the last few months? No, I don't believe we have. MS. GUWMAN: I don't believe EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: they have. As you know, Governor, those are both proprietary 10 and we signed a confidentiality agreement with the Coastal 11 Commission for them to take a look at the data. CTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: But the County has 12 13 not had an opportunity? EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: The County has not. 14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Can't we find out 15 if we can get permission to do tat because I think it's 16 17 important that the County look at whatever data exists? EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Certainly. 18 19 MS. GUZMAN: We routinely sign confidentiality 20 agreements. EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's not a problem. 21 If the County wants to see the data, Diane knows where I 22 23 live. ACTING CHAIRFERSON McCARTHY: Any questions by 24

25

other commissioners?

D)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I have one problem I'd like Mr. MR. HIGHT: For the record, Mr. Chairman. we'd like to clear up some small area of debate. It's the position of the staff that Section 6873.2 is not applicable to this stage of the proceedings. ACTING CHAIRFERSON McCARTHY: Use the microphone on that if you're trying to get something on the record. MR. HIGHT: It is the position of the staff that 6873.2 of the Public Resources Code is not applicable, to this 10 stage of the proceedings and that that provision has already 11 been complied with. 12 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: We're referring to 13 the reference in the second paragraph. 14 ACTING CHAIRPERSON MCCARTHY: All the lawyers in the room understand what that's about 16 MS. GUZMAN: There is one other point that I should The position that has been submitted to you was approved by our Board of Supervisors on a four-to-one vote. 19. There was one Abstension. It was Supervisor Holmdahl. ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you, Miss Guzman. EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK; Mr. Chairman.

15

17

18

20

24

25

RS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Miss Dedrick.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Could we give the

court reporter a short break just for a few minutes?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Does the court reporter want a short break yet? All right. We'll give the court reporter 90 seconds.

[Thereupon a recess was taken.]

10

13

14

15

16

97

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Naida West,

California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance.

MS. WESE: Thank you, Governor, members of the Commission. Naida West for the California Council for Environmental and Economic Balance.

From the beginning of this lease process CEEB has been supportive of the concept of the State's sale in this particular area at this particular time. Our position is based partly on the apparent existence of significant, resources and partly on the realization that it takes a considerable length of time before oil and gas leases are fully operational. CEEB has been supportive of the sale because of employment opportunities, positive economic spinoffs, and the need for state revenue. Additionally, CEEB supports carefully thought-out and mandatory environmenta safeguards. We are pleased with the cooperative efforts of the State agencies facilitating this new lease program. However, we have several concerns which come under the general heading that in its understandable effort to protect special biological areas, the State might unnecessarily

restrict its opportunity to achieve its economic goals in this lease. Specifically, the drilling limitation in special biological areas could mean almost any zone in the lease area. For example, I've heard testimony in previous EIR hearings that the entire lease area contains large number of species and great specie diversification. On page C-5 such areas are listed as examples where drilling may be prohibited.

Secondly, although apparently an open-ended number of studies are required within the lease area and the oil industry is required to pay for them, the Scientific Review Committee as proposed does not specifically include a representative of the oil industry. It would seem prudent to revise the language to ensure that call industry concerns are included in the review and hopefully the planning of such studies.

11

12

13

14

19

20

23

24

25

Thirdly, the process of studying the biological significance of areas appears to be unlimited as proposed and here I think you've already made my statement. As most of you are aware, questions never cease to emerge in areas of scientific interest. Further studies can always be conceived to augment and further validate previous studies. While this process is desirable from an academic standpoint, there should be limitations on it in the present context.

I see an attempt in the document to provide

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

limitations, that is, a \$25,000 per year limitation mentioned. Although the dollar per year limit is a good beginning, more controls may be necessary when one considers the number of years that such studies may be in process.

While those studies are under way, presumably no exploratory activity would be possible.

It would appear desirable that the first activity of the Scientific Review Committee as amended to include members of industry, the first activity should be to establish guidelines which seriously exempt the issue of how much and what kind of research is enough to give this commission sufficient information upon which to act.

Perhaps this doesn't have to come from the Scientific Review Committee. It may be that some other agency and perhaps this commission could establish such guidelines.

Finally, with regard to the lease area Advisory

Committee, care should be taken not to encourage an
adversarial process in which lease activities are delayed
during a new hearing process. One way to limit this sort
of occurrence might be to involve the industry or CEEB or
some other sort of industry organization in the committee's
composition.

In conclusion, CEEB believes that it is possible from an environmental standpoint to proceed with the lease program at this time and with the suggested changes it might

be possible to conduct an economically successful program. Thank you for this opportunity to comment. ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you very much. Are there any questions that you have, Commissioner Jervis? COMMISSIONER JERVIS: No. 7 ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Did we develop that information I asked for some days ago on this issue of studies, the nature of the studies and so on? 10 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDCICK: Yes. It's in the 11 backup package. 12 MR. TROUT: The last three pages 13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: . The last three pages. 14 of your package. 15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: That's the thick 16 package? EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes, silve the thick 18 package. 19 ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: I would ask any members of the audience who have questions about the studies 20 21 from any point of view to take a look at Exhibit 7A at some 22 point during the afternoon. They may want to comment on 23 it. Dr. Ruthann Corwin. 25 DR. CORWIN: I'm giving you copies of the material

that we submitted on the eighth. These are not changed, but I may refer to the attachments to them. So I wanted you to have them.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Okay. Thanks.

DR. CORWIN: I m Dr. Ruthana Corwin and I am representing the Oceanic Society and also the OCS, the Coalition, Environmental Coalition on the Outer Continental Shelf.

I want to thank you very much for your time and for the staff work and a number of the changes that were put into this lease language, particularly regarding the marine terminal, the insistance on pipeline transportation, the establishment of the crew boat access route, the Scientific Advisory Committee, language regarding discharge of drilling muds and so forth which we believe will aid in the consolidation of offshore operations in Santa Barbara County and thus lessen impacts and hopefully act as precedent to be considered by the Mineral Marragement Service in their operating requirements. I also want to thank you for the language on the amendments regarding the gray whale and the marine mammals, taking them out of the Operating I hope that you will consider putting Requirement Number 11. that language directly into the lease language today.

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

220

23

25

As you know, the OCS Coalition wishes to restate and stress its opposition to any sale of State leases in

the Point Conception, Point Arguello area, and our opposition is due to the need for a buffer zone from the massive industrial development on the adjagent federal OCS and the unique nature of this stretch of coast. be aware that Fish and Game originally in consideration of the federal sales asked for a 12-mile buffer zone arou the Point Conception, Point Arguello area because of the sensitive nature of the resources and the fact that there was going to be such extensive federal development in the area." It is our feeling that under the Coastal Act and the Environmental Quality Act policies, this area deserves protection for many reasons, including its pristine nature. its unique role as California's only biogeographic transition zone and the only one on the West Coast of the United States, its rich fisheries, the most productive kelp bed in the state, the last intertidal abalone population in Southern California and a cratical abalone spawning area, its location as a staging area for well migrations, its support go marine mammals and seabird populations, the rare and new invertebrate species, and I will have some comments on that, and the potential for sea otter habitat. We feel it's stall the case that alternatives to satisfy the purposes of the sale have not been fully explored, including the cooperative revenue sharing agreements with adjacent federal lessees -- and we have never seen a full explanation and

QII

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

discussion from State Lands Commission of what the efforts have been and what the result of those efforts were comprehensive planning, selective tract offerings this means offering less than the full eight tracts miximum consolidation potentials using directional drilling as an alternative before the sale, before the lease. As another alternative, California's continuing improvement. in energy conservation and the whole issue in question that was raised by some of the earlier speakers of the need for oil, and also the question which I'm sure the fishery industry representatives will also speak to regarding alternative state revenues from renewable resources such as improved fishery management plans and also the exploitation of pharmaceutical, agricultural, food industry and other chemical products and the bibchemical knowledge that comes from the unique and diverse living resources. Since none of you individuals were present when I gave a presentation last year on this, I will only mention briefly that a lot of these new organisms that are being discovered have a long chain biochemical as polymers which we cannot yet synthesize in the biochemistry industry and which are of great/interest to the biogenetic companies for acting as examples of the kind of molecules that we can build new chemicals from, and these are chemicals for healing diseases and new food products and so forth. This is an industry

3

10

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

that is only beginning to grow and is exploring what it can do in the State of California. If we eliminate some of the species before they've even had an opportunity to be studied, it seems to me that that will be cutting off potentially new sources of revenue in the state that as oil disappears and we are concerned about how ease we're going to be supporting ourselves utilizing our credible research facility in the University of Carifornia and our industry, we can develop these as possible alternative revenue sources for the state. This is the future of the state that we should be looking to

IŸ

We feel also that the amendments as they now stand, and from what we have been able to look at this morning. do not invalidate the court action requesting complete biological studies prior to the sale which would have responded to Mr. Earl Stout s objection to Operating Requirement Number 4 and also the court action requesting a supplemental EIR and a thorough analysis of the facts and alternatives to proceeding with the sale of eight tracts.

With respect to the full study of biological resources. I would add that what you are calling for in the lease sale is to have these funded subsequent to the sale and the lessee will be paying for them. We feel they should have been funded by the State prior to the sale and not awaiting funding after the sale when the ability to

°2

1

5

7

9 10

11

12

14

15

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

prohibit damaging activities is far more restricted. point out that virtually all of Tract Number 1 is unsurveyed and large portions of other tracts have not been looked at.

I'd like to give you a copy of the map witch we did present just for your looking at reference which. indicates the areas where the studies were made and also shows you what some of the new and rare species were and where they were found if you wouldn't mind just looking at that during the course of this discussion. I'll go into those points in a little bit subsequently,

I do want to turn first though to points regarding 13 the process. We continue to have problems with the State Lands Commission process in carrying out the sale. with Diane Guzman from Santa Barbara County regarding the 16 issue of timing. We still did not have, we are pleased to see a schedule with respect to the studies, but we still have not had a schedule of the leasing and operation decisions that are to be made as a result of the studies, relating the studies to those decisions and saying what the opportunities for public hearing will be. I think both the oil industry and public interest groups and other agencies would like to see such a study. This is something that the Federal Government does provide. So at least we know what, the steps of the decision process are and we can

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 TELEPHONE (916) 972-8894

see them in relationship to when the studies will be performed and understand whether or not they will be completed in time for the information to be utilized in the studies.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Let me see if I can understand what you were just saying. What is it that the Federal Government does that would be helpful for us to do?

5

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. CORWIN: They put out a schedule that says at this point they will come out, they will have the drafts and finals and so forth and then the decision points that would be made.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Of what kind of studies?

DR. CORWIN: Of both the environmental studies and the other studies. You have a schedule of studies, but also points with respect to, for example, to notice of sale in which there is a decision made about which alternative will be selected, for example, and then final notice of sale.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: You're satisfied that when it comes to a definition of sensitive areas, a decision that would be based on the results of the studies, that that is going to be a public hearing?

DR. CORWIN: Yes. I understand that's part of

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3

5

10

11

12

ું!3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: What is it otherwise that should be a public hearing that the feds do that we should be doing?

DR. CORWIN: For example, a final -- well, I'm basing this upon the schedule and timing we saw last fall and hoping that that will not be repeated with respect to this which would be announcing, for example, which tract will be leased and what exactly the alternatives will be. that those decisions need to be laid out in the schedule oso that we would know when they are going to occur. that in your envilonmental process you will have that, it's subsequent to the environmental process where you have specific public steps, decision steps, and then there has to be an announcement of some sort as to what action will ? " actually be taken. Now, you have the Coastal Commission and the County reviewing these. Then we would like to see at what point then it will come back following their review.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Following the Coastal Commission's review?

Then you would have a public DR. CORWIN: Yes. hearing again to say we will adopt or not adopt what they are recommending.

AGTING CHAIRPERSON MCCARTHY: You want to respond to that, please?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: To clarify the process,

25

24

PETERS SHORTHANG REPORTING CORPORATION

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 ... TELEPHONE (916) 972-8894

as a rule, this commission grants permission to, say, explore or to build a platform or whatever (lse is necessary subject to all state, federal and local ordinances and laws. So that we usually are at the front end of the process and the Coastal Commission is usually at the tail end of the process. But our permission to go forward with any activity is always subject to compliance with other regulations. So there's no need for it to dome back to us.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: So If the Coastal

Commission were to take an action prohibiting drilling in

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: -- that would be the

final action?

13

14

15

-16

17

18

19

20.

22

Nobody's come back and asked as to go in and sue the Coastal Commission. I mean, it's not the responsibility of the State Lands Commission to get those permits. That responsibility lies with the lessee. But all of the permits must be obtained before they have a legal action before us. So, as it happens in a recent case, the Coastal Commission refused to grant a permit for a well in a near shore area to one of our lessees. The lessee can't drill our well.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: And that's the end

25 of it

That's The end of

0

10

12

13

25

16

17

₹19

20

21

24

25

othose amendments.

If the Conscal Commission were, and this is facing us currently, makes amendments in their interagency agreement, for example, at the hearing which they will be having, that would then, I assume come back to the commission to make the decision about whether or not they will accept or reject

EXECUTIVE · OFFICER DEDRICK:

on which of the various processes that this commission carries out your addressing yourself to. I mean, an interagency agreement has nothing whatsoever to do with the obtaining of a permit by a lessee. Can you be a little more specific as to what your precise question is?

events that are occurring right now. This material will go to the Coastal Commission and they will have a hearing on it presumably in the next couple of weeks. I assume that out of that can come some specific language which they would be suggesting to be included in the lease or in an interagency agreement because that's only a draft agreement. They would come out and they would vote on some final and they may make changes in that language. We then wonder when the next meeting would be for State Lands Commission

20

21

22

23

25

to review those changes and decide whether or not they would accept or reject them.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: August 2001.

ORWIN: Is that two days following the Coastal

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Correct.

DR. GORWIN: -- meeting?

Okay. But the point is that none of these decision processes are spelled out. We don't know the schedules'

Scheduled meeting that we have.

DR. CORWIN: But with respect to the events that on my calendar.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Be happy to.

DR. CORWIN: But the point is for each of the stages of the process from last fall and presumably into the future, we have not known these things and we have had to wait and get notification or hear by word of mouth or whatever when these things are going to occur.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: We'll try to be as cooperative as we possibly can to all of the interest groups concerned with this issue. We're keenly aware of

2

4

6

8

10

12

13

14

16

17 18

19

20

22

23

24

25

the deep interest and the legitimate conflicting points of view that have every right to be represented in this process and we'll go out of our way to try to give notice.

DR. CORWIN: I'll only ask that you recognize that we have been trying to follow the process and participate in it in a legitimate fashion.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Appreciate it.

DA. CORWIN: Let me turn to some specific comments on the materials that we received today and try to cover some of those points.

itself. On page 5 there is a reference to the groups that are being represented by the OCS Coalition, and I do note that we have 22 groups in our coalition including such organizations as the Natural Resources Defense Cuncil, the Friends of the Earth and so on. Friends of the Sea Otter is a member in addition to Greenpeace and Sierra Club, and that all these groups are concerned with this sale, with the precedent that it sets and with the effects that might occur in the sensitive area.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Did you say page

DR. CORWIN: Yes. That was on page 5.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you.

DR. CORWIN: On the calendar item.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you.

1. Me . 20

10

12

13.

140

15

16

17

19

20

25

DR. CORWIN: Then on page 8 -- that was simply a correction to the point that there are other organization involved in the Coalition besides the two that are mentioned there.

language regarding the special studies and I will have to turn to that. This one was with reference to the work being done by the Fish and Game. Those were impact studies. That's not the same as the comprehensive planning studies that we were talking about. So this paragraph on page 8 referring to special studies kind of lumps together the two aspects of studies that we have been referring to. To clarify that, we assumed that this funding was for studies regarding the impacts from the effects of oil and gas perations. I was told by staff that this was a specific request from Fish and Game to look at oil, oil dispersants: , a combination, on the marine biota. We appreciate your removing the limitation from that.

EXECUTEVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That is correct.

DR. CORWIN: But that was not the eare as comprehensive planning studies which is what it says here under this paragraph. So that's a confusion that really should be clarified in your calendar item.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Would our staff

respond to that, please.

9

10

11

12

13

14

0150

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Jim, can you respond to that, please?

MR. TROUT: I'm not sure what Dr. Corwin means by a comprehensive planning study.

DR. CORWIN: Well, perhaps I should turn and speak to that, Ithough I have it a little further down. On page 9 you refer to the fact that we made this suggestion and that in fact is what we are talking about there. Simply on page 8, to correct that, it would say: "Prior to commencement of any exploratory drilling or seismic survey operations," — this was our recommendation — "the impact studies funded by the Department of Fish and Game" — I mean — "carried out by the Department of Fish and Game should be completed,"

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: I don't have any problem with that. Staff have any problem with it?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: With the interpretation?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: With the rewording
of language proposal.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: No.

changes the substance.

DR. CORWIN: No. That's just to clarify the

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: You want us to more clearly state what Fish and Game is going to study is referred to in that paragraph? DR. CORWIN: That's all. EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the purpose of a hearing such as this, for the record, is to correct on the record such misinterpretations. AGTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY You want to read the language again that you were suggesting to us so that everybody in the audience -- you're talking about page 8, the paragraph entitled, "Special Studies." DR. CORWIN: If the words "a comprehens ve

planning study" are replaced by "the Department" of Fish and Game's studies," then that will be correct.

MR. TROUT: Third line?

DR. CORWIN:

(12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ACTING CHAIRPERSON /McCARTHY: Yes

Staff have any comment on that?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK:

MR. TROUT: No.

DR. CORWIN: With respect to

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Go ahead, please.

DR. CORWIN: With respect on calendar item, and this is raised as a question and it also is raised as a point that we are still calling for which is not clear that

it will be included in the work, which is that we have asked for, assuming that this lease goes ahead, the biological studies and other reports which we have mentioned such as the discussion of implementation of pipeline and facility agreements, federal cooperative agreements, directional drilling and the mitigation of impacts on a tract-by-tract basis, be completed as a comprehensive study rather than having a set of eight different EIR's. So that we can see as a result of the work done under the interagency agreement and done under these studies a complete review of the development potentials of this area, where the sensitive areas are, what will be mitigated and what will be allowed to go cahead. This is simply saying, this is asking for the work that we hope would have been done prior to the lease and this is saying that if this lease goes ahead and the studies are going to go ahead, they should be integrated with the Environmental Impact Reports into one report so that the public and the industry and other interested parties can see exactly what is being planned and what will be allowed to be developed.

10

12

.13

15

16

170

18

19

20

21

23

24

In relationship to that, I would ask you to look at your timetable, Exhibit 7, in which you show these various studies. There should be one additional bar calling for a final report which would begin at the end of the bars that line up with the exploration EIR's and the full year

biological inventory and would continue for whatever length of time was needed to complete that report which would pull those individual reports together and come out with one comprehensive understanding of what will be done in that area. This suggestion is simply making sense to integrate that information and to ansier the questions about consolidation, unitization, and optimum location which are to be covered as objectives in the interagency agreement. We do not see how they can be met unless there is one final report that integrates these other reports and answers all of those questions. This would be a specific change recommended for the time frame and also for either to be stated in the interagency agreement or to be stated as part of the operating requirements.

10

12

13

14

15

16

18

20

21

22

23

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: You've asked that we add a bar. Does include, for summarization of these studies and trying to correlate them, is that under the full year biological invertory list? Are you asso including the oil dispersement study?

DR. CORWIN: Well, it doesn't look like that will be done in time to be integrated into that.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON MCCARTHY: Right.

PR. CORWIN: Because those would be ong ing studies,

wouldn't be completed in time.

I would assume that at least a minimum of a year would

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

10

11

12 °13

15

16

18

19

23

be adequate. So you will have the full year inventory. You will have the special site studies that are done as part of the individual EIR's and you will have some of the input from the neurological study and the oble dispersement study to look at.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: The special site studies could be occurring over a period of several years. You appreciate that. That's not all going to occur oin the first year or 18 months.

DR. CORWIN: That wasn'toclear because I assume that after 120 days the exploration plans are submitted and then following that you had p year to do the environmental studies. Am I correct on that

MR. TROUT: That's correct.

DR. CORWIN: Then I had the impression that they would all be coming at once.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: You expect the EIR studies to be completed at the same time?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK:

MR. TROUT: No.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: We don't expect things to get completed at the same time. There are always special circumstances. The lease regaines that the exploration man be filed within 120 days of the time the lease is awarded If the exploration -- in individual cases it frequently

comes to the commission and asks for an extension. If it's a reasonable reason, normally the commission grants that extension. There's a lot of variable corcumstances among companies and between leases. So I don't think they'll all arrive on the same day.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Is there a way that we can try to summarize what information we have at the end of the 18 months? Is that what you intended in the final report?

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Are you asking me?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Yes.

Department of Fish and Game who is responsible for carrying out that full year study will be writing a report on it.

I would expect that they would also publish a report on any other studies that they do and certainly the allocation of monies for those things is entirely within the discretion of this commission. So it's entirely the way you want to do it. The scientific studies are always published just as the Chamber's report was published. Fish and Game is very professional with that kind of thing. They have been doing it for years.

I don't know precisely what Dr. Corwin has in omind. If what she's thinking of is a marine biota map,

our basic map, for example, the one that this map that Dr. Corwin's appears to be taken from, just being augmented as more information comes in, certainly I think that would be desirable and I'm sure that it will be done. No point in wasting all that knowledge by leaving it laying around.

10

12

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

DR. CORWIN: What I'm referring to is taking a close look at the communities which have not been studied and, if you would look at that map that I gave you, and look at The points that were on that map -- I'm not sure If you could just hold it in front of you, where it is. you could see that there are g number of the lease tracts that were not surveyed at all. Tract Number 1 had virtually no study. There was one sample station that was taken quite close to the edge of that tract. A number of the other tracts had no point at which there was any data that was taken. So these are the holes, the gaps in the data. I may refer to these communities that are out there, they're not like gy sy camps that come and go. You asked this question earlier with respect to what's in the sand. They're more like a residential hotel in which you have year-round and seasonal species, seasonal residents that come into the hotel. You can characterize, just like you can characterize the residents where they come from and what their status is and so forth, you can do the same with the species and describe these communities. Ther you can also find out

where are the rare and the new species. Are they scattered widely over this area? Are there quite a number of them 2 in some locations and less elsewhere? Are there representative examples of them in each lease tract? that you would be less concerned about eliminating a small [♀] 5 portion of them in one tract than in others. What J'm ∘್ಗ6 speaking of basically is trying to protect and make sure that you retain not just some examples of the new and rare species but at least a couple of examples for each of them so that there is something there for the scientists to study and that they don't disappear as a result of these operations. You can't do that unless you know what's out there. combination of the year-round biological study and the site specific EIR's will give you the information to know what is out there so that you can plan to avoid them.

7

8

็เบิ

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23.

° 24

25

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Isn't that a property of the Scientific Panels that we're going to establish? Is that some of the very things that they would want to look at? Those are important issues. Aren't hose things that they would look at and try to intensify, take note of?

DR. CORWIN: I would assume that they would be looking at the Environmental Impact Reports and the yearround biological study for that information But unless this information is brought together in one report and is

AND REPORTING CORPORATION

compared with potentials for directional dilling, for unitization and consolidation and for this issue of question of optimum location of facilities, neither the public interest groups, the people who are concerned with what is out there in the biological resources, nor the industry is going to know exactly where and what will be allowed. The mitigation measures can be specified in order to see that some of these individuals are left untouched.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: So your suggest on again was to give us the words on the additional bar you wanted to add at the point it says "Final Report"?

11

12

13

14

15/

16

17

₽ î§

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. TROUT: Staff understands Dr. Corwin to be requesting from month 18 through month 30 cone-year period in which the full year biologic inventory and the typical exploratory EIR's, the EIR on the exploration plans, would be reviewed and the information consolidated into a slattle report. So that the approval of an actual exploration plan would not occur at month 18 or so or some period after that depending on how complete the applications are, but at month 30 and 1/ter.

DR. CORWIN: As part of that report, the suggestions that we made on page 9 of the comments that we submitted on August 8th were that it could discuss directional drilling potentials and implementation of pipeline and facility agreements and potentials for mitigation of

17

18

19

Ko

210

23

24

25

issue of unitization, consolidation and optimum locations could then be solved. This is essentially what the interagency agreement calls for, but there's no mechanism as we see now to respond to that without saying that there would be a report that would pull that information together.

a suggestion as to how that can be done within the same time frame.

-DR. CORWIN: Within the time frame here?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Yes.

Just stated what it would be.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Without adding another 12 months on.

DR. CORWIN: I can't see how it would be done without the information coming in from the biological studies.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: To do that

concurrently with the other studies that are going on, I think the point you're trying to make is I think that's the kind of information they're going to be developing in the studies we undertake. We ought to be pointing to that. I think you're going to find a lot of reluctance here to stretch that out another year if that kind of data can be developed within the 18-month period.

°2 ...

المرام

7

ى **ب**. ئ

10

11

12

13

14

16

୍ପ 7

18

19

₌ 22

23

24

25

DR. CORWIN: Well, I wouldn't think that you would necessarily need a year, although I'm not sure I would want to be the person required to pull the report together. It could be done in a few months following the end of that 18-month period, three or four months, perhaps. But basically it's saying, look at all the data, review it and come out with a consolidation, unitization and optimum location potential.

MR. TROUT: One thing, Mr. Chairman, that I think needs to be kept kind of in front of our minds is that none of the project BIR's may stand alone. That the EIR's have to include the impact of all the adjoining EIR's, all the adjoining projects and the impact of the federal projects in upland development. So that in effect each project EIR must consider the information and the impacts of all adjoining projects including the biologic and other data so that I would suspect that very shortly before the completion of the EIR process there will be in fact at the draft EIR stage a compendium of impacts over the whole area within each specific EIR.

COMMISSIONER JERVIS: Is what you're saying is it's going to be done anyway and what you're asking for it that it all be crawn together in one conveniently bound place. He's saying it's going to be there anyway, but spread out.

DR. CORWIN: I don't think that's the kind of analysis which answers the question of what are the optimum locations, consolidation potentials will come out of any individual ETR's. That will have to be added on after looking at all the information from each of the EIR's. There's no way to consolidate across eight tracts when you only look one tract at a time.

GOMMISSIONER JERVIS: Ideally who would do that

DR. CORWIN: I assume that the State Lands.

little misunderstanding about the process. The data developed in the process of the exploratory portion of the oil operation will clearly be available before any production decisions are made. In siting platforms and such things, those are the kind of decisions that are production decisions. We're talking about a long period by the time you get to production. The exploratory period, all of these studies will be completed, not all of them, but as many are continued for the life of the lease, but those which are not will certainly be completed before the production phase of anyone's lease comes up. CEQA, California Environmental Quality Act, requires, as Jim has pointed out, that you have to look at the larger context

> 2 2

. ით

>) (

8 2

10

]] ວິດ 12/

13

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

and you have to utilize the available data. If what Dr. Corwin is after is a single bound volume, that's a separate question. But if what she's after is to have the biologic data available prior to the installation of production in platforms or the selection of sites for the production of platforms, that will occur.

I think that there are questions DR. CORWIN: also with respect to -- this entire area is clearly sensitive, and there are species scattired over the whole area plus the fisheries resources that will be difficult to decide how to avoid even in the exploratory phase. EIR's that are going to be done on the exploration wells will also have to answer these questions: What are the best places to develop that would minimize the impacts on the species? You may allow, if you do not gull this information together and review it, exploratory wells to take place such that they would impact the new and the rare species before you have seen where they are located that you would eliminate some of these organisms before you would even have the opportunity to dind out what s there.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTAY: We'll be happy to have you give us, alter this discussion, your perception of what may be deficient in these studies. I am interested in getting the data that you're talking about and we'll have to figure out how to do it procedurally if any piece

of it is going to be missing in the sequence of steps you

DR. CORWIN: I would say the minimum that could be incorporated in the language here would be, say, a fourmonth summary report that reviewed the biological data and locked at all the potentials for optimum location of exploration and production activities.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Okay.

120

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. TROUT: Mr. Chairman, I think we need to make sure that there's no conjusion in the area. Dr. Corwin said that some of the tracts were not surveyed or were not studied. I think we want to clarify that each and every tract was examined. There may not have been the same number of surveys, but there were transects run all the way across all eight tracts in the Chamber's report. So I wouldn't like it to stand that there is a tract out there that hasn't been looked at, because that's not the case.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Would you like to move on to the other part of your testimony?

DR. CORWIN: I certainly will. I just want to correct that. Tract Number 1 did not have any samples taken and you cannot know what's there until you have samples and have the taxonomist look at them. The other large portions were not looked at.

I would like to speak particularly, I will speak

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

21

22

23

24

briefly to this 30 fathom buffer zone question and simply for the receid note that we believe that 30 fathom bathometric contour should be utilized to provide the shoreline buffer zone. We will support the fishermen's reasons as they will state them later on and we believe it is possible to tap an adequate amount of the resource to allow the development to proceed and that in order to talk about what you will not be able to reach with that buffer zone, you also have to indicate the value of the marine resources and the fisheries resources that would be lost if you go ahead with the 15 fathom buffer cone. I am sorry to feel that that's a decision that has diready been made and that it is pointless I belleve that that should still be open to argue that. to discussion and I will leave that one for you to make the recommendation that such a buffer zone-benadopted. that is turned down by your commission, obviously, there's o not much we can do about that. But we are still very concerned about that

I'm particularly concerned on page C-4 of the operating requirements with the discrepancy between this and the original lease language, excuse me, the original callendar item language from July 21st which called for exploratory and production activities to be prohibited. We notice that this lease language here says only production and development activities and that is a change that should

certainly have been noted. It's a major important change and it's not discussed in the staff report at the front of the calendar item and we are very disturbed to see that the word "exploratory" has been dropped from what was in there.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Are you suggesting that this language would permit exploration within the 15 fathom boundary?

DR. CORWIN: That's what it seems.

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

19

20

25

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's certainly not

DR. CORWIN: Well, in the July 21st calendar attem on page 3 where that 15 fathom buffer zone is first described, the word "exploratory" is used, "exploratory and production." Here it says "production and development."

Dr. Corwin is correct, it should have been highlighted -that was done because the way it was written, exploratory
would include such things as geoseismic activities where
a boat would just go across or there would be some other
exploration activities. The intention of the staff in working
out this was that there would be nothing on the ocean bottom
or through the ocean bottom in the exploratory phase, but
that it would not prohibit the other kinds of exploratory
activities such as seismic activities or perhaps even

the biological surveys that were required. The intention I think is clarified in another spot.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTEY: Is drilling, exploratory drilling excluded by this language?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes.

MR. TROUT: Yes. In the 15 fathom one-half mile boundary.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTRY: Let it be stated for the record it is the intent of the members of this commission if this proposal is approved today, that exploratory dilling be prohibited within the 15 fathom boundary. Is that satisfactory Dr. Corwin?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

DR. CORWIN: Well, if this language stated "exploratory and production" as it did in the calendar item, that would be clear.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: "I just stated if" this ever goes to court --

DR. CORWIN: That's fine.

DR. CORWIN: That's fine, afthough I will mention, since Mr. Trout mentioned seismic activity, that that would be extremely disruptive in the inshore area where you have a number of species that can't even get away that would be directly affected. We assumed that seismic activity owas, covered under a specific permit. We are concerned that

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Why don't you proceed

Tebruary and that seismic operations in this zone would also be very disruptive. We'd just as soon not see them occur there either.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: I'm not sure gyhat we're referring to. What is the permit that's up rext. February?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I don't know.

MR. TROUT: Mr. Chairman, the commission has granted to a number of firms permits to make geophysical exploration within a number of zones. Those permits were for a period of time, 18 months, so that those permits will expire at sometime. I'm willing to agree that Dr. Corwin's right in her date. I'm not certain. But those permits are to a great number of companies to conduct Ceophysical activities.

10

11

12

13

A. 4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

executive officer DEDRICK: Those activities are conducted on the surface. A boat dragging hydrophones and making boom-booms and the echos come down and come back and we get those maps. That is strictly a surface activity.

DR. CORWIN: It doesn't just affect organisms on the surface. It affects all of those that in --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: We understand that.

DR. CORWIN: T'm sure that the fishermen will have something to say about that. That's certainly a major

concern.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With respect to the Scientific Advisory Committee, we certainly thank you for including that and we would like to add that it would be appropriate that these individuals, if they become state appointers which I assume they would be appointed to work on these committees, are required to sign off on the State Conflict of Interest provisions. had requested, understanding the adequacy of the \$25,000 / that's been allecated for that, in relationship to all the various things that these people will be required to do and the studies that they will be required to utilize, we don't know, we can't tell at this time whether that amount I would only assume that you would preserve dis adequate. the right to increase that if it runs out before the work that they have is required. But we would suggest adding conflict of intere t language unless perhaps you can tell me that that would already be required under the law

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Counsel, would it be required?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: For a contractor.

MR. HIGHT: For advisory only, no.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: But if they re paid by the State or under contract with the State, it is required

MR. HIGHT: I don't --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Isn't it?

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

MR. HIGHT: I think we'll have to -EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: We'll have to get back to you on that. However, one thing that you can always do is adopt just a regulation that requirement of this particular type of contract.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Would you move on, please.

Okay. With respect to the stipulation, I be the letter has been changed from (d) to (e) on page C-7. We would like to note for the record, I don't know whether you would make the change I believe staff had suggested, with respect to the second qualification Ç⇒ 120 regarding the finding of adverse impact that it would be very difficult to establish through submission of an oil spill contingency plan or critical operation curtailment plan that operations will not have a significant adverse effect on the resources identified. Given your own staff language that said that it is impossible to control oil spills from coming close to shore if the spill is large to get out there and do anything about it, to require someone to state in a document that you can do that, would be purting them in a very unfavorable condition. I think that that stipulation, too, should be stricken, that qualification

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Beginning with what

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 FELEPHONE (916) 972-8894

2. 3

8

10

13

14

15

167

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

language?

25°

DR. CORWIN: It begins on the seventh language where there's an "or," the lessee shall pursue feasible alternatives or shall establish through submissions to the State of documents such as an oil spill contingency plan, and both the Coastal Commission and your on staff have indicated that, given the stated technology of oil spill containment, that it would be, it would seem unreasonable to require someone to have to prove that they could do something which they cannot do at this time and that the lessee should be required to pursue feasible alternatives. In other words, the number one would be the appropriate mitigation, but number two would be simply calling for reports to be produced which would be hypocritical.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Staff, do you want to respond to that, please?

regulations, all lessees have to have a viable operational oil spill contingency plan with the equipment to back it up. The critical operation curtailment plan is also required and, among other things, prohibits carrying out critical operations at a time when oil spills containment equipment is not immediately available or could not operate. The lease conditions on the oil spill containment condition require, in the first place the lease requires primary oil

spill response capability at the site of the well, whether it's platform or drill ship or jackup. So that that response is immediate. Secondary response, the Commission requires that that response be available within two hours of the most distant portion of the site of the lease sale area and the tertiary, the equivalent of the strike team must have a response time of no more than four hours. Currently in oil operations in the OCS in this area the quickest secondary response time with equipment that's available there now would be nine hours and the Coast Guard strike team has an absolute minimum of in the water time 24 hours. The Commission is requiring two hours and four hours for those two backup capabilities. But as I say, the immediate response has to be present at the site.

5

7.

8

10

11

°12

13

14

15

16

17

> 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Those are not just paper plans, sir. They are enforceable and carried out.

DR. CORWIN: I'm not disagreeing with staff with respect to that and I think those are excellent plans and since they are already required. I don't understand why as a mitigation measure they are then stated. In other words, since they are required and since it has been stated by your staff that available technology is not capable of controlling a major spill under adverse conditions, how can they then, in other words -

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: I think our lawyers

 might suggest that we don't want to imply by omitting them that this leasehold agreement is somehow different from the ordinary leasehold agreement where this is regularly required.

DR. CORWIN: I would agree with that if this word "or" at the end of the sixth line was changed to "and," then we would be sure that they would be required to pursue feasible mitigation measures.

MF. TROUT: I have to redincially admit that staff had intended to make that change "or" to "and" and it had slipped through our hands.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: It is now changed from "or" to "and," Gee, I wish you'd said that in the first sentence.

Go ahead, what's your next?

DR. CORWIN: I thank you. I've been up since 5:00 and no breakfast and no lunch. So I do appreciate your time in going over this with us. I will simply restate that even with these changes, these are excellent ideas, but this is not the area to do them in. We would request that all of you consider very strongly not going ahead with this sale in this area at this time, and that will conclude my remarks.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you very much.
Rachel Saunders, Friends of the Sea Otter, and

Martha Davis, Wildlife Coordinator for Greenpeace. Why don't you both approach the table if you both still wish to testify, please.

Miss Saunders.

2

o 10.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SAUNDERS: Yes. My name is Eachel Saunders and I am presenting testimony on behalf of Friends of the Sea Otter.

that we remain opposed to any oil and gas activities within the biologically rich and fragile near-shore waters between Point Conception and Point Arguello. As we have stated to you on numerous occasions, we believe that this area is far better suited for sanctuary than sacrifice zone.

The State's legitimate fears regarding drainage of State basins by federal leases would be far better addressed through revenue sharing agreements than by acquiescing to a bullying Federal Government and drilling in what should be a buffer zone between sensitive coastal resources and massive oil development on the Federal OCS.

We are aware and appreciative of the improvements which have been made in the language of the lease sale, particularly regarding the prohibition of the new marine terminal, the insistance on pipeline transportation, the establishment of crew boat access routes and a Scientific Advisory Committee. We are also appreciative of the drilling

prohibition zone and we are comforted to know that exploratory drilling will not be allowed. We do share the concern of Dr. Corwin's concerning seismic activity in this area.

We fully support, however, the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen Association's position that of drilling be permitted within the 30 fathom depth probe, a zonal prohibition which would offer protection from some of the immediate effects of oil activity in the area of greatest biological productivity.

Moreover, we strongly urge the Commission to adopt language which would not permit activity within one mile of shore. As currently proposed, drilling would be permitted within only a half a mile of shore. To permit drilling so close to shore essentially negates the many good oil spill response provisions which the Commission and its staff have so painstakingly developed for this lease sale. For example, the requirement that a clean seas vessel must be within two hours of a drilling site is an excellent one, but with rigs only half a mile offshore you have virtually eliminated any response time.

We ask you to prohibit drilling within 30 fathoms or one mile of shore, whichever is greater. We ask you to consider this provision not only with this specific lease sale in mind but also in terms of the precedent set for possible future State lease sales.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

with the Point Conception, Point Arguello State tidelands sale because this is an area to which otters were expected to return well within the life of the project. We are primarily concerned because this activity poses a clear and present danger to the sea otter today. Although only a handful of otters are found as far south as the Point Conception region at this time, we are naturally worried that contamination from state or federal tracts could preclude the otters! reoccapation of this suburb potential habitat, thus resulting in the nopulation's continued restriction to only a small section of the Central California Coast.

But the overriding concern is that a spill in the project area today could travel directly north to the established sea of ter range which extends as far south as the Santa Maria River mouth at the border of San Luis Obispo and Santa Barbara Counties.

16

17

.18

19

20

27

22

24

brift bottle studies conducted by Scripps Institute showed that bottles released off Point Conception in January and February came ashore in the San Simeon, Morro Bay and Monterey Bay areas within one week's time. Nor is the threat restricted solely to winter months. Drift bottles released off Point Conception in April were in Point San Luis area within two weeks' time; in July, within three weeks' time. In October within two weeks' time they had come ashore in

the Pismo Beach area.

3

10

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As we have testified before this Commission many times on the deadly consequences that a major oil spill , would pose for the sea otter, we will not dwell on them again here today. But we wish to reiterate our deep appreciation to the Commission and their staff for the recognition of this threat as demonstrated in the sea otter stipulation which ensures funding for both studies and mitigation measures designed to minimize the adverse impacts of offshore oil activity on the otter population. oil development poses the single greatest threat to the survival of the California sea otter, it is fair and appropriate that those who will profit from this lease sale should also shoulder the cost of providing the otter with the best protection possible, costs which are minimal when compared to the profits the oil industry will gain from this sale.

We again thank the Commission for ensuring that othis vitally needed funding is in place.

When we first saw the language in calendar item number 25 when it was distributed for comment on July 21st, we were sharply disappointed to see that some of the issues we had raised so often in the past had still not been addressed. We appreciated the opportunity to discuss these concerns at length with your staff last lednesday and we were

encouraged to learn that they would be incorporating language which would resolve the problem in the calendar item before you today.

The first of these items deals with stipulation 11, Special Studies. Marine birds and mammals should not be arbitrarily excluded from the Department of Fish and Game studies of the chronic effects of oil and oil dispersants on marine biota. The decision as to which studies need to be done should be determined by the Department of Fish and Game. The exclusionary language should be removed and we strongly encourage the adoption of the proposed amendment to the Special Operating Requirement 11(b) which you handed out.

° 12

The second item deals with the potential drilling window between December 1st and April 1st to project the sea ofter population. The intent of this stipulation initially was to afford protection to both ofters and gray whales, but along the way the gray whales got left out and they should be put back in as almost the entire world's population of gray whales migrate through this corridor twice a year, many of them young calves on their first trip north from the breeding lagoons in Mexico. It is clearly imperative that language be in place which could prohibit drilling operations during their migration if the State determines that such operation could significantly damage

the population. Again, we strong encourage the adoption of the proposed amendment to Special Operating Requirement 13(b).

As we have not had an opportunity until this morning to see the critically important intergency agreement between the Coastal Commission and the State Lands Commission or to review last-minute changes made in the calendar item, we request that the Commission make provision us to comment on these items next week.

In closing, we would again urge you to acknowledge
the Coastal Commission's permitting authority over oil and
gas lease sales within state waters. To deny it makes a
mockery of the state's hard-fought and well-resoned position
on Federal OCS lease sales. There will be no winners in
the turf battle between the State Lands Commission and the
Coastal Commission, but there can be many losers, citizens
and the marine life of the State of California.

Thank you.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17.

18

19

20

21

22

°23

24

25

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you. Any cestions by either commissioner of Miss Saunders?

Thank you very much.

Miss Davis.

MS. DAVIS: My name is Martha Davis, and for the record I am speaking as Wildlife Coordinator on behalf of Greenpeace.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

We apprediate the many hours both you and your staff have put into preparing the lease language for this lease sale and for that reason I while try to keep my remarks today very brief. Also because both Ruthann Corwin and Rachel Saunders I think have expressed very well many of the concerns that my organization shares about this lease sale.

For the record, I would like to say that we do continue to oppose the lease sale on the basis that this area is a unique area and of the biological significance of the Point Conception, Point Arguello waters. We also share the concerns about not having really an opportunity to review the lease language that was prepared this morning. It would help to have had more time on that.

The three comments that I would really particularly like to speak to age, one, the discussion this morning about the comprehensive planning process and the need for a report that will pull together the information from the one-year biological study and the environmental impact reports. In consideration of listening to the testimony this morning, I would urge that at the very minimum an effort would be made to pull all the studies together, at the very least summarize all the information and particularly the information about where the unusual species are located and the unusual communities on maps that can be included and interpreted

6°

•

10

(12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24 25 into the ultimately the map which will outline the areas in which either driving will be prohibited or mitigation measures are required. This should be done before any of the lease sale decisions are made. It's an effort to pull together that information, coordinate it in such a way that we really have that planning data in hand to make good common senge decisions about where the leases should be located and where the activities should be located.

Second, we did agree in concept with the prohibition zone. We are concerned about the size of the zone. We do believe that it should be extended to 30 fathoms. We do believe that this would help provide an adequate buffer zone, particularly for the gray whales in the northward migration, protecting the females and the calves who hang close into shore as they move up late in the migratory period.

We also are very concerned about seismic testing occurring within this area within the protected zone. We feel that, given the current uncertainty about the environmental impacts of seismic testing, that at the very least that within this buffer zone it ought to be prohibited. We also feel that that kind of prohibition should be extended through Stipulation 13 so that it would give the State the opportunity, enable the State to make the decision to restrict seismic testing activity throughout the lease sale area between the period December 1st and April 1st of the State

determines that it does have an impact on seriously impact the gray whale populations, particularly the females and calves as they move northward during the late spring. Clearly this kind of language is enabling language. It does not have the requirement that the State has to act, but only is based on a finding of serious impact on the population,

5

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of seismic testing, there really is not adequate information about what the impacts are, we feel that seismic testing should be included in the special studies, if possible.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you Very much.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Could I comment?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Miss Dedrick.

a couple of points. In regard to the seismic testing, there are currently ongoing studies by the Federal Government under the National Marine Fishery Service which is the agency of go nament that has full responsibility for the whales. At the request of the State Lands Commission, those studies which are the effects of noise, et cetera, on migrating whales have included precisely the information that has been requested. There are other ongoing studies in regard to oil operations including seismic exploration on the hump-back whale in Alaska, for instance.

In regard to the ability of the Commission to

close any area to seismic testing, that authority now lies. under our permit and regulatory program. It is my direct authority to close any area for any reason that we consider to be sufficient. In fact, last fall I did close the northern areas for seismic testing as a result of some concerns by various environmentallists. We investigated the situation. Found that there was no evidence to support the idea that there was damage to the whales and the areas

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you.

MS. DAVIS: May I comment on that briefly?

The reason why wo raised the seismic testing issue was because of the, not the conclusions, but the evidence that was gained this spring from the federal study on the gray whale migration. They did find that when the seismic testing ships were operating, the whales tured around and moved out of the area. So that sis the reason that we are raising it as a concern.

The other point I would like to add is thank you to the staff for including grawhales in Stipulation 13. We do appreciate that very much.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you both. That's the only tabs --

MR. TAYLOR: Three more.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Alan Hur, Director

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

·20

21

122

23

24

25

10

11 12

13

14

15 .16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23.

24 25 of Fisheries Protection Institute, California Federation of Fishermen Associations.

Mr. Hur.

Good afternoon. Win Swint, President. of California Abalone Association, came up with me and we thought wold make this a joint effort to possibly save time and make sure we could cover any questions.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTILY: Go ahead.

MR. HUR: There's a point I'd like to start off with and it's bothering the California commercial fishing industry, in particular, the people that comprise the Pacific California Federation of Fishermen's Association which is the largest organization in this state.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Excuse me. we also have Michael David Cox who's the attorney for the South Central Coast Watch, Central Coast Commercial Fishermen's Association. Mr. Cox, are you still here?

Yes Tam.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON MCGARTHY: Why don't going to be talking about commercial fishermens interests, why don't you join us at the table unless you think there's some quite different testimony you're going to give than these gentlemen. Why don't we provide a seat at the table.

> FROM THE AUDIENCE: Could we get their names? ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTAY: Sure.

Win Swint, California Abalone Association, Mr. Alan Hur, the Director of the Fisherles Protection Institute of the PCFFA, and we have Mr. Michael David Cox, attorney for the South Central Coast Watch, Central Coast Commercial Fishermen's Association.

Who would like to go first?

MR. HUR: Well, I guess I'll start. I want to a a loologize if at first it seems a little unorganized. It's because we've gone to four meetings in the bulk of this week. In fact, we just came from the EPA meeting that was in Santa Barbara yesterday.

One of the main concerns leading into the State Lands' role in this process is the lack of data and information that we feel the Fish and Game should be supplying to you in particular in testimony at such hearings as this, especially when we're talking about designing studies or implementing studies that are going to involve the Fish and Game.

development of oil off our coast, through the Governor's Office they have deemed that biological facts must be consistent with political measures. That gives us a little bit of concern. We rely on these people as guardians of our resource and the people that manage our resource and through whose branch we purchase our permits to have the

11

10

13

15

16

17

18

19

21

23

22

24

privilege to utilize this resource, and they're not being allowed to come forward and testify and actually supply pertinent and update more recent data at these hearings.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: There's no prohibition at this hearing that I'm aware of. Are you giving us some information?

MR. HUR: It's my understanding through Gordon Duffy that Fish and Game is not allowed to testify at any hearing dealing with oil development. I am the fisheries' representative to OTAC which is sanctioned by the State Water Quality Board and Jim Steele, who is the biologist for Fish and Game, is not allowed to testify at the EPA hearings or this hearing.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: All right.

Go ahead. We'll leave the administration to correct that.

MR: HUR: You may want to question that. They may have pertinent information which I think should be brought forward in regards to designing a lease sale program.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McSARTHY: Fine.

MR. HUR: Before I enter into a few comments I have on this document here, I'd like to give just a few facts that I haven't had time because of the shortness of notification for this hearing and I want to express a little information on the 30 fathom curve and why the fisheries is requesting that as a buffer zone. I remember when I

first took my first biology course and one of the basic point that they brought up when they were discussing the ocean, the life in the ocean, is that the majority of life along shore, in fact, it is in the high 90 percent range, is located within the first 200 feet of water. That is the depth at which light penetrates and various algae which are supportive of the biomass and the food web exists.

the staple fishery of, in particular, the Port of Santa Barbara. These fish are the fish that are primarily caught within 30 fathoms shoreward. I also have the months and peak times for these fisheries. This took about a year and a half to get this information actually where it's pretty on. It's within a day or two.

Okay. Halibut is year-around and the peak times is February through July and October through January 1st. (White sea bass, June 15 to March 15. Reak times is June 15 to August 1st, October 1st through Rebruary 30th [sic]. Soupfin shark and leopard shark, peak times, February 1st through March 15, July 1st to September 30th. Barracuda, peak times, November 1st through January 31st. Angel shark, year-around, usually caught with halibut. Lobster, the first Wednesday in October to the first Wednesday after the 15th of March. Crab are taken year-around. Abalone are taken year-around except for the months of August and

February. I think you notice by this list that if you go into a restaurant, there are very few restaurants that serve seafood that don't have at least some representative off that list. This particular area of constline from, well, I an't be general in regards to or specific in regards to Point Conception to Point Arguello because for us fishing the area which represents the bulk of these fish to us is from Gaviota, we recognize, to Point Arguello. Depending on the time of year, the season, the seasonal weather pattern or the currents, they'll be located at different areas along that coastline.

Okay. What do these fish mean to the Port of Santa Barbara? Well, first off, they represent 500 plus jobs. To the State, in Santa Barbara, the port alone represents \$27 million to the State's economy. Sixty percent of which of that 20 percent, the \$27 million, is sold directly and distributed throughout the Santa Barbara tricounties.

12

13

ol 4

15

16

17

a 18

19

20

.21

22

23

25

There's been a lot of talk by the oil industry in regards to the platform serving as artificial reefs. I want to take this moment now because we now have an actual valid response to substantiate some concern we've had in regard to this remark. Okay. Surface areas is at a premium in the ocean. Thus, an oil platform represents an artificial reef which produces surface area. Okay. None of the staple

fish mentioned on that previous list of the commercial species taken in that area and inside of 30 fathoms are found in the platform communities. The majority of species are invertebrates: muscles, anemone, barnacles, worms and so on. These are attached to or are on the platform superstructure below the surface of the water. The fish that are attracted to the oil platforms are predominantly sport fishing species. So you might ask, is this adding to the already-established ecosystem? No, it doesn't really add anything to it. Okay. What it does is it creates an environment within an already-established ecosystem that has been in existence since the oceans came to be in existence.

11

12

13

14

17

19

20

21

22

23

24

Okny. It is use a real good example that I got from Jim Steele. I wish he was here to testify, but he said that I could use this. In one oil platform case in particular off the Hollister Ranch, the squid come in in great numbers at certain times of the year. Okay. You have the halibut that follow the migration of the squid in and out of the depths and along the coastline and they feed on the squid. Okay. Now, you've created this artificial reef out there and in particular this is Platform Helen, and you have a population of fish out there that are feeding on the squid in competition with our halibut. This is an example where it actually takes away from the

() () future productivity of our halibut populations from being in competition with them for food.

3

10

11

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

° 23

24

25

The physical presence of rigs causes problems in many ways. Most we feel can be mitigated though. Scheduling of rig placement along with its location, traffic lanes for crew and supply vessels, scheduling of subsea completion installations along with pipeline placement these must be scheduled in conjunction with fishing seasons and fishing requirements. We need to have access to these areas throughout different periods of the year and we hope that the developmental period of the oil field will take this into consideration.

Things that cannot be mitigated are such incidences as I explained where you have an artificial environment created in the middle of an already-established ecosystem and it in a sense takes away from it.

brill muds, okay. The fishing industry is very strong on this point. The drill muds, whether they're in the OCS or particularly in this case in State waters, should be hauled ashore. They shouldn't be dumped in the ocean where hey contain hazardous chemicals that hold the potential to be passed on up the food chain. They hold the potential to kill our juvenile fish stock, both invertebrate and very brate, and thus destroy the future of our fisheries.

2,

4

6 7

8°8

10

11

13

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

On top of that, we don't want to be going out to fish for poisonous fish or bringing in fish that may be infecting the health of our society.

I would request that the commission, that this Commission request the transcript from the August 11th, 1983 EPA hearings in Santa Barbara for further details on drill muds and it will also give you an update as far as findings on studies that have been conducted. This is a hearing that we attended yesterday.

Okay. Seismic exploration. Claire, you mentioned that studies were being conducted by the feds. To my knowledge, Gordon Cota sits on that board that you discussed and the budgeting is going to be taken into consideration in 1985 and the feds at that time will start looking into allocating funds or looking into designing a study. So as of yet there has been no study undertaken that is looking into seismic concussion and the possible damage or fish dispersal which can result from that.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That is included in the Yankee Point study which is it ongoing or is it completed

MR. FABER: Yakee Point study is --

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Identify yourself if you're going to speak for the record, Mr Faber.

MR. FABER: Mygname is Robert Faber. I'm counsel for the State Lands Commission.

The Yankee Point study covered whales. It doesn't cover fish dispersal.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I apologize, Alan.
That's true.

MR. HUR: I just want to make sure that fact was clear that as of yet there has been to timely studies looking into the possible or potential damage that can be being done to our fisheries.

In this case, the burden has been placed on us to come up with proof that damage is being done. We would like to ask that this burden be removed from us and that the State assumes the responsibility for that. They can do this by putting a moratorium on all seismic activity until such a time that timely studies are conducted and show that there's no damage being done to the future of our fisheries.

ſ٦

There is laboratory evidence to show that pressure shockwaves can cause cytoplasmic evacuation in juvenize larva. What that means is it can cause them to explode. It is utilized in the lab for removing delicate organelle. It only takes between four and eight pounds of pressure in the laboratory to dissect these creatures using this pressure. Any further pressure can result in totally smashing the creature or have shearing effects in which they're cut. The pressure waves that are being utilized in seismic

the fact that the majority of the zoa and phytoplankton which carries the future of our fisheries is located within the first 11 fathoms of water beneath the surface and the shockwave conducted is going down to the bottom of the ocean in the several ton range, hitting the bottom of the ocean continuing its shockwave and then coming back up, they regetting a double pulse of energy going both ways. One out of a thousand lobster, panular sineruptis, makes it to a harvestable size.

റ്

These babies when they're born are carried by the currents in large plumes. They're referred to as part of the zdoplankton. They're located within that depth of 60 feet or to the surface. Seismic vessels passing over and using the shockwaves far exceed the normal effects of natural selection.

We need some studies on this and we need some protection to make sure that the future of our fisheries isn't being damaged.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Is your study that the seismic waves kill the small plankton that are necessary to feed --

MR. HUR: There is no study to show that as of today. What that is based on is the seismic vessel creates pressure waves through various means. These pressure waves

are oscillated from the boat either, well, as I said, from various means. It goes down and is picked up by a transducer on a cable. Okay. In the laboratory, they use pressure, various forms. It can be generated either by a hand pump or a vacuum pump, but it's pressure. Pressure is the same in all factors of physics. It is in these laboratory experiments where pressure is used, it is used for dissecting or removing the organelle. There has been nothing to date looking at this, and it's these kinds of studies and information that comes forward that gives us concern.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON MCCARTHY: Do the live studies show that the feed for the fish that we want to grow into commercial catches, it's the feed and not the commercial fish?

MR. HUR: It sall aspects of it.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: All right. So halibut other fishes?

MR. HUR: Correct.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: All right. Go ahead,

MR. HUR: Okay. Excuse me just a second. My notes got a little mixed.

Okay. As an industry, the California commercial fishing industry represented in 1982 a billion and a quarter

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A SACRAMENTO, OALIFORNIA 95828 TELEPHONE (916) 972-8894

3

5

6

1,5

•

y

10

1.

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

900

23

24 25

dollars of the state's economy. It employs thousands of people all along the state's coastline and inland that are involved in processing and transportation and distribution We pay our share in state's fees. of the fish. of paying our own personal state taxes, we pay hoat licenses, commercial license general for each person on the boat. specificense permits for each species taken such as lobster, abalone and swoodfish. The lobster permit, for example, is \$125. The abalone is 200; swordfish, 150. We pay property tax on our boat. In the last couple of years we've been paying, let's see how I can pronounce that. possessory tax, possessory use tax. That's tax on the state lands in the harbor where our boats float over. We're paying tax on the seabed underneath our boats. We pay processing tax on the fish that's landed and processed. sales tax on the goods that we buy that don't attach to our boat.

₀ 3

11

12

₹13

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

We've been pitted against a very powerful political and economic entity, and the burden of proof and justification for our concerns is weighing very heavily on us. In good faith, we have bought boats, bought these permits, created businesses and helped add to the state's economy. Now another user group has come along who we've been in competition with for space in the ocean and it has bought up the last remaining spaces or proposes to buy up the last remaining

spaces available to us as fishermen. The richest area on the Santa Barbara tri-counties for the diversity of species that I mentioned is between Gaviota and Point Arguello. Sixty percent of the fish that is derived from the Santa Barbara fish industry comes from this area.

It's a situation where we've invested all this time and all this money and now somebody comes along and represents more immediate revenue to the state and the United States and the feds get to have rights that supersede ours. We're not against them putting all the oil platforms they want out there. We have against dirresponsible development that doesn't take into consideration the preserving and protecting of our fighery. That responsibility is one thing that I think is really being neglected by the oil industry. and in many cases it seems to be being neglected by various representatives in our governments. We would ask that we have some help in carrying that responsibility. We have It's well expected to be assumed. We use the assumed it. resource. But fish are our renewable resource and there's very few renewable resources in this world. Long after the oil well is scraped, there should still be fish out there to be caught. It's a big ocean. us all out there, but we got to take that responsibility on it. So that's what I have to say in regards to that.

10

11

12

19

14

- 15

16

17

19

20

21

23

24

25

I have a little problem here with this Point

Conception lease area map that's in the thick handout that you have. The halibut trawling ground now, I've never seen a halibut make a right turn like that and head out to sea or into the beach or whatever. I wonder if I can have that explained to me. I showed this chart and then the original chart to representatives in Santa Barbara of the fishing community that actually do halibut fishing in that area and they're not familiar with anything like that.

00 1

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McGARTHY: Miss Dedrick.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes. The halibut, the legal halibut trawling grounds under state law are between one mile from shore to the 25 fathom line. That outside line is the 25 fathom line. The reason that the area is shown where it is is based on data from the Department of Fish and Game.

%0

12

13

14

15

16

18

₽°19

20

21

22

23

24⁴

25

MR. HUR: Okay. Another thing I'll point out is this is very inaccurate here as far as trawling. It's virtually impossible is my message from the trawlers in Santa Barbara to trawl this area because of the rock formations and the geological structures that are there. Although it's allowed, they do not trawl specifically in that area. The area that is halibut fished is predominantly between Hilama which is this reef right here that sticks out and then up to the Boat House, what we refer to as the Boat House, just below Point Arguello. That is probably

one of the more sandy and easily accessible areas for that

You know, one thing that's not taken into consideration when comments are made on the sandy bottom habitat. It's one of the things that biologists even baving gone up there and looked at it have a hard time making a statement in regards to is the population there. with OTAC helping them design their collecting technique for the first stage of their study for Texaco's Anita project, and they had a submarine up there and a collecting bucket and everything and they wont down and they went all ower the bottom and, God, they spent, some money. They looked everywhere and there's nothing here. But, yet, there's traps all over the place and I don't think the fishermen are putting the crabs in the traps. But anyway, I arranged for some fishermen to go up there and place the crab traps where they had gone and done their site survey and we usually set the traps for three nights. Well, they were in a hurry because, it was the end of their study. They ended up catching more crabs than they'd seen in two weeks up there in the three traps that we put in that area for them.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The point is this. The crabs burrow into the sand. As the sand currents move, they move with them as the feed's exposed. They migrate in and out. We fished them as deep as 35 fathoms is the extreme. We consistently

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

fished them 20 fathoms throughout the year. Sometimes they

move into ten or 15 fathoms for short periods when the squid or anchovy move th. These are things that need to be looked

at and taken into consideration as far as studies.

Also, I'd'like to make it known that the fisheries is more than willing to come forward with that data and to try and help the Fish and Game also, through the help of the Fish and Game to give validity to this data that we would present, where the resource is and how it moves around. We have a real unique occurrence off the Santa Barbara Coastline and it occurs up to Point Conception or Point Arguello areas. It's one of the major spawning grounds for California spawning of lobsters. At the beginning of the season the lobsters are located in depths anywhere from two to three feet out to 30 feet and then as they go through dioecious, they molt, then they move into their reproductive phase. They walk out and then the vill follow a lot of these geologic formations gut to 20, 30 fathoms and they walk up the coastline. They concentrate at the Point Conception, Point Arguello area. At the end of the season you'll see maybe there's 400 traps along the whole coastline at the beginning of the season and they're all concentrated mainly up in the Hollister Ranch and around the corner. These are things that are what we base the 30 fathom request on the migrational pattern of our crabs, the requirements of

our fishery as far as having access to satch the fish, and the biomass that is located within those depths. I'm sorry, the fish and Game to my knowledge does not have the data to fully substantiate that and it's my understanding that the records are only as recent as 1976. I would like to see the data brought up to date, if possible, but they by they're having lunding problems.

This is, I think has been pointed out, is a very rich area and it represents the future of the Santa Barbara fisheries. We need and are requesting a 30 fathom buffer zone to make sure that the biology and the ecosystem that exists them survives during oil development.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you for your testimony.

Any specific data that you could give Fish and Game people would be helpful to us since you're clearly suggesting we should not rely on their data. Ckay?

MR. HUR: I have one more thing here that I forgot.

I'm sorry.

It's on page 022, (d).

10

12

. 15

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

25

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Go ahead.

MR. HUR: It says: "Exploratory drilling shall not be conducted between October 1 and March 31 within halifut trawling grounds as shown on the sensitive biologic area map described in Special Operating Requirement 4(f)."

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3

5 5

7.

10

() °

12

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

22

250

well, we need to sit down with the Fish and Game or the Fish and Game needs to sit down with you and update that and make sure it's a little more accurate, as I pointed out. By the same token, there's no mention of lobster or crab and Fish and Game documentation shows that the Point Conception to Point Arguello area and down to Gavieta is the richest area on the entire California coastline for rock crab, the entire California coastline. There is no mention of that whatsoever. These are things that need to be entered into consideration and before this can go ahead.

There's one other thing on (c). It says -
EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Same page?

MR. HUR: On the same page. It says: "Lessees shall comply with crew and work bout shipping corridors, whenever established, to control ingress and egress to and from drilling and production sites within the lease area."

Okay. The fishing industry would ask that the verbiage or the wordage be changed to say "whenever" to something along the lines of "to be." We need these corridors established. I brought this to the fishermen's forum last year and various assurances were given me that corridors would be established. Claire has the information on that.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's what it's doing

in here.

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HUR: I very much appreciate that. But they have to be established.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: "Whenever established" does not suggest that they're not going to be established. Is that your concern?

on the role that when a rig is placed that a traffic corridor be established upon each permit application and site location. It's the oil industry representatives I've met with have had no problem with that. They just don't want to sit down and take the time to work it out as of yet. But I will reiterate and apologize for that statement. We are working towards a limison office which might help to establish a means of communication in establishing mutual agreement on that.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Does staff have any comments on that?

MR. TROUT: Mr. Chairman, nothing other than it's the intention of the Lands Commission staff to work with the Coastal Commission staff, the Coast Guard and other people in establishing such corridors. That's a major concern to the Coastal Commission and it's been one of our concerns for some time. So we have no pride in that word other than the intention was that crew boat and work corridors

would be established and we want the elessee on notice that when established they've got to use them.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: The Coast Guard having the authority to establish such things.

ASTING CHAIRPERSON MCCARTHY: Okay. do that unilaterally. I'm sure you appreciate that.

MR. HUR: Okay. That's fine.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Mr. Chairman, could we have a break for the paper change?

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: All right. 60 second break.

[Thereupon a recess was taken.]

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Next witness.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I'd like to say one thing in regard to the Fish and Game. The Department has worked very closely with us throughout this entire process, has made available masses of information, a lot of time and work on the part of their biologists and the enforcement people. They couldn't have been more helpful to us throughout this whole process. I think the record should show that.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: All right.

My. Win Swint.

OMR. SWINT: Good aftermoon. I'm here representing the California Abalone Association. I'm going to make my talk gather short.

25

17

918

19

20

21

22

23

24

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 TELEPHONE (916) 972-8894

3

I would like to first say that I concur on the basis of being a member of the fisheries with most of Mr. Secondly, I'd like to express some of my Hur's comments. concerns. Basically that being, to reiterate, the seismic testing, as abalone after spawning are in a larval state and at the mercy of the currents in, through and about those areas and, as Mr. Hur expressed, that a very few pounds of pressure used to dissect the organelles of these particularly gentle creatures in a laboratory situation and seismic testing takes place at several thousand psi. It's also my understanding that there are more than one It's usually three vessels competing for the best vessel. price and the areas that are sometimes covered as accurately as almost every square foot. We find this a little bit disturbing.

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Secondly, as a diver, I see, and my people report to me as they see, some disturbing things from time to time and also experience some things. I have been diving in this particular area between Point Conception and Point Arguello in a depth of about 35 feet while outside of the seismic testing was going on at a range of approximately two miles from me. I can guarantee you it's a very uncomfortable feeling for a mammal of my size to be within two miles of seismic testing. I can substantiate this with other diver's testimony. I don't know how the whales feel

about it. I understand they have the ability to communicate about over four or 5,000 miles. So they must be able to hear quite good. I'm quite doaf. But as I said, the shock-wayes are very intense.

The other thing that I'm concerned about in particular, although I would like to point out at this time that I am also in no way against oil development. fishery is a very heavy user of gasoline and oil. no intention of being included in trying to block any lease sales based on we don't want oil development. We are very concerned about the responsibilities that go along with One of them is: What are the consequences of seismic testing? Second is, we would like to know what the effects of drilling muds are on these development of larval animals. This also goes somewhat outside your jurisdiction I understand in the federal waters. But our evidence, the best that I've been able to come up with and have studied shows that on certain organisms between zero days and 16 days old exposed to 50 percent acquiesce mud fraction solution for a period of 100 hours, the surviving animals express a 93 percent development anomaly rate. Anomaly ois defined by Heritage Dictionary as abhormality, unnormal, not developed as should be or normal or, in other ways deficient from the normal. We're concerned about that. We support the fisheries and their loss of traditional

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

fishing areas. However, we are an in-shore fishery. We don't do very much fishing outside of a hundred and a hundred and twenty feet of water which is 11 fathoms, 12 fathoms --

MR. SWINT: 20 fathoms of water. However, we do support the fisheries and these things because we feel that what's happening is a setting of a precedent. So we do support the 30 fathom line.

Another thing that I'd like to bring up is that I worked on the Chamber's study. I have a great deal of respect for Dr. Davis and Russell who is previously and I believe still with the Army Corps of Engineers. However, as it came up at the time of that study, one of the problems that I saw with it and I would like to share with you is that a baseline study where a transect is stretched out across a particular area, a line — I don't remember how long the line was; I'd say it's a thousand feet, perhaps—and the divers swim along that line and every so often they snap a picture and they take samples from either side of that line.

13

16

17

20

22

23

My experience as a diver in these areas is that the pan or the bottom there has various outcroppings along it and it's covered over with sand. These little outcroppings that stick up are variously spaced and a diver, for instance, can go through them one day and swim through an area numerous

directions running search patterns and finding almost no rocks at all, can come back on another day with a little bit better visibility and move over just a little bit more and he'll find estrings of rocks. The life on these rocks is also or outcroppings is sponadically placed. So, in other words, a divermight work through an area specifically for abalones two or three times and not find mything and then on the fourth time apparently in the same area he'll find a great deal. So the configuration at the bottom, and I'm not talking about the hard reefs but in the sandier areas, is often confounding to the most professional divers and search people that are very experienced in searching.

Another thing that bothers me a great deal about this is on either side of the transcat lines that are shown in that study, we have had very high population of abalones, both at what is known as the Hilama reef if I could skow you on this map here, on this particular area here. This is the outer reef. Point Arguello up in here. We have to-shore reefs where there's a great deal of abalone. Now, there's a breakwater being put in there. I don't know what that affects the in-shore abalones. But we know that this particular area has been profoundly rapid growth for shell fish. I pointed out that there was a very high density bed of abalones at this larger Hilama reef. Since that time of that study here abalones we virtually disappeared.

14

15

°.73

47

19

20

21

22

23

25

I can also say that too of this reel here and that reef

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Why have they

MR. SWINT: I do not know, sir. I have reported this to Mussell Go drich of the Department of Fish and Game and the population has been totally disseminated. know, we do have some problems with sea otters and there's been some conflict. However, we do stand behind the sea otter people on the issues that are here. I'm not blaming this on sea tters. I'm not venturing to say why because I did not see why. . I did not participate in anything that 12 will cause the dissemination. However, Lodocknow that this was pointed out. Another thing that I'd like to point out at this time is that in the areas these transects would run, had some discussions with Dr. Davis about the fact that the animals in that area seem to be extremely healthy. Not only that, the teragofin (ph.) and other bottom plants exhibit -- I don't know how to express it -- just an extreme heartiness and value in their life apparently attributed to the upwelling in that area. The upwelling in that area is what makes it so tremendously rich. I would urge this panel to be very cautious about examining the idea of having less than the 30 fathom line because this is an unusually rich area and I would hate to see future damage done to it.

16

17

18

_ø 19

20

21

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3436 AMERICAN JÜVEH DRIVEP BUITE A BACHAMENTO, GALIEZHTIKA 95825 TELEPHOTE (VIO) 972/0894

as the abalone association are the first fishery in the State of California, perhaps in the United States or, the world that has started a trend to replace animals with absolutely no outside funding, with no sources other than the money that we raise ourse wes to contract for and purchase abalones and we place them out, we put out 9,200 abalones on August 2nd. Our members donate their boat times, their own fuel. We go out and we're trying to put back new breeding populations on public domain which we feel is a benefit to everyone. These are not leased areas, although we have done some of that. We're also doing it out in publi domain. If the primary purpose is for us to create new breeding populations, we're currently doing this at the 13 Channel Island and we have not done it in this arec. 14 so, we're concerned about the current movement and the ultimate effects of drilling mud. As you know, there s a great deal of conflict from Dr. Morris' version of what may be going on as compared to what some of the oil companies' 18 versions may be going on. This deeply distresses me because if we're setting out new breeding populations in hopes of **\20** getting something started by putting out these extremely 21 expensive populations of abalone, as they reach the larval 22 state, between the seismic testing and the effects that 23 may be caused on the larval by drilling muds, we would like 24 to know because we certainly don't need to proceed in a ba

direction of rejuvenating resources in the effects are as some evidence seems to suggest.

MR. HUR: I just wanted to comment of one thing.
Win made a point that we're looking into right now. It's a real baffling question. There's two or three shortbeds of abalone around the corner that are very --

it show that Mr. Hur is testifying again. Thank you, Mr. Swint.

Mr. Hur

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

₹24

25

MR. HUR: And after the Chamber's study was completed, the abalone in that area disappeared, the juveniles along with the mature harvestable size. Now, Win, I think you clarified there was no inference as far as it being sea otters () anything like that

to point an accusing finger.

MR. HUR: Now, the inference was it's way beyond whatever one, two, or ten or whatever sea otters could possibly eat. It raises some concern. We don't know why.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: We don't have the answer to that.

MR. SWINT: We do not have the answer. One answer may be, from my observations in these areas, well, perhaps it's not an answer, but the populations of animals in these

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

20

21

22

23

24

25

areas seems to leapfrog. Rather than having set long-term populations in these areas, the way the bottom is set up, that small intense concentrations of abalones in particular, and l've noticed it with other animals in these areas, tend to leapfrog around in some sort of a rotating fashion that I don't quite understand myself. But we do find this area extremely rich and that's the bulk of my testimony.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you very much.

Mr. Cox.

MR. COX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

about the modifications or clarifications that I think can be made in your conditions document. We feel that we can track the Commission on several items here. On C-5, page 18 of your document, line 11, you talk about biological surveys that will, and I quote, "Contains areas used as a breeding ground for commercially recoverable species," and we suggest that you modify that to "breeding, feeding and migration areas for commercially recoverable species."

ACTING CHAIRPERSON MCCARTHY: Wait a minute, please.
Staff understand what's being proposed?

not understand the significance of it at the moment.

You're proposing, "breeding" -

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: "Feeding and

migratory areas."

MR. COX: "For commercially recoverable fish." Fish not only breed but they also feed and move about.

We feel that those elements of the --

ACTING CHAIRDERSON McCARTHY: Well, migratory areas could cover perhaps anything. I assume that this could deal with movement of various species.

MR. COX: Yes.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Probably every square foot would be very involved here. Maybe a migratory area of one of the species.

MR. COX: And that is the sort of information that I believe the Commission would want to have in terms of analyzing the impacts of oil development on the commercial fishing industry.

doesn't sound appropriate.

MR. COX: What about the feeding areas?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Migratory sounds pretty

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: What about the

MR. HUR: Migratory is used as a Fish and Game term in all its texts. So it would cover all of it. It would cover breeding, feeding and everything. Just a

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

. .3

5

. .

8

9

10

11

ू 12 ू 13

16

17

18

19

20

-

` . • •

*23°

24

25"

suggesti

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I Whink we need some more data, Mr. Chairman, to determine what the effect is.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: What about the word

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: My answer is the same. We know where the breeding areas are. Somewhere in our data we probably know the rest of those answers, but I don't have them in my mind.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Gd ahead, Mr. Cox.

MR. COX: Yes. The second suggestion is C-6 on

19, line 15, in which we are adding the last sentence of Item (c), where it presently says: "Sample species collected shall be identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level." We would like to add that we also analyze the biomass and density of critical organisms with respect to the results that will be coming back from these studies.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Repeat that.

MR. COX: Add to: "Sample species collected shall be identified to the lowest possible taconomic level," the fact that we will be gathering data on biomass and density of critical organisms. In other words, we will not only be identifying the type of species but the mass and their density at these particular sampling stations

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Isn't that included,

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3

7.

. >

7

8

9

9

10

91

12

13

al A

15

16

17

18

19

20

,21 22

23

24

25

that kind of information included anywhere else in our

studies? I just assumed that that would be a pretty basic

form of information.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I need Dwight Sanders

make sure I'm telling the truth.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON MCCATHY: Mr. Sanders.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I think that that's

what is done now; isn't that correct?

MR. SANDERS; What will generally be done in the

box core is to not only determine -- my name is Dwight

Sanders. I'm on the staff of the State Lands Commission.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

In a bex core to determine not only the types of animals within that box core but their density and so forth. As Mr. Cox has testified, that information has been provided to us through the biological studies that have been done and we see no difference in any studies to be done in the future.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Is that mentioned anywhere in any conditions of the lease, the proposed lease agreement?

MR. SANDERS: It is not mentioned spedifically to my knowledge, Governor. It is a standard operating procedure, a valid and bonafide biological --

WILL mentioning it specifically at this point?

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

2

4

6

8

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

18

19 20

20

22

23

° 24

25

MR. SANDERS: I don't see any.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Not that I see.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Would you give us the wording that you have in mind, Mr. Cox?

MR. COX: "Sample species collected shall be identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level and the biomass and density of critical organisms shall be analyzed."

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Staff have any further comment on that?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: 8 No.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Any objections by my two fellow commissioners on that language change?

All right. That's adopted.

Go ahead, Mr. Cox.

MRO VOX: On line 17, right below the area we've just been discussing, as presently worded, "The marine mammal surveys shall be performed by a qualified marine mammalogist..." We suggest that you add in there a study of the sea birds in addition to the marine mammals.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: We started cut with this a while back with a qualified biologist, with qualified biologists. We changed it to marine mammalogists at the request of the people who are interested in mammals and that inadvertently left out the sea birds. Maybe we better go back to biologists.

5

8

10

••

12

14

15

15

. 18`

10

20° 21

22

23

25

MR. COX: What we'd like to do here is just clarify the intent here and I would believe that adding in sea birds would certainly make the studies comprehensive enough to include not only mammals but also birds.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: I think they should be included. Now, you're saying they're excluded by the way we describe our experts?

MR. COX: That's correct.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON, McCARTHY: Not necessarily excluded, but you're saying this expert may not be qualified to --

MR. COX: That's correct?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Well, a markine mammal survey is for marine mammals and birds are not marine of mammals. Edological survey covers everybody else we thought.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Let's take care of it. I think it was intended that they be included. How do we do it?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Well, I would suggest that you put forward your intent which you just have. If the Commission concurs in that, give the staff the latitude to write the precise wording.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: All right.

MR. COX: Yes. Thank you.

On page C-7, this is a matter that may involve

a policy question, but I will approach it now? The last sentence on page 7 reads: In lease areas where adverse effects cannot be mitigated to the satisfaction of the State the State may prohibit development." We suggest that you change the word "may" to read "shall." Because if you do find that adverse impacts have not been mitigated to your satisfaction, the proper course would then be to actually prohibit such development. I believe that that is your intent. Changing the word from "may" to "shall" will make that Thear.

question. EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: It is indeed a policy

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: I'm for changing it to "shall." How do the other commissioners feel about that?

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

212

22

23

24

25

I think it's the clear intent that we're trying to encourage mitigation actions. If mitigation cannot be accomplished, then the option that's pretty strongly implied in this is that the development and that specific site will not go forward.

I'd recommend we change "may" to "shall."

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Would you give me
a moment to concur with counsel?

ACTING CAAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Go ahead.
Go ahead, Mr. Cox, your next point.

talks about the meteorological studies. In particular, we would like to recommend that you include, with respect to currents, at the surface and at depths because knowledge of currents at depth is necessary in understanding what will happen to oil that is spilled, where that jil will go. Not only in terms of the surface, but also subsurface migration

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: I'm not following

MR. COX: It's line 84

10

12

13

₀14

15

16

17

18

19

·20

21

22

23

24

25

ACTING CHAIRPYRSON McCARTHY: Yes, go ahead. What point are you trying to make? I missed it.

MR. COX: The point is that we should study currents at the surface and at depth. This was a suggestion -

MR. COX: This is a suggestion made to me.

MR. TROUT: Mr. Chairman, page C-20 Operating Requirement 14, the line that starts with "Necessary to obtain high quality measurements of wave, wind, current and temperature," the intention was that both temperature and currents would be studied throughout the water column and the results of the studies indicate what long-term, where for the long term the on-time real-time reporting information needs to be collected. I don't know that we

would argue it all. I guess I don't think we need to change it. I wouldn't argue with Mr. Cox only to say that that's our intention.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Is it our intent to collect the data as to surface and subsurface currents to EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes.

MR. TROUT: Yes.

100

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: All right. Make that a part of the record, Mr Cox.

MR COX: Thank you.

CACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Go ahead.

You want to revert back to the last item?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes. 1 think, Mr.

Chairman, that the Commission should hear from the Attorney General, in this case, Rick Frank, on the question of the "shall" versus "may."

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Mr. Frank.

MR. FRANK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This refers back to the previously suggested amendment on pages C-7 and C-8. The only concern we would raise is that this carries over under into the Commission's obligations and duties under the California Environmental Quality Act. Under that Act, and in the approved initial lease proposal last December, the Commission on several circumstances indicated mitigation measures might be appropriate if they were properly and

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 TELEPHONE (910) 972-8894

. 5 6

7

9

10

12

∘13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

legally within the responsibility of other agencies. Under this document we we the term "state" -- state is defined as the State Lands Commission -- to adopt the suggested change may preclude or prevent some of those other agencies from exercising their discretion within their regulatory sphere. The Commission's only ability under CEQA and under existing laws is to make recommendations as to suggested mitigation measures which are properly within the jurisdiction of those other agencies.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Are you talking about the Coastal Commission primarily?

MR. FRANK: Any number of agencies. The Air Resources Board, Local Air Quality Management Districts, State Water Resources Control Board. It's an overriding concern.

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

¥25

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCAPTIFF: What are you suggesting, that we limit how they may define mitigating circumstances?

MR. FRANK: We'll, we suggest that the best course, given the options and the duties under CEQA, would be to leave the language as it is in its present condition. The Commission adopting the proposed change might be reducing its own discretion, more importantly, the discretion of other regulatory agencies that have a say with respect to this project.

2 .

4

6

8

10

(12

13

15

16

17

18

20

2.1

.23

24 25 MR. COX: That really doesn't address our question of what happens if the State does determine that mitigation reasure are not being implemented to your satisfaction. It you say that the State shall prohibit development, there you are making the decision that old development can to go forward unless it is in fact mitigated to your satisfaction.

counsel? In order to proceed with development, wouldn't lessee require a permit from some other agency?

MR. FRANK: Yes. That's frilly requested in the existing lease.

COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: So if they were unable, because of environmental matters, to obtain a permit, therefore, they would be prohibited from developing; is that correct?

MR. FRANK: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Thank you.

MR. COX: I'm not really clear I understand why the Attorney General is objecting to the change. It seems pretty clear that if it's your intent not to allow oil development if significant impacts are going to result, then why the wishy language?

MR. FRANK: Well, just giving out one possible scenario, it may be that there are some mitigation measures

that might be available for adoption by, say, the State Water Resources Control Board. The State Lands Commission would not have the ability to do that. The Commission mights want to condition any approval or recommend mitigation measures to be adopted by the appropriate regulatory agency. In that case, the State Water Board.

I'm just concerned that the language being proposed here might circumscribe this Commission's ability to adopt that either/or course of action.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Let me ask the If any of those agencies adopt mitigating actions that can be taken by the lessee, then we're not put in the position of prohibiting development?

MR. FRANK: That's correct.

10

11

120

EL[®]

18

21

22

23

25

15 ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: So oif we did change this from "may" to "shall," why would they be prohibited o from framing mitigating actions that could be accomplished or not accomplished by the lessee?

MR. FRANK: I'm not sure I fully understand the question you're raising

ACTING CHAIRPERSON MCCARTHY Well, the Zanguage is in the lease areas where adverse effects cannot be mitigated. So if they put forward required mitigating action and that was followed, then this sentence wouldn't be applicable to the lessee in that circumstance.

MR. FRANK: I think you have to read the continuing lenguage "to the satisfaction of the State," the State here being the State Lands Commission. The problem is you're maybe asking the State Lands Commission --

090

OF 10

.12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

. 21

23

23

24

ACTING CHAIRPERSON MCARLY. You're saying that we in this sentence would restrict al judgments about whether the missgating circumstances is proper or not to this State agency?

MR. FRANK That's the way the language currently reads.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: In effect we would be holding ourselves as the judge of whether each of the other agencies might require certain mitigating actions {} had acted properly or not:

MR. FRANK: And that might require a degree of technical expertise this Commission does not have on various of those subjects.

MR. COX: That's clearly not what we intend. We intend that an environmental review of each one of these production phases as they gome in, if you determine that the environmental impacts cannot be mitigated within the purview of your discretion, then this language would of indicate that you would prohibit development. In other words, you would not, for example, with Class I impacts make a statement of overriding consideration.

I think that the intent of changing that word to "shall" is to place potential lessees on notice that fenvironmental impacts cannot be mitigated then it is clear that development cannot go forward. That's important in terms of our contention that there may be a parcel here that is so significant environmentally or from the commercial fishermen's perspective hat oil development would be inappropriate. That's why we feel that it's very important to clarify that basic core concept.

ACTING CHATRPERSON McCARTHY: Yes, Commissioner Ordway.

COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Has there ever been a case where the State Lands Commission has allowed development to a lessee who has not been able to acquire the appropriate environmental permits?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I'm sure not.

o MR. HIGHT: No.

12

. 13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Don't see where this

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Mr. Cox, I must confess I'm a little bit concerned about the statement made by the Attorney General as to whether or not we circumscribe unintentionally the actions that might be taken by some other state agencies. I do understand your basic thrust and maybe we can try to pursue this to see if there's a

way to clarify. Why don't you go on to your next point

0 %

with the conditions. I did want to suggest that in terms of your interagency agreement on Item number 3, which is on page 3 of the interagency agreement, in terms of the Scientific Review Study that will be done by the Advisory Scientists, that you also include in there a representative from the commercial fish industry. I think that if there is one thing that's been demonstrated here today from the fishermen's testimony is that they can add a perspective to the scientific data that is going to be analyzed that is missing.

certainly appropriate for us to seek their halp and their expertise. The interagency agreement, as you appreciate, is intended to cover governmental agencies that involve them to save a statutory charge in these areas to be involved. But we take seriously the comment that we stay very close to the commercial fishermen and the data that they can provide us.

MR. COX: Yes. Thank you.

12

13/

14

15

16

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Mr. Chairman, we checked with Pete Phillips, our Fish and Game representative today, on the question Mr. Cox raised on page 18 or C-5 in regard to feeding and migrating. If you'd like to hear from him

directly, I think he's available to make scientific comment. The summary of the comments which I'm sure you'll correct me if I have wrong is that they could be migrating and feeding · '3' anywhere in any part of the lease area. So I would recommend then that we do not take that amendment. ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Mr. Phillips, do you have anything you wish to aid? MR. PHILLIPS: That is a good summary. ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Want to identify yourself for the record? 10

MR. PHILLIPS: Thank you. Good afternoon Pete Phillips with the Department of Fish and Game. is a good summary of our first view of that recommendation. You could characterize the entire area as a place where feeding and migration of marine organisms occurs.

ACTING CHATRDERSON MCCARTHY: All right. Thank

Thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony.

11

12

13

14

15

16.

17

18

19

₩20

21

22

23

24

25

you

OMR. COX: I did want to follow up on one very significant point; and that is that we ware a bit concerned about the question that you raised early at this particular hearing with respect to the timing of the studies that will be undertaken. You raised the point that what phase do the specific studies get undertaken. Is it at the lease sale stage or is it at the production or exploratory phase?

ERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

MR. COX: -- with respect to at what phase these comprehensive studies are undertaken. We feel that since it's clearly understood that no exploratory or production projects will be undertaken until the studies are performed, that it would be immensely helpful to you as decisionmakers to have this information up front before the lease sale actually takes place. That way we can answer some of the

22

23

24

25

critical questions that we were just discussing with respect to what happens if an entire parcel is so sensitive that using hindsight you would have dead to delete that particular parcel from this entire lease sale. that it will not create the sort of uncertainties that one might expect, especially in light, of the fact that it will certainly supply us with the information up front that we will need in answering some basic threshold questions.

In terms of the actual cost of those studies, I'm quite certain that the Commission would like to have the individual lessees bear those costs. I feel that you can, of course, undertake those studies initially and then recoup the cost of those studies within the cost of the lease saloto the individual lessees.

We feel that, from our perspective, in the absence of that type of information, it should be made perfectly clear that basically what the lessees will be obtaining from the State is a lease option with a condition subsequent. That is that they would have the right to drill for oil upon the condition that it was determined that there were areas within the lease sale that would not have significant environmental impacts or impacts on the commercial fishing So, I believe that somewhere within the intent of the Commission this concept should be made clear. 'think that it's important because we're very

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3435 AMERICAN RIVER DRIVE, SUITE A SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 EPHONE (910) 972-8004

1

10

11 12

• 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

23

25

much concerned that once a lease is leto the oil companies will feel that they have a vested right to actually go into each one of these parcels. Once the oil devolopment takes place, no matter how sensitive the area might be, it might be very difficult to actually regulate the oil companies once they're of site. I feel that it's a fundamental threshold question that heeds to be answered by the Commission. Somehow that language should be reflected within your intent.

10

11

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

15

23

24

25

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Mr. Cox, the balance we've tried to strike here on the studies that are going to be undertaken, and so far there's over \$8 million worth of studies that have never been done by the Federal or State Government anywhere else that I'm aware of to this death. That the balance and the method of figment is obviously an attempt to reconcile strongly clashing views on whether oil drilling should go forward at all in this area or whether it should not. It so happens that there are a fair number of elected officials in this State Government that believe it should, starting with the top of the government and with a fair number of people in the Legislature. I won't speak for the other commissioners regularly here, but let me tell you that there's some substantial sentiment on this Commission that there should be oil drilling to obtain revenue. So this whole method is an attempt to reconcile

the values you've been pointing out in your testimony to us with the thrust, the interest coming from others that are not thinking perhaps as deeply or attaching the same weight as you are to those issues. That's what we have before us. I understand why you've stated your point of view. I know we're not going to get \$8 million out of the State General Fund or any major part of that for these studies on some contingency that we're going to get it from oil companies later on. That isn't going to work, not if you follow this current budget process and the Legislature closely and saw what was left on the floor.

MR. COX: Yes. I just want to leave you with one last thought; and that is that I have constant contact. with commercial fishermen in the Santa Barbara area and have been informed that Point Conception is one of the last areas that they can go into without having to get involved with a lot of conflicts with the oil industry and that over the last couple of years they have been subjected to a lot of damages as a consequence of seismic testing in the area. I've had several commercial fishermen tell me that they are being literally driven out of business due to the loss of nets and traps. I feel that it's very important for this body to understand the importance of protecting a critical economic interest that will be severely impacted by this particular lease sale primarily because it's the

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

4

Ta ↓ II ∰ II

10 ° 14

12 13

15

17

18

19

21

23

25

in-shore area within the 30 fathoms that you find the critical marine biota, the fishing masses. We just want to urge this body to adopt a 30 fathom fishermen sanctuary and we would like to urge the Commission to so proceed.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Cox.

MR. COX: Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: That's all the witnesses I have listed. It's time for the Commission to act or not to act, whatever it chooses to do.

Do you have any closics statements giving us information we need to know about, Miss Dedrick?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: No. I'll be glad to answer any questions you have or at least try.

[Thereupon a discussion was held off

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTY: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, at the beginning of this meeting I referred to a fcur-page matter that included several amendments, two of which were from the I think, from an oil industry source and two of which were from environmentalist sources. We have had references to those during the testimony of several witnesses. If there are any further comments from either of my fellow Commissioners, I'd like to ask if there's a motion now to adopt these amendments into the main packet that we've all been addressing that was under the face sheet

of calendar summary on this item today? Do I hear a motion? COMMISSIONER JERVIS: Yes, I'll move. COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: Second. ACTING CHAIRPERSON MCCARTHY: All rights Without dissent, these amendments are adopted. The amendments described as Proposed Amendments to Special Operating Requirement 5(d), Version 1, and the amendments on the following pages. It is my understanding, and I want to hear this from my two colleagues on the Commission, that the amendments proposed by several witnesses that we adopted during the course of the testimony will be included in Ĥ language changes in this packet, and that if we act to approve 12 this proposal, that those changes are incorporated in it 13 is that the understanding?" COMMISSIONER ORDWAY: 15 COMMISSIONER JERVIS: Yes. ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCAPTHY: I would now 17 entertain a motion to adopt this packet. Before I d want to state that we have not addressed another issue that 19 this Commission wishes to further address. 20 That's the issue of jurisdiction. 21 We intend to address that issue at the August 25th hearing of this Commission. Further, we intend 22 to be in close contact with the Coastal Commission on that 23 issue and with any parties that want to raise the issue With us. Obviously, our discussion of the jurisdictional

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

2°

, **T**

7

9°

10

12

13

1*0* 15

16

17

18 0 19

20

انگرا 22

23

24

25

matter is occasioned by the litigation that exists on the subject, occasioned by the interest of members of the Coastal Commission and occasioned by our own interest to resolve the issue of jurisdiction.

time, but it is our intent to act upon that at this time, but it is our intent to act upon every other aspect of the lease sale proposal so that the Coastal Commission may have before it at its August 23rd meeting this package as an action aken by the members of this Commission if that's our decision momentarily.

Is there any further comment from members of the Commission? If not, I'm reddy for a motion on action on this packet before us.

COMMISSIONER JERVIS: 1'11 move it.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON McCARTHY: Mr. Jervis moves.

Without dissent, we unanimously adopt this packet as the proposed set of conditions and approval for this lease sale. Staff will present it on behalf of this Commission to the Coastal Condission meeting as scheduled on August 23rd.

Is blere anything further to come before this Commission at this time?

If there is not, the meeting is adjourned.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

[Thereupon the State Lands Commission



SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95825 TELEPHONE (916) 972-8894

CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, CATHLEEN SLOCUM, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify: That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing State Lands Commission meeting was reported in shorthand by me, Cathleen Slocum, and thereafter

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

transcribed into typewriting.

IN WITTESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand $\not \mathcal{Z}$ 3. day of August, 1983.

Cathleen Cleans

CATHLEEN SLOCUM Certified Shorthand Reporter License No. 2822

16

17

10

13

14

15

18

19 2Ô.

21

22

24

25