

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Minutes of the Meeting of the
State Lands Commission
Sacramento, California

March 31, 1975

A regular meeting of the State Lands Commission was called to order by Chairman Kenneth Cory at 10:02 a.m. in Room 6031, State Capitol, Sacramento, California, on Monday, March 31, 1975.

Present: Kenneth Cory, State Controller, Chairman
Mervyn M. Dymally, Lieutenant Governor, Commissioner
Roy M. Bell, Director of Finance, Commissioner

Staff Members in Attendance:

William F. Northrop, Executive Officer
R. S. Golden, Assistant Executive Officer
D. J. Everitts, Manager, Energy and Mineral
Resources Development
James F. Trout, Manager, Land Operations
W. M. Thompson, Manager, Long Beach Operations
W. R. Atlee, Legislative Coordinator
Robert C. Hight, Staff Counsel
Luella Kunkle, Secretary

Also in Attendance:

Representing the Office of the Attorney General
N. Gregory Taylor, Deputy Attorney General

Appearances:

Re Minute Item 8 - 6-Month Noncommercial Lease;
Running Fence Corporation; Sonoma
and Marin Counties

Howard N. Nemerovski, attorney, representing
Christo, appeared in favor
Paul Kayfetz, attorney, representing Christo,
appeared in favor
Dr. Ernest C. Harris, project engineer,
appeared in favor

Re Minute Item 11 - Termination of Noncommercial Lease
PRC 3935; River Mansion Development
Corporation; Sacramento County

Darrell J. McConnell, representing the California
Marina and Recreation Association

Re Minute Item 30 - Status of Major Litigation

Darrell J. McConnell, representing the California
Marina and Recreation Association

Re Minute Item 33 - Request by City of Pittsburg for
a fishing pier permit; Contra Costa
County

Joel Summerhill, Park Planner, representing the
City of Pittsburg

1. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF FEBRUARY 27, 1975

Upon motion duly made and carried, the minutes of the meeting
of the State Lands Commission of February 27, 1975, were approved
as written.

2. CONFIRMATION OF NEXT MEETING OF THE STATE LANDS COMMISSION

The next regular meeting of the Commission was confirmed for
Wednesday, April 30, 1975, at 10:00 a.m. in Long Beach.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

During the Executive Officer's report, Mr. William F. Northrop reported on the following matters:

1. Negotiations relative to Atlantic Richfield Company's permit to resume drilling in the Santa Barbara Channel, South Ellwood Offshore Field, Santa Barbara County, stating that the final review should come before the Commission at its April 30 meeting. W 9723
2. Denial of request by the City of Pittsburg, and the reasons therefor, to have its application for a fishing pier permit heard at this meeting. W 20893
3. Possible settlement with the Federal Government concerning the lawsuit on the sell-offs in the Huntington Beach area, Orange County. (PRC 4832)

During the report, Commissioners Bell and Dymally instructed the staff to review the policy of applications for piers by political jurisdictions and individuals and the consideration in connection therewith. Mr. Northrop pointed out that authorization for a public hearing concerning revising the Commission's rental rates is currently before the Commission.

In concurrence with the other Commissioners, Chairman Cory appointed Commissioner Dymally to head the legislative liaison committee for the Commission.

Attachment:
Exhibit "A" (2 pages)

EXHIBIT "A"

EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT

March 31, 1975

by
William F. Northrop

1. ARCO

I would like to report that the staff review of Atlantic Richfield Company's permit to resume drilling operations on Platform Holly is still underway at this time. Negotiations are also proceeding in an orderly fashion. We expect to be able to bring the final review and proposed permit changes before you for consideration at the next Commission meeting: April 30 in Long Beach.

2. CITY OF PITTSBURG

The City of Pittsburgh had requested that their application for a fishing pier be made an item in today's agenda. Staff was forced to deny the request for the following reasons:

- (1) The Negative Declaration and Notice of Determination provided by the applicant were not in compliance with the procedural requirements of CEQA or of the State Guidelines.
- (2) Since the applicant had ample time to comply with CEQA regulations (the Negative Declaration is dated June 1974 and the application to the Commission dated February 1975), the staff could

not justifiably treat the matter as an "oversight" on the part of the applicant.

To do so would have been asking the Commission to certify documents known to be invalid.

- (3) As a courtesy to the applicant, we checked with the State Clearinghouse as late as Friday, March 28, 1975, and found that the Negative Declaration still had not been filed with that agency. Possible concerned agencies, therefore, have had no opportunity to comment on the project or, in some cases, to even know of such a project. Had the usual circulation taken place, it is possible that concerned agencies might have wanted to comment on the project.

3. RUNNING FENCE

Mr. Chairman -- when you get to Item 5(a) in order, I have some preliminary remarks I would like to make at that time.