1	REGULAR MEETING
2	STATE LANDS COMMISSION
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	ROOM 447
11	STATE CAPITOL
12	SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
7A	
19	WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1987
20	11:08 A.M.
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	Nadine J. Parks Shorthand Reporter
	0

1	MEMBERS PRESENT							
2	Leo T. McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor, Chairman							
3	Jim Tucker, representing Gray Davis, State Controller, Commissioner, and Peter Pelkofer							
4	LaFenus Stancell, representing Jesse R. Huff,							
5	Director of Finance, Commissioner							
6								
7								
8	STAFF PRESENT							
9	Claire T. Dedrick, Executive Officer James Trout, Assistant Executive Officer							
10	Robert Hight, Chief Counsel Jan Stevens, Deputy Attorney General							
11	Wilbur "Moose" Thompson Sue Breece, Secretary							
12	Dwight Sanders Allen Willard							
13	Allen willard							
14								
15								
16								
17								
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								

INDEX

2		Page
3	Proceedings	1
4	Opening Remarks by Chairman McCarthy	1
5	Confirmation of Minutes for the Meeting of August 20, 1987	2
6	Consent Calendar, Items C-1 through C-22	2
7	Regular Calendar Items:	
8	Item 23	4
9	Walt Harvey, Citizen	6
10	Item 24	168
11	Item 25 (Off Calendar)	
12	Item 26	, <b>9</b>
13	Item 27 Presentation by Staff	9
14	Assemblyman Jack O'Connell	11
15 16	James Rote, representing Senator Barry Keene	13
17	Luke Breit, representing Assemblyman Dan Hauser	15
18 19	Robert Faber, International Association of Geophysical Contractors	19
20 21	Larry G. Bowles, Government Affairs Manager, International Association of Geophysical Contractors	31
22	Randal J. Ashley, Palagos Corporation	
23	Question/Discussion	57
24	Phillip Buttolph, Humboldt State University	70
25	Question/Discussion	72

1		Page
2	INDEX, continued	
3	Item 27, continued:	
Ę	Supervisor Norman L. DeVall, County of Mendocino	74
5	Richard Charter, Local Government Coordination Program	79
7	Question/Discussion	37
8	Zeke Grader, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations	102
10	Lily Jones, Citizen	109
11	Wayne Scott, Salmon Trollers Association	111
12	Question/Discussion	116
13 14	Helen Barrington, Ocean Protestion Coalition	118
15	Eleanor Lewallen, Citizen	122
16	Announcement and Comments by Commissioner Tucker	128
17	Chase Mellen, III, Attorney	129
18 19	Steven Rebruk, Fisheries Protection Institute	133
20	Travis O. Evans, Fisherman	137
21	Phil Schenck, Fisherman	138
22	Steve Dunn, Fisherman	141
23	Ed Powers, Fisherman	146
24	Richard C. Williams, Save Our Shellfish	149
25		

١	INDEX, co	ontinued	Page
	•	continued:	
		Lionel Gambill, Friends of the Coast	156
		Chase Mellen, III, Attorney	157
		Warren DSmidt, Citizen	158
		Paul Wiley, Fisherman	160
-		Tom Morneau, Fisherman	163
***		B. J. Kirwan, Attorney	165
		Question/Discussion	166
The state of the state of	Item 28		170
	Item 29		170
	Item 30		171
-	Item 31		172
	Item 33		172
į	Item 33		172
	Item 34	•	172
	Item 35		172
	Item 36		3
		Larry Bowles, Government Affairs	
-		Manager, International Association of Geophysical Contractors	3
-	Item 37	(Off Calendar)	
	Item 38		173
	Item 39		173
1	Item 40	•	176

2

4

3

5

7

8

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## PROCEEDINGS

--000---

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I want to thank you all, all the members of this audience who have patiently waited here for this commission meeting to get started.

I first want to mention that Items 25, 37, and 42 -- 25, 37, and 42 are off calendar, if there any people in the audience who are here on those items. Are there more chairs outside that we might bring in? Let's see. Do we have a sergeant-at-arms? We used to have those in the Legislature. Do we have anything like that anymore?

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: If we could get some folding chairs for the folks who are standing in the back. Yeah, there's some over here.

MS. REECE: Let me see what I can do.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I think your Enforcement Officer is the closest we get to a sergeant-at-arms, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIPMAN MC CARTHY: I see. Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: The lady in the purple dress.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Some of these experiences are character building.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I'd like to propose, for the

convenience of the audience, if I may, that -- first of all, I wanted to welcome all of you, as I said before, and I want to welcome Assemblyman Jack O'Connell, who's here representing his constituents in Santa Barbara.

We will get to the item in which the Assemblyman and so many of you are concerned and here today about,

Item 27. But there are — there are people who have given us slips indicating that they may wish to testify on two other items. And what I want to do is to get to the major item s promptly as we can. I don't think there is a dispute on the other iwo items. I'm going to put all the other items on the calendar in abeyance, and the Commission can take care of those after, because no members of the public apparently are asking to testify on all the other items in the calendar.

So, let me first announce that the consent calendar -- minutes of the last meeting. Any objection to their approval? Hearing none, they are approved.

Consent calendar is 1 through 22. Any questions about the consent calendar? Consent calendar is approved.

Now, we have two items. One is 23 and one is 36, before we get to the --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: 36 is -CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: -- main event of the day.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Excuse me, sir. 23

is the marina study. 36 is a noncontroversial item. And I believe Mr. Bowles is here for -- in case you need information.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Give us a quick staff report on 36.

executive Officer Dedrick: On 36, is a geophysical on -- primarily on-land study with explosives approved by the Department of Fish & Game, which is their authority to do some gas exploration in the Delta.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Any questions by the members of the Commission? Any questions by members of the public?

If not, the request is granted -- I'm sorry,

step forward, sir, please.

Is this Mr. Larry Bowles?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Government Affairs Manager,
GSI.

MR. BOWLES: Mr. Chairman, just for my own edification, I request to know under what permit program the permit would be granted as CGG? It was my understanding that there was only one program -- permit program that would allow the Commission to issue permits on submerged and tidelands. And those are the permits in which about 23 companies are represented here today.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: The program that you

are hearing as Item 27, Mr. Chairman, is an offshore program.

1

2

3

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The program under which this CGG permit is being issued is not for the offshore, but is, in fact, for inland waterways. If Mr. Hight can clarify that --

MR. HIGHT: It's an onshore permit, and the Commission has the authority to issue these permits on a case-by-case basis. It would be a special permit.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Mr. Bowles, do you have any other -- all right.

MR. BOWLES: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Fine. Unanimous by the Commission.

All right. Item 23 and 43 are the only two other items where there may be witness interest.

Let's take up 23.

is the implementation program of the -- for the marinas on the Sacramento River, Mr. Chairman. To make this a brief statement, the staff recommends that the moratorium be lifted, and that the Commission authorize the staff to go forward with an expanded application/information form and an expanded CEQA information form.

The purpose of this -- these two expansions is to allow the Commission staff to obtain the kind of

information that will allow them to give you guidance as to how the proposed application would affect the conditions that have been described by the extensive marina study the Commission has just conducted.

1

Ź

3

7

10

11

12

13

14

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We also are asking or urging -- or urging other local -- the other governments involved -- we've got a lot of entities here. And we'd like your authorization to go forward in working out cooperative arrangements with the other government agencies so that we work toward a coordinated program on the river.

This item does not approve any of the five applications that are now before the Commission, although it has been -- those five applications have been used to test the validity of the questions staff has developed. And it is from those five items that these questions have been refined.

We have also, as part of the calendar item for your information, resolved the long-standing question that we have had with the City of Sacramento as to how to have a working notice situation with them.

We have developed a letter of permission from the State Lands Commission which is acceptable to the City of Sacramento, which can be sent to the city in each case of a proposed marina lease so the city will authorize their people to go forward with an EIR on proposed marinas

2

3

7

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

within the city limits.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right,

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's the short version, and we can give you a longer version if you'd like.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: There were three people who submitted potential witness slips. I wonder if I might ask them collectively -- Mr. Wait Harvey, welcome; Mr. Tom Freeman, Mr. Thomas Westley, given the statement of the staff, do you wish to make any comments at this time? Any of you threa gentlemen?

All right. Thank you. Any questions by members of the Commission?

Is the action of the Commission unanimous? The action of the Commission is unanimous. All right. A final item before we get to the main event.

> EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Mr. Harvey --CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I'm soriy.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: -- has indicated --EXECUTIVE OFFICER MC CARTHY: Your name, sir?

MR. HARVEY: Walt Harvey. I had a statement that I wanted to make. And I'm not certain that this is the appropriate place to do it. But I wanted to request of the Commission that they consider extending what is known in your report as Reach 4 to the Bright Bend Bridge, which is

upward of the existing Reach 4 boundary line about a half a mile or so, because there are other marinas planned at those locations and they would be -- they would fall under that Reach 4 policy.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I apparently didn't make clear what the staff's recommendation is here.

The staff's recommendation would lift the moratorium for the entire river. Reach 4 is no longer relevant.

MR. HARVEY: Oh, okay. Fine.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Okay?

MR. HARVEY: We didn'to receive notification of that.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Well, we haven't released the report, because we were coming right up to the wire today. But it is available now, and we will make sure that everyone receives it.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: We'll get you a copy.

MR. HARVEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. The action of the Commission is unanimous.

Now, Item 43.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 43, Mr. Chairman, is the staff's request for an authorization for a refund to the Union Oil Company for overpayments in the amount of

a little over a half a million dollars, and direction to 1 the Union Oil Company that they should file a Board of 2 Control claim for the amount that has been -- that we're 3 talking about here, which is about 523 million (sic) I think. 5 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Mr. Phil Harrington, did you wish to give any testimony on this, 7 or the action being recommended by Commission staff -- is Mr. Harrington here? 9 MR. HARRINGTON: Mr. Chairman. 10 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Yes, sir, did you hear the 11 staff's recommendation? Did you wish to make any comment? 12 MR. HARRINGTON: I have no further comments, sir. 13 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Thank you. 14 All right. Commission unanimously acts, then, on the 15 recommendation of Item 43. 16 All right. Now we'll put off all other items and 17 move to Item 57 at this time. May I ask --18 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: 27. 19 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I'm sorry, Item 27 at this 20 time. 21 Staff, do you want to make a very brief opening 22 remark? I'd like to call on Assemblyman O'Connell to make 23 his remarks. 24

Briefly --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes.

25

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Want to set it in context?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Excuse me, sir.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Go ahead.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Briefly, this is a long-standing program of the State Lands Commission to authorize -- or to permit and, therefore, control to some degree geophysical operations in the State waters offshore California.

The program was initially developed under a categorical exemption for scientific investigation for a three-year period three years ago. The extension of the program was reauthorized under that categorical exempt on with the Commission authorizing and promoting some scientific studies which have been ongoing in the subsequent three years.

During that period, the staff developed a negative declaration for the extension of this pxogram, which — that program terminated in May. At that time, the information available from the studies had not been received. Just prior to the expiration of the program in May, we received information that these studies would be completed during the summer.

On those grounds, the Commission extended the program for another 120 days. The studies have since been released. The results of the studies are inconclusive.

There has been a great deal of public interest.

A lot of information has been generated. And a lot of it really needs clarifying.

The staff recommends to the Commission the following action: That the major program of high-energy exploration, because of the degree of uncertainty of information that is currently available to the Commission, should be subject to an environmental impact report.

The low-energy operations of two-tenths of a kilojoule -- two kilojoule or less, there is no evidence nor any public controversy as to this being -- these various operations, which are goite benign, to be of any damage.

So, we recommend that that program go forward.

But in the interia -- since the staff report has not been available to the public, the staff recommends that the Commission put out that staff report for public review today, and that we hold a special hearing in the relatively near future, within notice, at which the Commission can make a final decision.

We have one further problem, and that is that there are some permits that are -- are or will be -- the 884 will have run, and we recommend that the Commission terminate -- what do you say --

MR. HIGHT: Deny.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: -- deny those permits during the -- for the interim period without prejudice.

Mr. Hight may have other comments. I'm not sure.

MR. HIGHT: The only comment, Mr. Chairman, would be that the denial would be without prejudice and the applicants would naturally be reconsidered at the next Commission meeting, given their desire to do so.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Assemblyman, would you please give some testimony.

ASSEMBLYMAN O'CONNELL: Thank you very much,
Mr. Commissioner, members of the Commission. Thank you
for taking me out of order.

I appreciate the opportunity to be able to make a few comments. I have communicated correspondence that both Senator Gary Hart and I have sent to each of you in a letter dated August 19th.

And I really want to reiterate my concern. It has been a long-standing issue, and particularly in the Santa Barbara Channel, as Miss Dedrick accurately pointed out. And my testimony represents that also of Senator Hart and the County of Santa Barbara, and our opposition to the State Lands Commission's current seismic testing program until an environmental impact report is completed.

The State Lands Commission did grant its last extension of the seismic testing permit, in part, because

no data were available to show significant environmental impacts. And as Miss Dedrick pointed out, that now is not the case.

A study completed by the Minerals Management

Service foun that fish harvests can be cut by as much as

50 percent in some areas where seismic testing is, in fact,
taking place.

In view of this, we would like to request -Senator Hart, the County, and myself -- that you suspend
the seismic permits, as is being recommended by your
staff, until all of the data is available for public
review, and the environmental impact report is completed
and all potential impacts are adequately addressed through
the CEQA process.

The seigmic testing industry has been given the benefit of the doubt for many years now, again, as Miss Dedrick pointed out, despite indications that it should have previously triggered the CEQA process.

will agree to the protection of the environment -- should now be given that same benefit. Your decisions, as you know, certainly uniquely affect Santa Barbara County and our entire coast, and we greatly appreciate your strong support for protecting our coastal resources, and hope that we can continue to count on this Commission for

22

23

24

25

support of the matter of seismic testing in State waters.

I thank you for the chance to be with you here again today. I certainly look forward to reading your report and sharing it with those interested parties in Santa Barbara County tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you very much,
Assemblyman. Any questions of Assemblyman O'Connell by
members of the Commission?

All right. Thank you for your testimony.

ASSEMBLYMAN O'CONNELL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: And we have yours and Senator Hart's letter, and we'll make that a part of our record.

ASSEMBLYMAN O'CONNELL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you. In addition,

other members of the Legislature are represented here.

Mr. Jim Rote, representing --

MR. ROTE: Senator Keene.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Senator Keene, sir.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Senator Keek 2.

MR. ROTE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners.

My name is Jim Rote. I'm the principal consultant to the

Joint Committee on Fisheries and Aquaculture, which is

chaired by Senator Barry Keene.

Senator Keene is attending the Western

Legislative Conference meeting this week, and asked me to present his views today.

Senator Keene does represent the 2nd Senate

District, which covers the entire North Coast from the

Oregon border to Marin County, and so he's vitally

interested in this issue as well as other offshore issues

that might impact marine resources.

We were encouraged by the recent action that this Commission took to enter the lawsuit over the adequacy of the Federal Five-Year OCS Leasing Program. And in keeping with that action, we would urge the Commission today to adopt strict criteria for permitting geophysical operations in State waters.

In the interest of time, with all the other witnesses and in light of the staff recommendation, I'll just shorten my comments, and say we do concur with the requirement for a full environmental impact report before any new permits are allowed.

We do contend that insufficient information exists on the impacts of these seismic surveys on marine resources. We've had many calls from concerned fishermen, the trollers from Eureka concerned with conflicts between their vessels and seismic vessels off the Humboldt County area, calls from salmon fishermen concerned with conflicts in the timing of the salmon fishery season, calls from

sea urchin divers, processors, the impacts that the
seismic activities may have on the urchin divers and the
resource.

So, I think it is very important that you take
this action to do a full EIR. And I think I'll just leave
it at that, unless there are any questions.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you. Are there any questions by Commission members?

MR. ROTE: I'll leave some copies of the full statement if it would help.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: We'd appreciate that very much.

Thank you. It's good to see you. It's been a while.

MR. ROTE: Thank you.

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Mr. Luke Breit now, who's the chief of staff to Assemblyman Dan Hauser. Welcome, Mr. Breit. Please give us your testimony.

MR. BREIT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am

Luke Breit, and I am here representing Assemblyman Hauser,

who has just returned from Canada where he's Vice Chair of
the Pacific Fisheries Legislative Task Force.

He is in the building today, but he's wearing jeans and a T-shirt, and didn't want to appear before you, so he sent me.

(Laughter.)

MR. ROTE: You do have a letter, I believe,
Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Hauser has sent to you. And he
would like to have it read into the record. So, with
your permission, I will do so.

"Dear Chairman McCarthy and members of the Commission:

"I'm writing today to once again
to express my unequivocal opposition
to seismic testing off the Mendocino
and Humboldt Coasts and to urge the
Commission to adopt the full environmental impact statement procedure for
any future permit applications for
seismic testing anywhere in California."

I'd like to interrupt just for a second to say that
I hope you will listen carefully to testimony you will
later hear today from Norman DuVall, who's Chairman of the
Mendocino County Board of Supervisors, who has some
interesting data on the sound repercussions in the marine
environment.

Back to the letter:

"In my opinion, the State Lands
Commission has been a generally positive
force in the ongoing attempt to curb the

0

C

 Department of the Interior's voracious appetite for the California coastline and its willingness to sell off our most valuable resource to the highest bidder wrapped in the patriotic cloak of national security, that new catchall phrase for any activity that cannot be otherwise defended.

"However, it's terribly important to those people on the front lines of this battle against the oil giants and their operatives in Washington that the Commission takes a consistent position as regards the offshore oil centroversy, one that can be counted on by those thousands of people who look to your leadership.

"I believe there are sound scientific reasons to call for the full environmental impact star ments on seismic testing. The impacts on the vital North Coast fisheries, such as salmon and the lesser understood sea urchin responsible for millions of dollars into the local economies makes such studies not only reasonable, but

Ī

mandatory. But I will not shy away from the central issue, and I hope that the Commission won't shy away from it either.

\*The central issue is that seismic testing is a precursor to offshore oil development, and offshore oil development is something that the people of California have stated unequivocally that they do not want. I call on the Commission today to live up to the hope that thousands of Californians have placed in you.

"While there may be little that can legally be done to halt present testing, I would hope that you would acknowledge that the Commission made a mistake in the earlier case, and ensure that it does not repeat that mistake when present and future applications are considered.

"I hope you will join with me, with members of the Legislature and of Congress, with representatives of local government, and with the people of the

State who have taken the only responsible

position there is: Protect the coast,

preserve our great heritage."

And, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hauser also wanted me to

add that he hopes you will take another look at

Assembly Bill 284, which would add Humboldt to Mendocino

Assembly Bill 284, which would add Humboldt to Mendocino Count's -- the State waters therein -- to the moratorium on offshore oil drilling within those waters, which is a two-year bill. It will be up again in January in the Senate.

So, thank you very much for your time. Be happy to answer any questions if anybody has any.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you very much, Mr. Rote.

Any questions? No. Thank you very much.

MR. BREIT: Thank you.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Appreciate your testimony.

Now; I have a number of witnesses representing the geophysical companies. And I didn't know if you had internally discussed any particular order among yourselves as to how you wanted to set about doing this.

Are there three key spokespersons for the industry that you wanted to bring forward? Would you help us on that?

MR. FABER: Governor, my name is Robert Faber.

I'm here on behalf of the International Association of

Geophysical Contractors.

I would like to take a moment to give the Executive Officer and to each of the members of the Commission a folder which summarizes or more fully sets forth some of the testimony that we would like to give.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Does your walking to that table with such confidence indicate that this discussion has taken place, and that you are speaking for the industry at this time? Or are there other witnesses? Just to give us an idea.

MR. FABER: Yes, that is just what I was ready to address, which is to say that we have a number of people that have come from a great distance to participate in this process. We have about seven that would like -- well, we have four or five that would like to speak as part of the geophysical industry directly. And then I'm aware that there are two or three others that would also like to make a presentation.

We certainly are conscious of the time constraints and would try --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: We are also conscious of a number of Californians coming a good distance, and the inconvenience that's a part of that.

May I suggest this? We, as a Commission, are going to meet on this issue in the very near future. And

I'm going to suggest to staff that they consider October 7th, not October 6th. October 7th --

1

2

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Certainly --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: -- as the date --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: -- Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: -- so that we all have a date certain on which final action will occur on the issue that staff framed at the outset if that is the decision at this meeting of the Commission; that it would occur on October 7th.

And having said that, what I was going to suggest was that those witnesses that have come a good distance perhaps we might give preference to today. It might be more difficult for them to return the second day, a great distance. Those that are in the Sacramento region, of course, they can testify today if they have come, but perhaps they wouldn't mind deferring their testimony until October 7th.

Now, if that doesn't make a shambles of how you want to present your case, you might think of that kind of division as you go along.

Why don't you proceed.

MR. FABER: My only response is that --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: We'll leave the discretion in your hands. This is not some iron formula here. We will

. 

0E

give you the opportunity to present your case as you wish.

MR. FABER: Thank you very much, Governor.

I would just say that virtually all of the people that we have that are here are not from the Sacramento area either. And so, I think they could return at a later date to provide further information. But if we're going to limit the whole thing, we could select a few.

My request might he, though, that if you want to have the others that you were referring to give their presentation first, we can make a quick caucus and try and sort out, you know, three or so that could present our side.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Why don't you open up on your testimony first, and then you can have that caucus.

MR. FABER: Thank you very much.

Again, I represent the International Association of Goophysical Contractors. And I wanted to take a moment to identify who geophysical contractors are. There I can see there's a lot of discussion here with regard to oil industry and oil development. And I think there should be a clear distinction made between the geophysical industry and the oil industry.

The geophysical research companies are companies that do not have an interest in subsequent oil

development. Their project -- their responsibilities are
to determine what the subsurface of the Earth looks like,
what the shape of it is. And they, as a matter of
professional responsibility, do not have a monetary interest
in the subsequent development as it would arguably color
the results of the objective information that they're
trying to present.

The -- again, the study of geophysics is the study of what the subsurface of the Earth looks like. It is not a determination whether oil is down there or some other such thing. It is the science to find out what the shape of the Earth is, be it earthquake faults or otherwise, and then to turn that information over to those that can interpret that information and use it.

mind as to what geophysical research is done for. One of them — the largest commercial consumer of this type of data — is for petroleum exploration. And again, it is not a matter of being able to see whether there is or is not oil down there. You find out what the Earth looks like.

A second is for oil development. That is to say, on those leases that the Commission has already issued, the purpose of geophysical operations is to maximize the revenue to the State by determining where those pockets of oil are by what the shape of the Earth is and, therefore,

maximize the revenues, the tideland revenues, which you folks bring in on those existing leases, say, in Huntington Beach or Long Beach, or in the Santa Barbara Channel.

And they also are a key environmental defense. The point is that without good geophysical data as you're developing those leases and managing those leases, it's much harder to — it's virtually impossible to determine where casing ought to be set. The staff is involved in regulating how the drilling programs take place. And geophysical data is the data on which you have to rely to make a lot of critical decisions to make sure that you don't have an accident; that there isn't a problem.

Also, you are well aware of the Federal development on existing leases, which are in Southern California, where there is very probably going to be drainage of State oil revenues.

Geophysical data is the data that you would use on the onshore to determine what your fair share of 8(g) funding is. And, therefore, that is another purpose for which this geophysical data is used.

Eut equally important, there is a whole host of nonoil uses for this data, and we will have some people that will talk just briefly about what those are and why we do that kind of work. But it shouldn't lose sight of that there are -- are these other things. And you use the

same processes to find out this information.

A key example is: Without geo -- offshore geophysical data, we would not have known about the earthquake faults for Diablo Canyon. And therefore, this type of information is very important in protecting the environment.

I just want to take a minute, Governor, to the fact that three years ago, we had this discussion. And the question, you know, what have we done with the time that you have -- that you challenged us to do scientific studies to try and get information to deal with the issues before us.

And in that regard, we have participated in a number of those studies. We have participated in the pilot fish dispersal study down in Santa Barbara. We have participated in what is called the eggs and larvae study, which was to determine the effects of this type of activity on the eggs and larvae stage of anchovies, selected because it was representative of that type of fish.

We have participated in Zeviewing information for the Minerals Management Service study that was referred to. And we have somebody that can make -- give a little further description on that. It is known as the dispersal study, but I think as we get into it, I think it

best -- would be better called a nondispersal study, since it showed there was not dispersal.

And most recently, within the last 120-day extension, there has been a diver demonstration test, because the divers off the North Coast of California hadn't been aware of this type of activity before, and they wanted to know more information. And so, we performed a test to show that type of information.

We have participated in the engoing joint committee meetings down in the tri-county areas around Santa Barbara. We have rescheduled operations to accommodate fishing concerns. Several companies lost in excess of a million dollars last year in order to accommodate fishing schedules. And we think this is no insignificant amount, because these are small companies. These are not major oil companies.

We made an application for these permits over a year ago with the idea that we knew that it is -- it's a long process that we need to deal with. And our concern is that we find ourselves potentially in a situation where operations are going to have to cease while some new and additional studies are done.

We have participated regularly in this process.

We have responded to their request, Governor, that you asked three years ago, that we be involved in a broad spectrum

of things.

And what our story is here is we think that if additional study work needs to be done, we will participate in that process as fully as we have and even more, but we think we ought to be able to continue to operate.

That pretty much summarizes what I'm going to say. And if we have a couple of minutes, I think we can sort out two or three others.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Let me first ask if there are any other elected officials in the audience besides Supervisor DuVall? Where is Supervisor DuVall? All right, Mr. Supervisor.

Are there any other elected officials who are here to testify today?

Let me suggest that we'll break for 15 minutes. You can have your discussion. And why don't you figure out which five people will speak first. And then we'll -- the other, the opposition to your point of view is more varied and widespread. Perhaps some of them might have a discussion, too. But what I will do, in selecting opposition, is to go first to elected officials who are here, then to people like Mr. Grader, who represent significant associations of many members who have a direct interest.

And we'll try to be as fair as we can in arranging the testimony. All right. With that, we can probably get

a room for you, if you want one, across the hall. All 1 right? 2 MR. FABER: That's all right. We can take care 3 of it. CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: We'll break for 15 minutes. Thank you. ß (Thereupon, a recess was taken.) 7 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Mr. Faber, if we could have 8 your attention, please. Do I understand that there are 2 10 or 12 people in your ranks who want to speak a minute 16 each? 11 MR. FABER: Yes. 12 (Laughter.) 13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: No. 14 Assemblyman Hauser's people from Mendocino. 15 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: That's Assemblyman Hauser's 16 I'm sorry. people. 17 MR. FABER: Yes. 18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: That is not a suggestion. 19 MR. FABER: We truncated things, but not quite 20 that far. 21 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Okay. Why should I ask of 22 you what no one else in this building ever succeeds? 23 (Laughter.) 24 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: What is your preference in 25

how we proceed at this point?

.5

. 8

MR. FABER: What we included in that gray folder that we sent you, the first page is a list of folks that we specifically have as part of our presentation.

I would like to substitute one name on the bottom of the list, and make the further suggestion that, in fact, we do have a number of people -- more than five and from a substantial distance, as many of the others are. And our suggestion would be that we would put on our five. And if, in fact, the other side is going to have a lot more people, we'd like to have an opportunity to come back.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Fine. Let me first -Supervisor DuVall, are you under any time constraints?
We'd certainly welcome your testimony now if you are.
Otherwise, if it meets your personal time requirements,
we can hear from these five witnesses and then call upon
you.

SUPERVISOR DU VALL: Thank you, Mr. McCarthy.
On this issue, I'll be here as long as necessary.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Okay. All right. Mr. Faber, why don't you start.

MR. FABER: I will just -- for the sake of the record and the audience, introduce that we will have five

people at this point, and then if there's additional time and we take more testimony, there will be some others that can introduce themselves.

îE

Mr. Larry Bowles, who you heard from a few minutes ago, will come back and address the issue dealing principally with the oil development aspects of it.

Randy Ashley will be up to talk about the nonoil development aspects of this type of research.

Dr. D. Chamberlain, who represents our group but is from Arco, and has done a lot of work on these studies, will make a presentation.

Mr. Phil Ruttolph from Humboldt State University will make a presentation that deals with this diving question and the test that he participated ir.

And then we'll have B. J. Kerwam, who is counsel for the real parties in interest in the lawsuit that you are involved in with the Santa Barbara fishermen, make a presentation instead of Gary Bartlett. Gary, along that is, instead of Gary Bartlett, who is the last person on the list.

As I said, if we have additional opportunity afterwards, Gary and several others would very much like to participate.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Do you have an estimate of how much time these six witnesses together will take?

25

MR. FABER: I would anticipate between five and ten minutes each. And we'll try and keep it as short so possible.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Let's start.

MR. FABER: Thank you very much, Governor.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Mr. Bowles.

MR. BOWLES: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Sounds like the introduction of an old vaudeville show.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Let's hope this is more serious.

MR. BOWLES: I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you here, especially since -- I'm rather honored. We have enough people to field three basketball teams, and I'm on the first team.

We do have two other teams that we can shald if it becomes necessary in the interest of equity as the

I also -- like to insert that that, although I didn't know the staff recommendation to date, from the standpoint of the company specifically I'm employed by -- Geophysical Service, Inc. -- I would like the record to show that we continue to feel that the comments we made on April 25th, 1984, are valid, even with today's staff

recommendations. I'd like that reentered into the record.

Mr. Chairman, my name is Larry Bowles. I'm an employee of Geophysical Service, Inc. I'll abbreviate GSI from this point.

I'm also here today, though, on behalf of the International Association of Geophysical Contractors. I serve as Chairman of the IAGC Government Affairs Committee, and have represented my industry on ad hoc and standing committees with fishermen and representatives of the State of California and Federal agencies for over four years.

research for petroleum exploration offshore the U.S. and 85 percent of geophysical research on and offshore throughout the world.

I hope everything I say will be in complete sentences, but I have edited considerably, so I appreciate your bearing with me on it.

to 1984, when we appeared on a rather interesting social experiment with the fishermen and under these permit conditions -- I believe we made the estimate -- well, I know we made the estimate that there was between seven and nine vessels that we would anticipate to operate during the terms of the permit.

I'm sorry to say on my industry's behalf, that

that -- now we're talking about in terms of only four vessels that are operating offshore California.

ô

And that reflects, addmittedly mostly, the economic health of the industry in general. On the issue of permitting, our vessels operate in accordance with numerous State, Federal, and international laws. And we are required to obtain permits from California State Lands Commission, as you well know, the U.S. Department of Interior's Mi. erals Management Service.

Those permits are contingent on disclosure of a considerable amount of information. In fact, I — I can speak with authority, that nowhere else in the world do we disclose as much information to the public and the specific entities within the public about our plans as we do offshore California.

And where we operate -- excuse me -- about how, when and where we operate and dissemination of that information to a broad list of ocean users and managers.

Excuse me. And as in stark contrast to the flexibility and freedom from information disclosure enjoyed by fishermen.

I want to mention something about technology in our industry. Since the late 1960s, the most prevalent energy source in the world geophysical fleet -- in fact, 95 percent from a survey done in 1984, is the

pneumatic device involving controlled release of compressed air from chambers suspended aft of the vessel below the surface of the ocean.

This type of acoustic pulse generator was developed partly in response to concerns about having control of the frequency of generating acoustic energy and control of the repeatability of the parameters of energy generated so as to create good seismic record (sic).

The development was equally responsive to concerns about the potential for adverse effects of high velocity explosives on the natural environment. We have also made advances in the hydrophone streamer that result, however, in a very sizable investment, represented in each streamer of one and a half million dollars or more.

A given survey -- excuse me -- because of -- okay a given survey just occupies space for a short amount of time. And because of that relatively short duration and because of the nonintrusive methodologies used, geophysical research for petroleum exploration has little or no lasting impact on fish or fishing.

Finding petroleum resources is not an exact science. It involves the application of a number of sciences and technologies, geophysical research just being one of them, along with the training and experience of explorationists and risk capital.

1 2

And as I'm sure you can appreciate, one man's dry hole might be another man's wildcat recov-- discovery. Proprietary technology as applied by one service company -- and, in fact, the competitive market situation is a considerable part of the factor that there has been an advance in technology that there has beer.

I want to talk about a timing of our role in relation to offshore petroleum activities. Geophysical research can precede the offering of leases, as most of you know; serve the leaser — the minerals manager, in this case, the State Lands Commission, for resource and bid evaluation, and the lessee for evaluating prospects and determining levels of bid before drilling.

The data we provide also assists in proper and safe exploration drilling and then development in the event of a commercial viable discovery. In fact, in the last two years in the United States, offshore and onshore, 70 percent of the amount of expenditures in the petroleum industry for geophysics has been in the application of geophysics to development, safe -- and resource conservation and cost-controlled use of geophysical data (sic).

It has been a busy and productive journey,
Mr. Chairman, since this Commission issued permits to my
industry in May of 1984. In fact, at that time, you,

Governor McCarthy, expressed the belief that cooperation and communication among my industry and other ocean users would continue to progress.

And I'm pleased to say progress has continued, as is chronicled in the attached document, which is part of your materials that are in the folders that Bob Faber gave you, a list that looks like this (exhibiting document).

Let me point out that it just so happened -- we didn't do it deliberately -- but it just so happens the items on the first page lead up to the May, 1984 issue of permits. And the next two pages are items that have occurred since them.

As Bob Said, we have been very busy. We've been working with the fellow ocean users, especially focusing on the commercial fishermen. Communications was the key ingredient and key to negotiating and selection of spokesmen that truly represented the interest of each parties (sic). The IAGC designated a representative. In fact, I was that representative until about a year ago, at which time Gary Bartlett took my place.

And the petroleum companies operating in the area designated their representatives. From that step, there was formed a formal negotiating group, called the joint committee, composed of five representatives of five different commercial fisheries, four representatives of

petroleum companies, and one representative of the geophysical research community.

I won't go into detail about the dynamics of that community (sic), but I am sharing with you in the folder an article that was produced that describes the dynamic process, and indeed, making the point that is a very unique social experiment that has — has had considerable advantages, but admittedly, there have been some problems in working with such a large group over such a diversity of issues.

Additionally, the joint committee agreed to establish a liaison office, staffed with a professional who has experience in fisheries to facilitate communications, recommend measures to avoid and minimize conflicts and facilitate education and improved understanding among all parties involved.

One tool for accomplishing that goal was the development of an operational manual (exhibiting manual), which describes not only our operations, but fishing operations, so that our people can be as educated about the different kinds of activities that commercial fishermen carry out, as we would like them to be educated about our operations, so we have a better understanding of how we operate and the constraints that we operate under.

The joint committee has -- has negotiated several

things. Among them, was -- resulted in the joint committee recommending to this Commission in -- prior to the issuance of permits in May of 1984 -- that there be a system of notification, and that the -- the permits continue under those -- those kinds of considerations. And they have been.

I'm pleased to say that no less than a worthy -
I won't say opponent -- but another person that's going
to speak today -- Mr. Zeke Grader has testified before the

U. S. Congress that the present notification process in

California appears to be working satisfactorily.

The joint committee even requested that the notification process -- apologize -- as I said, I'm not good at editing within a very short time. I've said that before.

But I do want to point out that there has been a continued interest on the part of the joint committee to proceed in a spirit so that the main parties of concernant that is two economic or business entities that are having space use conflicts — can proceed in a manner that — bilaterally negotiate. And because of that reason, they have submitted a letter to the Commission, which I believe a copy is in your folder, recommending that the G and G permits be issued under the existing permit conditions.

In addition to the communication between the

fishermen, FAGC members have helped finance the Marine Advisory Newsletter. And in that rewsletter is not only information about activities of geophysical research, but activities about laying pipelines, platforms, fishermen's marketing techniques, fishermen's fishing techniques, and general information about public policy that affects not only minerals resources, but fishery resources.

And I understand it is a very valuable tool for many people. We've jointly financed that in the past, and I assume we'll continue that.

Next issue is the -- are we having an effect on fish and fisheries? The preponderance of the breadth of literature, which Dr. Chamberlain will talk more about from the standpoint of his scholarly background, is these issues show no significant harm resulting from the use of compressed air type of acoustic pulse generator.

I brought only a few here. (Exhibiting documents)

And I will point out that I'm not putting anything on this
table that's not before the staff. The exceptions are
in your folders.

One researcher, Les Trasky of the Alaska

Department of Fish & Game, in a report on environmental impacts of seismic exploration, stated that the type of energy produced by the so-called air guns has been

1 d

\_

demonstrated to be relatively harmless to fish and other aquatic organisms, while producing good seismic record (sic).

Mr. Trasky went on to say, quote, "The use of a source of this nature would guarantee that fish kills would not occur under any circumstances and would eliminate the necessity for excluding certain areas from all seismic exploration."

IAGC members agree that our operations do not adversely affect our environment. We also desire to operate in the spirit of community with the fishermen. For that reason, our industry entered into an extraordinary social experiment to resolve disputes that involve nonpartisan experts, consultation, scientific investigation, and objective appraisal of the facts followed by consensual resolution of the issues.

One study dealing with a claim about affecting fish and shellfish distribution — that is, dispersal — has been conducted with the joint financial support from all parcies involved. The study showed none of the assertions of dramatic gross behavioral changes by the species were a fact, and there was not a clear causal relationship between the seismic research acoustic energy source and fish behavior.

The so-called pilot study, as I say, is in possession of the staff. That study was cofunded. There

were fishermen -- commercial fishermen who worked with the study. And so, there was in-kind support on their part, and approximately \$450,000 on the part of my industry.

Another concern was potential harm to eggs and larval life stages. It is presently under investigation through the same consensual approach described above.

And there was a public statement released about -well, I'm sorry, I don't have the date -- anyway,
announcing that the group was going to go through a
consensual process and do this study.

It has been done. There is a press release presently being negotiated to be released. The study will be made available imminently.

Let me point out who -- who is în this consensual negotiations cî these scientific inquiries. It involves commercial fishermen -- there are two representatives. It involves -- in fact, Mr. Zeke Grader is one of them. It involves myself, representing the International Association of Geophysical Contractors, and Mr. D. Chamberlain, who represents the Western Oil & Gas Association.

And, Mr. McCarthy, I know this isn't something that you necessarily remember, but you were the one that -- that helped draft us for that position three years ago.

1

2

5

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I want you to know that we're continuing in service and, hopefully, we'll retire with full benefits.

The American Petroleum Institute and the California State Lands Commission have already funded one phase of the complex steps required to adequately address this issue. In fact, I think, to the tune of about \$200,000 combined. And efforts are progressing to study -for additional studies. That one was dealing with vertebrate fish. And next, we're going to focus on invertebrate, the dungeness crab.

The next phase of studies, by the way, are being funded by, I believe, 8(g) settlement funds.

On this issue, I've had the pleasure of working with Dr. Joyce Bradley of your staff. And I want to say that she has done a fine job of helping us understand the Lands Commission's interest and finding resources for support of our science investigation,

Besides the people I've mentioned, there's also a representative of the State Fish & Game Department, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the Minerals Management Service. And negotiations are facilitated by Mediation Institute, and then we also have the liaison officer that I mentioned earlier as a technical adviser. as well as the marine adviser, Mr. Richards.

On this -- our continuing commitment to scientific

investigations and the space use accommodations are a part of an important relationship between two ocean users, business entities who must continue to nurture that relationship through, through times of bliss and times of stress, so that each can continue to serve their roles in our society.

The trade association I represent is proud to have been a part of these roble social experiments and to share our successes with the fishermen and regulatory agencies involved.

We want to continue to progress in our relationships with our fellow mariners. We also appreciate the recognition by the State Lands Commission that avoidance of conflicts between the offshore geophysical research community and fishermen requires all parties to work at using the notification procedures, following navigational rules and, above all, communicating.

We -- we continue our commitments. Besides

continued participation in consensual science investigations,

participation with the joint committee, and communication/

education measures, and the measures described in the

State Lands Commission and Federal permits, is the formation

of an industrywide petroleum industry/fisheries task force.

That task force, among other things, has produced a video, which we use as part of our educational program.

And this video was produced in cooperation with some of the commercial fishermen that operate in the Santa Barbara Channel.

In addition to that, we have participated in the major commercial fishermen's trade show, called "Fish Expo". We have participated on both coasts. They alternate coasts. And we have participated in both coasts. And have also had the pleasure, quote, of participating in panels — panel discussions with all different vested interested groups involved. And, again, among those people that I participated with is Mr. Zeke Grader,

This video (exhibiting video cassette), by the way, was at the cost of the industry of about \$52,000.

With regards to marine mammals, we conform to the law and additionally participate in research to assure our evolving technology and operations procedures do not adversely impact marine mammals.

Of particular interest to offshore California are the gray whale and the California sea otter. Our industry -- in Sact, my company, has furnished a geophysical vessel some rears to participate in government-sponsored research of those two species at a cost of about \$150,000.

I have a copy of one of those reports (exhibiting document). And, again, the staff has a copy of this. In

addition, there was another one on sea otters. This one's on the gray whale.

I want to point out that -- that in -- and there's nothing to contradict this statement in either one of those reports -- it is important to note that the geophysical research community has been conducting operations offshore California regularly since the early fifties.

And during that time, the gray whale has continued to increase in population to an estimate of -- in excess of 15,000 dollars (sic). That's based on the national agency that's responsible for that.

California sea otters were the subject of this research involving a fully operational vessel, the GSI vessel I mentioned. The scientists directed the vessel to within about a half a mile of the otters, which were observed to continue feeding, playing, and mating, apparently unconcerned.

benefit considerably from our industry's activities.

Without the data shared with them at nominal expense, it would have cost several millions of revenue dollars to -for vessel, equipment, and people to collect the same data.

The adverse effects of denying geophysical and

geological permits on State waters, in my view, a de facto moratorium, are loss of jobs, jeopardy of millions of dollars invested in faith that our elected and appointed officials would effect the purposes and goals of mineral resource acts, revenue, and projects for the public good.

Specifically, the things that we are concerned about -- we hope don't happen -- are loss of jobs in California and other States. A jeopardy of expenditures of three to five million dollars by our crews in support of our crews to California vendors. A less of remaining capacity of offshore geophysical research for the U.S. West Coast due to the rationalization of the fleet (sic) resulting in continued deployment -- remember, I said we -- we were at nine and now we're down to four -- outside the USA or mothballing, or even, or even dismantling. And those things have occurred.

We have even had companies just flat go out of business out here.

There would be a cessation of data for minerals resource management by the State Lands Commission. Bob Faber mentioned some of this, regards 8(g) tracts and safe production in existing leases.

And a loss, depending on how long the Horatorium might last, of up to \$40 million in future contract sales to our industry.

1 2

-

In summation, there are numerous benefits to local, State, and Federal Governments, a large variety of small and midsized companies in California and throughout the U.S., petroleum companies, yes, and fishermen, and to the general public resulting from offshore geophysical research activities.

There are significant adverse effects to those entities when safe, environmentally sound offshore petroleum activities are aborted because of denying operational permits.

Our industry does not adversely affect our environment. And with respect to being good neighbors, we have made significant progress with commercial fishermen to resolve their real and perceived concerns about the interactivities of our business endeavors.

We are committed to continue our efforts, and hope to do so within the context of government policies that engender a spirit of opportunities for bilateral and multilateral conflict resolution, rather than inequitable application of public policy.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something I've been holding back for some time. Mineral Management Services has issued a report. Dr. Chamberlain will be reviewing this somewhat. But I'm going to be reviewing it from the standpoint of a man who works for a geophysical

company.

奪

And I read a lot of reports. I want to point out, first of all, that this report -- although it doesn't state such -- is actually in two volumes. And part of the misunderstanding about what's in this report is that it does not -- when someone asks for a copy of it, they don't get the second volume, which describes the acoustic physics of the situation.

But -- and staff does have this report, and has had it as long as I have, to have reviewed it. Let me make my comments. And I'll try to be brief. But this is a, I think, a key issue. It's been mentioned already.

The title of the report is, "Effects of Sounds from a Geophysical Survey Device on Fishing Success."

The word dispersal is not even in the title. 's not even in the preface.

There's some general comments. What it is, it's an observation of fish behavior associated with a catch success and reaction to and during the use of an acoustic pulse generator in a contrived and unrealistic manner.

What it is not: It is not a report of effects of acoustic pulse generators operated in a manner used by the seismic exploration research fleet and those who have come before you with an application.

It is not an environmental effects report. It is

not a sufficient report on the phenomenon of fish behavior that affect catch success, nor the environmental variables that affect them. It is not a report on the usual practices of the commercial fisheries.

That's stated in the report. It is not a report on the effects on catch success or the reported manner of operating acoustic pulse generator (sic).

Now, I'll say what it is not. And after making those general comments, some of you may -- may feel like that it sounds like we're about to enter into Lewis Carroll's Wonderland through Alice's Looking Glass, and perhaps we are.

But if you'll bear with me, maybe we'll find out the Cheshire Cat has some wisdom for us. First of all, was the APG presented — acoustic pulse generator presented in an unrealistic manner? It was. In fact, what they did was — and I have determined through a careful, considerate survey to find out nobody conducts geophysical research like this.

They found a fish plume. They steamed over it.

They used the pulse generator, and steamed around it for

85 minutes. I found no one that operates geophysical

research in that manner.

Let's compare some characteristics that result from that. They used 10-second pulse frequencies. We use

12. That's about the same.

They steamed at one knot. We steam in five knots. That means right there that they're going to have more pulses in a given space than we would under operational conditions.

Translate that over 85 minutes, and you get
510 pulses impacting on the fish; whereas, we would
probably have 10 or maybe as many as 30 if we were doing
a concentrated detail survey called 3-D.

In my opinion, basing a permit or effects judgment on such a situation as analogous to judging a small landscaping reflection pond should not be built, because a pond 25 to 50 times the size might have an environmental effect.

Some incidental observations of environmental effects out of the study, though, are, for example: Even though they steamed around as I described, and there were three different set lines or fishing periods, there was no fish mortality, there was no damage to the fish, and the fish did not disperse.

There is an issue about the variability -- I mentioned the variability of the -- of the fish being the phenomenon called on or off the bite. There was -- there is day-to-day variability. That's in the basic literature. And, in fact, it's in the data in the report.

ŷ

In fact, there's data -- there's variability
from line set to line set. And these kinds of variabilities
justify that there should be what's called paired data, at
least emissions or tests where the acoustic pulse
generator paired on the same day with a control test.
That wasn't done much. And that's a problem.

There was no time variable analysis. They didn't set antecedent catch conditions. They only fished while either the controlled situation, where the pulse generator was not being used or when it was being used, and they did not fish subsequent to that use to determine if the fish returned to the bite in some time frame afterwards. They stopped fishing when they stopped pounding on them.

The real situation of fishing methods. The authors expressed concern that the 80 hooks -- that the 80 hooks they used were not sufficient to sample the plume study during the trials.

The authors also state that the contrived situation was not reflective of the real practice of fishermen in terms of fishing efficiency. Now, let's reflect on this. The acoustic pulse generator was not presented in a realistic manner. In fact, it was presented in a surrealistic manner.

The fishing was not done in a realistic manner.

Okay. We have entered Alice's Looking Glass. I admit it.

But let's see what, if any, there is some wisdom in this. Besides the acoustic pulse generator, the data presented express a variability of catch among the three set lines deployed during the trials. Now, there, in itself, is a stimulus to the fish. The data showed that the diminished catch success between the first set line and the second set line for all but two species was more substantial within the controls than the difference between the emission and controls.

And rather than read this whole thing -- in other words, the most effective stimulus for diminishing the catch was the appearance of the fishermen's line.

This was not given sufficient test, and it was not given sufficient reporting, nor was there reporting on the implications to the wasult and conclusions of that particular planomenon.

Now, let's look at day-to-day catch variability. When date paired trials were done -- and I said there weren't many -- emissions and controls on the same day -- 30 percent of the time, the main catch during emissions while they were pulsing exceeded that during controls.

Other dates showed little difference. Large differences did result in some days, but there were significant differences in the depths to bottom of those

emissions versus controls.

Within days when there were more than one trial conducted (sic), there was diminished catch over the day, even within the controls. This suggests, as I say, in the report itself, that there are variabilities in this on or off the bite phenomenon that were not tested.

There were some depth preference of some species.

The authors reported on the depth preference apparent in their species specific data, and even the flaring, arising towards the surface of one species called chili pepper.

They did not report, though there is data in the report that supports this -- they did not report how that reality could affect the results and conclusions, considering the paucity of depth pairing of emissions and controls trials.

Chili pepper, which accounted for 63 percent of the total catch -- which accounted for 63 percent of the total catch from control trials and Bocaccio, which accounted for another 11 percent of the total catch from control trials, was more abundant in catches in trials conducted at depths to bottom greater than 60 fathoms.

In fact, chili pepper at depths around 70 fathoms. On those dates, where those depths -- and -- depths and day trials were done -- emissions and controls on the same depths and days, there were only two. It turns out

that on those two, the mean catch of emissions exceeded that of the mean catch of controls.

The authors did not report the effect on results and conclusions of this phenomenon in the data, nor do they report that this suggests the study was fatally flawed.

Now, as we return to reality through Alice's Looking Glass, I take exception to the staff recommendation for delineating a division among geophysical research on the basis, I quote, "low energy acoustical c passive data collection equipment should be allowed to proceed insofar as staff has been presented no evidence such activity has an adverse effect on the environment," end quote.

Since the staff is in possession of information that shows geophysical research, kilojoules or whatever, has no adverse effect on the environment.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Bowles.

Any questions by members of the Commission of Mr. Bowles?

Thank you very much.

Mr. Faber, let me indicate, my thought was -and I think the other two Commissioners agree -- that we
were going to let your side testify for an hour first,
and then, in fairness, we were going to turn to the other

side.

2

3

4

5

ß

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So far, your side has taken about 40 minutes.

So, whatever witnesses you wish to present at this point,
we'll give another 20 minutes. Then we'll hear an hour
from the other side. And then we can go back to any
additional witnesses you may have.

MR. FABER: That will be fine, Governor.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTEY: All right. Now, is Dr. Chamberlain up next? Or Mr. Ashley?

MR. FABER: Mr. Ashley is going to be next.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Or Mr. Buttolph?

MR. ASHLEY: Mr. Chairman, my name is Randy Ashley.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Mr. Ashley.

MR. ASHLEY: I will make this very, very brief, as opposed to Mr. Bowles, who had much more information to put on the table than I do.

I represent and work for a company in San Diego.

It's a California corporation called Palagos. We are
a small bysiness by every definition of the word, and we
have been located there for about ten years.

The specific point that I'd like to make right now, very briefly and very generally, is that the work performed by about half of the people that are applying for these permits, a significant amount of work that they

perform is for nonoil related activities.

A lot of the work is, granted, going to be covered by the low power systems that have -- by staff -- suggested to be exempt from or being issued under a new permit.

However, there is a fair amount of the work that is going to be required of systems above the two kilojoule range that they talk about. Two main items are power plant type studies. Mr. Faber discussed the seismicity or earthquake studies around conventional and nuclear power plants.

And the other and more significant one is the requirements for engineering design around sewer outfalls. Right now, EPA is requiring, as you probably know, all up and down the California coast an upgrading of all sewer outfalls. Some of them have been completed. Some of them are just now in the initial stages. All of these sewer outfalls require systems above two kilojoules to adequately design these facilities.

Without the permits to run systems above the two kilojoules, it's going to be an interesting conflict as to how local municipalities are going to be wife to comply with EPA requirements without being able to design the actual outfall facilities.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I'm going to ask the staff

to respond to these specific things that are being raised now. So --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICE: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Go ahead,

Mr. Ashley.

MR. ASHLEY: There are a lot of other activities. However, I won't go into them specifically, because very few times do they require the systems above the two kilojoule range. Some of these just -- that may would be any design besides the sewer outfalls. For instance, jetties, piers, all of these things do require subbottom information of these systems.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Commissioner Tucker has a question.

COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Can you very briefly describe what the process is that you go through to conduct that kind of study, where you do it in relation to the outfall or jetty, marina, et cetera?

MR. ASHLEY: In the instance of a sewer outfall, usually there's a location that has been selected based on oceanographic parameters; that is, the circulation of the water for dispersing the effluent, the temperature -- of being able to keep this stuff at levels below the actual ocean surface.

Once the general location is determined, a company

like Palagos will be hired to run first a fairly regional study to see where major hazards, such as faults or whatever, may occur which would prevent the location of the outfall at that location.

Once the proliminary location has been designed or been selected, then a more detailed design study is performed along that specific route. So, let's say, for instance, in San Diego right now there is a proposed outfall that'll run from the beach just north of the border out to approximately four and a half miles offshore right into the Federal waters. And that's based on basic oceanographic and bathometric conditions.

There's going to have to be about a 30-square mile area that is surveyed to look for just the regional type geologic conditions before they can actually site the specific route that that outSall will take.

COMMISSIONER TUCKER: That involves the same kind of instrumentation -- same kind of instrumentation as studies you would do to determine where oil is located?

MR. ASHLEY: It'll require the same instruction to a point. The oil is based looking at where -- through some very large regional studies up front, using a much more powerful system. They decide what may be target dopths. Once those target depths are found -- for instance, we've just done a more recent study for oil

exploration where they've targeted it at maybe some shallower depths than what they would nermally. Those same tools that would be used — that we used in that case for oil exploration would be the exact same tools that are going to be required to locate the sewer outfall.

COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Are there any of these projects that are now going on and, if not, when is the next one -- or when is one planned?

MR. ASHLEY: The one in San Diego is ongoing. The oceanographic studies have been conducted or being conducted right now, and they've been in place for over a year. The actual geophysical survey has been postponed three times waiting for the outcome of the oceanographic study. So, to say that it's going to be done next month versus six months from now, I don't hink that's been actually decided.

There are more studies that are being planned up near the Monterey Coast, and I'm not sure what the time scale is on those.

COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Thank you,

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I have a question. What tests are being performed in connection with any of the existing nuclear power plants along the coast?

MR. ASHLEY: There -- PG & E has just performed a test at Diablo Canyon looking for the regional -- in this

case, the major plate boundaries in the Earth and how they may affect the actual seismicity at that place.

San Onofre has also done that, and is feasibly going to do that again in the next couple of years, related, again, to nuclear safety, and whether or not the plant should be reissued their permits to continue operating and whether or not they meet the criteria under which they were built -- actually will be reevaluated to see if the potential for earthquake is larger than what they were actually built --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Are those tests performed under requirement of the Federal Government?

MR. ASHLEY: The -- that's right. I'm not quite sure about the nuclear power plants. The nuclear power plants --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: The nuclear power plants is what I'm asking about.

MR. ASHLEY: On the nuclear power plant they have to show that — they are being reevaluated for the seismic conditions under which they were designed and then built. Specifically in California, we're talking Diablo Canyon and San Onofre. If, through those evaluations, it is decided that they do not meet the — the potential for an earthquake there, say, is 7.5. I'm using this as just a relative term. I'm not sure it is or it isn't.

And they were designed for a 6.5, then they would have to upgrade that facility to meet what is the current interpretation of the major earthquake that occur (sic) in their vicinity.

And those are all based upon reevaluating and collecting new seismic data as the state of the art improves.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Is your company involved in doing those tests for the nuclear power plants?

MR. ASHLEY: No, we are not. But I said there was not --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Are there any companies here who are?

MR. ASHLEY: I don't -- I don't believe so. The one that was done for Pacific Gas & Electric was done about six months ago, and I don't believe there's anybody here --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I think we have to take a very careful look at that and find out whether or not those tests are required by Federal law or what the policy reasons are for the tests being undertaken. Moose, do you have some information on this?

MR. THOMPSON: I believe Mr. Willard can comment.

I think PG & E has requested some seismic data from us
recently.

24

25

MR. WILLARD: Yes, PG & E has contacted us and asked --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: The other one (speaking of microphone).

MR. WILLARD: Oh. Here we go. PG & E has contacted our office in Long Beach and asked to review and share some of the public information that we have available that's been collected within the three-mile zone there. And we are making that available to PG & E. That's existing data.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: This testing would occur immediately adjacent to nuclear power plants mentioned, or for a good stretch of the coast?

MR. THOMPSON: It could be both, because they're trying to evaluate a regional trend, and the recent faulting activities in the area.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: What does the regional trend mean? What distance are we talking about? How much of the coast?

MR. ASHLEY: I think on something -- I'm not sure about the exact distance. Someplace like --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Loughly.

MR. ASHLEY: -- Diablo Canyon, where you're dealing with a major fault, like the San Andreas type faults --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: The fault could go all the up to the Oregon border.

MR. ASHLEY: You've got to look along the trend of that fault, which may run offshore there -- maybe Allen knows a little better -- at least along a 15 or 20-mile stretch of that coast. And you've got to look at movement that has occurred within that time, both historically and particularly for recent.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Well, we need some information on this.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Now, what about the other

piece that Commissioner Tucker was asking about? Does

staff have any comment on that?

MR. THOMPSON: I would also like to get into this for this environmental assessment issue. We have made an arbitrary cutoff that we thought was reasonable.

You have indicated that you need a higher energy level. Could you get into a little more depth on that?

And are you looking for -- how many feet of penetration, some specifics like that.

MR. ASHLEY: That, as you know, is a function -how much power you need is really a function of the
geology in that location, someplace where -- you're dealing

in kilojoules. The industry very seldom deals in that,

You're dealing with actually the pressure waves, so we call them bar.meters (pronouncing). The equivalent of a couple kilojoules that you're talking about is less than one barmeter. In some cases, we need to go up to 10 to maybe 20 barmeters of pressure, which is well within the range of some of the deep exploration programs that -- that are being discussed here.

It further depends on what level that you really are trying to target, the geology that you're looking at for potential crustal movement. If you're looking at someplace like Diablo Canyon where you're looking at a large transform fault maybe down 20,000 feet below the surface, you're going to need a fair amount of power.

Some places, other, you're looking for recent stuff, and granted, a 2 kilojoule system may -- may be adequate.

MR. THOMPSON: Could we separate this into two -- t issues? The environmental assessment for something like a sewer outfall, is that the two poule -- kilojoule realistic for that?

MR. ASHLEY: Not necessarily. Again, that depends on the geology -- for instance, I was saying, in San Diego, the two kilojoule system I don't feel would be adequate. Talking joules again, you'd have to talk the equivalent of

10 to 20,000 joules to get the type of geology and geologic information that's going to be necessary there for design.

MR. THOMPSON: Again, is this only when you relate it to try and find the active fault systems versus a shallow description of the beds?

MR. ASHLEY: Primarily. There's other information that needs to be got at depth. But for things like a sewer outfall, they are not as critical as it would be for a nuclear power plant.

MR. THOMPSON: So, there would be a possibility to find more specifically where those higher energy levels would be necessary?

MR. ASHLEY: I think it could be if you were to look at it on a location-by-location basis. You could define them for each location. I don't think you could do it generically for the entire State.

MR. THOMPSON: But more location by location than -- thank you.

that the issue is one that we can pursue best by some meetings with these people on these specific issues. Al Willard has a good deal of information here. And I wanted to ask, Al, can you respond directly to Commissioner Tucker's question more directly, that is to say, than these

discussions have already elicited, or -- pardon? 1 MR. WILLARD: I think we need to get together 2 with --3 FXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: May I suggest that we do that in the period between meetings? 5 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Fine. The questions that have come up this moment are the variety of applications of these testing -- nuclear power plant safety, oil, sewage outfalls -- any others? We need to know whether there are any other 10 laws -- Federal or State -- that require this testing, 11 or whether we have wide discretion, what conflicts there 12 may be with any legal requirement that an EIR is required 13 14 for high energy testing, however we define that. And we should also know if there are such situations, where they 15 geographically coincide with heavy commercial fishing 16 interests along the coast, so we can try to sensibly and 17 fairly address these issues. 18 19 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: We will do that. 20 Mr. Chairman. 21 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Any other questions of this -- do you have some more testimony? 22 MR. ASHLEY: Just briefly. I'd like to state I 23 know that -- in quickly looking at the staff report, 24

recommendation of exempting the less than two kilojoule

25

definition here of systems. There are a lot of applications also under that. If the two kilojoule exemption were not considered to be valid, the list gets very long in things that are required of the low-power systems. And this gets down into things like pipeline inspections. The list can go on forever. I won't enumerate it right now. But I'm sure that was one of the reasons why trying to -- to actually put a cap on that -- but without -- if it were to be a total exemption of all geophysical activity, there would be a lot of conflict with like dredging studies with the Corps of Engineers. The list goes on and on.

For the sake of time, I will take leave now, and not have any more to say about that.

I would like to in turn introduce the next speaker. As probably a lot of you know, we have recently -- were involved in a survey up in Northern California where there was some concerns raised by divers, and the effect of seismic activity on divers.

A very quick research of existing literature and studies by ourselves and our clients led us to believe that with the output of power that we were having in our specific instance now, that we would have minimal effect on the divers.

During our meetings, we have agreed to conducting

what -- I want to make it very clear -- were diver demonstrations. They were not rigorously planned testing. They were to show that we could come within a reasonable distance of divers, where on one end people were talking that you'd have to stay several tens of miles away, and other people saying that you didn't have to stay at all.

And so, there was a -- we felt -- a realistic distance that we could -- for that specific instance -- operate within a certain distance of divers. And that distance was to be determinded by these demonstrations.

We set up --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Let me indicate at this point that this will be the last witness for this side of the argument in this segment, and then we're going to start to call upon witnesses from the other side.

MR. ASHLEY: You're saying the next fellow up?
CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Pardon?

MR. ASHLEY: The person I'm going to introduce -CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: You can call up the witness.

I just want to indicate the witness you're about to name
will be the last witness in this segment on your side of it.

All right. Go ahead, please, Mr. Ashley.

MR. ASHLEY: Okay. And with -- very briefly, we set up a program where we invited the -- in this case, the urchin divers to have somebody in the water and also to have

1 a neutral diver in the water.

2

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In short, it came down to two divers were in the water. One was actually a Palagos employee. We do -- we're involved in a fair amount of diving activity. And the neutral diver was the diving safety officer from Humboldt State University.

Phil Buttolph -- excuse me, Phil, for mispronouncing your name. But Phil is here to not represent our
point of view, but to just relay to you his observations
from being an independent neutral party in this. Phil?

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Is it Mr. Buttolph or Mr. Buttolph (pronouncing)?

MR. BUTTOLPH: You pronounced it correctly first, Governor, Buttolph.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Buttolph.

MR. BUTTOLPH: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you.

MR. BUTTOLPH: Well, Buttolph. But that's close enough. Buttolph. I'll answer to Phil.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right.

MR. BUTTOLPH: Okay.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Go ahead, please.

MR. BUTTOLPH: Governor, members of the Commission, I'd like to make one thing clear on the onset.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

As stated, I am not a proponent or an advocate for any position. In fact, throughout the original demonstration and at this hearing, I am donating my time. They have provided transportation for me to attend the hearings. But my time is my time, and it's not on State time, as I happen to be one of your employees also.

As diving safety officer at Humboldt State
University, I have dove in that area where they conducted
the demonstration since 19 -- not as diving safety officer,
but as a diver since 1964.

I've been diving -- just to qualify myself -- for 33 years. I've been diving safety officer at that university for eight years, conducted various research projects in that area, and have first-hand knowledge of the area that's utilized by the urchin divers.

On August the 27th, I was approached by the Department of Fish & Game employee, Pete Calvis, and then by Mike Bell of Palagos, asking me if I would substitute at a last minute -- the dive was to go off on the 28th, which is Saturday morning -- for a diver who could not make it, and be an independent observer of an underwater demonstration of a sound source that was brought into us on the bottom.

We went in the water at about 7:22. And for approximately seven minutes -- excuse me -- 70 minutes we

were on the bottom while the vessel -- I believe it was the Tampa Seahorse -- was brought, according to Department of Fish & Game report, within two-tenths of a mile of our position.

At that time -- and at another point, it also approached within a quarter of a mile. The only time that I could perceive or hear of any soun! at all underwater, other than the background and ambient noise, was, I believe, at 3:10 or 8:09, after we had gone down at 7:22, and just before the conclusion of the test.

And at that level, at the only time that I could perceive it, it was such a faint source that I had to actually remove the regulator from my mouth, which was partially malfunctioning, and hold my breath, and listen very intently for a very faint, far away metallic pinging sound, and which was cycling approximately every ten seconds.

I might add -- and just it hasn't already been offered (sic) -- that the lead diver was from Palagos, and his name was Al Bruten. I was there, again, just to collaborate or corroborate, I should say, his observations.

We concluded the dive after 70 minutes, and surfaced, and recorded our observations. And I also sent them a report. And I'd be glad to answer any questions as to my subjective opinion of the situation (sic).

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Yes, Commissioner.

. 1

COMMISSIONER STANCELL: Do you know what level they were using when you were under?

MR. BUTTOLPH: Well, sir, prior to saying I would go on this, I qualified it by checking what the power of the source would be. And I was told that the source was, in their terms, approximately 200 cubic inches, which was purportedly a very small -- a small sound-generating source.

Pete Calvis, the Fish & Game employee on board the vessel, was to substantiate that, in fact, they were sustaining that power output as they moved in on us, plus also the positioning.

I might add that Al Bruton had constructed, albeit, a quantitative scale of a rather subjective analysis. Obviously, we were just listening for this. And it was on a scale of one to ten. Ten being we had to get out of the water, because it was impinging on our safety. And number one was the first audible indication of a signal. It never went over, in my estimation, a 1.5 or a 2. It was -- just had to listen like the devil to hear it at all.

may, I think -- are you looking, Mr. Stancell, for a kind of a number to relate to the two kilojoules versus 20?

7

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

Mark Meier has just indicated to me that the number was in the range of 30 to 40 kilojoules; is that correct? MR. ASHLEY: Yeah.

> MR. MEIER: Mr. Ashley will probably have --EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Okay. I'm sorry.

MR. ASHLEY: Okay. That's correct. The system -like I said in my testimony, we discussed things in terms of barmeters, which is the amount of pressure at one meter away from the source.

This source varies between four and seven barmeters, where roughly a barmeter is equivalent to 10 kilojoules. So, we're talking in the 40 to 70,000 joule range that we were using for this program, which, as I also stated, was -- was targeted for oil exploration. There is a fair amount of oil exploration done in that -in that power range.

Granted, there's a lot done at a lot higher power, but this is a typical power there, too.

MR. BUTTOLPH: I might also add that I made two recommendations, which your staff has access to, on the conclusion of the study. And if you have any other questions, I'd be glad to answer them.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Any questions? No. you very much, Mr. Buttolph.

MR. BUTTOLPH: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Supervisor Norman DeVall.

And then I'm going to call upon Mr. Richard

Charter, and then I'm going to call upon Mr. Zeke Grader.

SUPERVISOR DE VALL: Mr. Chairman, my name is Norman DeVall, and this year I'm the Chairman of the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors.

On a 5-0 vote yesterday, they send you the following letter, copies of which I will leave with your staff and for the record.

"Dear Mr. Chairman and members:

"The Mendocino County Board of
Supervisors wishes to extend its concern
regarding the environmental impact of
seisnic survey activity off the Mendocino
County coast, and requests that an
environmental impact report be required
before any -- underlined -- i.e. low level
or high level testing general permit
authority is issued by your Commission.

"Numerous complaints and statements of concern have been received during the last two months while seismic surveys were conducted off the coast. Reported scarcity of fish in known productive areas, and a total and complete abandonment

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

Mendocino and Elk have been noted. We further request that local governments be a part of the planning process and that all relative staff reports be made available in a timely manner to local governments for their review and input.

"We are chagrined to note that as of September 21st, Monday of this week, in the A.M., that the staff report was not yet public."

In fact, it was not made public until the beginning of this meeting at about eleven o'clock this morning.

"Lastly, we request that an EIR consider the impacts of seismic survey activity on sea urchins throughout their life span and on sea urchin divers. Your favorable response to this request would be much appreciate."

And that is the action and minute order of the Board of Supervisors. And I'll make copies available.

On a personal note, I would like to extend my concern to the Commission on what we're talking about. The

last speakers have been focusing on the differences between the impacts -- the sound impacts of cubic inches, barmeters, and what is called a kilojoule.

James Prescott Joule lived from 1810 to 1890. He was an interesting individual. And a joule can be expressed as a unit of energy. At best, if you want to relate it to sound, one watt, at best, will equal about 126 decibels -- plus or minus -- per second.

2,000 watts of energy equal about 153 decibels.

A jet aircraft taking off at the end of the runway will generate about 160 decibels of sound.

In their report prepared in June of 1987, by

Bottell Marine Resource Laboratory and BBN Laboratories —

and an abstract of that report has been noted in your

record already this morning by the Assemblyman. They use
a unit of sound energy called decibels in reference to a

level of one micropascal. I submit that whatever and and
we will use, that, one, it be a logical one; two, it be

available to the public; and, three, that it be well known.

To find the definition of a kilojoule in the encyclopedic — in the Scientific Encyclopedia, the Nostrands, does not exist. And in the Encyclopedia Britannica, any relationship to joule being used as a level of sound does not exist.

I would like to ask that we use micropascals or

that we have a decibel equivalent of barmeters or cubic inches.

A

What is said to be so many cubic inches on a scale of 1 to 10 is not sufficient. I don't believe that that will meet the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

A couple of other points I'd like to make. The industry has spoken of jobs, of four to nine vessels.

Please be reminded that Fort Bragg is home port for over 300 fishing vessels. When we're talking of jobs, let's not just talk about the high cost of putting a vessel in the water, but the real impacts of what, if we make a mistake, can be detrimental in an area where we have indeed a very delicate economy at best.

In one, in fact, that the Governor has supported the Rural Renaissance Bill for up to \$20 million to help out rural counties. Mendocino County has 18 percent of its population signed with the Social Servic's Department, not something any of us can be proud of.

What is at risk is significant. Forbes Magazine has stated that 20 percent of the world's protein fishery resources are on the U.S. 200-mile escarpment. It is no small wonder that the Germans, the Russians, the Poles, as well as the Americans want to fish extensively off the Mendocino and Humboldt coasts. It is well-known

for its upwelling of currents and, indeed, very rich fishery resources. We must know what we're doing.

At this time, I contend if we're counting what we don't know too much in kilojoules, we should know a lot more before any testing goes on with these vessels in the future off this coast.

Lastly, or almost lastly, I ask that any meetings for negotiations between the various industries involved involve local government, our planning departments, the impacts, that we can also make contribution (sic). And lastly, similar to the request made by Luke Breit from Assemblyman Hauser's office, I, too, would ask, on behalf of our Board of Supervisors, that this Commission reconsider its position regarding AB 284.

Thank you.

(Applause. \*

SUPERVISOR DE VALL: I'd like to leave with your staff --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Why don't you give us that letter, and we'll put it in the record.

SUPERVISOR DE VALL: -- and also the micropascal definition used by the Mireral Management Service.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I want to indicate that -because I don't think I did this earlier -- we also have
a letter from Assemblyman Dan Hauser that we're putting

2

5

\_

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

into the record in addition to Mr. Breit's testimony.

SUPERVISOR DE VALL: Mr. Chairman, it's very difficult to find -- I don't find it -- of course, I've only had the staff report for the last hour -- there's any definition whatsoever that gives you any information whatsoever of the definition of a kilojoule.

And to go from that point today to a hearing on this matter on October 7th means that a lot of us are going to be very busy. And I would hope that local governments are involved.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you very much.

Richard Charter. Mr. Charter? Where's the bodyguard I saw in the elevator with you?

(Laughter.)

MR. CHARTER: My name is Richard Charter. I have spent the last seven years functioning as a coordinator for local governments along the coast who have some very intensive concerns about OCS-related activities. They also have some very intensive concerns about the health of their fishing industry.

And I think we all realize we're seeing today what has been a growing controversy over the last several years, which has escalated concerns in the arena of geophysical survey impacts to those concerns emerging as quantifiable impacts that are now showing up in scientific

studies conducted by such prestigious institutions as the Minerals Management Service.

And I think as those concerns emerge into quantifiable impacts, it's important that we don't make any precipitous decisions about things like thresholds of acoustical energy without gathering the full technical information that's going to be necessary to make appropriate decisions about things like thresholds of acoustical energy. And particularly, I think, we should be talking the same terms of acoustical energy. If the geophysical survey operators use barmeters. I think we should all be talking barmeters instead of things like kilojoules. We're trying to compare eggs and bananas here.

I have also noticed that the acoustic signature threshold, which is what we're talking about here, has some other questions associated with it beyond just how much energy's released in the water column by a sparker or an air gun.

And I'd like to cite a couple of things that I can just pull -- I have a habit of not reading things from documents into the record, and I'm sure you can appreciate that. I'm going to read about three sentences from the document, "Effects of Sound from a Geophysical Survey Device on Fishing Success," OCS study, MMS 87-0020.

Just to highlight some questions that I've developed about this idea of setting a threshold for which a negative declaration would apply below that threshold theoretically, and above that threshold you'd not issue further permits until you have an EIR.

There's more to look at here than just the energy released by the air gun or the sparker. There are a range of things that affect how that impulse is going to affect biological systems in the marine environment.

And I have been assured in your staff report and by conversations with staff that, well, gee, these low-intensity seismic activities are really not much more in the line of impact than the fish bathometers used by fishermen. And that statement really is what brought me to the point of realizing that we need to look at more than two — than just whether we're talking two kilojoules or three kilojoules here.

And I'd like to read three sentences from this MMS study.

"Whether a fish detects a sound depends on a series of factors intrinsic to the fish, the sound source, the transmission path between the fish and the sound source, and the immediate environment of the fish, characteristics

over which the fish can hear, the acuity or sensitivity for sound at each frequency of the range -- "

In other words, what I'm saying is there are factors like frequency, water density, salinity, distance -- obviously -- the configuration of the sea floor affects this. Important characteristics of the sound source include the sound level at the source, which is really what you're looking at when you talk two kilojoules, but also its frequency spectrum and its duration.

It happens also that fish are more sensitive to pulse sound, which happens to be what we're talking about here.

One more sentence from another page in the same document:

"The frequency spectra of the seismic devices cover the range of frequencies detected by fish."

Okay. That should be self-evident. Now we're talking about things that fish can pick up on. And in response to the assurance that I was given that, gee, fishermen use eche sounders that don't seem to hurt the fish -- first, the frequencies of echo sound or signals most utilized by fishermen, 38 to 120 kilohurtz, are well

beyond the frequency range of hearing in fish, up to 3 kilohurtz in marine fish (Platt and Popp 1981; Hawkins, 1981).

So, what I'm saying is there's a number of other things that ought to be looked at here. And as this thing gets more complicated, I think where you are is you're on the right track looking at an EIR, and that EIR may give you, may give you the information to help you decide what the threshold should be at which you issue a negative declaration.

And I think until you have that EIR in your hand, you probably are not in a situation where you can arbitrarily set a two kilojoule threshold as a cutoff for a negative declaration.

I think the EIR is exactly the document you need to do to get that piece of information, because it sounds to me -- listening here today and the dialogue between the geophysical industry and the staff -- that you don't know a lot of things. And I think those are things that are going to pop up in the EIR process.

There are three primary kinds of impacts from this type of activity that have emerged as controversial. The first is obviously the dispersal question. Do sound waves in the water column scare fish away?

And I think this study and its companion

document from the Minerals Management Service are beginning to answer that question, and I'm afraid the answer looks like it's yes. Sound waves in the water column do, in fact, scare fish away. And this documents certain fish species of 50 percent -- roughly 50 percent decrease in catch per unit effort.

I think that's a pretty significant piece of information. The other biological concern, of course, has to do with impact on eggs and larvae of various species. And I think we all realize that there are free-floating organisms in the water column in the ocean that are very fragile at various stages in their life form, and that there is a study coming out of MMS that probably is going to give us better information about eggs and larvae impacts.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: When is that study due?

MR. CHARTER: I am not sure exactly -- it's one
of those things where they have to keep having meetings
to see what they can release. You heard earlier -
CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: The Freedom of Information

21 Act?

MR. CHARTER: Yeah. You heard some -- you heard some discussion this morning about having a conference to decide what could be discussed at a press conference?

I think it's that sort of a study. And, of course, we all

heard the seismic industry criticize this study quite roundly this morning, even though some of their own members participated in it.

The third item that seems to be generic to both the low and high energy activity is the space use conflict. The fact is that whether you're talking high energy sound source or low energy sound source, you're talking about a vessel on the water. You're talking about a vessel towing a cable. The lc; energy seems to be 30 to a thousand feet, compared to two and a half miles, but it's still a cable. And I think the vessel conflicts — the space use conflicts — are probably the ones that are going to be most easily addressed, but I'm cautioning that they're not — they don't appear to be being addressed appropriately now.

Space use conflicts, I think you need a formal consultation process, not some sort of ad hoc negotiation between the industry and the fishermen, but some kind of formal comment procedure. I've had a number of complaints that local government has not been informed, particularly about -- specifically about some of these recent geosurveys on the north coast. In terms of vessel conflicts, I think you can also lock at things like seasonal closures as appropriate.

I've heard recommendations of a spring meeting

before the weather window opens up for this activity each year where the geophysical industry and the fishermen would sit down and kind of look at their calendars.

Obviously, these geophysical surveys don't pull a calendar out of a hat. They've got somebody's exploration budget on the deck there when they go out. It seems to me that if salmon season's going to be less than six weeks, and that's going to be limited by the Management Council that there ought not to be seismic activity occurring in a six-week salmon season as we've apparently seen recently. I mean, there are logical ways to solve the space use conflict question.

But basically, I'm here today to support your staff recommendation to require an EIR prior to the high energy testing permit, but I caution you not to take one step forward in doing that, and then take one step back by setting some sort of arbitrarily arrived at energy threshold below which you would then allow a negative declaration to intervene.

I think that if you're going to do an EIR, you're going to get into this situation in some detail -- an EIR, for instance, would allow you to convert your kilojoules to the barmeters that the industry seems to use as measurement, and to really find out what is the threshold below which the impacts are minimal. Because I don't think we know that today.

5

I certainly concur with your EIR plans for high energy testing. And I'd like you -- to see you extend that to -- also to the lower energy activity in order to establish this threshold.

I don't think we have a problem with things like subbottom profilers, side-scan sonar, and some of the passive research that goes on out there. And some of that's important for things like finding the sunken half of the tanker Puerto Rican when it's belching oil. Those are essentially nonintrusive technologies.

But I think as soon as you put a sparker in the water, you need to recognize that a sparker can actually generate as much acoustical energy as an air gun under certain conditions, under certain -- air guns and certain sparkers are that powerful.

So, I'd like to thank you for your time and entertain any questions you might have.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Let me ask the staff to respond first to the issue of what -- what is the appropriate measurement, acoustical measurement?

MR. WILLARD: Well, we selected the two kilojoules cut-off point primarily as --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I'm not asking the level now. I'm asking what is the appropriate measurement?

EXECUTIVE DEDRICK: The unit.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: We've just heard -MR. WILLARD: Right, the kilojoule -CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: -- criticized as

inappropriate. Now, what is our -- what's our Commission staff rationale for what measurement should be?

MR. WILLARD: Selecting the joules -- joules as a measurement of energy, and that is what is utilized in the -- this equipment, is the generation of energy to penetrate the ocean floor.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Is it the commonly used measurement of energy that is used in the industry and among people who would have the need to discuss these issues?

MR. WILLARD: As I indicated earlier, commonly used in the geophysical industry is this barmeter. Well, the barmeter is a much higher amount of joules. And so, therefore, they've selected another one that they can —that relates to it as 10 — 10 barmeters — excuse me. 10 kilojoules is equal to 1 barmeter.

so, when you get way down in the low ranges, you need to have something -- rather than saying a "point, zit zit" something of a barmeter, they switched over, and they've switched into the measurement in joules.

So you have two kilojoules, is much less than I barmeter. A barmeter, being 10 kilojoules.

these -- with respect to Mr. Charter -- these interconversions are not substantially difficult things to do.

You can do them -- as one of the earlier people demonstrated -- in your head, or you can do them with a calculator. I mean, you know, picking a unit is picking a unit, whether you're -- any unit that is picked should be, I think, in a report that relates to this kind of thing, you could certainly attach an appendix that shows the conversion factors for any number of units.

If you operate in the British system where you — which the United States uses, then you use the British system. If you operate on the metric system, you use the metric system. But there are conversion factors existing in normal publications, such as the Chem and Physics Handbook, which are commonly used by people in the engineering profession which make these conversions.

I mean, this isn't -- this is not an arcane field is what I'm trying to say.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Well, Supervisor DeVall indicated it was hard to get a definition of what a kilojoule was. Mr. Charter --

DeVall has not seen the Chem and Physics Handbook, sir.

I don't know. It's not that unusual a measurement.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Okay. Mr. Charter, do you see any difficulty? These are separate issues now.

MR. CHARTER: You know, my --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Are those proper terms to use to --

MR. CHARTER: Right.

Ę

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: -- use to measure the --

MR. CHARTER: Well, I have a document from MMS that quantifies these types of acoustical signatures as decibel related. The geophysical industry this morning seemed to be using barmeters. I wouldn't want you to miss my original question, which is to the degree that there are other factors, including the frequency of energy spectra and what we know about how those different frequencies affect different marine organisms — I guess what I'm saying is that it's not only intensity.

And you can express intensities any way you want, and we'll find a Chem-Physics Handbook and translate it. There are other factors that I don't see at all in the staff report. Now, there may be drawers of file folders that have some of that. I'd like to see those drawers of file folders wind up in an EIR so we can all participate in a logical process here that doesn't sort of jump around and say, "Oh, let's draw a line at '#O kilojoules," and not consider any of these other

ramifications of what might be still potentially

destructive sound sources in the marine environment. I sat
CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Are there any -- are there

any levels we could draw without completely shutting down -
MR. CHARTER: Well, I mentioned --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: -- testing? What we're talking about here is probably a period of at least 10 months.

MR. CHARTER: Yeah, I think --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Probably talking about a three-month search for an independent contractor to do an EIR, and then maybe another six or seven months -MR. CHARTER: Right.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: -- to complete an EIR. Now, short of shutting down all forms of testing --

MR. CHARTER: Right. I mentioned --

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: -- is there any level that -MR. CHARTER: I mentioned subbottom profilers,

side-scan sonar, other types of passive activities, which I don't think anybody has a problem with. I do know that seven years ago, I sat as an alternate on the Pacific States Regional Technical Working Group on behalf of the Department of Interior trying to direct, as it were, the budget for their environmental studies program, to make recommendations to the Secretary of Interior as to what

should be studied.

One of the things that I heard seven years ago in those meetings was the fishing industry saying again, and again, "Direct some studies dollars to the issue of fish dispersal, eggs and larvae," those kinds of questions.

And just now, seven years later, we're beginning to get some of those answers. And those answers have other factors beyond just the intensity of the sound. They have sound signatures. They have frequency spectra. And I just — at some point, maybe it's possible to do. And I qualify that maybe. Maybe it's possible to bring some of those factors to the table now and October 7th. But I don't see them on the table now.

And I'm hearing reassurances about, "Gee, this is really a lot like a fishermen's Fathometer." And I'm sorry, but it's not.

It's just not. And I haven't heard anyone this morning or this afternoon speak with authority that could say, "Gee, below two kilojoules we're all right."

And tell me. What's all right? Are the crabs all right?

Are the fish going to leave the area? I think we ought to be able to say that with some substantial knowledge before we draw that threshold. And that's all I'm saying.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Does staff feel we can say

The --

that?

ß

that if we do an EIR, that the necessary scientific work will be done. Yes, I mean, I think that this discussion, as it relates to the importance of a single scientific — single unit used for convenience's purposes in scientific measurement really doesn't have a lot to do with the issue.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: We're past that now.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRIC: That's right.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I'm now addressing the last points raised by Mr. Charter.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Certainly the purpose of doing the research studies, which were partly funded by the State of California, and the purpose of our recommendations for an EIR to address the actual physical effects, there certainly is no way in which you could limit that to only an energy level. I think the answer to your question is yes, sir.

made by this witness is that we have not yet made the case. That allowing testing to two kilojoules is it will not have a seriously adverse effect to different forms of marine life. All I'm asking — I don't know the answer either way. What I'm asking is; Does the basic research — what limited amount has been done — does our examination of

that basic research give us confidence that we could -should we go forward requesting an EIR and set that as
the cut-off point?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I would say so. Al, would you speak to that point? Very little basic research has been done, you understnad, Mr. Chairman. But also there is very little evidence of damage. So, it's kind of like it was three years ago when we -- when you ordered the initial studies. Al, could you speak to the point?

MR. WILLARD: For example, it's been noted to us that a typical diesel-powered fishing vessel or a commercial recreational boat is in the range of two to five kilojoules. So, you know, you're — we're talking about very low energy acoustic levels here. And there's been no conflicts or comments — adverse comments made with respect to these type of activities that employ devices that generate energy levels of two kilojoules or less.

MR. CHARTER: And again, I point out, with all due respect to staff, that a fishing vessel just may not be a valid comparison, because of what this study says about the periodicity, the periodic impulse being something that activates the startle response in the fish, the fact that a fishing vessel may have a completely different acoustic property in the water column. It's a constant

sound, yes. These sparkers are a periodic sound. And this seems to be indicating in this study that the periodic sound is what's spooking the fish, causing them to go to the bottom and hide out. And, you know, when I talk about impacts on the marine life, I include in the marine life I include the marine life the fishing industry.

Because if the fishing industry is going to experience a 50 percent loss economically because a seismic ship has been in the area, whatever seismic ship, then I think that's an economic impact on the communities along the coast that really ought to wind up in your equation.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: How well-defined -- how well have we defined all of the various activities for different purposes that would be covered by this cut-off point?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I'd like Dwight to speak to that.

MR. SANDERS: Mr. Chairman, to answer your question specifically, the equipment that would fall under that threshold are the types of equipment that Mr. Charter indicated that he would have no exception to; in other words, side-scan sonar, bottom profilers, Fathometers, bathometric devices, and so forth. So those type of activities would be below that threshold.

The types of energy levels that were used -- we

started off looking at the types of energy and the levels of energy used in the MMS studies and so forth.

These are in the hundreds of thousands of kilojoules of energy. They are varying devices that go all the
way down the spectrum, all the way down to the two
kilojoule level. So, staff was being very conservative
in establishing the level of two kilojoules as a point
below which activities could proceed without any evidence
on the record given to us that there would be a substantial
effect on the environment.

in a gray area. But we included them in the sevels of energy above which an EIR would be performed. So, I think we have -- perhaps our major flaw here is not equating apples to oranges. We're dealing with common terms, but we are dealing with different expressions of those terms. As Al has indicated, some are aggregations of joules and they're expressed as bars of pressure. If you get into decibels, that is a different measure of sound pressure than energy level.

So we perhaps should try to standardize that -those types of figures, but the levels of energy that we
have indicated here have been formed on the basis of a
fairly thorough evaluation of the literature that is
available to us, and the studies that have been done, and

we have shot literally below the level that we know that there is -- or even there is a perception of an effect.

MR. THOMPSON: Can I comment on one issue on this?
Chairman MC Carthy: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: We looked up from the bottom side up trying to look at environmental assessment. We've already talked about multiple use of the ocean. We also have multiple use among the people who want to investigate environmental impacts.

So, we have -- we're looking from the bottom side of the tools that will be available to look at environmental impacts. He's looking at the environmental impact for the f shermen. Someone else might want us to look at the environmental impact of an outfall, or dredging, or many other things. So, we were looking strictly from the bottom side coming up.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Thank you.

MR. CHARTER: And I think part of the point that I was making is that if you're going to have multiple use of the resource and the salmon fishery opens for a six-week window, multiple use with a 52-week year ought to dictate the seismic activity doesn't necessarily have to happen during that six-week opening.

COMMISSIONER STANCELL: Excuse me.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER STANCELL: I just have one question.

I just want some clarification on a point that you made.

MR. CHARTER: Sure.

COMMISSIONER STANCELL: I know we're beyond the point the measurement, trying to decide which is appropriate or valid.

But you did say something about the frequency.

MR. CHARTER: Right.

suddenness of a sound would have an adverse effect on the fish, even though the commercial fishing — I mean the commercial fishing vessels or recreational vessels may have the same level of sound. You're saying that because of the sudden intrusion in that environment, it would have an adverse effect on fish as opposed to this ongoing level that the fish has grown accustomed to out in that —

MR. CHARTER: That's correct. The MMS study, which I cited, what it seems to indicate is that one sound level constantly, a fish acclimates to that, gets used to it, and goes on about its normal day-to-day swimming around.

The same sound level introduced suddenly (snapping fingers), periodically (tapping fingers on witness table) ten times a minute, may cause that fish to (a) leave the area, (b) go to the bottom and stay there, (d) dart all

over the place, or sort of not bite.

And so, there are -- the level of the threshold is not the only factor. And before we -- just in closing, I don't want to go too far. We've been "Through the Looking Glass" this morning, and I don't want to take you "Through the Looking Glass" again.

I sat on a panel in Washington State this summer with some members of the coastal community up there that had had an experience in recent years with seismic activities and with space use conflicts specifically.

And I just want to say that this is the sort of thing that could happen, either from the low intensity or high intensity activity. They had a crab fisher y with crab pots in place with floats identifying, as you know, the location of the crab pots, so you can go back and grab it when it's full of crabs. And they had approximately a three to four hundred thousand dollar loss of crab pots as the seismic cable cut loose the floats along the coast of Washington State.

And what they said to me is that they lost about 10 percent of their dungeness crab catch there in Washington State. Now, that is something that is garmane to any vessel that carries a cable. And I think -- I just leave you with that as a reminder that there are impacts that can be significant and can have very serious

1 economic implications. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Commissioner Tucker.

COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Mr. Charter, I'm interested in your role as a coordinator of local government concerns. We've heard expressed today the need for this kind of testing in order to determine sewage outfalls, their location, et cetera.

MR. CHARTER: Right.

COMMISSIONER TUCKES: And there's been discussion about nuclear power plants. Is it your position that -- and let's say there is some impact of testing. Let's say we do an EIR and we find that it does have some impact on eggs or larvae or whatever.

Would it be your position that such testing should not occur?

MR. CHARTER: Well, I think we heard in opening this morning, some discussion that if you have a specific project — the example I believe that was given was the San Diego sewer outfall. And the response was about 30 square miles, I believe, would need to be surveyed preparatory to construction of that outfall. I think what you can see in that is perhaps an option where a site-specific permit similar — you know, MMS gives fairly specific permits for specific activities in Federal waters, what they call their G & G permits, geological and

geophysical survey permits. And they are for a given activity during a given time frame at a certain place for the most part. They're not like --

COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Your position is that testing should be allowed under certain circumstances?

MR. CHARTER: I don't think I'd want to see somebody build a nuclear power plant without checking to see if there was an earthquake fault immediately under the seawater intake.

And I think there's ways to accommodate those types of information needs.

COMMISSIONER TUCKER: How about things like the safe location of a marina or the appropriate -- as to whether or not a channel should be dredged?

MR. CHARTER: Those are a lot more site-specific types of information needs than, for instance, seismic activities that have been going on in the last month off the entire coast of Mendocino County and most of Humboldt County, which are obviously going back and forth from Federal waters to State waters gathering deep seismic information in many cases, which becomes part of proprietary data which is sold to the oil industry for the purpose of locating tracts that they might want to bid on in Lease Sale 91, which is coming up, as you know, in 1989.

The question becomes that data -- at what point does that data suddenly become oil data and stop being a pipeline corridor?

And I think if you look at specific industrial projects like that sewer outfall, you'd find that you don't need to cover the entire offshore of a county nor necessarily step over the fishing grounds two or three times as we're seeing happen.

We have an Exxon activity that's just been -- just now finishing up on the Mendocino Coast. Our understanding is that Mobil is about ready to utilize the same vessel to start over on the same set of tract lines.

So, you get repeated activity from a seismic operator working on behalf of different companies.

Certainly you aren't going to see something like that doing shallow seismic for a sewer outfall. You're going to do one survey. You're going to do it in a small location.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you very much.

Mr. Zeke Grader? And then we're going to ask for Lily Jones and Wayne Scott.

Mr. Grader, excuse me, our steno needs to change tape.

(Thereupon the reporter replanished her stenographic paper supply.)

MR, GRADER: Thank you, Governor, members of the

Commission. I note that the tape is now in.

My name is Zer Grader. I'm the Executive

Director for the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's

Associations.

I will be brief here today, because there are a number of other fishermen in the audience that I think can perhaps share with you their experiences in and about or in and around seismic vessels. And what I'd like to do is just simply prevent you -- present you with a short overview of this issue.

Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's
Associations, for those of you who do not know, represents
24 commercial fishermen's organizations along the Pacific
Coast. We are an unbrella organization of many local
associations.

since the 1984 issuance or reissuance of permits by the Lands Commission -- I do want to acknowledge what has been said here this morning, that there has been an improvement in communications between the commercial fishing industry and the seismic operators-- and Mr. Bowles elaborated on that -- as there has been cooperation on studies jointly conducted by the two private groups together with public agencies, such as the Commission and its staff.

And we're certainly not here to dispute the value

a

of seismic surveys. We're not here for that at all.

But we are here arising out of an ongoing concern with the impacts that those surveys are having, both on our fishery resources and on fishing activities.

I might add that we've heard discussions earlier regarding seismic surveys for the siting of nuclear power plants or for the siting of sewage outfalls. I might add that those surveys really have not been the problem the commercial fishing industry has faced.

The problem we're facing is the ongoing numerous and continuous surveys that are being done on behalf of oil exploration up and down the whole of the California Coast, not specific locations off San Onofre or San Diego, but I mean the whole of the California Coast.

And this is just ongoing virtually all the time, and it seems as if they almost pick the best prime fishing seasons to decide this is when they want to conduct these surveys.

I might also add, too, I don't think commercial fishermen are just up here because they're perceiving or they think there's a problem. There is an ongoing problem, otherwise you would not be -- see them here at meetings, such as this one today or ones in the past.

And I think certainly since May of this year, when you decided to reissue for a four-month period on a

.

temporary basis the existing permits, there have been two studies that have come out that I think give credence to what the fishermen have been saying.

The first was the eggs and larvae study. And I've served on the eggs and larvae committee, and though I would argue that it's probably inconclusive, it does nevertheless show that there were some impacts on anchovy. I think what we have to do now, however, is go on beyond the concern over the anchovy and look at other organisms, specifically dungeness crab. And I think it's very important that we do get the money from the State Legislature to proceed with the study now on the dungeness crab and perhaps, beyond that, begin looking at rock fish. Because I think we do need to know what the impacts are on these resources. And certainly, as inconclusive as it might have been, the eggs and larvae study done on anchovies, which is now out, does show that there were impacts.

Secondly, I think the fish dispersal study that was done by the Minerals Managment Service indicates fairly clearly that fish dispersal does occur, as fishermen have been telling people for years, when seismic vessels are in an area.

I think the statement that came out of the -- this report -- one sentence was, "The rock fish catch was substantially reduced under sound emission. In these tests,

the total catch declined by 52.4 percent."

That's substantial. And I would add that while there are those in the seismic industry that have problems with this test, this test done by Bottell, or this study, was done on behalf of the Minerals Management Service, which I think we all know is hardly pro fisheries. It is indeed the leasing end of the Federal Government that has been and continues to be -- push lease sales off the California Coast.

I don't think they're going to develop a study that is going to in any way impact on their ability to lease the Federal OCS.

I think for these reasons, particularly the two studies that have come out, therefore, that it is important that this Commission go ahead and conduct a full environmental impact report at this time on the impacts of seismic testing prior to the reissuance of any new permits.

It's a little difficult for us to comment on your staff recommendation, because we have not had the opportunity to examine the two kilojoules. And I'm not sure that we ever will be. But, nevertheless, I think the we certainly agree with your staff on the need for studies at least on those impacts above. Whether or not we need to look at the impacts below two kilojoules, I cannot comment

Ŗ

at this time, and I would hope to be able to comment more fully at your 7 October meeting.

Beyond the invironmental impact report, however, or perhaps as part of it, I would urge that the Commission also look at supporting the phase two of the eggs and larvae report that is going on into -- and assisting the eggs and larvae committee get the necessary funding to begin looking at the impacts on dungeness crab.

Second, to address the problem of physical conflicts. And this is particularly troublesome to those fishermen who have fixed gear and have lost it, whether this rixed gear be crab traps off the North Coast used for take of dungeness crab or for lobster in the Santa Barbara Channel, or prhaps even gill nets.

In any event, when these seignic vessels come through with their cables and they're in an area where there's fixed gear, this can result in a loss of that gear. And in the case of certain types of gear, can be damaging to the resource, because that gear could continue fishing and is no longer retrievable with its buoys cut off.

Third, I think, is develop some mitigation measures.

Part of the mitigation measures, I would say, would be to avoid the conflicts to begin with. Perhaps part of this should be to reduce the number of perhits allowed. Some people have compared the -- having the total number of

1

10

11

12 13

**14** 

15

18 17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

seismic operators out there and each company attempting to go out and get their own information as being sort of in a competitive mode, comparing it to Darwinism or good old-fashioned capitalism. I would, however, compare it more to the tragedy of the Commons (sic). I think we simply have too many seismic vessels out there for the type of information that's being gleaned.

I'd also mention in the mitigation aspect that I think measures have to be done -- developed, particularly standards to -- where there are unavoidable conflicts, to provide for some sort of just compensation for fishery resources; that is, working with the Department of Fish & Game, the same as we do when a hydroelectric project is put in, and also with the affected parties.

And, fourth, I think it's time that perhaps State Lands, particularly if it decides to go ahead with its staff recommendation or variation of that on conducting a full EIR, that it recommend to the Minerals Management Service in the strongest possible terms that that Federal agency -- it's time now for them to conduct an environmental impact statement under the Federal quidelines on this very same thing, on the seismic impacts.

Thank you. And, Governor, I'd be happy to answer any questions and work with your staff in the interim period before the next hearing.

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you very much. Any questions by either Commissioner? Thanks for being here.

Lily Jones, please.

MS. JONES: I'm not much one for going to meetings. This is the first time I've ever appeared to you. Politics is not my forte. I'm an art dealer. I have a large gallery in Mendocino. I'm an active member of the Chamber of Commerce, and my daily contact with artists and locals visiting my gallery and many, many, many tourists, including from out of State and from out of the country has given me access to a great deal of public feedback and opinion, which I would like to share with you.

And much of Mendocino's economy is based on tourism. We not only have a very active artistic community, but many inns, State Parks, restaurants, service related to tourism, shopkeepers, artists, crafts people, and numerous small cottage industries and businesses, many of which are dependent on tourism.

Tourism is a clean industry and a growth industry.

It is directly opposed to the presence of big oil. We adamantly do not believe that oil and tourism are compatible. In spite of how passive these seismic tests are purported to be, it misses the point. The populace of this coast does not want this mapping sponsored by big oil to take

place in the first place.

We are not fooled by the seismic surveys' stated multiple use of their findings. Seismic testing indicates intent to drill. Our ecologically fragile coastline, its esthetic assets, and its attractiveness to people from around the world is our valuable resource.

One oil spill could ruin all of this. We will not take second place to an oil interest which is a one-shot deal: drill, despoil, and depart for an estimated two weeks' worth of our nation's energy needs.

I urge the government to adopt the position of energy conservation and to leave our unspoiled coastline as a national treasure for both its inhabitants and its numerous visitors.

In the 18th Century, America was founded by a grassroots movement which rebelled against economic exploitation by an imperialist mother country. The result is our nation's proud heritage.

Other 'terests -- other instances in history also offer lessons which point to the power of grassroots' opposition to invading forces. 19th Century, 1812, Napoleon invades Russia. Rather than see their resources fall into enemy hands, peasants burned their fields and Moscow itself as French troops advanced. Napolean's army was broken.

J

•

Tables turned for France in the 20th Century.

A greedy Hitler, for five years, conquered France's land,
but not its spirit, 1940 through '45.

The heroism of the French underground resistance movement is still legendary. Today, we are not directly threatened by an imperial empire or fascist ruler. Instead, this threat has transmuted into multinational corporations still bent on economic exploitation of our national natural resources.

Humans have changed the course of history, but history has not changed human nature. The grassroots populace of our coastline is radically and determinedly opposed to the sacrifice of our local economy for a corporate empire's profits.

Thank you for allowing me the American privilege of allowing me to speak my mind.

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: Thank you. Any questions? Wayne Scott?

(Applause.)

MR. SCOTT: Good afternoon. Mr. Chairman, my name is Wayne Scott. I'm president of the Salmon Trollers Marketing Association of Fort Bragg. I represent 350 commercial fishermen, each of whom owns his own business.

Fort Bragg this year, pretty close to -Mendocino County, I should say, pretty close to 400,000

salmon have been landed in Mendocino County.

Somewhere near 8 million pounds of sea urchins have been landed in Fort Bragg. Hundreds of thousands of pounds of shrimp have been landed in Fort Bragg.

This is not the worst year for us. We have had a very fortunate year for our entire economy. My testimony is -- with the needs of concerns of salmon and crab fishery of Mendocino County, there are two aspects of the permit process which I'd like to discuss: Sharing the ocean and governmental agencies and the public trust.

There are seismic vessels and some fisheries that can share the ocean. Seismic vessels, salmon trollers, and crab gear cannot. There are too many possibilities for conflicts between one or two miles of cable trailing behind the seismic vessels, and the salmon trollers, and the crab pots.

The resolution of this impasse is to use the ocean at different times of the year. I suggest the live months -- September 15th to November 31st and February 15th to April 31st. This will result in almost no conflict between the seismic vessels and salmon and crab fishermen.

Currently, the seismic vessel operated by the Geophysical Survey, Incorporated has created no physical conflict between their actions and the fishing. The current

permit allows seismic testing outside of six miles during daylight hours and inside six miles at night.

This precludes any possibility of seismic effects on sea urchin divers which operate in the shallows.

Each of us believe or has believed that since a government agency has a responsibility to the public, that somehow the public is somehow protected. How naive.

Too often it has been easier for an agency to grant a permit rather than to generate the information and data needed to protect the public interest as required by the public trust doctrine.

Nowhere is this more obvious than the permitting of the seismic survey vessels and the oil drilling ships in State and Federal waters. Information developed so far has not been incorporated into the permit process, or it does not exist. No data relative to seismic blast on the larvae stage of fish and crab (sic).

Now I think you've heard that there is some data being generated. I probably should say no meaningful data, because data that can be argued back and forth as to whether it's valid or not certainly is not going to be very useful in developing a permit process based upon it.

Obviously, our beliefs as to the damage has not been completely proven. Certainly, the seismic operators believe that the damage, if it does exist at all, is very

minimal.

going to really help in the permit process as it goes on.

No data on the effects of fish dispersion due to seismic
blasting and fishery losses due to this dispersion (sic).

No mitigation requirements for the fishery losses to sport or commercial fisheries. No effort to compare the economic benefits of fisheries which last forever and the short-term value of the oil recovered.

I've limited my remarks to seismic exploration.

Oil drilling and its attendant needs are geometrically -
compound our concerns (sic).

One, we're asking that the seismic survey be limited to the five months suggested; that further, that no permits be issued until the environmental, biologic, and economic concerns are addressed. This would require an impact statement.

It is unfair to the permittee and to those to whom there may be conflict for these permits to be issued in the dark. Let's have the permits issued in the light of facts so that legitimate concerns and needs of all ocean users can be met

Now, that's in a sense the end of my comments relating to the salmon trollers. Each of us naturally has his own personal feeling. I would like to add a couple

of things here.

... **8** 

We heard about sound and noise and such as that. In 1975, there was a sea grant study conducted in Fort Bragg where they did compare the effects of the actual noise generated by the boats and compared it to their fishery, how well they could catch -- in this case, it was albacore salmon. And the simple test was taken this way.

They took known successful vessels and ran it by a microphone, underwater microphone, and made a graph of the sounds that vessel generated. Then they ran other vessels by that had not had successful fishing in the same area. And they found there was distictive differences.

Sometimes these were caused by a bent propeller or some other reason. It might be a bearing in the back that was pounding. But whatever it was, there was significant difference. And sound wes disperse fish. And on fishing vessels we make every effort to make our vessel as quiet as possible.

I noted that gentleman said there are only four or five survey vessels now working. In 1982, in Mendocino County, there were 19 vessels that worked there from a period varying from three days to five weeks.

Everybody should have an opportunity as an American -- as this young lady said -- to express themselves, so I will.

 Today, we have been made aware of AIDS, a disease spread by a dirty needle of one kind or another, which results in the slow, ever so slow killing of its host.

Now, I ask you to visualize a dirty needle thousands of feet long infecting Mendocino County. Visualize a slow death of a pristine coast with lesions on its belly and black sores on its face.

Visualize a slow death of the fisheries, the loss of hundreds of jobs and tons of fish feeding thousands.

Visualize a slow death of a grandfather's joy finding a fighting salmon for his grandson.

The Surgeon General has advised as a nation we must practice safe oil exploration. We must protect our future and the Mendocino Coast with a condom of fact.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: Any questions? Sir, excuse me. We have a question here from one of the Commissioners.

COMMISSIONER STANCELL: Just one quick question, Mr. Scott.

You set aside the prospect of oil drilling. Did I hear you correctly in saying that the seismic activity and the fishing industry could coexist if you had a schedule?

MR. SCOTT: I said a schedule so that it would minimize the conflict. Nowhere in that statement conflict between you and I walking across the hall and occasionally bumping into each other, did I suggest that by stamping our feet we weren't doing some harm to the concrete floor. So, I'm suggesting here that we can work together.

And that if -- and that's all I'm saying, that the physical conflicts are possible to avoid, and that we should make -- in the seismic -- I mean the permits should try to develop that aspect.

And also I want to mention this. I'm only speaking for salmon trollers and for crab fishermen, and those are the dates that we could deal with. The sea urchin guys work year-round, but they're very close to shore. So, maybe seismic studies on the sound will -- you'll know what the range should be.

Certainly, the stuff done by Palagos could not be considered a hundred percent related, because that sound was not a very loud sound compared to other seismic studies.

And, in fact, in 1982, in Santa Barbara, I brought down 22 exhibits relating to seismic noise generated by these vessels. And they were of such severity that a mile and a half, people complained that they lost packing

out of the sides of boats and stuff like that. So, it was very, very loud. It was nothing to what's happening right now. I don't know what kind of effects they were using. But it was not the same.

COMMISSIONER TUCKER: Okay. Thank you. Helen Barrington? And we have ten minutes left to go for the persons that are speaking against continuation of the renewal of the permits.

MS. BARRINGTON: My name is Helen Barrington, and I represent the Ocean Protection Coalition of Mendocino County. And as a representative of a citizen's group, I wanted to relate to you the confusion that I have and give you an idea of what the public perception is of the State Lands Commission.

I myself have been trying to understand the policy of the State Lands Commission relative to offshore oil. And when I look at some of the recent positions the Commission has taken, I'm wondering if you can give me an idea of where the consistency lies.

I want to commend you on entering into the lawsuit with Attorney General Van de Kamp opposing the five-year lease plan offshore California. That's a very positive move.

But then I look at the position that you've taken on Assemblyman Hauser's Bill 284, which would put

g

Mendocino and Humboldt Counties into --

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: Let me just clarify --

MS. BARRINGTON: Sure.

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: The Commission's never taken a position on that bill. So --

MS. BARRINGTON: Which? 284?

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: Yes.

MS. BARRINGTON: Okay. Right. That was my point. That was my point, that the Commission hasn't taken a position. That is what I was getting to. And then further, looking at the fact that seismic vessels are permitted to do the work they need to do in our State waters. And the information from those surveys will be used for the Federal Lease Sale 91, which is upcoming for the Mendocino and Humboldt Coasts.

So, it makes us wonder, frankly, whose interests the State Lands Commission is serving. And I'm not trying to be accusatory. I'm trying to understand more than anything else.

It seems to me the first step that needs to be taken is for a consistent position relative to offshore oil must be developed for both Federal and State waters, and continued recognition that seismic testing is the precursor to offshore exploration and development.

I do have a statement from the Grean Protection

Coalition, which I would like to distribute to all of you.

And I'd like to briefly read it into the record.

And you'll be getting it as I'm reading.

"The Ocean Protection Coalition opposes all seismic testing, both in State and Federal waters. Seismic testing is always a precursor to offshore oil and gas exploration and development. Offshore activities disturb the marine environment and jeopardize the livelihoods of coastal residents.

"Before the State Lands Commission issues any more permits for seismic testing, several conditions must be met. A complete environmental impact report must be done on the effects of seismic testing on marine life. Public hearings must be held in the county where seismic tests are proposed, and three in the first section (sic) — the hearings must take place in a major coastal location within the county; for example, Fort Bragg in Mendocino County.

"Further, the environmental impact

report must demonstrate the following:
That seismic testing does not disrupt
or damage marine life; that seismic
testing does not disrupt or impair
commercial harvesting businesses,
including the sea urchin industry; and
finally, that seismic testing does not
disrupt or adversely impact the
economies of coastal communities."

And as a final point, finally, for seismic testing to proceed in any capacity, it must not be opposed by any of the concerned parties, industries that are impacted, or by the general public.

The program should be suspended at least until the lawsuit filed against the State Lands Commission has been settled.

you've heard in this room today, a great deal of outrage relative to our nonparticipation in the process of permitting. And I'd just like to finish by suggesting that you may reconsider your position on Assemblyman Hauser's bill and support it.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: Thank you. Eleanor Lewallen?

MS. LEWALLEN: Well, good afternoon. I'm here representing the Mendocino Sea Vegetable Company, a business of which I'm a co-owner, and the Mendocino North Coast Coast Greens. I'm also including with my testimony the two resolutions from the National Women's Political Caucus, which supports the Califoria ocean sanctuary and opposes offshore drilling, and the Sierra Club resolution, which supports the California ocean sanctuary.

And so I'd like to hand you my testimony. I think the thing we need to be most aware of is that the seismic survey testing we are talking about and opposing is that which is the precursor to effshore oil development. That's what we are opposing. I don't know if legally the State Lands Commission can make a difference — can make a judgment as to what its — what the seismic survey testings are used for.

But we are making a clear distinction. We're opposing offshore drilling. I think it's really important to understand the mysteries and the wonder of how the Earth is formed, what it is like under the oceans for both practical purposes of sewer outfalls and piers and things like that, as well as understanding life. But when it's used -- but I think that these tests shouldn't even happen at the expense of the damaging of sea life.

But when it is to be a precursor for offshore oil drilling, it becomes something else. The geophysical survey people say, "Well, that's not my responsibility.

I'm just generating the data."

And I think we have to take responsibility for what we're doing. And so, when they say they're not responsible, they're one link in the chain. They're one of the first steps. And while they were off our coast, as I understap it, the fishermen were bullied. The fishermen — the oil company people said, "You have to cooperate with us. You have to have some kind of consensus with us."

Well, the fishing industry doesn't want offshore drilling, and does not want their fish dispersed, doesn't want the livelihood hampered. And the public, whenever any fish are caught an brought in through the harbor, there's a multiplier of over \$3.00 effect on the public.

say. It doesn't just affect the fishermen. When I learned about the seismic survey testing, I learned that the sea urchin companies weren't informed about the coming of the seismic survey tests and when -- and when they were going to be there.

The people who take people out in kayaks weren't informed. The people for the sports fishing weren't

informed. So, I think we have a situation where they weren't informed, and the individual fishermen were approached. And they said, "You have to -- you have to play ball with us or we're going to just do what we want." And that's coercion.

So when the seismic survey companies talk about communication, I don't think they've heard what the population is saying on the North Coast. The population and the fishing industry is saying, "We don't want oil development."

That means we don't want seismic survey testing.

I think that's clear. Hasn't that been clear today?

It's been clear. We don't want it. So, what do you do when you have a population that doesn't want their environment degraded? We know that the environment is fragile. We know that it's rich. And we know that offshore oil development will destroy it.

We know that the Santa Barbara -- the fishing industry is being changed. One member -- one fishermen down there, Allen Hurr (phonetic) was quoted as saying that when his son said, "Will I be able to become a fishermen, Daddy?" He said, "I'm afraid not, son, because in the next five to ten years, our fishing industry in Santa Barbara is going to change so it's not even recognizable anymore."

And yet you hear often from the oil industry

\_

"They're doing fine in Santa Barbara with fishing and tourism."

So what do the fishermen say? "It's being transported. They're being crowded out."

So, on the North Coast, we say we don't want it.

We want to protect what we have. We've learned the
lessons of Santa Barbara, of Louisiana. So, we're asking
you of the State Lands Commission to please help
represent us. Please help protect this national treasure
that is part of California's heritage. It's part of the
national heritage that visitors come to forever -- or
rather they come to continually. And you see a number of
us here representing public organizations. We're
actually representing millions of people. We're
representing the people from our communities who weren't
able to come. We're representing the visitors who come
regularly. And we're representing the generations of
children that aren't yet born that want to have a healthy
coast.

Another thing I want to add is we've had tremendous forest fires in the California. And I notice it's still real smoky here. We need the fresh ocean breezes. We really need that. And if we have oil rigs out there, we're not going to get fresh air dispersal. We're going to just get pollution continually. And I know

the time is short, and I could -- I could go on, but I'm going to stop here and just tell you -- oh, the last point is: This a major -- this is the major environmental issue of the 1988 elections. Clearly, whether we're going to have a California ocean sanctuary or have our coast degraded is the number one issue. And people are concerned.

We're asking you of the State Lands Commission to please help with your regulations to protect our coast. I keep thinking I'm done. And I could go on. I've lost sleep over this.

I've been sick over this.

We're really distressed on the coast. We're just terribly distressed. And now is the turning point. If we have such disregard from the industry of our concerns now before there's even rigs, before there's even drilling, I'm afraid we're going to be totally disregarded.

We're going to have our culture destroyed. We're going to have our environment destroyed. I'd like to leave with you this reprint from the Wall Street Journal of what happened in Louisiana. And I urge you all to read it. It's very long. It talks about what happened when big oil came in, buy-out of politicians, acceleration of cancer rates. It's just the biggest issue we face.

One more thing. I'll just end with this. East
West Journal, which is the Journal of Natural Health, has
just awarded our sea vegetables as the best line of sea

3

4

5

7

8

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

vegetables in the nation. I'm down at the ocean probably eight days of the year (sic) for half of the year harvesting sea vegetables. I'm very bonded to the ocean. I'm bonded to the sea life. I'm here as the protector of the sea life.

And we're not going to be able to continue to feed people high quality protein -- I'm referring to both the fish and the sea vegetables -- when our oils -- our waters are despoiled by oil. And you can't -- you can't separate seismic survey for oil development and oil development. They're -- they're related. So, please, maybe what you can do is take not only location-by-location consideration and whether it's for the purpose of whether it's for a dump, or whether it's for evaluating a nuclear power plant, but look at what's going to come out of the seismic survey testing that the oil companies, and please tell them, no. And the way you can is by using the tools we're given you. Extensive EIRs. Having public input. Make sure you have public hearings in our area, because we public want to stand by the fishermen. We don't want them to be singled out as individuals where they don't feel strong.

The public is one hundred percent behind the fishermen. Thank you very much.

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: Thank you.

(Applause.)

2

3

•

6

7

8

9

10

please?

please?

Mellen.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: Okay. We've now -- the Commission has heard from both sides for an hour. We do have the remainder of the calendar that we have to get through. And in light of the fact that we are going to be meeting on October the 7th to take the staff recommendation --

VOICE FROM THE AUDIENCE: Excuse me. I want -ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: Would you let me finish,

(Thereupon the reporter requested the speaker to identify himself.)

MR, MELLEN: I want to formally object.

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: Would you --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: What's your name,

MR. MELLEN: I want to formally object. Chase

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: You want to sit down and wait for a minute, please?

I was about to say if there's anyone else who needs to be heard today because they cannot be heard on the 7th, we will be happy to hear them at this time.

However, keep in mind that it's the Commission's recommendation -- or I believe it will be the Commission's

recommendation today that until the 7th, the permits be denied and, therefore, you know, if there's any comment given the Commission's position at this time, or what will be the Commission's position, then we're happy to hear it.

Mr. Mellen?

1:

MR. MELLEN: The reason I feel that some of the people who are here with me should be heard is because they are working fishermen, eight of them, who took the time to come today. They are probably not going to be able to afford to come again.

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: Well, that's what I was asking --

MR. MELLEN: I understand.

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: -- before you interrupted me. And I was about to ask that, Mr. Hellen.

MR. MELLEN: Ohay.

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: Well, do you want to bring them up?

MR. MELLEN: Sure. Let me just get started with that. As you guess you now know, my time is Chase Mellen, and I'm an attorney in Santa Barbara. I'm representing a number of commercial fishermen here today. Those fishermen who came are Steve Reburk, Travis Evans, Ed Powers, Barbara Elein, Phil Schenck, Steve Dunn, and Pick Williams.

They are from almost all the fisheries that are representative of the Santa Barbara portion of this problem. Before -- we tried to condense their testimony so it can be rapidly presented to you and the heart of what they have to say given to you.

But I would like to say a few things before I start. First of all, I did submit a letter and a package of information to staff beforehand, which I would want made part of the record.

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: Fine.

MR. MELLEN: And that letter, I believe that's already probably been submitted.

That letter references an earlier comment, which contained a number of exhibits, that I would also like incorporated by reference. There are a number of scoping recommendations in that letter. I will not review those now with you. That can be -- I can certainly do that on October 7th.

But I do want to just make a couple — give you a couple of thoughts that have come to me while trying go through the — the staff recommendation. And some of those will be addressed by the fishermen.

We are generally I think in accord with respect to the two jorle -- two kilojoules measure. I think we would be very distressed to find that slipping away into this and that for this and that purpose, and pretty soon we're sort of back into the same mess we were before and we don't know what's really going on at all.

I would only ask that if there is any determination -- staff determination as to any of the requests by the seismic operators that we heard in testimony earlier, that we would be afforded a little more notice with respect to those kinds of matters than we did get on the staff report today so we could get into them before the October 7th hearing.

Also, with respect to the EIR process, the CEQA process, you will hear testimony from Steve Dunn today, personal testimony as to problems that he had with his gear — He's a trap and gill net fisherman — with respect to his crab gear from a thousand-foot cable, a low energy cable run that he and Allen Hurr — another fisherman's name you've heard today — had, and for which they received damages from the seismic operator.

We would like to make certain that the issuer of mitigation and co-use provisions -- even though the EIR will only refer to above two kilojoulas, it would also involve those kinds of activities of low energy, and so that that would be incorporated.

I think, also, this is -- I would like to just point out to you something that may -- I think the

Commission's not aware of or has not historically been aware of.

鑫

ŝ

\$

Tā

And that is that although -- particularly in the Santa Barbara area, there has not been a wide showing historically of the damage to the fishing industry because of seismic testing. That, in fact, certain fishing industries -- certain fisheries in Santa Barbara have virtually been eliminated by seismic testing, specifically the hook and line fishery between the Points Conception and Arguello. These people are just simply out of business.

There were 12 of them three or four years ago; there are three now. You'll hear flow one of those. And two of the three who still fish are newe today. I mean, they are in desperate trouble because of it. They're in desperate trouble right this week because of it. They're using gear; they're losing fishing. They're out of business.

This is primarily a Federal problem, of course, but it -- you can't say we don't see the conflict. You have not had reports of it, because historically the fishing community in Santa Barbara and probably elsewhere on the coast hasn't known how to be responsive to these problems. The tests come; they leave. They lose their fishery. There's no report of damage, but, in fact, they've

been damaged. They've been displaced.

some of the claims made by the -- by the geophysical operators with respect to their economic problems, to which I'm sympathetic personally, I think those economic problems are not because of regulation. Those economic problems are because of the price of oil. And I think we should be really clear on that fact.

Regulation is a cost allocation device.

me for interrupting, the Court Reporter has asked rather seriously for a five-minute break. I wondered if this might not be an appropriate time. I'm sorry, Mr. Mollen, I didn't realize you were planning to go into testimony of I would have stopped you earlie.

MR. MELLEN: I'm almost finished. I don't mind.

ACTING CHAIRMAN TUCKER: That's fine. We'll take
a five-minuta break.

MR. MELLEN: I don't mind taking a break myself.

(Thereupon, there was a brist recess
taken.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Are all the witnesses here who wish to speak at this point on this issue? Well, we'll begin.

MR. REBRUK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and ladies

and gentlemen, I'll be extremely brief today.

My same is Steven Rebruk. I am president of the Fisheries Protection Institute in Summer, and near Santa Barbara. I would like to reserve my comments on the staff report, since I haven't had an opportunity to share this with my Board of Directors, and we will comment in writing in October 7th at your next meeting.

I would, though, like to personally support the staff's recommendation of an EIR. I think that's very important. And I think the previous testimonies have pointed that out very well.

Submitted to the State Lands Commission and also the Minerals Management Service. This report was taken from numerous interviews of fishermen in the Santa Barbara-San Luis Chispo County area on their various problems with seismic surveys. And I would like agair for the record today submit that along with two letters, one from our Honorable Congressman Leon Panetta, and also one from the Morro Bay Commercial Fishermen's Associations.

These letters and documents are from earlier this year, but I think they're still relevant to this issue today.

The report basically covers some of the problems of area preclusion where fishermen are not able to work

straying outside of their defined areas of survey, the effects on markets, which can lead to overfishing of some areas, an example being fishermen that have to work out of Morro Bay and travel long distances during the summertime when they're not able to work those summer grounds, tend to work their winter grounds. The grounds then have the potential of being overworked later on the year.

В

ß

So, there's a very strong market effect on coastal fishermen. Also lost gear. There's problems with streamers and such entangling in set gear and dragging it off. And then the environmental effects on eggs and larvae which we've talked about earlier.

Now, one of the things that we found in our survey was that there is effects on diving fishermen. We've had one fishermen that has settled more than one claim.

I helped him work on one last year. And he indicated that he had been impacted by vessels where it had actually physically injured him to be in the water around these seismic tests.

Now, I'm pointing this out for a very important reason. In he region near Point Conception, just for your identification purposes, there's probably a half a dozen fishermen, diving fishermen that work that area. They tend to specialize. And it's divers that have had a

lot of experience in that particular area.

£

g

In the Point Arena, Mendccino area, now you've got probably close to a hundred and even maybe more diving fishermen associated with the sea urchin fishery.

So, as these seismic survey activities expand into the north, you going to have much more potential of injuring divers. And I think this takes it out of the previous problems of gear loss and area preclusion, and puts it in an area where we could cause some human damage here.

one other area that I've worked on the last year has been settling claims with fishermen, sitting down looking at their claims, making sure they were good, solid claims. There seems to be a problem with the prompt payment on these claims when a guy has lost some gear. The permit process requires that payment be made promptly. But in some cases, it's taken months and months to settle these cases, sometimes six months or more.

And I think there needs to be a streamlining of this portion of the permitting process that does compensate fishermen for legitimate loss claim, damaged gear, or lost fishing effort.

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak today. I'll turn it over. I think there's some fishermen here that have been directly affected that you need to hear

Ω

from. Thank you for the time.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Next witness, please.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman and members of the staff and Commission, thank you for allowing me to speak to you.

I am Travis Evans. I'm a commercial fisherman on the San Luis Chispo Coast. I have been a fisherman for 46 years, since I was 19 years old. I wish that I were a good public speaker, but you're looking at a fish out of water.

I feel as much out of place here as you would feel on the high seas on some of our worst days. But I'm here because I'm concerned, not for one particular phase of our industry, but I am concerned about the health of our ocean, wich ought to concern all of .5.

And I strongly recommend that you follow the staff's report. their recommendations on the EIR. I wished I had had time to review ic further. There are many aspects of the oil industry that is hurting our oceans. And I would like to have all afternoon just to sit down and tell you about them. I wish that I could show you in my storage yard the tons of material that I've hauled in from the ocean with my fishing gear that have been left by the oil industry in our area, the Santa Maria Basin area, in the last few years.

Δ

Part of it is even from the seismic people for -they use certain hoses and wires for their hydrophones that
I'm familiar with. For although I was a fishermen, I also
am licensed by the Coast Guard as a Master Mariner and
sailed oil drilling vessels, supply vessels, and at one
time operated Pacific Salver, which was doing seismic
work off the California Coast.

So, I speak from both sides of the fence. I have seen what they say sometimes in written policy and what they do when they're on the grounds. And I would urge you, help us protect the health of our ocean for all of our benefit. Thank you.

(Applause.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Our next witness?

MR. MELLEM: Phil; why don't you come up?

MR. SCHENCK: I want to thank you for le' and me be here this afternoon. My name is Phil Schenck, I'm the owner/operator of a hook and line rock cod boat, salled the LSH, and we've been fishing Point Conception-Point Arquello area for more years than I care to think about.

And what I just gave Claire Dedrick there -- we were requested by an oil company from a recent seismic survey to keep track of our catch record. And so this is more or less a record of the effect of fishing in the vicinity of a seismic survey has on the income of one

particular boat. Maybe it's a coincidence. Maybe I'm a terrible fisherman during this period of this survey, I don't know. I don't think that's it though.

and I, you know. I listened to what Mr. Bowles said. I want to discuss this seismic survey again here. And he's talking about one gun there shooting between 180 and 200 DBs. You know, in reality, wh't we're dealing with here is mostly -- I think there's 64 guns and 250 DBs. So there's a substantial increase in power there, plus it's a 24-hour thing, around the clock. An example of this -- what I just gave Miss Dedrick here -- this survey was supposed to be a 30-day survey. But due to the, call it what you will, it ended up running approximately 90 days. So, instead of just having 30 days of abuse here, we suffered 90 days of abuse.

And this isn't particularly uncommon at all.

As a matter of fact, it's more the norm, you know, to try to schedule a livelihood, you know, around these programs, it's really difficult, you know, as far as, you know, joint usage of the area that goes on at the same time. The particular fishery I'm involved in, it's a year-round fishery. And the method we fish, it's just totally isn't compatible at all with these. So, we're left with a reduced income during the period of these surveys, lost fishing gear, et cetera, et cetera. And at the conclusion

of these surveys, new technology, 3-D survey, it seems to be when we return to these areas to look for fish, we have great difficulty finding fish for long periods of time. These fish, they -- what I feel is each fish has its individual pain threshold and he swims away after so much abuse.

They just get tired of it and leave. And it's the type of fish, the rock "sh, they live on the bottom. And they like rock areas, outcrops, stuff like that. And these fish, they live here. I mean, they don't migrate around, per se, or anything. They live so -- you know, we have these locations and you keep going back to them. And when there's nothing there after one of these surveys, you know, there's specific places they live. So, the conclusion I can draw is that they are driven away by these seismic surveys.

And I'd like to comment also on the gentleman's comments from Pellargosos (pronouncing), or whatever the name of his company was there — the last fishing trip, — we're approximately three-quarters of a mile away from the Bathom Seal (phonetic) when he turned on his guns and commenced firing. And we're above the water. It's a wooden fishing vessel I own. And you feel a shock through the deck like an earthquake. And there's a substantial sound. I can't really describe it. But I can't picture

a diver being anywhere in the water in the vicinity of that. So, evidently, he's talking about something different than what we see. I don't know.

What's happening is we're getting our livelihood shot off from under us right now. This is — this has been an ongoing problem. It's going to continue. And I'd like to — you know, either one way or the other, either, you know, we're all mistaken about the effects of the seismic or else we're not. I'd like to have this put to rest. I feel that possibly your EIR would help accomplish that.

Thank you very much for your time.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Any questions? Do you have any other witnesses?

MR. MELLEM: Yes, a couple more. Steve?

MR. DURM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, staff members. My name is Steve Dunn. I'm from Santa Barbara. I'm a trap and gill net fisherman there.

And I, too, would like to concur with the intent of having an EIR done on this situation. I'd like to address a couple of items in the Calendar Item No. 27.

The first full paragraph on page 6, and the second full paragraph on page 7.

During early late May or early June of 1986, myself and one other fisherman out of Santa Barbara have had a

string of crab gear adjacent to the Point Conception area just north of Point Conception itself. And we fish regularly in depths ranging between 10 and 30 fathoms.

æ

1/4

And one morning I arrived just after sunrise in the area. At first, I thought I was the only boat in the vicinity. Then I discovered what turned out to be the research vessel, Misty Esserman (phonetic), an 85-foot boat that was contracted to Chevron to do what I believe was a side-scan sonar survey, a very intensive survey utilizing what is described as a fish on the end of a long cable.

I observed Misty Esserman traveling in an east-west pattern repeatedly throughout half of the day, ranging in depths from 9 to approximately 40 fathoms back and forth, back and forth doing their work. And I got close enough to observe the boat. I asked them what they were doing. They told me what they were doing.

And I did pt see at that time any reason why I should stop them or whether I could stop the activity. I observed at a point where they were in approximately 20 fathoms of depth the cable trailing from the back of the boat at approximately a 45-degree angle, indicating that they were towing a relatively short cable, and seaing that they pulled it into approximately nine fathoms to do their turnaround, I surmised it was a very short

cable.

The weather was not particularly good, but it was good enough for me to find my gear. I mentioned to them where the gear was and where the other fisherman's gear was. Subsequently, we lost between seven and eleven traps that day. We reached a fair and equitable compensation agreement with the oil company, Chevron. And our claims were satisfied.

I do not believe that those paragraphs on page 6 and 7 adequately address the concern of short cables.

Purther --

MR. MELLEM: Why don't you specifically point out the paragraphs?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: If I may ask you,

Mr. Dunn, you're speaking of page 6 — down in the bottom

corner, it will say 158.5, in the lower right-hand corner?

MR. DUNN: Yes. Near the top of rage 6, she first full paragraph, not the one that continued from page 5. And on page 7, 158.6.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Thank you. I just wanted to clarify.

MR. MANN: Yeah, thank you. Further, a couple of quick points I'd like to make. The need for consistency between State and Federal policy, which is not something we're addressing him: today, but I'd like to make a quick

mention of.

¥

If, in fact, we, through an EIR, established that there is significant impact on the environment, if we modify or halt seismic exploration in State waters, we need the same consistency in Federal waters.

We need -- I call for our State representatives to help us carry the battle into Federal waters. Foist Conception-Point Arguello area exists as a unique biological system. It could be described as a closed system with its own upwelling. The Pack Baroness freighter that sank the other day sank right on the edge of the upwelling coming up into this closed system.

If, in fact, larvae and fish common to this area are impacted significantly in either State or Federal waters, we will have, I believe, a significantl loss of production of fish and overall environmental concerns in that area.

I think that the staff recommendation and hopefully the Commission's recommendation to hold an EIR is an absolutely fantastic — and I need to say that in the scoping process, it is absolutely imperative that fishermen and/or fishermen representatives be involved in the scoping process.

In 1986, I believe the third or fourth quarter of 1986, we were -- I was among a group of fishermen in

1

3

5

6

7

9

10 11

12

13 14

ĉî 16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

Santa Barbara who were thrust into a very uncomfortable situation with a proposed seismic survey by Exxon Corporation. And this situation points out the lack of mitigation/compensation formulas that, we need to have some out of an EIR I believe.

Mr. Ebert Baxter of Exxon, who i believe is here today, met with a group of fishermen. And we proposed a method of determining compensation on an individual basis. It was in the 11th hour of the proposed test, and we found that we could not agree on terms. I thank there were problems on both sides of the fence. The main problem that there is not a function, not a formula to determine what sort of program was necessary between the two industries.

At any rate, the whole situation blew up to a very uncomfortable point where the group of fishermen I was involved in, including myself, were labeled extortionists. I was not an extortionist. I was simply trying to facilitate some sort of equitable interaction between the two industries.

As was mentioned here earlier today by a member of the geophysical industry, I don't really feel as though the joint committee I the liaison office is a social experiment. I believe it's a business experiment between two industries.

In summation, I would like to say that we are in the eleventh hour, perhaps closer to midnight than we think. It's my understanding that in 1962, there was a statement made by the petroleum industry, perhaps the geophysical industry, that compensation and mitigation for loss of fish, loss of shellfish, would be made by the companies concerned. This has not happened.

I would like to suggest that there has been the possibility of grave damage already incurred upon the environment, and that part of the — the process of mitigating and compensating to the people of the State, as well as the individual fishermen, La sought retroactively.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: May we have our next witness?

MP. POWERS: I'm Ed Powers. I'm a book and line fishermen off of Point Arguello and Point Conception. I've been fishing this 40-mile area for 20 years now. And I've seen the seismic boats go in and out.

They talked about their studies earlier. I could take anybody setting on this panel here or in this room and take them out on my vessel with my fish finder, and we could do a quick study to show fish dispersal. All we have to do is find a school of rock fish that I fish. We could watch the seismic boat drag their cable by it, and

we could see the fish disperse, just as clear as we're sitting here today. I don't know where they get their information, which is — begins to believe that half the stuff they said here today in their reports, they really don't know the facts.

I've been studying these fish for 20 years now.

I've been looking at this scope, which is eight inches by eight inches. For 26 years it's been in front of my face.

And I see everything that goes on on the bottom floor that concerns my fishery. () I just wanted to stress that the problems that we have there — right now, I am under heavy pressures financially. We have seismic vessels that have been working the Arguello area for quite a number of months. We have one there, it's in a three-month study right now, which is really a shame, because it's destroying my livelihood for the next three months.

But I'm one of the fishermen that you might hear from time to time in a report that, well, this guy pulled a gun and did those kind of things. Well, that's what they have me up against the well. As a matter of fact, when I leave this room, it's not unlikely if I go back to Point Arguello to go fishing, if that research boat endangers the fishing spot that I'm fishing for that day to make a living, he is in — jeopardizing his whole crew, because I'm willing to go to all lengths to stop that

vessel.

•

Last year, they tried to rain my Christmas. They were there the week before Christmas. Well, that particular time fish were biting well, and they — one of their vessels came through the area. Well, I had to physically pull up in front of that vessel with a double-barreled shotgun, tell that skipper that his life is in danger, to please turn the vessel back. I am going to make a living for my family. And I realize that they have to make a living also.

So, I suggested that he calls his company and resolve this situation. Well, the crew decided to their best interest that they move the boat and went on home for Christmas. And they called me up and thanked me very politely for sending them home for Christmas.

But that's some of the --

(Applause.)

MR. POWERS: — some of the things that I'm facing today, tomorrow when I leave this room. So, if you see it in the headlines or something, seismic vessel got stopped, well, it's three fighermen that are under pressure. There was 14 of us. Whey couldn't handle the financial part that they were causing us. Three of us stuck it out, and three of us are fighting to the end. If it means going to jail, whatever it takes, we're going

to get rid of the seismic vessel that's going to be out there for the next three months. And I just wanted you to be aware of that that's the problem. And I'm the person right here that you're going to read about if there is any disturbances.

And that's about all I have to say. And one last thing is, like I stressed, on the fish dispersal -- I don't know -- I hear thousands and millions of dollars of studies they've done. Well, any one of you people in this room can come out and bee it for yourself for a mere \$40 worth of diesel fuel. That's all I have to say.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Thank you. Questions? Wext witness?

MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you for continuing to listen to us. My name is Richard Williams, Director of Save our Shellfish, a commercial fisherman in the sea urchin industry. I'm representing the sea urchin divers and the sea urchin processors on the North Coast.

I'd like to put this oil process somewhat in a perspective and let you know, if you're not already aware, there's 9,000 offshore oil platforms already deployed worldwide. So, there's a cumulative impact that's already gone down. So, whatever studies you're coming in to study, which I hope with all my heart that you do participate in

3

\* 5

7

9

10

12

14

15

13

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

2\*

25

these studies, you're studying what's left, and what's left for our future.

With the nine thousand platforms, chere's been a lot of seismic surveys done worldwide to be able to put nine thousand platforms on the ocean floor.

They talk about the diver demonstration, and they brought the gentleman from Humboldt. And I'm sure he saw what he saw and heard what he saw (sic). What they didn't bring is the sea urchin diver that also participated in one of these tests. And he not only was not funded for his travel to come here, he was not even informed that the meeting was here.

He heard the same seismic noises two and a half miles away.

What he did was he went down to the bottom. It was very rough. He went down to the bottom and hung on the bottom of the bottom chain. At the day that he did the test, the other diver from the cil company hung on the chain midwater. Well, as the boat's going up and down, up and down, the chain's going up and down. That guy was holding on for his life.

He just didn't really know what he was doing.

He said he was a commercial diver. He wasn't. What

you're — that test was done on the least obtrusive

mechanism they have. They kept telling us, oh, it's only

one-tenth of what the other tests are. Well, if a diver can hear it two and a half miles away, what's ten times that? What does that do to the industry?

Sea urchin divers, they work right along the beach. They work up to two miles offshore. Even though, seismic surveys that are in Pederal waters can affect a sea urchin diver.

If you're under water at 50 feet for six hours, you're pushing your tables, and you get down some of these channels, some of — the sounds can be channeled down through the canyons under water. There's canyons under water, just like up on the rocky coast. You just have to envision that the same kind of rocks are down below.

It could intensified. The man could be very fatigued. So you could get a lot of effect by what may not have bothered one diver that just hopped in the water and was on the surface and listened versus one diver that's working on the bottom all day.

The sea urchins tend to spawn during earthquakes.

The processors—whenever there's earthquakes, the urchin
roe comes in soft. Okay. There was an earthquake up in
Fort Bragg last week, and the processors — all the urchins
that came in had soft roe. What happens is the seismic
surveys is also affecting the sea urchin roe.

The sea urchim industry is an international

industry. Our market is dependent upon the world market. If we can't compete in the auctions in Japan, we can start losing our markets.

ß

If the seismic survey is causing the urchins in our area to spawn, the quality goes down, we start losing on the international market, and it may take weeks or months to be able to regain your place in the market.

How do we get compensated for that loss? There is no mechanism. Sea urchin divers are professionals. They have air with them. They can more than likely hopefully withstand some kind of a jolt, like a big blast.

The North Coast abalone fishery is sport diving.

You hold your breath to get the abalone. It's a \$10 million
a year industry is what they figure.

You get people that are on the surface. They'll never hear the seismic hoat coming in. And they dive down, hold their breath — I know guys that go 60, 70, 80 feet as free divers. They're good. What happens if they get impacted down there? They get a blast, they get disorienzed; they se't have any air to hold onto. The sport industry was not appraised (sic) of this seismic survey that's being undertaken.

The urchin divers didn't know what was going on, where they were going to be. The processors didn't know when the meetings were going to be held. There is a very

dangerous lack of communication. You hear that they -you're told that there's this communication. We in the
field tell you there's not that communication. We need
the environmental impact report. We need to know what
type of effect these surveys have on our fisheries today
and tomorrow and the future. We're hoping that California
will lead the way. There's been nine thousand platforms
put in without any environmental impact reports elsewhere
in the world.

Those fisheries are going to be impacted. If they start declining, that means our fisheries here in this country will be that much more valuable. Our fisheries will be that much more — their fishermen will be that much more in demand on a world level. And I hope they are.

And I hope California continues to lead the way in -- if we're going to have offshore oil, let's have it in such a way that it doesn't be detrimental to other industries.

Thank you.

ACTING CHALMMAN STANCELL: Any other witnesses?

MR. MELLEN: Okay. That's the last of the

fishermer. I'm just going to make a closing remark if I

may.

I have a number of technical comments, I think,

3

5

7

9

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

that -- on this, but that can all wait. We can provide those in writing.

What I'd like to say to you is, first of all, something that none of us has perhaps said clearly enough. And that is thank you very much. We're extremely elated by this staff report. That may not come across, because of the tremendous amount of frustration that's developed over the years. But we are very excited about the fact that it a pears that at last these matters are going to be looked at in -- with some thoroughness and in a form which assures some neutrality in the findings.

An example of why neutrality is important, the RMS dispersal study of which you've heard so much, there's an administrative version of that which has been severely bowdlerized . You will probably never see those parts of which have been removed. There has been a concerted, conscious effort by the oil and geophysical industry to keep the facts away from you and away from the public. We're extremely happy to know that we now have a Commission and a staff that is going to help us finally get to the truth of these matters.

And so, we thank you for that. Secondly, I think it's extremely important -- it's contained in my letter -- but I do just lastly want to stress that this is really, when all is said and done, an environmental issue

above and beyond everything else.

and the fishermen are early warning. They're sensors. They are the only people in this room, in this State, on this Farth, who can really tell you what is happening out there. They need to be listened to. They probably haven't been listened to. And I think that they now will be. And again, we're very pleased about that. And I would only ask that as you go through the EIR process if, in fact, that is your decision to do one, that you give some serious consideration to a manner in which — in some formal way — a fishery advisory group, a fishermen's advisory group can give you the input, the information they have.

We talk about dispersal. There are fishermen who have a sweet spot which they've gone back to for 10 or 15 years. After the sersaic testing comes through, that sweet spot is gone. Gone forever. Gone for -- now it's been five years in one case of an assecdotal piece of evidence I have.

That is information. It's not scientific information, but it's a lead to the kind of scientific testing and objective findings you need to make. And I hope you will take advantage of the fishermen's willingness to work with you on this process. Thank you very much.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Are there any other

witnesses on this issue?

MR. GAMBILL: My name is Lionel Gambill. I'm
president of Priends of the Coast. We're based in Sonoma
County. And I want to thank you for listening to us
today. I'd like to start by clarifying a couple of things.
It seems to me we're not talking about pure science here;
we're talking about oil and we're talking about money.

If there were not a Lease Sale 91, I don't think that there would be seignic surveys going on off the Mendocino and Humboldt Coasts. I also want to address one thing I heard earlier today. It's an old chestnut, which is the argument that the oil industry makes jobs.

I've heard that before, and I've looked into that. And let me tell you what I found out. In 1980 -- and these are Department of Commerce and Bureau of Labor Statistics data. In 1980, the oil industry collected 40 percent of all U.S. manufacturing profit. In that same year, 1980, the oil industry employed six-tenths of one percent of the nation's workforce.

I don't read that as a sign of an industry that brings jobs into an area. And I could go on. I won't. But I could go on into all the ways the oil industry destroys jobs.

As long as there is any serious question whether seismic testing adversely impacts any segment of the

fishing industry, it would be a serious error to issue a carte blanche for seismic testing. And I'm pleased to see that the Commission probably is not going to do that.

The situation raised a fundamental question that lies at the heart of all the controversies over the use of coastal waters by the oil — for oil development and mining activities. Namely, does any government agency have the right to order an industry—the fishing industry, in this case, that is operating without harm to people or their environment — to submit to the ravages of an industry that is both intrusive and destructive, and to do so over the opposition of the people and the communities and the region affected. We believe no one has that right.

The fishing industry has been a good neighbor to coastal residents and a boom to tourism, the other major nondestructive industries on our coast. Even current studies by MMS indicate that a negative declaration would not be justified. We ask you not to lock yourselves into a position that may soon prove untenable.

We believe you case it to the people who live on the coast, who work on the coast or in its waters, and who visit the coast for recreation and inspiration to withhold a new master permit until you have held public hearings in the affected areas and until a new — a full environmental impact report has been issued, commented on, and reviewed. To do any less would be a breach of faith.

Thank you.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: You have one more witness?

MR. DSMIDT: My name os Warren DSmidt. I'm reading for a friend of mine who's fished the coast of Mendocino for a long time.

"I'm sorry I can't be here today in person, but a friend has generously offered to read this statement for me.

"I have lived on the Mendocino

Coast for almost 17 years, diving for
abalone and sea urchins, sport fishing
for salmon, and owning and operating
a commercial salmon troller for several
years.

"A few weeks ago, I went abalone diving with a long-time diving partner. The ocean looked calm and clear. As we were loading our gear into my friend's boat, which was docked in Albion, a sea urchin diver remarked that there was a strong undertow in the water and he almost had his face mask ripped off. It seemed odd to us, because we've never

experienced undertows in that area.

2

Creek and anchored in our usual spot. 3

As we were putting on our flippers and

"We motored to just south of Salmon

5

masks and snorkels, we heard a loud

6 7

a large wave breaking on the cliff. We

crash. When we turned shoreward, we saw

8

looked out to sea, and the ocean still

9

looked calm and still.

10

but anchored the boat out a little further 11

12

just in case. The whole time we were in

"That was pretty strange, we thought,

13

the water diving, things seemed unusual.

14

The schools of black and blue rock fish

is.

that are usually plentiful were nowhere to be seen. Although the water seemed

16

caim from above, down below there was

"When we returned to the boat, we

17 18

lots of movement.

19

talked about how odd it was and I

20

21 thought, maybe there's been an earthquake

22

somewhere. Later that day, I read in the

23

a few days before. I also discovered that 24

25

the salmon, which had been around in large

newspaper that seismic testing had begun

numbers all season, had disappeared.

Although the oil companies felt they
were compromising by just testing inside
the three-mile limit at night or going
further offshore during the day,
unfortunately, no one told the salmon
of this plan.

"There is no way to know for sure, but it wouldn't surprise me if they all took off after the first test.

many times in the past, please do anything in your power to prevent oil drilling off the coast of Northern California. I, too, an an energy user. But I'm aware of the fact that there are alternatives to fossil fuels, and I would like to see these alternatives seriously researched and developed instead of further de grading of the ocean.

"Dobie Dawson, Albion, California."

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Are there any other witnesses on this matter?

HR. WILEY: Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I'm a commercial fisherman from Port San Luis.

The name is Paul Wiley.

And I don't know numbers the way they're throwing them at us out here today. I don't understand that. But I understand that when you set a net down for three or four hours and you get a fairly good catch, and you say, "Well, that paid for the fuel."

Then you set it down again, and you make another four-hour tow, and then you meet one of these boats; you look up there, and he's coming towards you. And you have to make a detour, get out of the way from him. And maybe the fish is in 70 fathoms and you have to go out to a hundred to get around him. Well, there's no fish out there, and you don't just get around him, because they control a couple miles just about in every direction where they're at.

And you lose your catch that way. And then it bothers you when you wake a four-hour tow and you pull something up that cross off of one of these boats. And maybe it takes you two hours and up as much as five hours in the last two or three months to where — to even yet the net on board. And then you have to cut the net to get whatever it is out of the boat.

And these are thirds that are left from where they're working, where they're at. And just here a while back, we was hung a for seven hours on an anchor that

the oil people had left in that vicinity.

We finally, after staying a certain length of time, we broke the cable and 30t loose. But these things is all because of pollution that they're throwing into the water that they will not take off of the boats when they get in shore. But it's just things like that. And it's very frustrating to see that these people are destroying the last natural resource that we have.

There's nothing left when that ocean goes. Forget it. You ain't got nothing left. It's gone. And there's just things like that. And they never put their name on nothing. The only thing they put their name on was a minisubmarine that we picked up, and they really claimed that. That was worth a hundred thousand dollars. They claimed that right off of the bat. But anything else, we've — in the last six or eight months — we've gotten tractor tires that you could barsly roll inside of this building right here.

I'm talking about huge tractor tires that they have on the side of their big boats or on the side of the platforms to run their cables through to -- bumper: they call them -- fenders. These things you get. And we get as much as -- there for a while, when you work any area where they have been, you are going -- if you make three tows a day, at least tows of those you're going to get

things that are not natural down there.

Æ

You're going to get tires, barrels. We get barrels of -- 50-gallon barrels of oil rags. They sweep up the oil trimmings on the floor where they work. They pile them in a 50-gallon barrel, pile rags on top of them, and kick them off.

And then the commercial fisherman comes along and picks them up. I don't know about what damage it's doing, I don't understand that. But I do know that they are polluting this ocean, and it's going to be gone before long.

Thank you very much for your time.

(Applause.)

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Do we have any other witness on this, this issue?

Yes. I think we're at a point now where we can entertain the recommendation of the staff, unless there's another individual that -- I've been told that there may be an individual that may want to address the Commission? That individual has decided not to? Okay.

EXECUTIVE OPFICER DEDRICK: Please come up. You'll have to identify yourself for the record.

MR. MORREAU: My name's from Morneau, and I would like to speak for the proposal to allow the permits. It's our understanding, though, and many of our people have left,

that we were adjourning hearing the information for 1 2 issuance of the permit until the 7th. And I just wanted to confirm that before --3 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes. As I --Mr. Stancell, Commissioners, you -- we would -- the intent 5 was to leave the record open for both written testimony and 6 oral testimony, including testimony on the 7th. That is 7 correct, is it not, Commissioner? 3 ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: That is correct. 9 And that is the action which I was addressing. 10 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: We have one other 11 action. Mr. Hight, if you will, Bir. 12 13 ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: It's related to this issue? 14 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes. 15 16 ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Go ahead. 17 MR. HIGHT: I was just going to propose a motion, 18 but qo ahead. 19 COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: That's what I was going to ask you. Since I was not in at the beginning of this 20 matter and the motion is up to me, I'd like the staff to 21 indicate what they feel is the appropriate motion at this 22 23 point. 24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: I'd ask Mr. Hight to do that. This is kind of a legal technicality that we feel 25

needs to be dealt with.

₽

.2

2\*

MR. HIGHT: We would propose at this point that the Commission deny all of the applications contained in the staff report on page 158.10, Exhibit A, Part A, and authorize that those applications would be considered, if the companies so desire, at the next Commission meeting on the 7th, and authorize that this staff report be made public and hold a second hearing on the item on the 7th.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: You heard the motion?

COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: I would therefore move,
based on the recommendation of our staff, that we deny
the applications presented on page 158.10, and that we -as part of that same motion, reconsider the applications,
assuming the applicants wished them reconsidered, at the
next Commission meeting. And 7 so move.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: It's been moved. Second.

Ts there a question?

MS. KERWAH: Excuse me. My name is B. J. Rizwan. I had hoped to speak today and will in two weeks. I represent a number of the oil companies and grophysical companies, who are the real parties in interest in a lawsuit filed by some Santa Barbara fishermen who've been here today.

I would strongly oppose and really urge you to delay any action until you've heard all the testimony here today.

**\* T** 

I was trying very hard to be solicitous of the fact that you've graciously given another hearing time to hear additional testimony. And I really strongly object to taking action until you've heard that testimony.

We've a lot to say. And I don't want to take your time now when you don't want to hear it, and you've provided us with an additional time period. But I really would appreciate you're not taking action till you've heard it.

HR. PELKOFER: I understand that there's a legal consequence to our not taking action to reject at this point, which we're attempting to avoid, and that is wrowe are indeed rejecting the applications today. In the same motion, we're granting reconsideration of the applications at the next meeting.

It's simply a mechanical, technical need, as
I understand it from our legal staff, to operate in that
way rather than to take no action today.

Mr. Might, do you want to explain further or -
MR. HIGHT: Yes. Just to clarify. Under the

Permit Streamlining Act, there are a number of arguments
that could be made and this, we believe, clarifies those

arguments.

2

3

4

5

7

8

3

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

17

18

19

20

31

22

23

24

25

MS. KIRMAN: You're talking about things being deemed granted if they aren't acted upon in a certain period?

MR. HIGET: Yes.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Yes.

W3. KIRWAN: And you're running across that time period?

MR. RIGHT: Yes.

about five cases. So the purpose of this would be just to get rid of the loose ends so that the Commission can act on a clean slate on the 7th.

MS. KIRWAN: My concern is that many of these applications have been in since March of 1986. And by specifically denying these applications, you're beginning a whole 12 -- new 12-month time period, which is more than just wiping the slate clean. It's starting -- giving yourselves another 12 months to consider these applications.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Is that correct?

MR. HIGHT: That's correct.

MS\_ KIRWAM: So, it's affirmative action. It's not just --

MR. HIGHT: That is correct. It is affirmative action.

1	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: But the intent is to
2	deal with the issue on the 7th of October in terms of
3	reconsideration of the request for a permit.
4	MS. KIRWAN: The problem is what you're doing is
5	more than just
£	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: We understand.
7	MS. KIRMAX: All right. And I, for the record,
8	strongly object, because we've heard two over two
9	hours of testimony by the proponents of what is currently
10	the staff report and less than an hour and about an hour
11	from our side. And I was really trying to be gracious,
12	and I guess I regret it a little bit now, because I think
13	that there's a lot more to be heard.
14	ACTING CHAIRMAN ST NCELL: Thank you.
15	MR. PELKOFER: Vote on the motion?
16	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: That's the motion.
17	MR. PELKOFER: I vote age on the motion.
18	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Aye.
19	That is the order.
20	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: All right. Are you
21 -	ready for the rost of the calendar, Hr. Chairman?
22	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: I think so.
23	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Okay. Beginning with
24	Item 24, this is a request by staff to recommendation
25	by staff to rescind the authorization of a salvage permit

1	drauted two Aears ado to the will neaerobment
2	Corporation for the salvage operation off Point Arguello
3	in Santa Barbara County.
4	COMMISSIONER PELEOPER: Hove the staff's
5	recommendation.
6	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Without objection
7	VOICE FROM AUDIENCE: I can't hear. I'm sorry.
3	ACTING HAIRMAN STANCELL: Okay, Without
9	objection, so be the order.
10	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: No. 25 is off
11	calendar. No. 26 is approval of a one-year general permit-
12	public agency use for the Department of Parks and
13	Recreation
14	ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: Mr. Chairman,
15	can we ask these folks that are going to vacate to do
76	so, please, so we can conduct the rest of the business?
17	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Thank you. Those that
18	have no business remaining on this agenda and you're in the
19	process of leaving, we would ask you to leave very quietly.
20	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Okay. Thank you,
21	Mr. Chairman. Item 26. This is granting a public agency
22	use permit to the Department of Parks and Recreation for
23	the purposes of doing some scientific studying and sampling
24	of artifacts on a sunken vessel off the Sacramento
25	waterfront.

1	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Do I have a motion?
2	COMMISSIONER PELKOPER: A motion to approve the
3	staff's recommendation.
4	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCEL: It's been moved and
5	approved.
6	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Okay. Thank you.
7	And Item 28, City of Long Beach. This is approval of the
8	final report and closing statement of the 86-87 plan of
9	development and operations for the Long Beach operations.
10	Mr. Chairman, Moose Thompson would like to speak
11	to this issue.
12	MR. THOMPSON: I know we're in a hurry here. I
13	just want to point out the particular year is the year
14	where the crude oil price dropped. This is the period
15	right in here, started midyear. This is dollars per
16	barrel, and this is actually dollars per month. You can
17	see that here our revenue was getting down to the level
18	there. The oil industry was going through the same thing.
19	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: All right. Do we have
20	a motion?
21	COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: Motion.
22	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: It's been movel.
23	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Okay. Item 29 is
24	again relevant to the City of Long Beach. It's the
25	seismic report, subsidence report for now. And Mr.

Thompson would like to speak to this issue.

Î

2

3

5

8

7

9

11

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MR. THOMPSON: Twice a year we run ground elevation surveys throughout the whole portion of Long Beach.

We start over here (indicating on map). There's a solid rock outcrop up here. And we run elevation surveys throughout here (indicating).

This is merely a summation from May, 1965 to the current time. May, '65 is significant because that was before any oi. was taken out of the Long Beach Unit, this area right in here.

If there's subsidence damage in this area, the Commission has to make a finding. This shows you that from that period of time, this entire area is now higher in elevation than it was when the first production started, so there is no subsidence in that area.

COMMISSIONER PELKOPER: Are you sure the pumps are working in the right direction?

MR. THOMPSON: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: Ckay.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Do I hear a motion?

21 COMMISSIONER PELEOPER: Motion.

22 ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Moved. Next item.

23 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 30 is award of

24 a royalty oil sales contract for a State oil sale in

25 Huntington Beach in Orange County to Golden West Relining.

1	The winning bid was 69.9 cents.					
2	COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: Motion to adopt.					
3	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Moved.					
4	Next item.					
5	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: 31, City of Richmond.					
6	A maintenance dredging permit to the Port of Richmond in					
	Contra Costa County.					
;	COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: Move.					
9	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Moved.					
10	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Bush Oil Company,					
11	Ntem 32, amendment of State oil and gas leases 410, 429,					
12	and 1466 on the Rincon Oil Field in Ventura County.					
13	COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: Move approval.					
14	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Motion carried.					
15	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 33, again the					
16	Bush Oil Company. It's approval of drilling a well,					
17	No. "State 410" 15 off Kincon Island in Ventura County					
18	not off Rincon Island.					
19	COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: Move approval.					
20	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Motion carried.					
21	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Okay. 34, assignment					
22	of a State oil and gas lease, 3499, Santa Barbara County.					
23	COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: Move approval.					
24	ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Notion carried.					
25	EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Okay. Item 35, approva					

of prospecting permit for minerals other than oil, gas. 1 geothermal resources, sand and gravel in Imperial County 2 to Walter Wheeler. 3 COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: Move Approval. 4 ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Motion carried. 5 EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: And Item 36 is done. 6 Item 37 is off calendar. Ind Item 38, a legal item. 7 Mr. Highc, would you take the legal item? 8 MR. HIGHT: Mr. Chairman, 38 is the boundary 9 line agreement in the City of Torrance and a leaseback to 10 the city. 11 COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: And the recommendation is 12 for approval? 13 MR. HIGHT: The recommendation is for approval. 14 COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: Move approval. 15 ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Motion carried. 16 MR. HIGHT: 39, Mr. Chairman, is a very historic 17 At last, the Lands Commission and respective 18 parties in Batiquitor Lagoon restoration project have 19 reached an agreement which will expedite or help implement 20 the lagoon enhancement project. 21 And this is authorization to execute the 22 agreement. 23 COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: Move approval. 24 ACTIYG CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Motion carried. 25

Next item?

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HIGHT: 40 is the authorization to hold a public hearing for concurrent jurisdiction at Moffett Field.

COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: Move approval.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Motion carried.

Next item.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: 41.

MR. HIGHT: 41 is the authorization to approve a compromise title settlement, whereby the State will take \$125,000 in lieu of the State's interest, and you will also be acting as Kapiloff Land Bank trustees in this authorization.

PELKOFER: Move approval.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: Motion carried.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: That's the end of the calendar, sir.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: That's the end of the calendar? Then --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER DEDRICK: Item 43 was acted on earlier.

ACTING CHAIRMAN STANCELL: I will entertain a motion that the meeting of the State Lands Commission be adjourned.

COMMISSIONER PELKOFER: So move, Mr. Chairman.

1		ACTING CHAIRM	MAN STANCELL:	Approved.	Mary to the second				
2		EXECUTIVE OFF	FICER DEDRICK:	Thank you,					
3	Commissioners.								
4	(Thereupon the hearing was adjourned								
5	at 3:05 p.m.)								
6			000						
7		-							
8									
9									
10				S					
11			<u></u>						
12			•	·					
13									
14				•					
15									
16									
17									
18	Ð	e entre							
19									
20		•							
21					** <u>`</u>				
22									
23									
24									
25			-						
43									
			16						

.

## CERTIFICATE OF SHORTHAND REPORTER

I, Nadine J. Parks, a shorthand reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing regular meeting before the State Lands Commission was reported in shorthand by me and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 16th day of October, 1987.

Nadine J. Parks Shorthand Reporter