

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MEETING
STATE LANDS COMMISSION
STATE OF CALIFORNIA

ORIGINAL

SACRAMENTO MARINA
2710 RAMP WAY
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 1993
11:00 A.M.

Nadine J. Parks
Shorthand Reporter

MEMBERS PRESENT

1
2
3 Leo T. McCarthy, Lieutenant Governor, Chairman

4 Gray Davis, State Controller, Commissioner

5 Susanne Burton for Thomas W. Hayes,
6 Director of Finance, Commissioner

7
8
9 Staff:

10 Charles Warren, Executive Officer

11 James Trout, Assistant Executive Officer

12 Robert Hight, Chief Counsel

13 Also Present:

14 Jan Stevens, Deputy Attorney General
15 Alan Hager, Deputy Attorney General

16 Mark Meier
17 Mike Valentine
18 Dwight Sanders
19 Dan Gorfain
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

	<u>Page</u>
<u>Agenda Items</u>	
II Call to Order	1
Opening Remarks by Chairman McCarthy	1
III Confirmation of Minutes for Meeting of February 25, 1993	1
IV <u>Consent Calendar</u> (As described herein)	
Questions/Comments	1
Commission Action	4
V <u>Regular Calendar</u>	
Item 28 James Trout Assistant Executive Officer	5
Ernie Carpenter Supervisor Fifth District County of Sonoma	6
Questions/Comments	8
Commission Action	10
Item 42 Robert Faber Representing Gary Kaveney	10
Item 44 45 46 James Trout Assistant Executive Officer	12
Olin Jones Olin Jones Sand Company	13
Questions/Comments	14
Commission Action	19
//	

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1	INDEX, continued. . .	<u>Page</u>
2	<u>Agenda Items</u>	
3	Item 47 Charles Warren	
4	Executive Officer	20
5	Questions/Comments	27
6	Assemblyman Jack O'Connell	
7	County of Santa Barbara	29
8	Questions/Comments	32
9	Jim Shamas	
10	President	
11	Texaco Trading & Transportation, Inc.	33
12	Dan Mihalik	
13	Manager	
14	Gaviota Terminal Company	36
15	Questions/Comments	39
16	Continued Presentation by	
17	Mr. Mihalik	41
18	Questions/Comments	43
19	Andrew Moynagh	
20	Building Trades Council/COLAB	68
21	Richard S. Kasa	
22	California Energy Service &	
23	Supply Association	69
24	Questions/Comments	71
25	Angelo Castagnola	
26	Santa Barbara	72
27	Valerie Nera	
28	California Chamber of Commerce	74
29	Daniel P. Kramer	
30	California Independent Petroleum	
31	Association	76
32	Frank Morin	
33	Coalition of Labor, Agriculture,	
34	and Business of Ventura County	78

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
 TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1	INDEX, continued. . .	<u>Page</u>
2	<u>Agenda Items</u>	
3	Item 47 Robert K. Foote	
4	H & H Oil Tool Company, Inc.	79
5	Questions/Comments	81
6	Lou Blackwell	
7	General Manager, Western Supply	
8	Region, Chevron	86
9	Questions/Comments	87
10	Gerald D. Secundy	
11	Four Corners Pipe Line Company	94
12	Questions/Comments	94
13	Bill Douros	98
14	Santa Barbara County	
15	Board of Supervisors	
16	Questions/Comments	100
17	Continued Presentation by	
18	Mr. Douros	101
19	Questions/Comments	105
20	Linda Krop, Esq.	
21	EDC, Sierra Club, Get Oil Out,	
22	CPA, LWVSB, SF, HRA, and	
23	Commercial Fishermen	120
24	Questions/Comments	137
25	Jana Zimmer, Esq.	
	American Oceans Campaign	145
	Questions/Comments	153
	Steve Dunn	
	Santa Barbara Trap Fishermen	154
	Questions/Comments	158

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
 TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1	INDEX, continued. . .	<u>Page</u>
2	<u>Agenda Items</u>	
3	Item 47 Robert B. Klausner	
4	Citizen	162
5	Questions/Comments	168
6	Joy Piazza (By Linda Krop)	
7	Greater Santa Barbara Lodging Assn.	173
8	Tom Moore, Vice President	
9	Chevron Shipping Company	177
10	Dan Mihalik	
11	Gaviota Terminal Company	186
12	<u>Staff Summation</u>	
13	Charles Warren	189
14	Commission Deliberations	192
15	Motion by Burton to Approve	
16	Option 3	201
17	Discussion	201
18	Section by McCarthy	202
19	Discussion	202
20	Commission Action	203
21	Adjournment	203
22	Certificate of Reporter	204
23		
24		
25		

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
 TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

P R O C E E D I N G S

--oOo--

1
2
3 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Good morning, ladies and
4 gentlemen. At this time, I want to apologize for these
5 crowded conditions for those of you who are outside;
6 and at the same time, express my envy that you're in the
7 sun and we're in here.

8 And there's a lot of testimony, so maybe it'll
9 get a little warmer in this room than outside. We looked
10 at every possible place for a larger hearing room in
11 Sacramento -- I don't know what's happening today. But
12 we went to the Convention Center. We went to hotels
13 around town; every State meeting room is taken in some
14 way. So, I am sorry for the crowded condition here today.

15 At the outset, let me indicate that, without
16 objection, the minutes of the previous Commission meeting
17 are approved. On the consent calendar, we would like to
18 add Consent Calendar Items 40, 41 -- pardon me. I should
19 have started with 29. 29, 40, 41, and 43. 41's already
20 on the list. We deleted -- there are witnesses here on
21 28 and 42.

22 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Mr. Chairman, we'll
23 remove Consent Calendar Item 28 from the Consent
24 Calendar and put that on the regular calendar.

25 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: It's not on the Consent

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Calendar yet, so I'm not placing it on there, because I
2 didn't mention it. So, it remains on the regular
3 calendar. It's now on the Consent Calendar now?

4 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: It's now on there.

5 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. We're going to
6 remove Consent Calendar 28 and it is now on the regular
7 calendar. And we're removing from the Consent Calendar
8 Items 20, 34, and 41. 41 wasn't on the Consent Calendar.
9 We're removing removing 20 and 34 from the Consent
10 Calendar.

11 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: From the calendar
12 completely.

13 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: From the calendar completely.

14 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Let me walk you
15 through, if I may, Mr. Chairman.

16 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Why don't you? Slowly.

17 (Laughter.)

18 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Remove from the
19 calendar entirely, not to be considered --

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Not to be considered.
21 Category 1.

22 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Yes. -- Consent
23 Calendar Items --

24 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Out of our sight.

25 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: -- 20 and 34.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: 20 and 34, not on any
2 calendar today.

3 (Laughter.)

4 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Category 2.

6 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Regular Calendar
7 Item 41 is to be removed from today's calendar.

8 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Regular Calendar Item 41
9 is to be removed from today's calendar.

10 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: To be removed from
11 the Consent Calendar and placed on the Regular Calendar is
12 Item 28.

13 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: 28.

14 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: That will be
15 considered by you today.

16 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: That is to be seen today,
17 but on the Regular Calendar.

18 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Regular Calendar.

19 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I'm getting the hang of this.
20 On Category -- 14.

21 (Laughter.)

22 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: On the Regular
23 Calendar, transfer Items 40 and 43 to the Consent
24 Calendar.

25 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. 40 and 43 that

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 were on the Regular Calendar -- if any of you watch the
2 NFL draft on Sunday, you'll get the sense of what we're
3 doing here. 40 and 43 are going on the Consent
4 Calendar from the Regular Calendar. Any other
5 categories here?

6 How about 29?

7 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: 29 remains on --
8 Mr. Chairman, not seeing any -- would the Chair inquire
9 if there's any person in the audience who wishes --

10 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Does anyone here wish to
11 speak on 29? If not, 29 remains on the Consent Calendar.

12 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Yes, that's exactly
13 so.

14 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Now, that's all I have,
15 Mr. Warren. Do you by any chance have any other?

16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: That's all I have,
17 Mr. Chairman. My apologies.

18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Oh, that's all right.

19 All right. Without objection, the Consent
20 Calendar, as amended, is adopted.

21 COMMISSIONER BURTON: That's fine.

22 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Now I'd like to move to the
23 Regular Calendar. And we're going to start with --

24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Item 28.

25 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: What about No. 9, which was

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 on the Consent Calendar? Oh, it's not. That's only if
2 needed. Item 28. Would you step forward, sir, --

3 MR. CARPENTER: I beg your pardon. I haven't
4 had an opportunity to fill this out (speaking of speaker's
5 slip).

6 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Supervisor, is this on 28?

7 MR. CARPENTER: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right.

9 MR. CARPENTER: Where do I go?

10 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: The podium is fine. If
11 you'll wait just a second; Mr. Warren, who would you like
12 to address this issue from the staff?

13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Mr. Trout.

14 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Mr. Trout.

15 ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER TROUT: Mr. Chairman,
16 I think I'm going to take that issue. Item 28 is the
17 consideration of a request by Sonoma County to install in
18 the Russian River four bridge crossings for summer access
19 to facilities on one side of the river.

20 The application before you is a one-year permit
21 at four locations. There has been considerable interest on
22 the part of the Federal Government, environmental agencies,
23 the National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish & Wildlife
24 Service, and the State Department of Fish & Game with
25 regard to the long-term impact of these bridges. They have

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 been installed for several years across the river.

2 This year, we have a little different thing:
3 With the additional water available in the river,
4 portions of the river bed that formerly were dry by
5 summertime may, in fact, be wet.

6 We have appreciated the assistance of Sonoma
7 County in working on this item. They've cooperated with
8 us wonderfully. We think we've worked out a solution
9 that would take care of this summer so that they can get
10 the bridges in by May 15th, which is their interest, to
11 beat the Memorial Day weekend.

12 Staff remains concerned about the long-term
13 impacts, and we have suggested that the County look to a
14 long-term permit rather than a year-by-year permit. And
15 we would like to continue to work with the County.

16 However, staff recommends approval of the
17 calendar item as submitted.

18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Any further
19 testimony for our side? Supervisor Carpenter.

20 MR. CARPENTER: Yes, Mr. Lieutenant Governor,
21 thank you. First, we agree with the permit conditions
22 for this year, and we've come up the freeway simply to
23 address a grievance on the part of Sonoma County. And
24 while we have enjoyed our brief relationship with the State
25 Lands Commission's staff, we haven't enjoyed it that much.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 (Laughter.)

2 MR. CARPENTER: And really, when they say a
3 short period of year, one bridge has been in for a
4 hundred plus. We can document that two others have been
5 in for fifty-plus years, and the third a mere -- or
6 fourth, a mere 28 years.

7 And the Russian River is artificially controlled
8 as far as releases go. We've had to educate your staff.
9 And we've come to an agreement. We'll agree to it for one
10 year, and we're going to continue to raise some opposition,
11 and we'll have a friendly back and forth.

12 The reason we came up the freeway today to speak
13 to you is that we paid \$1,750 for a permit, and then
14 negotiating through conditions -- which simply can't work
15 on the Russian River, because people who are involved with
16 this did not know how the Russian River worked, and we had
17 to educate them -- they're charging us another 2,250 bucks
18 for somewhere around the neighborhood of 4,000. My
19 question is is, is there a nexus to these charges?

20 We've been in this condition for 50, 100 years
21 with these summer crossings. They do not impede fish
22 flow; they do not impede canoe traffic, or any other
23 traffic that could go up and down the river. The Army
24 Corps of Engineers has given us a five-year individual
25 permit. We should get some credit for that. That's not

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 The National Marine Fisheries, Fish & Game, and
2 Water Quality Control Board have all signed off. The only
3 people who have a problem at this point is the State
4 Lands Commission. And frankly, we don't quite understand
5 it. We're going to continue to work with you. We protest
6 the fees. We want to see a nexus study. The Attorney
7 General requires the counties to do that. But simply
8 because we negotiate over the telephone and have our
9 legislators involved, they're charging us for this. So,
10 I just don't get it. That's why I'm here.

11 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Okay. Well, I understand
12 your plea. I don't think we're going to resolve this
13 problem today, and I don't think you expected us to. But
14 I would like the staff to diligently pursue this
15 conversation with Supervisor Carpenter, his colleagues,
16 and his staff in Sonoma County, and let's see if we can
17 find a way to simplify this process.

18 MR. CARPENTER: Might I raise one issue? They
19 say they won't write the permit until we pay them \$4,000.
20 So, I just --

21 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: At this time?

22 MR. CARPENTER: That's the latest communication
23 by fax. They didn't previously warn us of that. They
24 simply sent us a fax saying it's going to cost us four
25 grand. I have to go to my Board of Supervisors to get an

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 authorization. If we could -- well, what's the 1750 for?
2 If we could pay that and get our permit, and then
3 negotiate costs and see a nexus, we might pay it. We may
4 I don't know. I hate to present you with this quandary.

5 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I don't know the answer
6 to that.

7 MR. TROUT: Well, Mr. Chairman, the fees are
8 based on a schedule which was derived from the actual hours
9 required to process a permit. There's some upfront
10 fees that are required for the processing, and there are
11 post-fees that are required. We'd be happy to work with
12 the Supervisor. However, to be consistent with the
13 Governor and Legislature's request that agencies become
14 self-supporting as much as possible, we have, with the
15 Commission's agreement, established these funds.

16 We'd like to work with the Supervisor and see what
17 we can come up with. We will demonstrate the connection.

18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Do a good job. All right.
19 We won't give you satisfaction on that today, Ernie, but --

20 MR. CARPENTER: A final comment?

21 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: -- we're sensitive to the
22 issue you raised.

23 MR. CARPENTER: Okay. Should I sit down or make
24 a final comment?

25 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: No, you can make a final

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 comment.

2 MR. CARPENTER: Well, if you'd get the conditions
3 right, you wouldn't have to charge us, because then we
4 could work with this, and not here on the stand.

5 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you for your
6 clarity. All right.

7 (Laughter.)

8 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right, without
9 objection, the recommendation is adopted.

10 MR. CARPENTER: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Next item on the
12 Regular Calendar.

13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: That's Item 42,
14 Mr. Chairman. This is an informational calendar item
15 concerning the matter which you directed the staff to
16 provide you with information. The information is
17 contained in the staff report. And Mr. Robert Faber
18 wishes to address the Commission on the item.

19 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Mr. Faber?

20 MR. FABER: Governor, members of the Commission,
21 generally speaking, working with the staff, since you met
22 with us -- or we met with you in December -- has been
23 satisfactory. There are a couple of points in the calendar
24 item which are, we believe, need correction. There is a
25 statement on the second page that certain information has

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 not been provided. That information has been provided
2 since, apparently, the calendar item was drafted. There
3 is a statement in there indicating that the application
4 is complete as of the date, sometime in the last three
5 weeks. I don't want to belabor it, but simply want to
6 make the point that we do not concur with their
7 determination of when the application was complete. Based
8 on the circumstances surrounding this, we believe the
9 application was complete earlier than that.

10 But, as long as we continue to be working in a
11 productive fashion, there's no need to belabor that.

12 The final issue is that the administrative
13 draft of the environmental impact report is complete at
14 this stage. Mr. Kaveney is responsible for the payment
15 of that document. And what we have is, he has a payment
16 due at the end of the administrative draft stage, a
17 payment due when the draft is released, and a payment
18 when the final is released. And we are faced with the
19 difficulty that between the stage when the administrative
20 draft is completed and when the draft document goes out
21 when the next financial responsibility falls on him, we
22 have no access to the draft. We have no way of knowing
23 whether it's been adequately or appropriately completed.

24 Now, we have been working with staff and we're
25 trying to resolve this issue. I spoke with Dwight Sanders

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 this morning, and we will continue to try and resolve
2 that issue. But I simply wanted to bring it to the
3 Commission's attention. And if we can't resolve
4 something, we'll have to get back to you.

5 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Faber.
6 Thank you for the information.

7 Staff, next regular item on the calendar, please.

8 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: The next items, three
9 in number, can be taken up together.

10 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: 44, 45, 46, without
11 objection, we'll do it that way.

12 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Mr. Trout.

13 MR. TROUT: Mr. Chairman, at the request of
14 the sand and gravel industry, three parcels of State
15 land were offered for extraction lease, and these three
16 calendar items will provide for the leasing of those
17 three sites. One of the sites is in the Carquinez
18 Straits, two of the sites are in San Francisco Bay. We
19 drafted the lease, submitted it to the industry for
20 comment, advertised for bids, opened the bids, and after
21 review, have selected the high bidders.

22 For Item 44, it is MOE Sand Company. For
23 Items 45 and 46, it is Bell Marine. The contracts were
24 awarded on the basis of a multiplier to a specific
25 formula for royalty.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 The specific formula provides a percentage
2 not less than .65 cents per yard, and based on material
3 actually sold by -- out of the yard by the dredger.

4 I think that we're prepared -- the staff does
5 recommend the approval of these items. And I understand
6 there may be someone here to speak on one of them. But
7 this has been a very open and public process, and we
8 recommend your approval.

9 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I have a request from
10 Mr. Olin Jones to address this item. Mr. Jones, you're
11 welcome, sir.

12 MR. JONES: I'd like to thank the Commission
13 for the opportunity to speak.

14 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Would you pull that down
15 just a little bit (speaking of microphone).

16 MR. JONES: Point it down like that? Better?

17 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: So it's pointed right at
18 you. Thanks very much.

19 MR. JONES: Sure. It's my position that the bids
20 should be rejected at this time because the staff and the
21 Commission does not know and cannot know what royalty the
22 State will receive from each bidder. The bid multiplier
23 is a multiplier that is to be multiplied times the cost of
24 production. And the cost of production cannot be determined
25 or was not given in the bid package.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 This is a flawed process. It is similar to
2 asking a contractor to bid on the remodeling of your
3 kitchen and asking for a multiplier times his cost. And
4 you pick the multiplier that is lowest, but you have no
5 idea what his cost is going to be.

6 There was only one bidder who submitted a cost
7 per cubic yard that he would pay the State. The other
8 bidders did not submit that. Okay?

9 The questions that I have of the staff are: Is
10 there a better offer in writing than 70 cents per yard
11 and, if so, is it in writing (sic)? And number two, would
12 the bidders object to multiple leases on these sites?

13 I'd also like to ask, you know, if there could
14 be multiple leases on these sites, giving everyone equal
15 access to the public resources -- creating the fastest
16 maximum cash flow to the State? That's all I have to
17 say. Are there any questions?

18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Just a moment, please.
19 The bottom line is, how do the taxpayers get the most
20 money from this competitive bidding process. Now, you've
21 just heard what Mr. Jones has said. Where are we? If we
22 did it his way, would the taxpayers get more money from
23 this competitive bidding process?

24 MR. TROUT: We don't see so, because the formula
25 that we've established is based on the actual sales price

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 times the number of yards that are actually sold, and
2 then multiplied by a factor greater than one.

3 The bid factor was this multiplier. The higher
4 bidder, for example, Bell Marine, on one of the leases
5 had a 2.3 multiplier. If we assume \$7.00 a yard is the
6 price and the multiplier is 2.3, that comes out to a total
7 on the yardage of 1.61, a dollar sixty-one per cubic yard.

8 Mr. Jones bid a bid factor of 1.3. In order to
9 get the same \$1.61, Mr. Jones would have to sell the
10 sand for \$12.30 as opposed to \$7.00. The other thing
11 I'd like to point out is that we sent these leases and
12 this proposed formula out to the industry. We mailed out
13 over 25 bid package -- draft bid packages for industry
14 to comment on. And after receiving comments from
15 industry, we felt that, with the exception of Mr. Jones,
16 that the formula basically was understandable and okay
17 with industry.

18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Do you have any comment on
19 that, Mr. Jones?

20 MR. JONES: I have two comments. Number one,
21 each bidder has a different wholesale price. No one
22 knows what that wholesale price is, because it wasn't
23 requested in the bid documents. In other words, I could
24 have had a bid factor of 5 and made my wholesale price a
25 dollar. So, you cannot tell what the royalty to the State

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 is, unless what you're saying is that Bell Marine has
2 agreed to a dollar six-one per cubic yard. I don't believe
3 that's true.

4 I have reason to believe that other bidders
5 did not approve of the process.

6 MR. TROUT: Well, the gross sales price -- and
7 it's an auditable price -- is the actual price that they
8 get for the material, for the raw product. And this is a
9 price which fluctuates with the market. If sand is
10 more valuable, the price is higher. The bidders are all
11 bidding on the same sand, the same quality, and all of
12 them would be selling on the market the same sand, and
13 the market would then drive the actual gross sales price.

14 So, while we can't determine what it is, we
15 certainly can't imagine Mr. Jones selling the sand for
16 a dollar just to keep the State royalty down.

17 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Mr. Jones has made the point
18 that some others in the industry tend to agree with his
19 point of view that this method doesn't necessarily give
20 the best yield for the taxpayers of the State. Did I
21 understand you correctly, Mr. Jones?

22 MR. JONES: That's correct.

23 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Did you hear from any other
24 people in the industry -- ideas about how the bid could
25 be reformulated to maximize the return to the taxpayers?

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 MR. TROUT: Yes, we did. One other potential
2 bidder, which was Tidewater, which did not actually bid
3 on the leases, but which is in partnership with another
4 company, their concern was that -- that the -- it's set
5 up on a basis of both a minimum and a maximum, and they
6 argued that the bid factor could be lower and that an
7 applicant or lessee extract more sand and ultimately pay
8 a higher amount. But so could the -- the high bidder
9 could also extract that same amount of sand. It's just
10 a question of how much they can sell in the marketplace.
11 So, while anyone who sold -- dredged and sold more sand
12 would have a higher volume, that's nowhere guaranteed in
13 the lease.

14 We set a minimum, we set a maximum to provide
15 a range in which the operator could function.

16 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. I think we're
17 going to have to make a decision on what's before us,
18 Mr. Jones.

19 Thanks for your testimony.

20 MR. JONES: Thank you.

21 COMMISSIONER BURTON: I have a question.

22 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Yes, Commissioner Burton.

23 COMMISSIONER BURTON: A couple of questions of
24 staff. How many bids did you receive for these items?

25 MR. TROUT: We received three bids on one -- let's

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 see, one lease, I believe, and two on the other two.

2 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Okay.

3 MR. TROUT: Out of some 25 operators who were
4 advised of this initially.

5 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Why weren't there more
6 bids? Is this not profitable? What's going on?

7 MR. TROUT: Well, we really don't know. These
8 are the bidders that have been involved in the past with
9 State Lands, and that may have something to do with it.

10 The bidders were Olin Jones, Jones Sand; MOE
11 Sand & Gravel, and Bell Marine. And they bid in
12 different numbers in different leases, but those were
13 the three bidders we got.

14 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Okay. And you only had
15 two expressions of concern about the bid packages and the
16 process?

17 MR. TROUT: Right.

18 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Okay.

19 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: I would like to point
20 out -- and I think, correct me, Mr. Chairman and
21 Commissioners -- that the new bid structure should result
22 in an increased revenue to the State on a cubic-yard
23 basis by a factor of perhaps as much as three or four.

24 So, compared to what we've been getting in the
25 past, this new bid package should result in considerably

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 more revenue to the State.

2 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Why don't you tell us when
3 you have evidence of that? Just give us the information.
4 I think we have no choice but to go ahead on the matter
5 that's before us today. But I think, as soon as you
6 start getting the return in, when this is awarded in
7 these three separate contracts, that you let us know what
8 the return is, because I think there should be some
9 discussion in the industry about what the appropriate
10 formula is for the bid to see whether we could do an
11 increase.

12 But let us know what it is when the return is in.

13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: All right.

14 MR. JONES: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Jones.

16 Any other questions? All right. The matter's before us.
17 Without objection, approve the recommendation.

18 The next item on the Regular Calendar.

19 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: The next item on the
20 calendar is the last item on the calendar, and that's
21 Item 47. We have a number of --

22 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Anybody here interested in
23 Item 47?

24 (Laughter.)

25 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. I see that

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Assemblyman Jack O'Connell of Santa Barbara is with us.

2 Do you have a couple of minutes so that we could
3 hear the staff presentation, or would you like to go on
4 now? Whatever your schedule is.

5 ASSEMBLYMAN O'CONNELL: I'll be happy to listen
6 to the staff presentation.

7 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Mr. Warren or
8 whoever you're going to have make this presentation.

9 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Mr. Chairman, I'll
10 try to be brief in the presentation of this long-standing
11 controversial and complex issue.

12 The staff report is, I think you you will find,
13 lengthy, perhaps unusually so. It has been distributed
14 to all interested parties previously, who have had an
15 opportunity to review and comment on it.

16 In your package, also, is correspondence from
17 all interested parties concerning the issue and concerning
18 the staff report.

19 Item 47, briefly, concerns an application for
20 an industrial lease by the Gaviota Terminal Company for
21 the operation and maintenance of an existing marine
22 terminal located offshore Santa Barbara for loading of
23 tankers for shipment to the Los Angeles area. The term
24 of the lease is two years and eight months, beginning May
25 1, 1993, and ending January 1, 1996, or sooner, as provided

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 by certain provisions of the lease.

2 The consideration for the lease is a rental in
3 the amount as we've been receiving since the issuance of
4 the first lease, \$230,000 per year.

5 Consideration of this item today brings to a
6 near close one phase of a long-standing and complex
7 controversy over the terms and conditions governing the
8 development and transportation of oil from federal leases
9 offshore Santa Barbara County. This phase of the
10 controversy involves the means and manner of transporting
11 oil produced from an offshore field known as the
12 Point Arguello Field by a constortium of companies known
13 as the Point Arguello Producers, which is represented
14 generally by the Chevron Oil Company.

15 The producers, the Point Arguello Producers,
16 have received a shipping permit issued by the California
17 Coastal Commission subject to a number of conditions.

18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Excuse me. You cannot hear
19 in the back? All right. Why don't you move that
20 microphone a little bit closer to you?

21 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: I'm sorry. The
22 producers have received a shipping permit issued by the
23 California Coastal Commission subject to a number of
24 conditions. The Coastal Commission issued the permit
25 after rejecting certain conditions to a permit issued by

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 the County of Santa Barbara.

2 The point of difference between the County and the
3 Coastal Commission concerns how best to accomplish the
4 commonly held policy objective of exclusive transportation
5 of oil by pipeline.

6 The County's approach was to prohibit tankering
7 until such time as the producers signed a throughput and
8 deficiency agreement with one of three groups of competing
9 pipeline proponents. Such an agreement -- that is a
10 throughput and deficiency agreement -- assures financing
11 for the construction of the favored pipeline proposal.

12 None of the three proposed pipelines have had
13 nor have necessary permit approvals at this time. The
14 Coastal Commission set aside the County's shipping
15 permit and established a set of way points designed to
16 achieve the construction of the desired pipeline by
17 January 1, 1996.

18 Among those conditions -- the major conditions
19 are the following: First, the Coastal Commission permit
20 allows tankering to begin from the terminal as soon as the
21 operators of the terminal have a lease from us to do so,
22 which is the issue before us today.

23 The Coastal Commission shipping permit also
24 sets a limit on the amount of oil to be tankered to no
25 more than 50,000 barrels per day on a quarterly average,

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 provided that at least 40,000 barrels per day are shipped
2 by existing pipelines to various destinations with at
3 least 25,000 barrels per day shipped via an existing
4 pipeline to Los Angeles, known as Line 63.

5 On this point, it should be noted that production
6 of the Point Arguello Field is being presently increased --
7 or as they say in the industry, "ramped up" -- and is
8 expected to peak at 85 -- and some say perhaps as much
9 as 90,000 barrels per day.

10 Presently, production, I understand, is around
11 55 to 60,000 barrels per day level.

12 Now, the Coastal Commission permit also requires
13 that the producers execute a throughput and deficiency
14 agreement for the construction of a pipeline to Los Angeles
15 by February 1, 1994, 10 months from now; or, if not, to
16 cease tankering at that time.

17 If a throughput and deficiency agreement is
18 timely executed, then tankering may continue beyond
19 February 1, 1994, until January 1, 1996, when it must
20 terminate. In the event a pipeline is, in fact,
21 constructed and becomes operable before that date, then
22 the tankering would cease at the time of the pipeline's
23 availability.

24 It is assumed by the Coastal Commission permit
25 that by such time -- that is, January 1, 1996 -- the

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 throughput and deficiency favored pipeline will have been
2 constructed and will have the capacity to transport all
3 of Point Arguello's production.

4 All that now remains is the issuance of the
5 lease sought by the application before you. The applicant
6 is the Gaviota Marine Terminal Company, again, which is
7 composed of a number of oil companies, but is headed
8 nominally and in fact, and represented by the Texaco
9 Oil Company.

10 Now, there are a number of subsidiary, but
11 significant, factors which you should consider. There has
12 been a petition filed with the Coastal Commission to
13 revoke its shipping permit because of certain specified
14 reasons.

15 The Coastal Commission will not consider the
16 matter until its next meeting, presently scheduled, I
17 believe, for May 12, 1993.

18 Secondly, the second subsidiary factor which you
19 should have in mind, is that the Point Arguello Producers
20 have not as yet elected to pick up the Coastal Commission
21 permit and, in fact, has filed a legal action challenging
22 the Commission's authority to condition the permit.

23 The producers have indicated to your staff,
24 however, that upon the issuance of an acceptable lease,
25 they will, in fact, pick up the permit and dismiss the

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 legal action. I think that it would be worthwhile to
2 have that representation confirmed on the record.

3 Staff has concluded that there are four
4 options available to the Commission. Each of the options
5 has its adherents and its opponents. The first of these
6 options is to deny the application. This option or its
7 refinement is proposed by a number of groups, such as the
8 American Oceans Alliance, the Environmental Defense
9 Center, Get Oil Out, and by a number of elected officials
10 and private individuals.

11 Although they are here today to describe their
12 views, I think generally they contend that, first, that
13 existing pipelines are adequate for the transportation of
14 Point Arguello production and, secondly, if the existing
15 lines are not, in no event should tankering be permitted
16 until such time as a throughput and deficiency agreement
17 is, in fact, executed.

18 The second option is to delay action on the
19 application before you until such time as the Coastal
20 Commission has acted upon the revocation petition. As I
21 said, that will not be until May 12th. However, I must
22 say that none of the interested parties in their written
23 comments to us on the issues involved in this matter seem
24 to be urging this course.

25 The third option before you is to approve the

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 lease, but limit the use of the terminal to shippers who
2 hold a shipper's permit issued by the Coastal Commission,
3 but subject to the same conditions imposed by the
4 Commission on the permit holder.

5 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Coastal Commission.

6 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Yes.

7 This view is supported by the producers, by the
8 terminal operators, by the Coastal Commission, by the
9 Wilson Administration, and certain other private groups
10 and individuals. It is opposed by the anti-oil group,
11 the composition of which has been heretofore described.

12 The County of Santa Barbara has responded to the
13 staff analysis by a letter received today, but does not
14 indicate a position one way or the other.

15 The fourth option available to you is to approve
16 the lease, but limit the use of the terminal to shippers
17 who hold a shipper's permit from the Coastal Commission,
18 as provided by the preceding option that I've just
19 described, but who agree further to transport on a
20 quarterly basis through Line 63 to Los Angeles that amount
21 of oil determined sufficient to fully utilize the
22 existing pipeline capacity.

23 This option was developed by your staff in order
24 to deal with the issue of the extent to which pipeline
25 capacity presently exists. Presumably, this option would

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 be supported by the existing pipeline companies and, to a
2 limited extent, by those who are otherwise opposed to the
3 Coastal Commission's shipping permit issuance.

4 The applicant, the producers, and others, however,
5 strongly object to the refinement of the Coastal Commission
6 permit.

7 As I indicated at the outset, a detailed staff
8 report on this matter has been provided you and all
9 interested parties. You will today from all of the
10 groups mentioned. Copies of their correspondence have
11 been provided you.

12 We have a number of requests to speak. I have
13 attempted to sort out the requests into groups who are
14 for the lease, subject only to the Coastal Commission
15 permit terms, and there are others who wish to speak to
16 the alternative options.

17 It would be my recommendation, Mr. Chairman, that
18 we first hear from the applicant, and then from the
19 producers and others who support Option 3.

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: After we call on
21 Assemblyman O'Connell, here's what I would like to
22 recommend to my colleagues on the Commission and to all
23 of you in the audience here to testify: That each side --
24 and that's a rough categorization, since we have several
25 options in front of us -- but we've roughly grouped them

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 into those that we think are here to support adoption of
2 the application and those who will have total or qualified
3 opposition to that action, or may like some aspects
4 of one or the other options; that we give 45 minutes to
5 each side, and then if you could be thinking about this --
6 and I appreciate this is sometimes hard to do -- but if
7 each side could think of the one, or two, or three people
8 that they want; then, once a motion is made and is before
9 the Commission for consideration, one, or two, or three
10 people from each side can rebut or argue further at that
11 point to ask clarification or to challenge assertions that
12 have been made so that the Commissioners can get fully
13 rounded testimony on this issue.

14 Now, if that's an acceptable approach on this
15 issue, I'd like to proceed on that. Does anyone have any
16 serious objections to that?

17 COMMISSIONER BURTON: I just need at some point,
18 before 1:30, a chance to make a phone call to rearrange my
19 schedule. It sounds like the 45 plus 45 puts us past
20 1:30.

21 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: We'll take a 90-second recess.

22 COMMISSIONER BURTON: That'll be fine.

23 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Then, may I first
24 have the pleasure of inviting up to testify Assemblyman
25 Jack O'Connell, who represents Santa Barbara County.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 ASSEMBLYMAN O'CONNELL: Thank you very much,
2 Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. I appreciate
3 the time that you've put in on this already; the focus
4 that you've given this is very gratifying for all of us
5 that live in the area. And also to your staff; your
6 staff's practically been living in the area trying to work
7 on the four options that Mr. Warren so eloquently that's
8 before us.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER IN AUDIENCE: Turn the mike
10 up, please.

11 ASSEMBLYMAN O'CONNELL: I'm speaking on behalf
12 of both myself and Senator Gary Hart. We have submitted
13 written testimony, and I'd like to just briefly summarize
14 our testimony.

15 As you know, the oil development and the
16 transportation issues in our area have been long-standing
17 concerns. And we believe that the Commissioners should
18 first deny the Lease Option 1, which Mr. Warren stated,
19 on the following grounds: That insufficient environmental
20 information has been accumulated thus far; notwithstanding
21 the staff findings, we believe that the EIR submitted for
22 approval on the Point Arguello tankering permit is not
23 sufficient for the questions that continue to arise as
24 a result of the application. Also, the inadequacy of the
25 data about the production levels, the varying degrees of

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 interpretations of the capacity levels and the availability
2 therein. And to date, we're not convinced that there is
3 inadequate capacity to currently carry the Point Arguello
4 crude through the existing pipelines from this area.

5 We're also concerned with the lack of a signed
6 throughput and deficiency agreement, also which Mr. Warren
7 stated. And, as the Commissioners, oil producers made a
8 commitment a decade ago to transport this crude from
9 Point Arguello by pipeline. Since then, they have expended
10 considerable capital in attempting to try to circumvent
11 that earlier commitment. And the incompatibility with
12 Santa Barbara County's local coastal plan is also a
13 concern for many of us in the community.

14 And in 1987, the County of Santa Barbara approved,
15 as the sole consolidated marine terminal, Exxon's Las
16 Flores Canyon Marine Terminal, and that designation remains
17 current to this day.

18 As an added note, we're also concerned with the
19 level of inaccurate information that has, unfortunately,
20 been circulated during this process and throughout the
21 earlier Coastal Commission process where Senator Hart and
22 I also provided testimony. And for that reason alone,
23 we would urge the Commissioners to, at minimum, exercise
24 extreme caution in considering this lease.

25 In an absence of an outright denial of the lease,

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 we request that the Commissioners delay a decision until
2 you have had an opportunity to further deliberate the
3 outcome of the forthcoming Coastal Commission meeting,
4 which Mr. Warren also referenced.

5 The action on that could affect the potential
6 revocation of the permit to tanker oil in the Santa Barbara
7 Channel.

8 In any case, the lease that could be granted
9 should contain the following conditions, which we believe
10 to be not only necessary, but also extremely reasonable,
11 to ensure the health and safety of the people of this
12 community be preserved.

13 Line 63, which was mentioned, does have the
14 capacity to be fully utilized before any tankering can
15 occur, and a limit of the 50,000 barrels per day should
16 be placed on the terminal capacity.

17 We also believe that the users of the terminal
18 should be required to complete and sign the unconditional
19 throughput and deficiency agreements, which have yet to be
20 forthcoming, for the pipeline construction prior to any
21 tankering. And also the users of the terminal should know
22 with certainty that the permit will not continue past
23 January 1st, 1996, regardless of any real or imagined
24 extenuating circumstances.

25 I hope that the Commissioners will seriously

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 consider our request and those similar requests that'll
2 be forthcoming before you here this afternoon. I know
3 that the issue is very complex. And, again, I appreciate
4 the time that not only the Commissioners have put in on
5 this issue by the thorough understanding, but also that
6 of your staff. And in behalf of Senator Hart and
7 myself, thank you for your time.

8 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank very much,
9 Mr. Assemblyman. Any questions of the Assemblyman?

10 ASSEMBLYMAN O'CONNELL: Thank you very much,
11 Lieutenant Governor. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: We've identified the
13 proponent's side of the matter before us, and we have
14 arranged the witnesses that turned in these requests
15 to testify in the following order:

16 Mr. Jim Shamas, President of Texaco; Mr. Dan
17 Mihalik, Manager of the Gaviota Terminal Company;
18 Mr. Andy Moynagh of the Building Trades and Colab Council;
19 and Mr. Richard Kasa, President of the Essence Engineering,
20 Inc., representing the California Energy Service &
21 Supply Association; Mr. Angelo Castagnola of the Gaviota
22 Interim Marine Terminal; Mr. Cliff Monyama, representing
23 the California Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Daniel Kramer,
24 the Acting Executive Director of the California
25 Independent Petroleum Association; Mr. Frank Marin of the

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Coalition of Labor, Agriculture & Business of Ventura
2 County; Mr. Robert Foote, Vice President of Finance for
3 H & H Oil Tool Company, Inc. Forty-five minutes for that
4 group. My apologies if some of you get squeezed if
5 you're towards the end of that list. And we would like
6 to start now at the hour of noon with Mr. Shamas.

7 MR. SHAMAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and
8 Commissioners. We will try to hold our presentation to
9 30 minutes in the interest of time, or shorter, if we
10 can do that.

11 My name is Jim Shamus. I'm currently President
12 of Texaco Trading & Transportation, which is the
13 subsidiary of Texaco that has constructed a new state-of-
14 the-art terminal at Gaviota. I'd like to trace a little
15 bit about the history of that terminal.

16 I've been associated with it since 1977, when I
17 was Manager of Transportation for Getty Oil Company.
18 Getty Oil was merged into Texaco in 1984. In 1983, I
19 presented to the Getty executive committee a \$15 million
20 brand new terminal to be constructed at the site of the
21 Gaviota Terminal.

22 Gaviota Terminal has been located where it is,
23 26 miles west of the City of Santa Barbara, since 1896.
24 In 1896, Tidewater Oil Company shipped asphalt crude to
25 China. We've gone back through the records; since 1896,

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 we can't find a recorded spill, accident, or
2 environmental incident at Gaviota Terminal.

3 In 1953, we modernized that terminal. We put in
4 the first vapor recovery system in the County of
5 Santa Barbara. We also invented a new color called
6 Gaviota Green, which we painted all the tanks to match
7 the surroundings and try to blend in.

8 When we appeared before the Santa Barbara
9 Planning Commission with our new terminal idea, a lot of
10 people didn't know that the terminal was out there. It
11 had been operating since 1896, and not many people knew
12 of its existence.

13 We donated three acres of land, along with the
14 Hollister Ranch, to support a school, a ten-acre school
15 across the highway from our terminal. That terminal is
16 now -- that school has now been moved and a brand new
17 modern school has been provided by the industry.

18 So, what I want to address today is a little bit
19 about good faith, a little bit about what we've learned.
20 We shut down that terminal in 1985. It was then loading
21 from one to two tankers a month. We've spent more than
22 \$60 million on a brand new terminal. The vapor recovery
23 and balancing system designed by Exxon that's been
24 employed at this terminal is duplicated nowhere else in
25 the world. It's the best state-of-the-art vapor recovery.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 And we've checked every terminal that we can find; it's
2 the best there is.

3 We're very concerned about the environment and
4 about discharges into the atmosphere. And so, we've
5 done tanker modeling studies. All of the studies show
6 that we are far below the emissions which were allowed by
7 the County; even though we haven't been allowed to load
8 one barrel since we completed the terminal in 1989, we've
9 bought more than \$2 million worth of air quality permits
10 so that we can improve the quality of the County.

11 We've also paid close to a million dollars in
12 fees to State Lands, even though we weren't allowed
13 to load one barrel of oil.

14 I want to address a little bit about the pipeline.
15 We in Texaco operate more than 20,000 miles of pipeline.
16 We have made two attempts -- one in 1982, with Chevron,
17 Getty, Arco, and Shell -- to build a pipeline from Emidio
18 to Los Angeles. We spent more than two years and a
19 million dollars trying to find permitting in viable
20 routes. We folded up that effort. We couldn't find a
21 pipeline route to Los Angeles.

22 In 1984, when we started looking at the Gaviota
23 development, Texaco, Chevron, and Arco spent more than
24 \$6 million trying to find a pipeline route and a viable
25 way to get a pipeline into the City of Los Angeles.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Again, it came down to, after three years of
2 study and multimillion dollars, we couldn't find a way
3 to get a pipeline there.

4 As you know from the staff's report, there are
5 now three proposals. We're not against pipelines. Since
6 we operate more than 20,000 miles of them, we're certainly
7 for pipelines. The problem is, after our attempts, we're
8 not convinced the pipelines can be built into the
9 Los Angeles area; therefore, we're hesitant to back any.

10 As terminal partner and operator, we feel that
11 this is an issue that's already been addressed in front
12 of the Coastal Commission and is not proper.

13 What we're suggesting and wanting now is a
14 terminal permit to follow through with what we were
15 granted in 1985, before we spent the \$60 million, and to be
16 able to load at what I consider to be the most
17 environmentally safe and state-of-the-art terminal in
18 the world.

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Any questions of Mr. Shamas?
21 All right. Thank you, Mr. Shamas.

22 Mr. Mihalik?

23 MR. MIHALIK: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman
24 and Commissioners. My name is Dan Mihalik, Manager of the
25 Gaviota Terminal Company project for Texaco Trading and

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Transportation, the operator.

2 This terminal was built to satisfy the oil
3 storage and marine transportation requirements of OCS
4 production. Our project was approved by the County of
5 Santa Barbara for the express purpose of primary
6 transportation services, both pipeline and marine
7 terminal, for production as it comes on line at
8 Point Arguello.

9 I hope you become convinced today, if you're not
10 convinced already, that we have done everything possible
11 to provide the utmost in safety. As you know, the
12 facility will only use relatively small, 250,000 barrel
13 double-hulled tankers. Also, presently, in Southern
14 California, we feel the system that exists to respond to
15 oil spills is the best available.

16 The facility has been built using a safety
17 inspection, maintenance, and quality assurance plan
18 agreed upon by the various agencies, including the State
19 Lands Commission and Santa Barbara County. It's also
20 important to note that a tanker can only enter the Gaviota
21 Terminal under very restrictive, relatively mild weather
22 conditions.

23 On another subject, there were 283 permit
24 conditions on the original interim marine terminal project
25 in 1987. These were decided on after a very extensive

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 environmental impact report was completed.

2 In 1990, the County added 14 more conditions
3 after a marine emergency management study was completed.

4 In 1992, a supplemental EIR was completed. It
5 cost in excess of \$1 million. And at that time, the
6 County added 30 more conditions. This was this past
7 summer. Your State Lands Commission staff was very
8 involved as part of the joint review panel in deciding
9 on these various conditions.

10 In addition to this, GTC has committed to an
11 extensive list of various plans which have the force and
12 effect of permit conditions. We literally have bookshelves
13 full of plans that have the force and effect of permit
14 conditions.

15 Your staff today is recommending that you
16 approve more conditions. And I'm fairly certain, after
17 being involved in this process for quite a long time, that
18 every issue imaginable having to do with marine safety,
19 having to do with pipelines has been studied as part of
20 this process.

21 We ask you to not cause further delays in the
22 startup of the Gaviota Terminal. If you do so, it will
23 jeopardize the significant compromise that occurred with
24 the Point Arguello Producers. As you know, the compromise
25 with the producers was based on the assumption that the

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Gaviota Terminal would be allowed to start up relatively
2 soon, hopefully in June.

3 We ask you to support the basic lease option
4 presented in the staff report. But we also urge you to
5 delete two proposed requirements in the basic lease
6 option. They appear on page 22 of the staff report.

7 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Do you want to refer to them
8 specifically?

9 MR. MIHALIK: Yes, sir. First of all, paragraph
10 H(1), this paragraph talks about the State Lands
11 Commission reviewing and approving a throughput and
12 deficiency agreement. And this would seek to interpose
13 the State Lands Commission's judgment on the adequacy
14 of the T & D agreement being signed by the shipper. This
15 approval process is already part of the Coastal Commission
16 permit.

17 And then in Paragraph H(2) --

18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Well, before you leave that --

19 MR. MIHALIK: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: How does this requirement
21 differ from what the Coastal Commission has already
22 imposed as a condition?

23 MR. MIHALIK: I think the wording is virtually
24 identical, Mr. Chairman. The only difference is it adds
25 the State Lands Commission as a reviewing agency in

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 addition to the Coastal Commission.

2 Presently, the Coastal Commission's Executive
3 Director, I believe, reviews the adequacy of that
4 throughout and deficiency agreement.

5 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Well, I might as well
6 introduce this statement as this point, just so witnesses
7 can address it if they wish. And I speak only as one
8 member of this Commission. If you want us to, in
9 balancing the equities in everything that will come
10 before us here, to consider what the Coastal Commission
11 has done, we will not give you a blank check. We will
12 not say, if the Coastal Commission decides to materially
13 alter the deadlines they have imposed -- I'll retract
14 the "we," I'll use "I." We will not simply say,
15 "Whatever the Coastal Commission does, we will endorse."

16 So, we don't know what's going to happen. I
17 don't know what's going to happen at the next Coastal
18 Commission meeting.

19 They have imposed three time lines here that
20 everyone is telling me on your side of the picture that
21 they're quite serious about meeting and will meet. Now,
22 that's very critical to me on how I decide on how I
23 decide on this issue. So, the way this is worded, we
24 don't require another meeting of the State Lands
25 Commission if the Coastal Commission is not going to

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 materially revise their deadlines. So, you don't --
2 Mr. Warren, help me on this one now. We don't necessarily
3 have to have a Commission meeting, but we have the option
4 of having a Commission meeting if the California Coastal
5 Commission materially revises its first requirements.

6 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: That is correct,
7 Mr. Chairman.

8 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Go ahead, sir.

9 MR. MIHALIK: Thank you very much.

10 The other item on page 22 I'd like to point your
11 attention to -- it's paragraph H(2). This also deals with
12 throughput and deficiency agreement, and it deals with
13 other shippers, shippers other than Point Arguello. And
14 this would require any shipper in the future who received
15 a shipper's permit from the County or the Coastal
16 Commission after February of '94 to first sign a T & D
17 agreement. And there is no shipper that has gone through
18 the environmental review that has had the hearings, other
19 than the Point Arguello shippers. So, this applies to
20 another shipper. And I think it also is something that
21 would be most appropriate to delete. A slightly different
22 matter but, again, our position is to delete.

23 And let me just kind of give you our general
24 feeling on both of these. Both of these matters are
25 shippers' matters. One, paragraph H(1), deals with the

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Point Arguello shippers. H(2) deals with other shippers,
2 certainly Exxon has applications possibly in the works.
3 But these are shippers' matters.

4 Inclusion in our lease would be fundamentally
5 at odds with the respective roles of the Coastal Commission
6 and the State Lands Commission. These are not terminal
7 matters, the marine terminal that's in front of you for a
8 lease today.

9 We believe that such matters are the province
10 of the County and the Coastal Commission and are beyond
11 the proper scope of the State Lands Commission's action
12 on the GTC lease. And we believe there is no legitimate
13 concern that the other agencies -- County and Coastal
14 Commission -- will not discharge their obligations as
15 they should.

16 The Coastal Commission is the reviewing agency
17 for this T & D agreement. Under paragraph H(1), you've
18 described -- again, under paragraph H(2), we don't have
19 any company in front of you or in front of any agency
20 right now with, you know, with an EIR complete or with
21 an application in front of you.

22 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: We'll address that when you
23 finish your points.

24 MR. MIHALIK: All right. I'm finished,
25 Mr. Chairman. One other just procedural matter that I'd

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 like to bring up with you.

2 Lastly, we understand that all of our
3 correspondence with your staff concerning this lease is
4 part of the administrative record of these proceedings,
5 and we'd like you or your staff to acknowledge that this
6 is correct.

7 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: It is correct.

8 MR. MIHALIK: Thank you very much.

9 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Mr. Warren, would you
10 have your staff address that last point, please, on
11 Mr. Mihalik's remarks regarding H(2).

12 MR. HIGHT: Yes. Mr. Chairman, it was the
13 staff's thought that, if you so chose to take this
14 option, that the same conditions that apply to the
15 existing shippers should apply to any other shippers in
16 the future, and that it just put everybody on the same
17 level playing field.

18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Is that any objection to
19 that logic, Mr. Mihalik?

20 MR. MIHALIK: Well, regarding future shippers,
21 again, they haven't gone through the County process; they
22 haven't gone through the EIRs. I'm not sure what sort
23 of conditions are going to be put on them in addition to
24 T & Ds. It's too hard to predict at this point. I think
25 that your staff has made it clear that any other future

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 shippers that may want to use the Gaviota Terminal will
2 have to come to you or GTC will come to you for a lease
3 modification. And it's certainly a matter that could be
4 addressed at that time.

5 And I think it's most appropriate to address
6 when we come to you for a lease modification, if that
7 happens.

8 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Is there any objection
9 to the view that any future shippers -- and I take it
10 we are anticipating there may be future --

11 MR. MIHALIK: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. -- other
13 shipment of oil from -- not from Point Arguello Producers
14 but from others. Is there any objection to the point that
15 any such future shippers should comply with the same set
16 of conditions materially that Point Arguello Producers
17 are being asked to comply with?

18 MR. MIHALIK: Yeah. I can't represent those other
19 future shippers.

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I'm not --

21 MR. MIHALIK: But I think the point, Mr. Chairman,
22 is this: When another shipper comes in, he's going to be
23 faced with going through a whole process with the County,
24 the Coastal Commission. I don't know what the conditions
25 are going to be, but I think it's most appropriate to

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 look at them at that point, and then the State Lands
2 Commission, if they decide to make them consistent with
3 the Coastal Commission, they could. But we don't have
4 them in front of us.

5 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Why would you want to
6 subject any future shippers to a less reigorous standard
7 than the existing shippers have been subjected to? Why
8 do you want to make it easier on future shippers than
9 we've already made it on existing shippers? What's the
10 logic in doing that?

11 MR. MIHALIK: I don't know that it would be
12 easier, Mr. Commissioner. I'm just not sure. I just
13 can't predict the future and what the Coastal Commission
14 permit is going to look like if some other shipper gets
15 it.

16 I think we just ought to have -- or the Commission
17 should have everything in front of them at that time and
18 make a decision. I don't think it's a decision that
19 the Commission needs to make now. And, you know, they
20 don't have the environmental impact report and all the
21 review for other shippers in front of them.

22 I don't know that I can answer whether it's
23 easier or harder. It's certainly a complex set of
24 circumstances and facts, and hard to predict the future.

25 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I just would refer you to

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Mr. Shamas' testimony, which I thought was quite cogent;
2 that, as time went by, partly due to developing
3 technology and the conditions increased rather than
4 diminished. And I would suspect, if anything, that would
5 be likely to happen in the future.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER IN AUDIENCE: We can't
7 hear you.

8 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I just challenged the
9 wisdom of asking us to delete Item 2, because it would
10 seem to suggest that we should treat future shippers
11 less vigorously than we've treated existing shippers.
12 And I noted your testimony, which I thought was quite
13 cogent, where you've clearly indicated that, as time went
14 by, standards and conditions increased, not diminished.

15 MR. SHAMAS: (From the audience) We don't think
16 the problem is making the playing field level, all the
17 conditions equal. We do have a problem -- I don't think
18 there's six people in this room who have ever seen the
19 20-page throughput and deficiency agreement (sic). We
20 do have a problem with having another hurdle to go through
21 with every T & D agreement having to be reviewed by
22 every agency. That was our point Dan made first.

23 But, secondly, we don't have a problem with
24 everyone having the same conditions. We think that's
25 fair. So, we just feel like that by putting it in there

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 in advance, you know, we don't really see the purpose of
2 that.

3 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. If I may also
4 address this, I think the point of this is not to keep
5 creating additional hoops, but the point is to try to
6 get enough clarity on the point of whether anyone in the
7 future will attempt oil tankering or use whatever pipeline
8 or pipelines will ultimately be selected after an
9 economic judgment is made by the shippers using one or
10 two pipelines.

11 Now, I can't envision all of the circumstances.
12 But if there are oil companies who wish to ship in the
13 future that are not immediate parties to the matter
14 before us, if they want to come in, we're not so much
15 thinking about additional loopholes or trying to stop
16 them from doing their shipping, but rather in the other
17 direction. We're trying to maximize the use of the
18 pipeline, and we're trying to make it clear that there
19 won't be oil tankering.

20 MR. SHAMAS: (From the audience) You know, we
21 believe in the date certain that's shown in our permit,
22 that that's when the tankering will stop.

23 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: We're not challenging that.
24 We're not on that point now. We can address that as they

25 MR. SHAMAS: (Interjecting) If they're going to

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 come in, they're going to have to hurry to get in, because
2 we're looking at two years and six months, maybe. And
3 the thing we're worried about is if every agency reviews
4 the T & D agreement -- and I'm an engineer, but I also have
5 a law degree -- a lot of attorneys like to change things.
6 And if every one of them changes a 20-page agreement,
7 we'd never get approval of T & D agreements. So, you're
8 right when you mentioned other hoops to go through. We'd
9 just like to have a level playing field and one agency
10 approve all the T & Ds.

11 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Is there any difference of
12 opinion that anybody who produces oil along this coast
13 is going to ship through the pipeline and is not going
14 to ship by tankers? Is there any difference of opinion
15 on that?

16 MR. SHAMAS: Ultimately?

17 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Well, by the dates we're
18 talking about here.

19 MR. SHAMAS: Well, no. We don't have any
20 difference of opinion with the dates that are set out
21 in the lease.

22 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Now, what we want
23 to do is make it absolutely clear in the action that we
24 take here that that, in fact, is what we're reaching for.
25 We're not attempting to complicate the series of

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 governmental agencies that need to do this recurringly.
2 But we do want to make sure that there's no misunderstand-
3 ing here about the ultimate result of that. That by the
4 dates we're talking about, should this be the option
5 that's exercised -- it's the good faith that you indicated
6 in your opening remarks, Mr. Shamas that's needed all
7 around here -- these dates have meaning. Are they going
8 to be taken seriously; are they going to be complied
9 with? And will any other oil company that wants to ship
10 through these pipelines understand that there is no
11 oil tankering after this 1996 date?

12 MR. SHAMAS: (From the audience) Well, to my
13 knowledge, they all understand that. They've all seen the
14 terms and conditions. You know, Exxon is coming along at
15 a different pace than the Point Arguello Producers. But
16 I shouldn't speak for one of the world's largest
17 corporations. But they understand and have lots of
18 people who can read, too.

19 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Can I ask a related
20 question? You said in your testimony, Mr. Shamas -- and
21 I meant to ask you at the time, but it didn't occur to me
22 until after you left the podium. You mentioned the
23 difficulty you had in 1982 and in 1984 in trying to
24 develop plans to site pipelines to Los Angeles.

25 Why do you think you'll be successful in doing

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 that by January 1, 1996, when you were unsuccessful
2 in '82 and '84?

3 MR. SHAMAS: Well, those conditions grew out
4 of three or four months of negotiations. We, the industry,
5 had tried it. We, the industry, didn't think that the
6 All American Pipeline would ever be built. And, yet, it
7 was constructed. So, we really can't say "can't be,"
8 and the Southern Pacific people, the railroad -- the
9 people that have the railroad right-of-way -- seem to have
10 one of the things we could never overcome. We couldn't --
11 the last part of our pipeline, after we closed our
12 \$6 million study, went down the middle of Western Avenue
13 for about 10 miles. And we were told by the City of
14 Los Angeles that wasn't very practical.

15 And so, we finally gave up after three years and
16 \$6 million. They have a different way in. The Line 90
17 reversal is a different way in that we didn't have available
18 to us. And the Cajon is even a third way. So, we're going
19 to try to back something that has a real good chance of
20 being successful.

21 But we had two attempts where we struck out both
22 times. I didn't want the inference to be left that we
23 didn't try to do that, because we certainly did. And I
24 was involved. And after you keep putting more money and
25 more money and 27 or 28 different agencies tell you you can't

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 get into Los Angeles, then you finally give up. So, that
2 was all I was trying to say.

3 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: So, would I be correct
4 in deducing that there may be a pipeline constructed by
5 January, 1996 --

6 MR. SHAMAS: There better be --

7 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: -- but there may not be.

8 MR. SHAMAS: -- because we're going to shut the
9 terminal down.

10 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Did you hear his alternative?

11 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yes. In other words --

12 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: There may or may not be.

13 MR. SHAMAS: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Did you hear it?

15 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: No. I'm saying that I
16 think it's important that everyone realize that these
17 discussions, which began back in 1983, before -- at least
18 before I was on the Lands Commission, but I had just been
19 elected -- were all premised on the Gaviota Terminal being
20 built and the oil being shipped by pipeline.

21 Now, you've run into a lot of hurdles, presumably
22 not of your making. And I have some empathy for the
23 difficulties you've faced. But this lease assumes that
24 something will be built by January, 1996. And what I just
25 said was that I think it's important to realize that it

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 may be built; it may not be built. Would you quarrel
2 with that characterization?

3 MR. SHAMAS: No, I think that's exactly true.
4 I might also add that when we proposed this in 1983,
5 we had a 30-inch pipeline that went from Gaviota over to
6 Emedio. When All American called us and said, "Could we
7 use that same route," we said, "Fine. Go ahead and use
8 it. We don't think we're going to be able to build it."

9 And then they built it and showed us they could
10 get through the National Forest, and they did it.

11 So, I'm here to tell you that we believe those
12 dates are real. And I can't speak for the producers.
13 They'll have to cut back production; they'll have to take
14 whatever actions are necessary, or they will have had to
15 have chosen a viable pipeline in time to meet the end of
16 January, 1996.

17 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Just one final question.
18 Recognizing the difficulty you faced in the eighties,
19 why wouldn't you sign a throughput agreement conditioned
20 on obtaining the permits? In other words, why wouldn't
21 you enter into --

22 MR. SHAMAS: (Interjecting) We could do that,
23 but it's not meaningful. T & D agreements are taken to
24 the bank. And the bank says, "All right. We'll look at
25 the credits you've got. Six people have signed it. Here's

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 a strong one. Here's one that we think is in financial
2 trouble. And then they take and they value that, and
3 they'll loan you a hundred million, 200 million, whatever
4 you're seeking.

5 If you go to them with a conditional, then
6 they're not going to loan you any money. It's got to be
7 ironclad.

8 And so, conditional T & D agreements don't do
9 much good. We could give them out to each one of the
10 three competing things, and they'd be meaningless until
11 they got all their permits and could convince a bank that
12 they were really going to go into construction.

13 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: So, a T & D agreement
14 is really not appropriate until the pipelines have been
15 permitted?

16 MR. SHAMAS: Till you know that you can build
17 a pipeline, that's when T & D agreements are really
18 important. Then you go to a bank for some money. Or,
19 really, in this case, it'll be five, or six, or ten banks
20 that come together to finance it.

21 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: But you wouldn't have any
22 objection to signing one that -- on a conditional basis,
23 even though I understand you to mean that no bank would
24 lend any money based on that?

25 MR. SHAMAS: We offered that -- there's some people

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 here in the crowd -- way back when these negotiations
2 started, and then it was decided through the three or
3 four months of negotiations that conditional T & D
4 agreements really weren't worth it.

5 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Charlie, is that your view?

6 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: It's my view that
7 the purpose of the T & D agreement is to enable the
8 pipeline proponent to obtain the necessary financing for
9 construction. And that, if it's conditioned, that that
10 financing will not be forthcoming.

11 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: But it is a demonstration
12 of good faith if you're willing to sign that agreement.

13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: There is the -- at one
14 time, staff was giving consideration to the possibility
15 of having conditional T & D agreements signed with each
16 of the three pipeline proposals. Because of -- well, for
17 reasons which Mr. Shamas has indicated and others, we
18 abandoned that alternative, because we felt and were so
19 informed that the entire arrangement would be collapsed.

20 We didn't -- consequently, we concluded that
21 the limited value of pursuing that option was not worth
22 the effort to be made, that seemed to be necessary to
23 push it.

24 We favored -- we thought that, inasmuch as there
25 were only ten months --

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Can you hear back there?

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: -- inasmuch as there
3 were only ten months between now and February 1, and
4 inasmuch as at least two of the proposed pipelines appeared
5 to be on the verge of obtaining necessary permits,
6 conceivably, we would -- a full T & D agreement could be
7 executed months before the February 1 date. For example,
8 we understand that Pacific Pipeline to be within four to
9 eight weeks from receiving a PUC permit. By receiving
10 a PUC permit, we understand that Pacific Pipeline would
11 then be entitled to the designation of a utility, and being
12 a utility, could push its pipeline -- it could overcome
13 local objections, any local objections to the construction
14 of the pipeline.

15 On the other hand, Line 90 reversal is a pipeline
16 that already exists. It has the permits. The only
17 thing I understand that would be necessary for Line 90
18 is for there to be some agreement on the tariffs that it
19 will -- it will take one to two years to put -- to install
20 necessary pumps and stations on Line 90, but that could
21 be done.

22 But the question is, is Line 90 the preferred
23 pipeline? The producers make the point that within the
24 next few months, that question will be -- could be better
25 answered. Line 90 might not be the best way to go because

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 of limitations on capacity and other reasons.

2 MR. SHAMAS: Mr. Chairman, you can tell from all
3 the confusion that this is not a simple solution. And
4 what we've asked you to do is let that be the Coastal
5 Commission's problem. We, the terminal who are not the
6 producers, would just like to have a straight State Lands
7 lease. And those other things will have to work out,
8 however they work out, in the next five or six months.

9 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Let me speak to this
10 one point, if I may, Mr. Chairman and members.

11 Mr. Shamas and Mr. Mihalik seem to indicate that
12 we have no option other than to give a lease, an open
13 lease for the operation of the terminal, and have no
14 interest in imposing conditions; we would accept whatever
15 conditions are imposed by some other agency. We're
16 dealing here with a lease of State property. And we have
17 an -- it seems to me we have the responsibility of seeing
18 to it that known State policies are implemented by us in
19 the execution of that lease.

20 We have a further interest here of a proprietary
21 nature. We have some assets offshore of a considerable
22 amount. Conceivably, sometime in the future, the State
23 will determine that it might be worthwhile to develop
24 those mineral assets. It is clear to me at this time,
25 however, that if those development opportunities are to be

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 pursued, it will have to be within the context of a
2 pipeline transportation.

3 So, the State Lands Commission, in the interests
4 of its own responsibilities, should ensure that there will
5 in fact, a construction of a pipeline.

6 Now, this H(2) condition, which seems to be
7 troubling the lease applicants, I don't know why they
8 should be bothered. Another producer group should be --
9 perhaps should be troubled by this lease condition, but
10 the terminal operator shouldn't be inhibited or troubled
11 by this condition. It's really none of their business.
12 But it is ours.

13 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Yes, except that they want
14 as many companies pumping as much oil as possible through
15 those pipelines, because it affects the price that they
16 pay.

17 And we, on the other hand, want the other side
18 of the coin, a guarantee that there's no slippage anywhere
19 for oil tankering under circumstances that even we, in our
20 wisdom, may fail to envision.

21 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: I think that's a
22 legitimate and responsible exercise of our responsibility.

23 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Commissioner Burton.

24 COMMISSIONER BURTON: I had a question. It
25 seemed to me that the reason these issues were being raised

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 had to more to do with potential time delays than with
2 any intention of trying to get around Commission staff.
3 Because it's clear the applicant has accepted these
4 conditions from the Coastal Commission.

5 And so, my question -- it seemed to me the
6 point is that there is a question about how long it would
7 take for our staff to determine that the T & D agreement
8 is, quote, "adequate"?

9 Because the phrase here says that, ". . .determined
10 to be adequate by the Commission staff." And I'm
11 assuming in the Coastal Commission case, it was meant
12 to be the Coastal Commission. And you're supplanting or
13 adding that it be adequate -- be determined to be
14 adequate by our staff as well.

15 So, my question is: Do our staff have any
16 different way of determining adequacy of the T & D
17 agreement than the Coastal Commission staff has, or is
18 that something that could be jointly done in order to
19 expedite meeting the time lines?

20 What was envisioned when you put this in here?

21 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Well, what was -- first
22 of all, if I may say, the lease requires staff to do
23 a 20-day turnaround on T & D review. So, if staff makes --
24 that's 20 days within which to make that review. If for
25 some reason they would find the T & D agreement to be

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 unacceptable, then I assume the matter would be brought
2 to your attention.

3 But what we had in mind here, frankly -- and
4 this is -- I cannot underscore the importance of this
5 component in the whole mix -- is that there is a widespread
6 suspicion on the part of a number of folks and
7 organizations that the -- that the producers will in the
8 future seek an opportunity to amend or vary the terms of
9 the Coastal Commission's permit; that they will concoct
10 some excuse for not complying with the terms of the
11 Coastal Commission's permit; that they will then petition
12 the Coastal Commission for an amendment relieving them
13 from the burdens of these way points, and then we will
14 have nothing to say about it.

15 And because of the length of this controversy and
16 the nature of the controversy, these suspicions exist.
17 And this is our effort, I think, to assure folks that in
18 the event we concur with the terms of the present
19 Coastal Commission's shipping permit, that those conditions
20 will not change -- cannot be changed exclusively by the
21 Coastal Commission, but will also be subject to review
22 by you folks.

23 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Okay. More specifically,
24 though, are you uncomfortable with the adequacy of the
25 Coastal Commission's staff review of the T & D agreement,

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 so that you feel it's necessary for your staff to
2 also have review and a determination of, quote, "adequacy"?

3 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: You ask me an
4 embarrassing question.

5 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Thereby adding another
6 month's --

7 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Do we have confidence
8 in the ability of the Coastal Commission staff to do an
9 objective and thorough review of a T & D agreement?

10 COMMISSIONER BURTON: To determine adequacy,
11 which is what this says.

12 Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Want to go into closed
14 session?

15 (Laughter.)

16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Well, perhaps my
17 pause is answer enough.

18 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Let me put it a different
19 way.

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Answer it a
21 different way.

22 MR. SHAMAS: You know, this is exactly what we're
23 worried about. Every attorney on every staff wants to
24 look at it. Every attorney has a certain favorite phrase
25 that they like to use. And in the end -- at the end of

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 the day, it doesn't matter what every one of those
2 attorneys did, because either the financial institutions
3 are going to accept them or they're going to turn them down.

4 And if you didn't write them the way they think
5 they should be written, they're not going to loan you
6 the hundred million dollars.

7 So, we don't feel that this is the appropriate
8 thing to be in a request for State Lands lease. We want,
9 because we were led to believe if we modernized, we put
10 a new 30-inch line -- further adding to the water, we
11 put two new 12-inch lines to recover vapors. We spent
12 \$8.5 million on vapor recovery. We put the best system
13 in the world in. And now, somebody wants to change the
14 rules and inject producer issues into this. This is not
15 the right thing to do.

16 I'm not against the State having other prospects
17 of other people that would use a pipeline. We think
18 pipelines are very safe, or we wouldn't have so many
19 miles of them.

20 But you're changing the conditions. You're
21 making what could be a rather simple lease into a very
22 complicated thing. I don't know if that's another attorney
23 calling or what! (Speaking of ringing telephone)

24 (Laughter.)

25 MR. SHAMAS: So, our plea is don't get us enmeshed --

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 don't get us enmeshed in all of these other issues that
2 were between the Coastal Commission and the producers.

3 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Mr. Shamas, with all due
4 respect, I've dealt with Texaco in many different
5 capacities for many years. They're a very fine company.

6 But it's not fair to come before us and say
7 you've accepted the Coastal Commission terms, when, in
8 fact, you've sued the Coastal Commission challenging the
9 validity of its lease, and then, say, "Don't you,
10 Lands Commission, tinker with the Coastal Commission,
11 because we think that's just fine. Forget the fact that
12 we've sued them, because we'll drop that suit as long as
13 we get you to sign it off."

14 I mean, this has to all be done in good faith.
15 And we may or may not agree with what the Coastal
16 Commission did, but I don't think you can come before us
17 and say, "We're happy with the Coastal Commission. Don't
18 change a thing. Oh, by the way, we got a lawsuit against
19 them, because we think they acted illegally."

20 MR. SHAMAS: We've had to file, from the time I
21 started on this, 12 lawsuits to protect our interest, not
22 because --

23 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: No, I mean, just looking at
24 it from our perspective --

25 MR. SHAMAS: -- we ever wanted things to happen.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 But everytime we would do something, someone else would
2 change something. So, to preserve those rights, we've
3 kept the attorneys of California employed to the full
4 extent possible.

5 (Laughter.)

6 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: And we may follow your lead.

7 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Suppose we put a time limit
8 on our own staff review of this.

9 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: There is a time limit.
10 Mr. Chairman, 20 days.

11 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Where is that?

12 MR. SHAMAS: Does it run concurrent with --

13 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Excuse me. Point to where
14 that is.

15 MR. HIGHT: It's in the lease between the
16 Commission and the terminal company, which you don't have
17 and I can give you a copy.

18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Is that a problem for
19 you. Mr. Shamas? 20 days?

20 MR. SHAMAS: If it could run concurrent with some
21 other reviews, it'd be great. But if the County took
22 20, and the Coastal Commission took 20, and the State
23 Lands took 20, two months are gone.

24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: It's 20 days after we
25 receive it. So, as soon as they get it to us, we have 20

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 days.

2 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Okay. And then, what
3 happens if you find it, quote, "inadequate"?

4 MR. HIGHT: Then we would come to the Commission
5 with that issue, and you would be the ultimate
6 arbitrator.

7 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: So, within 20 days after
8 our Commission staff receives the T & D -- proposed T & D
9 agreement, we'll have a response to you, specific
10 response.

11 MR. SHAMAS: Could there be another 20 days until
12 the final action?

13 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: That will depend upon the
14 members of the Commission. But if this materially
15 meets the statutory obligations of this Commission to
16 serve the public with what are our clear mandates, we
17 won't automatically set a Commission meeting.

18 MR. SHAMAS: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Two other members of the
20 Commission could overrule me on that. But it would not be
21 my assumption that we would set a Commission meeting
22 unless there are significant problems in the proposed
23 T & D agreement that our own staff points out to us.

24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: On that point,
25 Mr. Chairman, the lease provision specifies that in the

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 event the staff determines the throughput agreement to be
2 insufficient, the lessee has the right to request the issue
3 to be brought to the Commission. And we do so within
4 five days after that request has been filed.

5 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: And there's nothing to
6 prevent you from submitting that to all the agencies
7 and look at it at the same time?

8 Am I right about that, Charlie?

9 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Yes, sir.

10 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: In effect, that would be
11 running concurrently.

12 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Thanks, I understand it
13 better.

14 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Shamas.
15 Mr. Mihalik, do you have a comment?

16 MR. MIHALIK: Yes, Mr. Chairman, just one
17 procedural issue. If it would please your Commission,
18 we would appreciate just a very short moment at the end
19 to rebut or discuss any comments?

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I don't know if you were in
21 the room when I announced it, but after both sides have
22 roughly 45 minutes -- which may be a little longer than
23 45 minutes -- to present their main case, case in chief
24 for those in the legal profession -- then there will be
25 a chance for rebuttal.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 MR. MIHALIK: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Incidentally, those of you
3 among the proponents of this application, I wanted to
4 ask, are there any pipeline company representatives in
5 this audience? All right. Which pipeline companies
6 do you represent?

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER IN AUDIENCE: Four
8 Corners Pipeline.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All American Pipeline
10 Company.

11 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. So that's Line 90
12 reversal option.

13 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: And 63.

14 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: And 63. All right. I
15 take it that the proponents, as a group, the Point
16 Arguello Producers, would create a company to build
17 the Pacific Pipeline, or is that some other entity? How
18 does that come about?

19 MR. HIGHT: It's another entity entirely,
20 Mr. Chairman, that they would contract with.

21 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: The railroad company --

22 MR. HIGHT: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: -- that owns the right-of-way.
24 All right. Are they represented here? The railroad
25 company represented here?

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER IN AUDIENCE: The
2 producers are represented here, however.

3 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. The next
4 speaker for the proponents is Andy Moynagh. Thank you,
5 Mr. Moynagh.

6 The pipeline from Four Corners did not ask to
7 testify. If you have something you'd like to say, we'd
8 welcome your testimony. Not at this moment. I'd be
9 happy to call you up.

10 Are you able to testify?

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: If I could just clarify
12 what you're asking. We will testify if there are any
13 misstatements or you need any clarification. But all of
14 our testimony has already been submitted. We have nothing
15 further to say at this point in time.

16 MR. SECUNDY: I'm Jerry Secundy, President of
17 Four Corners Pipeline.

18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Mr. Secundy, let me just
19 ask you -- I'll pose to you one question, and then you
20 can decide whether you ought to answer it representing
21 your company after we go through the other witnesses.

22 The question is: Within the time limits that the
23 Coastal Commission adopted for action by the producers to
24 ship through pipelines, within those time limits, can you
25 conceive of any reason why your company could not make

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 the chances necessary to increase capacity so that the
2 producers, if they chose -- they're obviously going to make
3 the best bargain they can through a couple of pipeline
4 companies. If they chose to do so, if they get a
5 competitive price from you, is there physically or in
6 any other way any obstacle that would prevent the use of
7 your pipeline, your company's pipeline by the dates we're
8 talking about that the Coastal Commission adopted and
9 that we have before us?

10 MR. SECUNDY: If you mean the date of January
11 1st, 1996, there is no physical obstacle that I'm aware
12 of that would prevent us from reversing the pipeline
13 and adding additional pumping capacity to have either
14 a throughput of a hundred thousand barrels a day or 70,000
15 barrels a day to Los Angeles.

16 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. Don't answer
17 this now, because we're going to go through the rest of
18 the witnesses, then I'd like you to give a considered
19 response. Are there any other reasons, problems of
20 permits you have to obtain from different governmental
21 agencies, any other reason you could reasonably anticipate
22 that would block you from being able to pump oil through
23 your line at a hundred thousand barrels daily capacity
24 by the January 1st, '96 date?

25 MR. SECUNDY: Not that I'm aware of.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you.

2 Mr. Movnach.

3 MR. MOYNAGH: Good afternoon, Mr. Mc Carthy,

4 Mr. Davis, Ms. Burton, staff members. I am Andrew Moynagh,
5 Executive Secretary of the Santa Barbara Building
6 Trades Council, Vice Chair of the Coalition of Labor,
7 Agriculture, and Business for Santa Barbara County, and
8 Vice Chair of the Tri-County Central Labor Council.

9 The Building Trades Council is comprised of 36
10 affiliates, 6,000 per capita paying members. The
11 Coalition has in excess of 1,000 business, organizational,
12 and individual members.

13 The Tri-County Central Labor Council represents
14 about 30,000 individuals in the three counties --
15 Ventura, Santa Barbara, San Luis Obispo. I'm here today
16 on their behalf. We have for years now watched the
17 Gaviota Marine Terminal and other projects, such as
18 the Hyatt and some other larger scale projects within the
19 community. They have perhaps become somewhat of a
20 symbol of our concern, that despite meeting the most
21 rigorous and stringent of conditions that agencies can
22 require, these projects are either denied, delayed, or
23 are not able to operate to profitability.

24 The Gaviota Marine Terminal has had to -- pardon
25 me -- has had to submit to years of additional permitting

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 demands. And despite having been deemed to have
2 mitigated to the maximum extent possible back in 1987,
3 we are at it again.

4 These are the types of activities that have
5 created our rather user unfriendly persona, this same
6 persona that now impedes economic recovery, not only in
7 Santa Barbara but throughout the State of California.

8 A \$60 million investment deserves every opportunity
9 to return to its investors a reasonable profit. Concerns
10 for capital investment should relate only to
11 performance. And we want to express our confidence in
12 the performance of the terminal at this time.

13 Community success has become our common
14 denominator, and we would hope that you would join us
15 in our success efforts by granting to the applicant the
16 requested lease.

17 Thank you for your time.

18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you. Any questions?
19 Thank you very much.

20 Mr. Richard Kasa, representing the California
21 Energy Service & Supply Association. Mr. Kasa, welcome.

22 MR. KASA: My name is Richard Kasa, and I'm
23 President and owner of Essence Engineering and, as was
24 mentioned, I'm representing California Energy Service &
25 Supply Association.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 This is an amalgamation of a number of companies
2 that provide services and supplies to the oil and gas
3 production business.

4 I'm a State Licensed Professional Engineer
5 and have offices and employees in both Ventura and
6 Santa Barbara Counties. I firmly believe that the
7 majority of people in our area do not oppose this project.
8 We are both for jobs and the environment. It's my
9 professional opinion that the GTC project is the most
10 highly conditioned project of its type in the United
11 States and most likely the world.

12 This terminal is state of the art in every
13 category, whether it be operational safety, emergency
14 preparedness, or environmental mitigation. It's not
15 inconsequential to note that there has been no spill of
16 product at the Gaviota Marine Terminal throughout its
17 entire history. I'm simply asking the Commission to grant
18 the lease consistent with the permits already granted
19 by the Coastal Commission.

20 I further ask that the Commission resist attempts
21 to add additional and unreasonable conditions on this
22 lease based on tactics and emotional appeals that have
23 little basis in fact.

24 Specifically, adding any additional, or
25 unnecessary, or unworkable conditions will likely

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 jeopardize the compromise so painstakingly worked out
2 among the producers and the various agencies.

3 I would not like to see this Commission supersede
4 or usurp the authority of the County of Santa Barbara or
5 the Coastal Commission in their work on future permit
6 actions. As I'm sure you know, this permit has had
7 permits -- this project has had permits since 1987, but
8 has never transferred a drop of oil to a tanker.

9 Opponents have taken every opportunity in the
10 intervening years of delay to throw up additional
11 roadblocks for this project. Please don't be misled
12 by carelessly used and poorly understood information
13 being presented by project opponents. This is a sound
14 project, mitigated to the maximum extent, feasible, and
15 should be approved to proceed without further delay.

16 Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Kasa. Any
18 questions of Mr. Kasa?

19 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yeah, I have a question.
20 I was struck by your line about, "Please don't usurp the
21 authority of the County of Santa Barbara." I'd be
22 delighted to support the conditions that the County of
23 Santa Barbara wanted, but those were usurped by the
24 Coastal Commission, which you're trying to usurp through
25 a lawsuit now. So, I find it kind of ironic you come to us

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 and say, "Please don't usurp the conditions of the
2 County of Santa Barbara."

3 MR. KASA: To clarify, what I was talking about
4 is the future permit actions on other shippers.

5 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Are you talking about H(1)
6 and H(2)?

7 MR. KASA: Correct. Other shippers' permits
8 could be conditioned differently than your Commission
9 has proposed. And maybe "usurp" is a strong word, but
10 I would hesitate to -- I would like to see, as the Gaviota
11 Terminal people would, I would like to see the process
12 worked through by all other applicants to create the
13 level playing field that we, I think, all desire.

14 Thank you.

15 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Kasa.
17 Mr. Castagnoli. Castagnola, pardon me. San Franciscans
18 should not pronounce that name.

19 MR. CASTAGNOLA: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners,
20 my name is Angelo Castagnola. My family has been in the
21 fishing business and operating workboats in California
22 for 80 years. Like most fishermen, I use radar. In fog
23 or at night, it is an essential aid to navigational
24 safety.

25 I want to talk about the radar system that GTC

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 will install as part of this project and how it will
2 have a positive effect on my industry.

3 Let me quote from a letter written by the
4 Southern California Trawlers Association to Santa Barbara
5 County regarding GTC's permit for a conditional use
6 permit to install the radar system at Gaviota. I quote:

7 "It is SCTA's position that
8 construction of a radar facility at
9 the Gaviota Marine Terminal will not harm
10 fishermen, but will assist navigational
11 safety for all mariners in the area.

12 "Radars aren't new to the fishing
13 industry. They've been around for 50
14 years and nearly every vessel has one. In
15 addition, high-powered radar systems, like
16 in San Francisco Bay, Los Angeles Harbor,
17 and Long Beach Harbor, are used to guide
18 oil tankers and commercial carriers safely
19 in and out of port. A radar system on
20 Platform Harvest off Point Arguello also
21 helps large vessels avoid potential danger.
22 Fishermen have never complained of any of
23 these facilities and, to SCTA's knowledge,
24 nobody has ever been injured by them."

25 End quote.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 I am in complete agreement with the letter and
2 believe it accurately reflects the view of the vast
3 majority of fishermen and mariners. After years of
4 study and mitigation, the Gaviota Interim Marine
5 Terminal must be considered the most heavily conditioned
6 project of its kind ever. Well over 300 environmental
7 conditions have already been placed on the project, yet
8 opponents argue that mitigation is required and urge you
9 to delay permitting the project yet again.

10 I believe it is time to go forward and stop
11 standing in place. This is a state-of-the-art marine
12 terminal using the best vessels available.

13 I urge you to grant the lease for this project
14 consistent with the Coastal Commission permit. Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Castagnola.
16 Thank you very much.

17 Mr. Cliff Moryama, representing the California
18 Chamber of Commerce.

19 (Thereupon, a woman came to the podium.)

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Hi, . . .Cliff.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MS. NERA: Mr. Chairman, Commission members,
23 my name is Valerie Nera, and I'm standing in for Cliff
24 Moryama. I'm also a policy director for the California
25 Chamber of Commerce.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 I'm here today to show our support for the
2 approval of the Gaviota Terminal project. Many businesses
3 inside and outside of California view this project as an
4 example of how government agencies discourage
5 businesses in California. Having been permitted
6 originally in 1987, the marine terminal's still fighting
7 to begin operations in 1993. In the meantime, no oil has
8 been moved by tanker, production from the Point Arguello
9 field has been artificially limited, and millions of
10 dollars have been wasted in the regulatory bureaucracy.

11 Now, is it any wonder that many businesses have
12 the impression that California is hostile to the
13 business community? This project seeks to move oil by
14 maine tankers while, at the same time, protecting the
15 environment to the maximum extent feasible. The Chamber
16 believes that the State needs to send a positive signal
17 to California businesses, one that promotes a healthy
18 business climate by allowing businesses to operate
19 in California in an environmentally sound manner without
20 being placed in an unreasonable competitive disadvantage.

21 Failure to approve this lease will send the wrong
22 signal to the businesses at a time when California
23 should be concentrating on improving the State's
24 regulatory and business climate.

25 The Chamber urges you to approve the Gaviota

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Terminal lease.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you. Would you give
4 the spelling of your last name to our recorder, please?

5 MS. NERA: It's N, like Nancy, e-r-a.

6 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you very much.

7 We have three speakers left -- Mr. Daniel Kramer,
8 Mr. Frank Morin, Mr. Robert Foote -- among the
9 proponents. We invite them to come up and give their
10 testimony. Why don't all three of them please come up
11 to the microphone.

12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER IN AUDIENCE: Harmonize?

13 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Yes, if you could, as much
14 as possible, and in order. Mr. Kramer first, and then
15 Mr. Morin, and then Mr. Foote.

16 Representing the California Independent
17 Petroleum Association.

18 MR. KRAMER: I'll be as quick as I can. I'm
19 here before the State Lands Commission to urge your
20 support for the renewal of Gaviota Terminal Company's
21 lease to operate the Gaviota Interim Marine Terminal.

22 My testimony is on behalf of the California
23 Independent Petroleum Association. We're a trade
24 association representing the interests of approximately
25 550 independent oil and natural gas producers, service, and

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 supply companies throughout California.

2 We have two points to make before you today. The
3 first is to remind you that the term "interim marine
4 terminal" means exactly that. Once new pipeline
5 capacity is available for Point Arguello Producers,
6 hopefully through the new Pacific Pipeline system, or
7 perhaps through the new Cajon pipeline system, or the
8 reverse Four Corners line, they have pledged to cease
9 all tankering from Gaviota.

10 The second point is near and dear to the hearts
11 of those whom I represent. Because if the terminal lease
12 is not renewed, and if tankering from Port Arguello is
13 not allowed during the three years that is required to
14 permit and build new capacity to transport OCS crude
15 from Santa Barbara County to Los Angeles, the producers
16 will have no alternative but to pump more crude through
17 existing pipelines into the San Joaquin Valley.

18 That will mean economic hardship, if not
19 disaster, for the independent producers. Why? Because
20 of the already limited, already prorated capacity in
21 existing pipelines will get tighter still, and our
22 production will be left out in the cold, if not in the
23 ground.

24 It also means that the already scarce diluent,
25 or light oil, used to dilute Point Arguello crude to allow

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 it to flow from the existing lines will be even in
2 scarcer supply, which means its cost will go up, further
3 exacerbating the situation for small producers.

4 In sum, if you're supportive of a long-term
5 reduction in the amount of tankering off the California
6 coastline and if you're supportive of the creation of
7 additional pipeline capacity to transport OCS crude from
8 Santa Barbara to Los Angeles, and if you do not want
9 to damage the livelihood of small producers in the
10 San Joaquin Valley, please, I urge you, renew the lease
11 of the Gaviota Interim Marine Terminal. Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Kramer.
13 Any questions? All right. Thank you very much.

14 Mr. Morin, representing the Coalition of
15 Labor, Agriculture, and Business of Ventura County.

16 MR. MORIN: Correct. My name Frank Morin.
17 Can you all hear me in the back, outside? Okay.

18 Some people are weary of talking about jobs, and
19 I submit to you that only those people who have jobs
20 are tired of the topic. The folks who aren't working
21 are intensely interested in it. Some will tell you there
22 are only 11 jobs at stake at the terminal -- approval, 11
23 more folks are working; disapproval, 11 aren't going to
24 have jobs. Patently untrue. That is a manipulation
25 of the facts of the positions open for a particular task

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 to be performed there. Hundreds of contractors will
2 pass through that gate in a year in addition to the
3 Texaco personnel who will be working if that terminal
4 is reactivated.

5 I work in the marine industries or the
6 marine services industry, and I can recite the names of
7 12, at least a dozen, California companies providing
8 services and products to that terminal and others like
9 it, and I can rattle them off the top of my head. So,
10 that means there's a lot more of them out there.

11 They won't close their doors, in all likelihood,
12 if this terminal isn't reactivated, but there will be
13 jobs that are going to go. And when the jobs are cut
14 there, you could walk back in the town and cut a
15 librarian, or cut a policeman, or cut a mechanic, or cut
16 a drycleaners. That's the ripple effect you all know
17 about better than I do. And those are the facts.

18 This is a job issue. Please send a message
19 today that California wants and will fight for good jobs.
20 Thank you very much.

21 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Morin.
22 Mr. Foote, representing H & H Oil Tool Company, Inc.

23 MR. FOOTE: Good day, ladies and gentlemen. My
24 name is Robert K. Foote. I've been employed by H & H Oil
25 Tool Company out of Santa Paula for the past 13-plus years.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 H & H is one of the rapidly shrinking number of
2 oil service companies that is entirely dependent upon
3 oil field activity, on and offshore, generated by the
4 oil companies, such as Texaco.

5 In 1982, H & H employed 235 people, most of them
6 with families. Since that time, we have joined forces,
7 consolidating with two other related oil service
8 companies of approximately our same size.

9 Today, all three companies combined employ
10 only 155 employees. Last year, H & H had a reduction
11 of workforce and pay affecting 20 percent of the
12 employees.

13 A year ago, last May, I personally had to lay
14 off two of my coworkers with families. I'd worked with
15 these people for over ten years. One of them just
16 recently found a job, a much lower paying job. The other
17 is still searching for work.

18 During testimony today, as Frank just noted,
19 you -- there will be conflicting numbers of jobs stated
20 related to this particular project. I submit to you that
21 the actual number of jobs is a relatively insignificant
22 factor compared with a much larger issue. Intended or
23 not, the decision that you make today will send a
24 message to the hundreds of thousands of companies that
25 remain in California -- those same companies, which are

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 actively and aggressively being pursued by other states
2 and countries.

3 If two companies with the human and financial
4 resources of a Texaco and a Chevron cannot satisfy the
5 regulatory agencies' demands of this State, who then
6 could?

7 Jobs is an important issue. But much more
8 important, in my opinion at this time, is the perceived
9 business attitude of this State. You have an opportunity
10 to send a positive message. I urge you to approve the
11 Texaco lease consistent with the Commission permit -- the
12 Coastal Commission permit. Texaco rightfully deserves
13 your approval, and the entire business community of
14 California desperately needs the message.

15 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you, Mr. Foote.

16 Mr. Secundy, would you mind leaving your card
17 with our recorder so she has the correct spelling of
18 your name and your position with Four Corners.

19 MR. SECUNDY: All right.

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you. That finishes
21 the witnesses for the proponents. Mr. Shamas, may I ask
22 you a couple of questions, please, regarding the pipelines?

23 MR. SHAMAS: Yes, sir.

24 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Would you mind coming back
25 to the microphone? Mr. Shamas, you heard Mr. Secundy

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 who is an officer with Four Corners -- as I understand
2 it, there are two primary pipelines competing for this,
3 although there are three possibilities. And I'm not going
4 to ask you any questions which would reveal how you and
5 those in your group want to go about negotiating to get
6 the best deal from these companies.

7 But what I am interested in ascertaining right
8 now is what you think the maximum capacity necessary is
9 in the pipeline, and tell me what sources of oil would
10 be included in what you anticipate would be the maximum
11 capacity necessary. And then I'm going to relate that
12 to what Mr. Secundy just told me about what his company
13 could do, which was 100,000 barrels a day.

14 MR. SHAMAS: Well, I don't know if I -- as
15 managing partner of the terminal operation -- should feel
16 that I can speak for those two groups, but I can give you
17 my opinion, because my feeling is that a minimum of
18 50 to 60,000 barrels a day -- well, let's say 40 to 60,000
19 barrels a day of the PAPCO group crude would need to move
20 to Los Angeles. And then, if you look at the Santa Ynez
21 Exxon unit that's slated to come on late 1993, early --
22 actually it's between six and twelve months before they
23 get up to full capacity. If you took the total output
24 of those two projects, you're looking at between 170 and
25 180,000 barrels per day.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. So, you said
2 40 to 60 for PAPCO.

3 MR. SHAMAS: For the PAPCO group. Exxon has a
4 similar -- and, again, I can't speak for Exxon. But
5 Exxon has indicated they have a similar expected market
6 in the L.A. Basin for their type of crude in that same
7 range.

8 So, if you want to add the maximums, it's 120.
9 I could be off some, because I really can't predict what
10 the refiners are going to select. If you look at our
11 very own refinery in the L.A. Basin, we select crudes
12 from all over the world. And so, I really can't, you
13 know, tell you. But my guess is it's going to be
14 between 100 to 150,000 barrels a day.

15 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. When you set out
16 to negotiate with the two or three pipeline companies
17 that you will be talking to, it's an understanding
18 accepted by every producer that will use the pipeline
19 selected, that there will be no oil tankering and that
20 the pipeline selected will be the source of shipping
21 to Los Angeles?

22 MR. SHAMAS: The pipeline selected will be the
23 source.

24 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Right. But there won't --
25 the point is, there won't be a question of a lack of

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 capacity and, therefore, we have to revert to oil
2 tankering?

3 MR. SHAMAS: Well, it depends upon which
4 project is constructed or which phase.

5 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: That's why I'm asking these
6 questions.

7 MR. SHAMAS: The original scoping -- and
8 again, this is a pipeline issue. But the original
9 scoping is not a terminal issue. I'm answering this in
10 a nonterminal way.

11 The original scoping of the pipeline down the
12 railroad tracks looked at three different cases -- the
13 16-inch, an 18-inch, and 20-inch. Every one of those
14 would have been capable of moving what was expected to
15 be the maximum L.A. demand. And the reason that the
16 20-inch line was chosen was because you can put a number
17 of pump stations on. But that was the most efficient
18 sizing for the line that Pacific Pipeline thought was
19 needed to go to the L.A. Basin.

20 So, there's a line that we have no question
21 that, if it is 150, the industry thinks that line will be
22 fine.

23 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. So, everyone
24 shares the same understanding that whatever oil is going
25 to be shipped is going to be shipped through the pipeline

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 selected and not tankered.

2 MR. SHAMAS: We all have the very same under-
3 standing because of the conditions that the producers will
4 have agreed to at the Coastal Commission; that they will
5 move by pipeline or they won't move.

6 And I don't want to give the impression that
7 I don't think the Cajon pipeline project is not a good
8 project, nor do I want Gerry Secundy's pipeline to think
9 that I'm against the Four Corners -- All American Four
10 Corners reversal. Each of them has a different benefit
11 to it.

12 The Four Corners line, you know -- Gerry says
13 it's 100,000. And they have indicated to industry they
14 have some options between 70 and 100,000 barrels a day,
15 and I would not differ with that.

16 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I don't think we're asking
17 you to negotiate that out here now. I understand there
18 are differences within the producers in your group as
19 to which of the pipelines should be used. So, that's
20 a matter you can work out as long as everybody understands
21 that whatever oil is shipped is going to go through
22 pipelines and not tankers.

23 And you've said yes to that.

24 MR. SHAMAS: I've said yes to that, but, again,
25 let me emphasize I'm not here speaking for those ten
producers. I'm here speaking for the Gaviota Terminal.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 We understand that our terminal will shut down.
2 If they want to ship it in helicopters, or trains, or
3 trucks, or something else, but our feeling is that the
4 terminal has a date certain at which it's going to close.
5 And the only thing that'll be used there anymore will be
6 tanks, so they can tender to a pipeline.

7 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I've had the distinct
8 impression that the producers were a part of this
9 dialogue, together with you, and you're not speaking or
10 operating independently, and that they understand they're
11 going to be part of the negotiation process with competing
12 pipelines, to the end that there will be no more oil
13 tankering after the specified date, and that everybody
14 will be shipping through the pipelines.

15 Now, if there's any dissent from that, we need to
16 know that right now.

17 MR. SHAMAS: The Coastal Commission conditions
18 will force the producers to select a pipeline option.

19 Lou Blackwell is here from Chevron. Lou? I'm
20 sorry if I've given anything that indicates that I
21 represent the producers, because I don't.

22 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: You want to identify
23 yourself for the record?

24 MR. BLACKWELL: Yes, sir. My name is Lou
25 Blackwell, and I'm General Manager of the Western Supply

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Region for Chevron, but I'm also chairman of the
2 Point Arguello Producers Management Committee, and I'm
3 here in that capacity. Maybe I can follow up. You've
4 done a great job for an attorney, Jim.

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. SHAMAS: I'm an engineer.

7 MR. BLACKWELL: Let me just answer your last
8 question. The Point Arguello Producers understand and
9 accept that, if we get to the position that we can accept
10 the Coastal Commission permit, that all oil that will
11 move out of the processing plant after the 1996 drop-
12 dead date will move by pipeline. It's unequivocal.

13 Now, what we can't guarantee, as Jim has
14 referred to, is that a new pipeline or new capacity
15 will be built or made available.

16 Those negotiations are going on currently. But
17 what we do accept -- again, without reservation, if
18 we accept permit, that once the date is triggered --
19 I think it's January 1st, '96. I could be a little bit
20 off. After that date, no other Point Arguello crude will
21 move to any destination by marine tanker.

22 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Now, I appreciate that
23 there are negotiations that have to go on regarding the
24 tariff that will be paid to whatever pipeline company
25 is ultimately selected, and that a T & D agreement would

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 have to be signed before bank loans would be given. But
2 what I'm trying to get a sense of here is that there's a
3 clear understanding on everybody's part that there will
4 be no oil tankering after the date certain, as far as
5 one member of this Commission is concerned, and that that,
6 in part -- there are other considerations, your
7 negotiations with the pipeline companies, what you
8 consider a fair price from them, whatever permit
9 processes go through. Obviously, there could be someone
10 in California that says there should be no more oil
11 tankering, we should only use pipelines, and then it
12 could go into court and try to stop the permit process
13 from going forward that would allow the very pipelines.
14 We understand that.

15 And we'll be able to look at all those facts
16 and make that judgment as to whether there are any
17 positions like that taken, which really serve to undercut
18 what the good-faith agreement may turn out to be here.

19 But what I'm trying to get from the producers
20 is that you understand -- I don't know where these two
21 Commissioners are, but I'm speaking for myself now --
22 that I take very, very seriously this date that says
23 there'll be no more oil tankering after this date.

24 MR. BLACKWELL: I can tell you unequivocally on
25 behalf of the Point Arguello Producers that, if we work

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 through all of this and we accept the Coastal Commission
2 permit, we will live up to all the conditions in that
3 permit, one of which is that after a date certain,
4 irrespective of whether pipelines are constructed,
5 built, reversed, or whatever, there will be no more
6 marine movements of Point Arguello crude after that date
7 certain. And every producer in our partnership under-
8 stands and accepts that.

9 I can't say it any clearer than that.

10 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Can I ask a question of
11 Mr. Shamas?

12 As the State's -- one of the State's chief
13 fiscal officers, I'm somewhat struck by the difficulty
14 of your position; you have spent a lot of money.

15 My question is, how can you recoup that
16 investment between now and January 1, 1996? Let's
17 assume the pipelines are available; how can you recoup
18 all the investment that you've made in this terminal?

19 MR. SHAMAS: We -- the answer to your question
20 is, we will not. We -- and it's interesting. Lou and I
21 have been working on this. We made the decision back in
22 1985, when we had two competing terminal projects --
23 Gaviota and Las Flores. And Chevron was really backing
24 the other terminal. We made a decision and a pledge to
25 the county we would operate whichever terminal we

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 constructed for four years, and then we would shut it
2 down.

3 That has now been compressed to 2.8, two years
4 and eight months. That was through the negotiations,
5 which I differed with, but that's what happened when
6 they got together for four months. And Lou was one
7 of the lead negotiators between the State's representatives
8 and the producers.

9 We will get revenue from the tanks, but we can't
10 get a payout in 2.8 years on about \$40 million of our
11 investment that went to go out 3500 feet into the sea
12 and build the tanker loading.

13 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Did I hear you suggest
14 that you will get -- you'll be compensated from the
15 pipeline revenues once it's switched to pipeline?

16 MR. SHAMAS: No. The tanks that are there, which
17 were mandated by the County of Santa Barbara, will be
18 used then to deliver into All American Pipeline, or
19 Pacific Pipeline, whichever line turns out to be the
20 one that ends up being the option to go to L.A.

21 There will still be a tankage fee, but it will
22 be much reduced compared to what it costs to load a
23 tanker. And we'll do the tankage on about a 15-year
24 payout

25 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: But when you crank all that

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 in, does the investment ultimately pay for itself, or
2 is it not going to pay for itself?

3 MR. SHAMAS: It has between a two -- well,
4 between a two and three percent return. It's not the kind
5 of thing we'd go into business, you know, to end up with.

6 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: So, at a two to three
7 percent return, it takes a long time to get the
8 investment back.

9 MR. SHAMAS: A long time to pay it out. Close
10 to 20 years. So, it doesn't have good economics. But,
11 as I stated in the introduction, we set out to spend
12 \$15 million. Everytime we met an APCD condition or the
13 firemen made us add something, we ended up over \$60
14 million. So, it just grew.

15 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Questions? Mr. Warren.

16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Mr. Chairman, with
17 the presence of Mr. Blackwell at the lectern, I wonder
18 if he would advise the Commission on the record of the
19 status of the determination by the producers on resolving
20 the question of whether or not they'll pick up the
21 permit?

22 As you recall, I indicated that was a
23 subsidiary question in my opening remarks. And it's
24 still not clear to me exactly what the intentions are of
25 the producers with respect to the Coastal permit itself.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Mr. Blackwell?

2 MR. BLACKWELL: Yes. Mr. Warren, when we
3 started this process in the State facilitation effort
4 last summer, at that time, we were anticipating a
5 fourth-quarter '93 startup, and the permit had a
6 certain cost/benefit ratio associated with it. Because,
7 as you know, we've agreed to some very substantial
8 concessions in this permit.

9 As this thing has stretched on and we still have
10 not been able to reach full production, because we're
11 still in this process of seeing if we can get the
12 permits -- the value, i.e. the benefit, has continued to
13 erode while the costs have continued to mount. So, we
14 are a partnership of ten companies that in normal --
15 in our normal business we compete with one another. We
16 are here together in this partnership for this
17 particular project. So, I have to be candid. There are
18 individual partners who are now questioning whether this
19 permit has any value to them.

20 I am hopeful -- I know from Chevron's standpoint,
21 we continue to believe that this is a fair solution to a
22 very complex problem that the State's been wrestling with
23 for a number of years. And from our standpoint, we would
24 like to proceed. But I have to admit that the longer
25 this drags on -- and I think this was the point of

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Mr. Shamas' comment on having another agency review a
2 T & D another 20 days, another request for another
3 hearing, as this drags on, the benefit of this permit
4 continues to erode. And it's a very -- it's in the
5 balance now. And if we can get this thing wrapped
6 up and get going, I'm hopeful that we're going to be able
7 to get everybody on board. I can't guarantee it.

8 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Incidentally, perhaps you
9 didn't understand the back and forth on the 20 days
10 before. There need not be an additional 20 days. The
11 20 days will run from the time the T & D agreement is
12 received, and that's to be --

13 MR. BLACKWELL: Well, I think that -- because
14 this is the February date that we have to hit. And if
15 this thing progresses in the timing that we were on,
16 which has been disruptive a little bit here -- but the
17 timing we were on was going to lead us to where we would
18 have had a T & D by the fourth quarter, in which case
19 we would have had plenty of time. We'd have done it before
20 then.

21 But with the uncertainty -- in fact, we're
22 going tomorrow to a meeting of the producers in Phoenix.
23 I'm hopeful that I'll be able to carry with them the
24 news that we've gotten a relatively clean lease.

25 But a lot of this depends -- they're holding back

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 their decisions based on what they think the ultimate
2 regulatory cost of this project's going to be.

3 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you very much. How
4 about a two-minute recess? Stand and stretch. A short
5 seventh-inning stretch.

6 (Thereupon, a brief recess was taken.)

7 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I thank the rest of the
8 witnesses for their patience. I think the proponents
9 took about 35 minutes to testify, and we took about an
10 hour to ask them questions. So, you still have your
11 45, and we'll have questions of you as well.

12 Let's start with Mr. Bill Douros, the Deputy
13 Director of the Resource Management Department of
14 Santa Barbara County.

15 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, I have a
16 question that I intended to put to Mr. Secundy. Is he
17 still here?

18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Mr. Secundy, could you step
19 up? Would you mind just a moment, Mr. Douros?

20 Mr. Secundy, would you mind taking the microphone
21 for a minute? Commissioner Davis would like to ask you
22 a question.

23 MR. SECUNDY: Certainly.

24 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: First of all, do you
25 operate Line 63?

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 MR. SECUNDY: Yes, I do.

2 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: How much additional capacity
3 does Line 63 have now that is going unutilized?

4 MR. SECUNDY: As of today, it has zero
5 additional capacity. What I think you have to do is
6 look at the volumes that we've moved over the last year.
7 Just to go back a few months, in the month of March --
8 in terms of the PAPCO crude, which we blend with a
9 diluent of about 10 to 12 percent, so we call it
10 high viscosity/high sulfur crude, HVHS crude -- in the
11 month of March, I believe we moved approximately
12 52,000 barrels a day of that. Excuse me. 56,000
13 barrels a day of that.

14 In the month of April, we'll move about 52,000
15 barrels a day. In the month of May, we've been
16 nominated (sic) about 41,000 barrels a day. With those
17 capacities, and with the light crude oil that we move,
18 we are full. But if you go back over the last year or
19 so, we have had additional capacity that's ranged between
20 10, 20, 30, 40,000 barrels a day.

21 It depends on which month that you pick. It's
22 not an easy question to answer, because it depends on how
23 much of the light crude you're moving at the same time.
24 We are certainly very comfortable with the amount that
25 we're moving right now.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: If this Commission were to
2 condition a lease on the premise that pipeline capacity
3 was fully utilized, would you be in a position to advise
4 our staff and obviously the producers as to when you had
5 additional capacity?

6 MR. SECUNDY: Yes. Actually, Mr. Warren asked
7 us for a specific proposal as to how this could be done.
8 We propose something that was done on a quarterly basis
9 as opposed to a monthly basis. I think it's feasible.
10 We are not advocating that system, but it is certainly
11 a feasible system, and it would give everyone enough
12 opportunity and time in order to be able to nominate.

13 The pipeline capacity is going to vary month
14 by month. But certainly, there's a very substantial
15 minimum capacity that exceeds 25,000 barrels a day.

16 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: When you say minimum
17 capacity, you mean that --

18 MR. SECUNDY: That's for the heavy sulfur.

19 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Pardon me?

20 MR. SECUNDY: For the heavy crude. For the PAPCO
21 crude. Did I make myself clear?

22 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: No. But it's not your fault.

23 (Laughter.)

24 MR. SECUNDY: Let me go back, because, again,
25 it is not an easy subject to understand.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: My question is just, you
2 know, I just want to utilize all the efficiencies we
3 can. And if there is unused capacity, can we -- if the
4 Commission were to require the producers to first utilize
5 the capacity before exercising any option to tanker,
6 could you develop a plan -- and you suggested it would
7 be something you could do on a quarterly basis. And then
8 my next question was, can you identify -- I think you
9 gave me a figure of about 25 minimum. And I don't know if
10 that was the unused capacity or that was the demand
11 that goes through the pipeline all the time.

12 MR. SECUNDY: First of all, in terms of a plan,
13 a plan has already been submitted. Mr. Warren has a
14 copy of that plan. I believe it's in the documents
15 that you currently have. So, there is a plan and it is
16 a feasible plan, and it's a workable plan.

17 In terms of how much capacity that plan would
18 enable you to move, what I'm convinced of is that it
19 would enable you to move substantially more than the
20 25,000 barrels a day that the Coastal Commission is
21 putting in as a requirement for their permit. That was
22 the reference to the 25,000 barrels a day. But I can't
23 tell you a specific month.

24 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you.. Mr. Douros.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 MR. DOUROS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members
2 of the Commission.

3 For the record, my name is Bill Douros. I manage
4 the County's Energy Division. I'm here to present a
5 letter that our Board of Supervisors approved unanimously
6 last night.

7 I also want to say that I appreciate being
8 sandwiched between the proponents and opponents, because
9 I think it accurately reflects our Board's position.

10 (Laughter.)

11 MR. DOUROS: Our Board offers these comments to
12 clarify the scope of the County's permit for the Gaviota
13 Interim Marine Terminal and the SEIR prepared for
14 Chevron's proposed tankering for that facility, as well
15 as the relationship of these matters to Exxon's tankering
16 application.

17 Our suggestions are intended to ensure that
18 any lease the State Land Commission issues is based on
19 accurate facts and is consistent with the County's
20 local coastal plan and the final development plan issued
21 to the Gaviota Interim Marine Terminal.

22 The County's LCP allows for only one consolidated
23 marine terminal on the South Coast of Santa Barbara
24 County. In 1987, the County approved Exxon's Las Flores
25 Canyon Marine Terminal as the permanent consolidated marine

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 terminal allowed by our LCP, and authorized interim
2 use of the Gaviota Interim Marine Terminal until either
3 Exxon's marine terminal was constructed or until new
4 pipelines to Los Angeles and Texas became operational.

5 The linkage between the interim status of the
6 Gaviota Terminal and the designation of Exxon's marine
7 terminal as the permanent consolidated facility is made
8 explicit in several related conditions imposed in the
9 separate permits issued by the County to the Gaviota
10 Terminal Company and to Exxon.

11 These requirements assure that there will be
12 only one consolidated marine terminal in the County.

13 And also, the reason for this and for allowing
14 that for only an interim period would be to allow
15 Chevron to complete its commitment made to the Coastal
16 Commission in 1983 to, quote, ". . . assume the lead
17 role in arranging for the design, permit, organization,
18 and capitalization of an industry-sponsored pipeline to
19 Los Angeles," end quote, and also to allow Exxon to
20 develop its marine terminal in Las Flores Canyon.

21 In 1988, GTC applied to the County, in coordination
22 with Exxon, for GTC to become the permitted marine
23 terminal while Exxon deferred construction of its Las
24 Flores Canyon Marine Terminal until April of 1994.

25 Indeed, at our request, the Coastal Commission's

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 February, 1993 approval of a new coastal development
2 permit for interim operations of the Gaviota Interim
3 Marine Terminal included a condition that we had asked
4 for -- and that's also included on page 2 in Italics of
5 our letter -- I won't read that, but I believe you have
6 that letter in your record.

7 The second point that the County Board of
8 Supervisors wanted to make is with regard to the volumes
9 of the permit -- the lease before you today. Because
10 Exxon's proposed use of the Gaviota Interim Marine Terminal
11 is beyond the scope of the County and the Coastal
12 Commission permits for use of that facility, as well as
13 it's beyond the final SEIR prepared to review the impacts
14 of Chevron's tankering from the Gaviota Marine Terminal,
15 we also request that any lease authorize a throughput
16 of 50,000 barrels a day rather than 100,000 barrels a day
17 recommended by your staff.

18 And I'll outline the reasons for that. First,
19 use of the GIMT by Exxon is beyond the scope of the final
20 SEIR prepared under the direction of a joint review
21 panel consisting --

22 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Mr. Chairman -- pardon
23 me for interrupting, but perhaps in the interest of
24 time, the staff accepts that suggestion on page 394,
25 paragraph 6F. Strike the numerals 100,000 and insert

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 50,000. I think that would be as suggested by the
2 County. And we find that suggestion appropriate and
3 acceptable.

4 MR. SHAMAS: (From the audience) We don't accept
5 that.

6 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Well, we'll return to the
7 point in a minute.

8 Go ahead and finish your comments.

9 MR. DOUROS: Well, perhaps, then, because there
10 is some controversy, I'll continue with reading from our
11 Board's letter.

12 When GTC withdrew its applicaton for the
13 permanent Gaviota Marine Terminal on June 5th, 1992, the
14 partnership confirmed that it would accept an
15 appropriately conditioned lease from the State Lands
16 Commission accommodating Chevron's tankering application;
17 that is, a term of approximately three years allowing the
18 transport of at least 50,000 barrels a day of Point
19 Arguello crude oil to Los Angeles in Chevron Oregon
20 Class tankers.

21 As a consequence of GTC's permanent marine
22 terminal application withdrawal and the desire of GTC
23 and the Point Arquello Producers to have a county
24 decision on Chevron's tankering application by August of
25 1992, the final supplemental environmental impact report

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 was narrowed to serve as the environmental analysis of
2 the Point Arquello Producers' May 22nd application to
3 tanker from the GIMT.

4 Thus, although the draft SEIR for the Gaviota
5 Marine Terminal was originally prepared for a larger
6 project, the County certified the final SEIR, quote,
7 ". . .for action by the County on Chevron's tankering
8 application," unquote.

9 I'll note that that is a quotation from findings
10 adopted by our Board.

11 Neither the County or the Coastal Commission
12 has utilized the final SEIR to approve tankering from
13 the GIMT for Exxon or for volumes greater than 50,000
14 barrels a day.

15 On February 12th of this year, the County
16 deemed Exxon's application to tanker 50,000 barrels a day
17 of its Santa Ynez unit crude oil for five years from the
18 Gaviota Marine Terminal in single-hulled tankers and
19 to construct a feeder line to allow Exxon's oil to get
20 from the Las Flores Canyon to the Gaviota Terminal (sic).

21 Exxon's proposed use of the Gaviota Terminal and
22 the new feeder line are beyond the scope of the activities
23 evaluated for or contemplated by the County's permit for
24 interim use of the Gaviota Terminal. Allowing such use
25 by Exxon will require modification of the County's permit

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 to GTC regardless of the State Lands Commission action
2 on the lease.

3 GTC has notified the County that it intends to
4 submit an application to modify its final development plan
5 by May 17th, 1993. It is also likely that GTC will
6 seek a modification of the Coastal Commission's new
7 permit to increase the 50,000 barrel a day throughput
8 limitation to allow for Exxon's proposed use of the
9 Gaviota Terminal.

10 We believe that approval of a State Lands
11 Commission lease to accommodate Exxon's tankering should
12 await final County and Coastal Commission action.

13 Finally, we commend your staff's efforts to
14 identify lease conditions that can maximize feasible
15 use of existing pipelines. The County's LCP requires
16 that crude oil be transported from the County by pipeline
17 as soon as the shipper's oil refinery center of choice
18 is served by pipeline.

19 Both the County and Coastal Commission have
20 rejected Chevron's claims that the use of Line 63 to
21 Los Angeles is economically infeasible or constrained by
22 an inadequate market for blended crude oil.

23 Tankering may occur only if, among other things,
24 available pipeline capacity to a shipper's destination
25 of choice is first utilized.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Our Board also identified a number of
2 clarifications to the staff report. There's five of
3 them. I won't go through those. They are in the letter.

4 And also, I want to point out one thing that's
5 not in our Board's letter that I've noticed today in
6 reviewing the staff report. And that pertains to
7 Condition 6I on page 23 of the staff report.

8 That condition identifies that, if for any
9 permit issued by the Coastal Commission or the State
10 Lands Commission, a permittee, a shipper, is notified
11 that they have not met the conditions of compliance,
12 that G -- that the lessee, GTC, shall be notified of the
13 State Lands Commission (sic) of that violation.

14 Because it's theoretically possible for the
15 County to issue a permit that, if not appealed or if
16 appealed is not accepted by the Coastal Commission,
17 there would be a County permit that would also be a
18 viable permit. We believe that 6I should also include
19 an acknowledgment that a County-issued permit as well as
20 a Coastal Commission-issued permit should carry the same
21 weight. And any notification of a lessee -- of a
22 shipper not in compliance should be one that could be a
23 notification by the County to your staff.

24 I talked about it with your staff. They
25 understand and agree that that, I believe, is an

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 acceptable amendment to that condition.

2 That concludes the comments from our Board of
3 Supervisors. I can answer any questions.

4 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Let's return to the issue
5 of 50,000 versus 100,000 barrels per day. Was that an
6 argument that the County presented to the California
7 Coastal Commission?

8 MR. DOUROS: Mr. Chairman, that's an argument
9 we did not need to make because their recommendation
10 and their action was only for 50,000 barrels a day.
11 And our Board concurred with that as part of their
12 action.

13 So, I don't believe we've specifically made any
14 comments because we didn't need to.

15 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Mr. Shamas?

16 MR. SHAMAS: (From the audience) I'd like to
17 have Mr. Milhalik address that.

18 Just as a lead-in, we've decided that terminal
19 for 150,000 barrels a day. We did an SEIR for 125.
20 The County has continued to just change and drop things.
21 It's the same thing that they've done all the time.

22 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: You did an environmental
23 impact report for 125?

24 MR. SHAMAS: That's what we submitted. And when
25 we came down to whether or not we could start the
terminal up, which was April of '92, the County said we

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 had to -- how'd they phrase it, Dan? We had to withdraw
2 it, we had to change it.

3 MR. MIHALIK: We withdrew our permanent terminal
4 application. I think the point that needs to be
5 clarified here is that -- I think it's important
6 throughout this whole process to keep the owners of oil,
7 the shippers and their permits separate from the Gaviota
8 Terminal Company. I mean, they are one of our
9 customers.

10 And it's true that one of our customers, the
11 Point Arguello Producers, has a limit in its permit
12 conditions of 50,000 barrels a day. But if you go back
13 to kind of the main framework here of conditions for
14 Gaviota Terminal Company -- and that is the County's
15 final development plan -- we have a permit from the County
16 right now that's good for 100,000 barrels a day. That's
17 the Gaviota Terminal. And we have always expected -- and
18 I think the State Lands Commission has always kind of
19 undertaken the approach that they use that final
20 development plan from the County as sort a framework in
21 developing conditions.

22 So, our expectation would be, we would receive
23 a permit for 100,000 barrels a day. We're mitigated for
24 that. We're designed for that. And we're an open,
25 consolidated facility, open to everyone. Again, you have

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 a provision in your proposed lease that would cause us
2 to come in and ask for a permit modification later if
3 there are other shippers, you know, you'll be looking
4 at mitigation measures and that whole area.

5 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: So, the 50,000 barrels
6 per day condition in the California Coastal Commission
7 permit refers to Point Arguello Producers only.

8 MR. MIHALIK: Well, the Point Arguello Producers
9 have a condition; but to be accurate, the Gaviota
10 Terminal Company right now has a Coastal Commission
11 permit which really reflects our ability to run Point
12 Arguello crude oil only. There is a recognition by
13 the Coastal Commission -- so implied in that, it's
14 50,000 barrels a day if we could only run Point
15 Arguello crude oil --

16 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Back it goes to the
17 Commission, when the San Ynez people want to start shipping,
18 and get another Coastal Commission permit to increase that
19 50,000?

20 MR. MIHALIK: Mr. Chairman, that's correct. We
21 would have to go back to the Coastal Commission; we would
22 have to come back to the State Lands Commission to modify
23 our coastal development permit and lease to be
24 consistent with what another shipper like Exxon may
25 propose.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Have any reason to believe
2 that you would not be granted that permit by the
3 California Coastal Commission? Is there any discussion in
4 the public record that the Coastal Commission might want
5 to limit you in some way that could be shipped daily?

6 MR. MIHALIK: The Coastal Commission, I think,
7 made it very clear -- I can't speak for them, but I
8 thought they made it very clear the facility is designed
9 for 100,000 barrels a day. It has the capacity for
10 for 100,000 barrels a day. I don't think that's an issue
11 with anyone. But we can't predict what will happen with,
12 you know, some future shipper, like Exxon. Don't know.

13 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you. Mr. Douros,
14 could you give the Commission the reasoning of the
15 County in suggesting that there be a limit to 50,000
16 barrels a day?

17 MR. DOUROS: Yes, I can, Mr. Chairman. It's
18 important to keep in mind that there are two permits
19 that we are speaking of. There is a permit that has been
20 issued to the Gaviota Terminal Company to construct and
21 operate the marine terminal. That's the final
22 development plan, but the specific name is not important.
23 It's a permit to GTC.

24 There's a second permit that allows the use under
25 our LCP that when a shipper wants to ship by tanker,

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 they need to come and get a separate approval by the
2 County Board of Supervisors.

3 The original permit that the County granted in
4 1985 to GTC to construct and operate the terminal
5 has a throughput limitation -- a maximum limitation
6 of 100,000 barrels a day. And that is because that
7 marine terminal was designed and built to accommodate the
8 transportation needs of the Point Arguello Producers,
9 whose peak production at the Chevron facility -- literally
10 across the street -- was 100,000 barrels per day.

11 So, that is a correct statement Mr. Mihalik made
12 regarding the maximum capacity from a County permit.
13 However, because shippers need to get additional permits
14 to use the terminal to tanker -- and Chevron, as the
15 original intended user of that, has received a permit,
16 but only for 50,000 barrels a day. Anyone using the
17 terminal between 50 and 100,000 barrels a day -- in this
18 case, in practical reality, that's Exxon -- would be
19 introducing a shipper that wasn't originally considered in
20 the permit that the County granted that gave them
21 100,000 barrels a day throughput.

22 So, it's because the shipper's permit is limited
23 to 50,000 barrels a day, and the Coastal Commission has
24 acknowledged that and provided an additional permit lease
25 to 50,000 barrels a day, then our view is that you

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 shouldn't offer them a lease that, in effect, extends the
2 potential users to incorporate Exxon. That's a separate
3 discretionary action that will come before the County
4 later this year and before the Coastal Commission on
5 appeal, and on a permit modification. And we don't think
6 it's appropriate for you to extend this lease to
7 accommodate a shipper not originally intended.

8 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Let me ask you a question.
9 Are there any reasons why you anticipate that Exxon will be
10 requesting that they be allowed to ship another 50,000
11 barrels a day through the pipeline might be rejected?

12 MR. DOUROS: Mr. Chairman, I will decline to
13 answer that, in that we have only just received their
14 application, and we've begun what is an extensive
15 environmental review and public hearing process. And I
16 think in all fairness to Exxon, as well as our Board,
17 it's just inappropriate for me to give some sort of
18 speculative response.

19 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I'm troubled, because there's
20 sort of an inherent contradiction here in what we're
21 trying to do to glue all of this together. We're trying to
22 stop oil tankering. And the only way we stop oil
23 tankering is put -- ship all this oil through the
24 pipeline. And we have to ship the maximum amount of oil
25 through the pipeline to make it as economical as possible

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 to make this a worthwhile undertaking.

2 So, to the degree we make it sound like we're
3 taking actions that are going to limit them -- I mean,
4 there's a lot of argument that there's unused capacity.
5 Commissioner Davis was asking some questions on that,
6 because friends that we share are suggesting that there's
7 unused capacity in the existing pipelines, and that the
8 oil companies haven't been operating in good faith; that
9 they wanted to continue oil tankering and didn't use
10 the existing capacity.

11 Now, either we're going to encourage the
12 construction or expansion of pipelines so that they can
13 ship the maximum amount daily or we aren't. And I'm a
14 little bit confused in this process.

15 Now, what compelling reason is there for us to
16 amend this from 100 to 50?

17 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: You mean reduce it
18 from 100 to 50?

19 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Right.

20 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Two things, but
21 neither of which may be compelling, however.

22 First off --

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER IN AUDIENCE: We can't hear.

24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Oh. Two reasons I
25 would offer in reply to your question, but none of them

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 may be compelling necessarily.

2 First off, as I understood Mr. Douros' remarks --
3 and I may have misunderstood -- it's my understanding
4 that the EIR was certified by the County only to the
5 extent of necessary to accommodate the Chevron permit
6 or 50,000 barrels per day. That raises the question in --
7 a legal question in my mind whether or not we can go
8 beyond the EIR -- certified EIR, which was limited to
9 50,000.

10 I have put that question to Mr. Hight, who seems
11 to indicate -- well, what do you indicate? Then I'll
12 have another reason I'll offer.

13 (Laughter.)

14 MR. HIGHT: The environmental impact report
15 prepared for the project looked at a capacity of -- of
16 a throughput of 125,000 barrels a day, even though the
17 County only analyzed or only certified it for 50,000.
18 It is our position that the entire EIR of 125 is valid.

19 The application before the Commission today is
20 for 100,000.

21 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Therefore, there's no reason
22 to amend it down to 50.

23 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: There's no legal
24 reason.

25 MR. HIGHT: Yeah. There's no legal reason. On

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 a policy issue, the issue is that Exxon will have to come
2 back to this Commission anyway. This would be another
3 signal if it was reduced.

4 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: What would the signal be?

5 (Laughter.)

6 MR. HIGHT: That they need to come back to the
7 Commission and they need to worry --

8 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: There will be a
9 difference. I'm sorry.

10 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: If -- this is what concerns
11 me a little bit. If we reduce it -- if we don't reduce
12 it to 50,000, is there any way Exxon can get in this
13 process without coming back to us?

14 MR. HIGHT: No.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Well, some people suggest
17 there is.

18 MR. HIGHT: At the moment, they do not have the
19 ability to use Chevron tankers. If they can arrange --
20 make an arrangement with Chevron to use their tankers,
21 then they can tanker up to 100,000 without coming back to
22 us. But they would have to go back to the Coastal
23 Commission.

24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: The Coastal -- the
25 shipping permit to Chevron requires Chevron -- the

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 producers to ship by Chevron Oregon Class tankers, which
2 are double-hulled. There are only four such tankers in
3 the world, and I understand that three of them will be
4 dedicated to transporting Point Arguello production.

5 There are no such tankers available to Exxon.
6 So, Exxon in its application to the County for a
7 shipper's permit, has requested to be -- I don't know if
8 they've made a request -- but the implication is that
9 that requirement would not apply to Exxon; that they would
10 be allowed to ship in tankers other than the Chevron Oregon
11 double-hulled class of tankers.

12 Now, that is a question which I think is a
13 significant one, and one which I think we might want to
14 take into consideration in the future.

15 If we could be assured -- and I'm embarrassed
16 to say I cannot give you assurance -- that we would
17 still -- that this Commission would still be in a position
18 to review whatever shipping permit might be given Exxon
19 in the future, then I would withdraw my suggestion of
20 modifying the 100,000. But I'm not quite -- I would like
21 to have that assurance first, because that is an issue
22 that I think we might want to consider.

23 MR. DOUROS: Mr. Chairman, if I might take one
24 more stab at summarizing the County's position. Our
25 Board has continually, both to the Coastal Commission on

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 several matters related to this project and in this
2 letter to you, taken the position that whatever permits
3 or leases are issued should be consistent with those of
4 other agencies and with the County.

5 And our consistency concern with regard to the
6 lease before you is that, in all practical effects, by
7 granting it for 100,000 barrels a day, you are extending
8 the lease to be more than just a marine terminal for the
9 Point Arguello Producers; it's one for Exxon as well.
10 Because, at present, the Point Arguello Producers are
11 capped at 50,000 barrels a day.

12 And so, if you want to issue a lease that meets
13 the request of our Board -- and that is, issue a lease
14 consistent with previous County actions -- don't extend
15 the lease to other shippers; keep it narrowly focused
16 on those who originally have and currently have permits
17 for that lease.

18 Does that help?

19 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I understand what you said.
20 I don't know if it helps. If the point is to end up with
21 no oil tankering within the time frame we're talking
22 about here, while the makeup of this Commission is as it
23 is -- and you never know whether the makeup of this
24 Commission will change after the November, '94 elections.
25 I'm not running for Controller and I'm not running for

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Lieutenant Governor --

2 COMMISSIONER BURTON: I'm not running for
3 anything.

4 (Laughter.)

5 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: If there's a change --

6 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Sorry, Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: No, not at all. I like it.
8 You'd be too tough.

9 If there's a change in the governorship, I may
10 request to be Director of Finance, so I can sit on this
11 Commission.

12 (Laughter.)

13 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Because I enjoy it so much.
14 But I think my interest is in figuring out how we create
15 these are important words that we used: a good faith
16 chemistry that helps us move forward on whoever shares
17 this common ground of stopping oil tankering and starting
18 to use that pipeline.

19 And I appreciate what the County has to do. You
20 have your statutory obligations that you have to fulfill.
21 I'm just not sure that I yet see the policy reason for
22 this Commission. Mr. Warren, you said you had one other
23 potential policy.

24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Well, that was the
25 double-hulled vessel question. I'm satisfied that the

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 lease we propose will have a special condition in it
2 requiring double-hulled tankers to use that -- before
3 that terminal can be used.

4 Accordingly, I will withdraw my suggestion that
5 the 100,000 be amended to 50,000. We will have an
6 opportunity to review the lease on that issue. Thank
7 you.

8 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Let me just make a point
9 here. Mr. Chairman, I don't understand where you're going.
10 If the point is to facilitate pipeline production,
11 why are we trying to expand tanker activity? I don't
12 understand that.

13 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I don't want to expand --

14 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I don't see any point in
15 emphasizing --

16 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I don't want to expand
17 tanker opportunity.

18 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Well, that's what we're
19 doing by not reducing the 100,000 to 50,000.

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: There is no tanker shipping
21 after the date that we're talking about in here. So, what
22 are we talking about? A very limited number of -- a
23 very limited period here.

24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: The concern is that
25 there will be tankering in excess of 50,000 between now

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 and January 1 of '96.

2 You're right on that point. So, we're only
3 talking about that two-and-a-half-year period.

4 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Now, the other side of it --
5 the other side of it is that they are trying to figure out
6 how to put this together with the pipeline companies and
7 all of the parties involved in that. And what I'm trying
8 to search here is how do we increase the certainty that
9 we're going to end up with pipeline shipment?

10 And so, any changes that are proposed here,
11 I'm trying to figure out how they affect that basic
12 purpose.

13 Mr. Shamas, you want to add to this?

14 MR. SHAMAS: Well, two things. One, Exxon is
15 a part owner of Gaviota Terminal. They understand that
16 everything is going to cease a date certain.

17 Two, they're going to come on the end of '93
18 with 12 to 15,000 barrels a day. And then, during '94,
19 they're going to come on with between -- using the staff's
20 report -- probably 60 to 80,000 barrels a day.

21 There's not going to be pipeline capacity by
22 that time. Line 63 will be chockerbloc full even if
23 Gerry has some magic solutions. But everything's going to
24 be full until such time as we can get these expanded
25 facilities on. And Exxon is going to have to come before

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 you, and the County, and the Coastal Commission and say,
2 "Can we tanker a while while -- up until the drop-dead
3 date until these new pipelines are built?"

4 That's the real thing. And so, I think to
5 unnecessarily limit this to 50 a day when we all know
6 that Exxon's coming right down the road pretty soon to
7 see if they can tanker on an interim basis. That's why
8 we differ. We built this terminal for 150. It's already
9 been downrated to 100. We've paid for the last three
10 years over 180,000 a year for a hundred thousand barrel
11 a day terminal we haven't been allowed to use. Now the
12 rent's been jacked up to 230, and you're going to down-
13 grade the capacity. We just don't think that's playing
14 fair.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER IN AUDIENCE: That's right.

16 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Any other Commissioner
17 questions of Mr. Douros on his testimony for the County?

18 COMMISSIONER BURTON: I just wanted to know
19 whether anyone has received a copy of the letter that you
20 were reading to us, so that we might have that for our
21 records.

22 MR. DOUROS: I would assume that you have a copy.

23 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Is it in here?

24 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Thank you.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 MR. DOUROS: And I have extra copies also.

2 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you. Is that it?

4 Thank you, Mr. Douros.

5 Now, the patient group that's been waiting that
6 have some serious questions about this. And we're going
7 to start with Linda Krop, who represents the Environmental
8 Defense Center, Sierra Club, Get Oil Out, CPA, League of
9 Women Voters, Santa Barbara; SF, HRA. You don't sleep.

10 MS. KROP: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name
11 is Linda Krop. I'm an attorney with the Environmental
12 Defense Center in Santa Barbara, and I'm here today
13 representing the Environmental Coalition of Santa Barbara.

14 As the Chair mentioned, I represent EDC,
15 Get Oil Out, the Sierra Club, the League of Women
16 Voters of Santa Barbara, Citizens Planning Association,
17 the Surfrider Foundation, Hollister Ranch Owners'
18 Association, and local commercial fishermen.

19 Our comments will address the staff report
20 we received on Friday, since we haven't had an opportunity
21 to review the CEQA findings and the other attachments
22 that were made available today.

23 Before I begin my prepared comments, I'd like to
24 note that we've heard many references to the Coastal
25 Commission actions and reliance on those actions. And I'd

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 like to point out that both the Point Arguello
2 Producers and GTC have sued the Coastal Commission twice
3 over the issuance of the Point Arguello tanker permit,
4 and now over the issuance of a permit for the Gaviota
5 Marine Terminal. The last lawsuit was just filed on
6 April 19th.

7 The producers and GTC have also both opposed
8 a bill proposed by Assemblyman Terry Friedman, AB 591,
9 which would codify the January, '96 tanker cessation
10 date. And I question, if we're looking at good faith
11 here, whether we have that on the part of the producers
12 and GTC if they're opposing those very Coastal
13 Commission actions.

14 I'd also like to point out that all five GTC
15 partners are producers who intend to use the Gaviota
16 Marine Terminal -- Chevron, Texaco, Phillips, and Oryx
17 are Point Arguello Producers, and the fifth partner is
18 Exxon, which has now filed its own application to tanker
19 from the Gaviota Marine Terminal.

20 So, although -- you know, as far as corporate
21 status, we're talking about independent entities, we're
22 actually talking about the same players. And I think
23 we need to look at the commitments of the producers when
24 we look at the commitment of GTC.

25 First, I would like to put this issue into proper

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 context. The Gaviota Marine Terminal was approved by
2 the County Coastal Commission and State Lands Commission
3 in 1987 as an interim facility to be used only until a
4 permanent terminal was built at Las Flores or until
5 pipelines were available to transport Santa Barbara OCS
6 crude to Los Angeles and Texas.

7 The agencies anticipated at that time that the
8 terminal would operate only until 1990, or until 1991
9 at the latest.

10 At that time, the County determined that
11 Las Flores was the environmentally preferred location
12 for a consolidated marine terminal on our South Coast.
13 In addition, whether the terminal was located at
14 Las Flores or Gaviota, the preferred location and
15 design was for a single-point mooring system 10 to 14,000
16 feet offshore.

17 This design and location would significantly
18 reduce impacts to air quality, esthetics, kelp beds,
19 and other marine resources, commercial and recreational
20 fishing resources, not to mention significantly reducing
21 the risks and effects of oil spills.

22 Contrary to what the applicants may tell you,
23 then, neither the County nor the State agencies guaranteed
24 GTC the right to operate the marine terminal after 1991.
25 In fact, the original lease granted by this Commission

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 specifically limited any potential holdover to one year,
2 or to 1992.

3 That maximum holdover has ended. The applicant
4 has no right to continue operations of the current
5 interim terminal. If GTC wants to continue operations
6 at Gaviota, it should apply for a lease for a permanent
7 terminal.

8 Now that Exxon has withdrawn its plans to
9 develop the permanent terminal at Las Flores, has
10 quitclaimed its lease to the State Lands Commission, and
11 has applied for its own tanker permit from Gaviota, it
12 certain appears that the producers intend to use the
13 Gaviota facility as the permanent marine terminal
14 facility.

15 Rather than apply for permanent status, GTC
16 seeks to incrementally extend the life of the marine
17 terminal and avoid its responsibilities to reduce the
18 environmental impacts of the facility by locating a
19 single-point mooring system further offshore.

20 We urge the Commission to deny the application
21 for a new lease on the following grounds -- and I had
22 prepared some overheads for you and, unfortunately, we
23 didn't have room to put the projector up, so I made a
24 packet for you. And the first item in the packet lists
25 the proposed grounds for denial.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 First, there is no need for a marine terminal.
2 There is available pipeline capacity to transport oil
3 from Santa Barbara County to various refining destinations.
4 Environmental review is incomplete. Marine tankering
5 would violate the Public Trust Doctrine by interfering
6 with established fishing, recreational, and environmental
7 uses in the area. Tankering would violate the Coastal
8 Act and LCP preferences for pipeline transportation.

9 The Gaviota Marine Terminal is inconsistent
10 with the Coastal Act preference for single-point mooring
11 systems. The project would result in unmitigated Class 1
12 impacts, and there are no significant benefits of this
13 proposal which can outweigh those unmitigated impacts.

14 And, finally, feasible mitigation measures and
15 alternatives have not been incorporated into the proposed
16 project.

17 The second item in your packet is a chart which
18 indicates the amount of Point Arguello crude which has been
19 transported through the All American and Four Corners
20 Pipeline system to various refining centers in Martinez,
21 in Los Angeles, and to Texas in tankage, as well as
22 through the Sisquoc Line to Santa Maria.

23 This chart indicates that the Point Arguello
24 Producers have been able to transport up to 69,500 barrels
25 of neat Point Arguello crude. That was transported in

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 March of '93. At peak production, the Point Arguello
2 Producers expect to produce 85,000 barrels per day.
3 That was listed in their tanker application.

4 As this chart shows, they currently produce and
5 ship approximately 70,000 barrels a day. And if you'll
6 note on the chart, that was transported without even
7 using the usual 20,000 barrel per day capacity in the
8 Sisquoc Line to Santa Maria. The reason for that was that
9 the Unocal refinery in Santa Maria was temporarily
10 shut down for maintenance.

11 So, actually, in March, the available capacity
12 in pipelines from Point Arguello's production was 90,000
13 more than their expected peak production.

14 The second grounds for denial is that the
15 environmental review is incomplete.

16 And the third item in your packet gives you an
17 outline of the CEQA requirements which relate to this
18 application.

19 Under CEQA, it's important that environmental
20 review occur early in the process and that it look at the
21 full potential uses of the project -- of the facility,
22 any potential phases, any potential future use that's
23 reasonably foreseeable.

24 Environmental review must also address the
25 potentially long-term use of projects, even if they are

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 termed temporary or interim.

2 In this case, both the County and the Coastal
3 Commission have already determined that the current
4 environmental review documents do not address the full
5 potential use of the terminal by both Chevron and
6 Exxon. The staff report mistakenly assumes that the
7 EIR certified by the County last August is adequate to
8 address GTC's application for a new lease. This is simply
9 not true as Mr. Douros explained.

10 Last August, when the County certified the
11 EIR, they made it abundantly clear that the EIR was to be
12 used only for Chevron's tanker permit for 50,000 barrels
13 per day, and that any actions relating to the marine
14 terminal permit or lease would require further
15 environmental review.

16 As stated by the County, the current proposed
17 use of the terminal is beyond the scope of the EIR
18 certified by the County last August. The County is now
19 preparing a subsequent EIR (sic) to address Exxon's
20 application to tanker from the Gaviota Marine Terminal.

21 This EIR, which was scoped a couple weeks ago
22 and is under preparation, will encompass all potential
23 uses of the marine terminal and will analyze the
24 cumulative impacts of tankering by both Exxon and Chevron
25 as well as the potential long-term use of the facility.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 This EIR must be completed before the State
2 Lands Commission can take action on the lease application.

3 Staff has presented the proposition that the
4 Commission is somehow exempt from full environmental
5 review because the Commission is a responsible as opposed
6 to a lead agency in this matter.

7 We disagree with this analysis. In any event,
8 the Commission cannot hide behind labels to avoid its
9 legal duties under CEQA. The fact of the matter is,
10 the EIR which staff seeks to rely upon, is incomplete
11 for the project proposed by GTC. And I think that's been
12 confirmed in the dialogue today.

13 Therefore, the Commission must complete
14 environmental review before taking action on this lease.
15 Yet another reason to require further environmental
16 review is some alarming news, which we just received
17 earlier this week, that five of the six tankers which
18 will be using the Gaviota Marina Terminal as part of this
19 lease do have accident histories. And I have a few
20 copies of a news report, which details those accident
21 histories. And this was not part of the EIR. We have
22 requested that the County look at this information in the
23 subsequent EIR that they're now preparing, and we think the
24 State Lands Commission should look at this information
25 as well.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Third, approval of the lease will violate the
2 Public Trust Doctrine. As we have stated in our letters,
3 tankering from the Gaviota Marine Terminal would interfere
4 with established public trust uses in the affected area;
5 namely, fishing, recreation, and environmental
6 preservation.

7 As a State agency, the Commission has a duty
8 to protect the public trust uses in this area. Steve
9 Dunn, a representative of the local commercial fishing
10 industry will tell you about the impacts to local fishing
11 operations.

12 Tankering will also disrupt recreational
13 activities at the Gaviota State Park and surrounding
14 beaches.

15 Finally, operations at the terminal will put
16 pristine ecological communities of the entire Gaviota
17 to L.A. Coast at risk.

18 Fourth, tankering from the Gaviota Marine
19 Terminal would be inconsistent with the Coastal Act and
20 the County's LCP.

21 And the next, the fourth item in your packet,
22 lists the Coastal Act provisions that this application is
23 inconsistent with -- primarily the preference for
24 pipeline transportation and for single-point mooring
25 systems. And, as the Coastal Commission determined in

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 February, there are several sections of the Coastal Act
2 which this application would be inconsistent with.

3 The application is also inconsistent with our
4 County's oil transportation policies, which are set forth
5 in the local coastal plan and coastal zoning ordinance,
6 primarily a series of findings that have to be made before
7 tankering can occur. The findings are that pipelines to
8 the refining destination of choice have inadequate
9 capacity; that a pipeline commitment has been
10 demonstrated before tankering occurs, and that environmental
11 impacts of tankering have been mitigated to the
12 maximum extent feasible.

13 And as our comments demonstrate, none of those
14 findings can be made; therefore, tankering would violate
15 the County's LCP.

16 A fifth reason to deny the lease is because the
17 project will result in many unmitigated impacts.
18 According to the County's EIR, tankering from the
19 Gaviota Marine Terminal would result in Class 1 impacts
20 to fisheries, recreation, biological, and marine
21 resources.

22 In addition, tankering will use up valuable
23 air quality offsets. Therefore, under CEQA, the
24 Commission can only approve this project if the benefits
25 outweigh the Class 1 impacts.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 The magnitude of the risks and impacts of
2 tankering are so great that there can be no credible
3 argument that they are outweighed by any alleged benefits.
4 The risks are too obvious. Tankers lead to oil spills,
5 leaks, and accidents. Prevention is impossible,
6 cleanup is incomplete.

7 One needs only to remember the major oil spills
8 that have occurred within the last six months in Spain,
9 Scotland, Finland, and Indonesia to realize that oil
10 spills are inevitable. It doesn't matter whether the
11 tankers are single-hulled or double-hulled. They
12 explode. They go off course. They crash.

13 Incidentally, these are not small tankers we're
14 dealing with. Each tanker will hold 250,000 barrels
15 a day, which is the volume of oil which was spilled by
16 the Exxon Valdez. That's not a small amount. And we
17 don't want to be exposed to that risk.

18 There are no real public benefits of this
19 project. Revenue stream will be unaffected because, as
20 I mentioned earlier, production levels are increasing on
21 a regular basis and existing pipelines are capable
22 of carrying the oil companies' peak production.

23 Taxes will also be unaffected as confirmed by our
24 County's Tax Assessor last August.

25 Neither will the project have a benefit on jobs.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 According to our County, operations at the Gaviota
2 Marine Terminal will result in only 11 new jobs. On the
3 other hand, construction of a new pipeline will create
4 literally hundreds of jobs. For example, according to the
5 EIRs for the pipeline projects, construction of the
6 Pacific Pipeline will result in a peak 605 jobs;
7 construction of the Cajon Pipeline will generate 211
8 jobs; and reversal of Line 90 will require approximately
9 135 jobs.

10 And although these jobs are temporary, as
11 supposedly tanker jobs would be, the long-term operation
12 of the pipelines will generate more jobs than tankering
13 as well ranging anywhere from 20 to 30 jobs per project.

14 These jobs will not result from tankering. They
15 only result if pipelines are required to be developed.

16 Finally, 11 jobs simply isn't enough when one
17 considers the number of other jobs which would be
18 jeopardized in the fishing, tourism, and recreation
19 industries if tankering is allowed.

20 Finally, the proposed lease does not include
21 mitigation measures and alternatives which could reduce
22 project-related impacts as required by CEQA.

23 Several mitigation measures and alternatives have
24 already been identified which could reduce tanker impacts.
25 The most obvious is moving the facility 10 to 14,000 feet

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 offshore and requiring a single-point mooring system.

2 Reducing throughput is another obvious means
3 to reduce impacts. Because of the existing pipeline
4 network, throughput at the terminal could be reduced
5 without any prejudice to the producers.

6 Other mitigation measures are available to
7 reduce impacts to fishing resources and commercial
8 fishing activities, and these will be discussed by
9 Steve Dunn.

10 Those are the grounds on which we hope that you
11 deny this application for a lease. If you do decide to
12 issue a new lease, then we would like to direct you
13 to some proposed conditions which we would like
14 incorporated into the lease, which is the final item in
15 your packet.

16 Your authority to condition the lease is based
17 upon Public Resources Code Section 6873, which deals with
18 leases, the Coastal Act, and the County's local coastal
19 plan, as well as the Public Trust Doctrine.

20 The first condition we propose is to clarify
21 that any operation of the marine terminal is consistent
22 with valid tankering permits as issued by the County or
23 the Coastal Commission, and consistent with our
24 County's LCP oil transportation policies.

25 The second condition relates to pipeline use and

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 is based upon staff's proposal to maximize the
2 existing capacity of pipelines.

3 We've added a couple suggestions to clarify
4 the scope of emergencies and exceptions to that
5 certification process.

6 The third condition deals with the pipeline
7 commitment issue and mirrors the County's permit
8 condition, which requires execution of a throughput and
9 deficiency agreement with the pipeline developer before
10 tankering commences.

11 And finally, given the capacity of Line 63 and
12 Sisquoc, the throughput volumes that we suggest would
13 be to allow 20,000 barrels per day on a monthly average
14 since we're dealing with supposedly just the Point
15 Arguello production.

16 I'd like to stress the importance of this
17 pipeline commitment condition. Although Chevron made
18 a commitment to use pipelines to L.A. in 1983 and
19 Exxon made a similar commitment to use pipelines to
20 Texas in 1985, neither company has lived up to its
21 commitment.

22 Ten years have passed since Chevron promised
23 to develop a new pipeline to L.A. Once the producers
24 are in tankers, it will be virtually impossible to get
25 them out. We have seen how ineffective deadlines and

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 terminations have been in the past.

2 More recently, the producers objected to a
3 proposal which -- by the County which would have required
4 them to put their money where their mouth is by signing
5 a throughput and deficiency agreement with a pipeline
6 developer before commencing marine tankering.

7 In addition, Chevron and the other Point
8 Arguello Producers have sued the minor partners over
9 their efforts to construct the Mariposa Pipeline.
10 This pipeline, which would provide a direct link from the
11 Gaviota processing facility to the All American Pipeline
12 network, would reduce pipeline costs by about a dollar
13 a barrel. And one would think that if the producers
14 truly wanted to pipeline, they would support a project
15 which would reduce pipeline costs.

16 Chevron and GTC have also sued the Coastal
17 Commission over its issuance of a tanker permit for the
18 Point Arguello Producers and over the issuance of the
19 marine terminal permit as well.

20 Finally, Chevron and GTC have both opposed
21 AB 591, a bill which would codify the tanker cessation
22 date set forth in the Coastal Commission's Point Arguello
23 tanker permit and the Gaviota Marine Terminal permit.

24 At every step of the way, the producers continue
25 to resist their obligation and their commitment to use

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 pipelines. To compound this resistance, no new pipeline
2 will be built without an upfront commitment in the form
3 of a T & D agreement by the producers.

4 And the reason is simple. In 1985, Exxon said
5 it would use pipelines to transport its oil to Texas.
6 Based on that promise, All American spent \$885 million
7 to build a pipeline to Texas. Now it's sitting virtually
8 empty. Based on this experience, no pipeline developer
9 now will construct a pipeline, will start the shovels
10 until they have a T & D agreement. That T & D agreement
11 guarantees the development of a pipeline, guarantees the
12 jobs that we were talking about, guarantees the
13 cessation of tankering. That's the only thing that
14 guarantees a cessation of tankering. Dates don't mean
15 anything. Pipelines do.

16 The other importance of the commitment is that
17 it's tied to the capacity of existing pipelines that
18 we've been talking about. We can try to increase the
19 use of existing pipelines by Point Arguello, but when
20 Exxon comes on line later this year, they're going to
21 back out half of that Point Arguello oil. And there's
22 going to be more tankering. So, the only way to ensure
23 that enough oil is going in the pipelines is to require
24 the throughput and deficiency agreement. That's the only
25 way we're going to deal with both Chevron and Exxon.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 In conclusion, we hope you'll give this issue
2 your serious consideration and, by the dialogue that's
3 gone on today, I can see that there's tremendous interest
4 and serious consideration of this issue. And we appreciate
5 that.

6 We urge you not to take action under the
7 threat of litigation. Succumbing to litigation threats
8 is not good planning policy, because it sends a message
9 to other applicants that they can pressure your agency
10 into taking action for their benefit regardless of the
11 laws and policies which may be undermined in the process.

12 In addition, no matter what you do, no matter
13 what negotiations you make, no matter what deals you cut,
14 you still might get sued. That's what happened to the
15 Coastal Commission. They've been sued twice on this issue
16 this year already.

17 Furthermore, we urge you not to let the producers'
18 threat of tankering for Martinez influence your decision.
19 They've been sending some oil through pipelines up to
20 Northern California, loading it onto tankers. I noticed
21 in the staff report that they were threatening to
22 resume that tankering if they don't get the lease they
23 want. And I just want to let you know that that tankering
24 has been sporadic. It's been minimal. It's been
25 expensive. It only occurs everytime there seems to be a

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 big public hearing coming up. And more importantly,
2 it's in violation of the OCS approved plan and is subject
3 to Federal enforcement.

4 Instead of making a decision based upon the
5 applicant's threats, base your decision upon the
6 applicable laws and policies adopted by the this State
7 and by the County of Santa Barbara.

8 Encourage the development of a new pipeline.
9 Remember that the only true incentive to building a
10 pipeline is to prohibit tankering. Please deny the
11 lease application, direct the applicant to complete
12 environmental review. Any resulting delay is no one's
13 fault but their own.

14 The GTC partners are the very producers who
15 intend to tanker from the marine terminal. They
16 promised to build a pipeline ten years ago. Had they done
17 so, the pipeline would have been built by now for a lot
18 less money and operational to their refining destinations
19 of choice.

20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you. Are there any
22 questions?

23 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I have a number of questions.
24 First of all, in fairness to the producers, there's been
25 a lot of opposition to the construction of pipelines. I

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 remember at one point, Mayor Bradley came out against
2 the proposed pipeline in Los Angeles. So, I don't
3 think -- believe me, I'm not their champion, but I don't
4 think it's fair to say that they have not made an effort
5 to build a pipeline from roughly the Santa Barbara area
6 down to Los Angeles.

7 MS. KROP: I do have a comment on that. The
8 SCOP's pipeline project was abandoned in 1986, and it
9 wasn't until the County forced them to pursue another
10 pipeline project in 1990, that the Pacific Pipeline
11 became a new proposal.

12 So, I agree that there have been some permitting
13 problems, but there also has not been a consistent effort
14 on the part of the producers to encourage the
15 development of a new pipeline.

16 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Let me ask you a couple of
17 other questions. You say there's no need for a marine
18 terminal, and that is based on your perception that
19 there's unused pipeline capacity?

20 MS. KROP: That's correct.

21 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: And also based on the
22 perception that only Chevron's contribution to or PAPCO's
23 contribution to -- let me see if I'm getting this
24 confused here. What assumption are you using as to the
25 total amount of oil that's now moving through the pipelines?

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 MS. KROP: The assumption is that there's been
2 demonstrated adequate capacity to transport all of Point
3 Arguello's peak production, which then leaves us with
4 Exxon, which committed to send its full production to
5 Texas.

6 Now, that they want to change destinations,
7 they can't tanker yet until the County's environmental
8 review and permitting process is complete, which won't
9 be until the end of the year. At that point, we'll
10 probably be up there objecting to that application for
11 various reasons. But one of them would be that a pipeline
12 hopefully will be under construction by then, and
13 Exxon could be held to its earlier commitment to
14 transport to Texas until that new pipeline capacity to
15 L.A. is available.

16 In the alternative, they should at least have
17 to show a financial commitment or T & D commitment to
18 the pipeline to L.A. before they can tanker.

19 So, it's -- they're not going to be ready to
20 tanker yet for quite some time.

21 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: So, you're assuming Exxon
22 is not going to come on line. When you say there's no
23 need for a marine terminal, that's based on that assumption.

24 MS. KROP: There's no need for a marine terminal
25 now. We do see Exxon in the picture, because they filed

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 their application, and we think that's part of the big
2 picture that has to be looked at.

3 And that's why development of the additional
4 pipeline capacity is so critical.

5 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. I think we all agree
6 on that. I think that's -- I'd like to put the cart
7 before the horse, too.

8 What about Mr. Shamas' response to my question
9 about a throughput agreement. He's basically saying
10 there's no point in signing one until you get the
11 pipeline permitted.

12 MS. KROP: We --

13 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Because you say that we
14 should insist.

15 MS. KROP: Yeah. The County's permit, which we
16 supported, required execution of a throughput and
17 deficiency agreement with a pipeline project that has its
18 discretionary permits. Otherwise, we agree, it does have
19 no meaning.

20 The only way the pipeline developer will obtain
21 the construction financing is if it's an unconditional
22 throughput and deficiency agreement and if the permits
23 have been obtained.

24 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay. But then you say
25 that -- I thought you recommended that we condition any

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 lease by the signing of a throughput agreement,
2 throughput and development agreement.

3 MS. KROP: I do. The County's condition, which
4 is the same condition we would like you to impose,
5 conditions the commencement of tankering upon evidence
6 of an unconditional throughput and deficiency agreement,
7 which is executed with a pipeline developer that has
8 all discretionary permits. It's our --

9 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: And none exists, right?

10 MS. KROP: None exists at this time, but it's
11 our understanding that the Cajon Pipeline expects to
12 have permits in May and that Line 90 expects to have
13 permits in September.

14 And perhaps the pipeline companies can
15 confirm that. But that's the information that we've
16 been given in staff reports and EIRs.

17 Again, there's no prejudice in that six month
18 or whatever delay, because Point Arguello, which is the
19 producer that now is ready to tanker, is sending
20 70-plus thousand barrels a day in existing pipelines,
21 and can send their full peak production. So, again,
22 if it takes until the fall to have a pipeline project
23 that's ready to execute T & Ds, that's no prejudice to
24 Point Arguello, and it's no prejudice to Exxon, because
25 Exxon can't tanker till the end of this year, beginning of

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 next year anyway.

2 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Can I ask Mr. Secundy
3 a question, Mr. Chairman? Just while she's there?

4 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Yes.

5 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: You may just answer from
6 there.

7 MR. SECUNDY: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Would you stay up there,
9 please (speaking to Ms. Krop).

10 Excuse me. Would you come up, Mr. Secundy?
11 Use the microphone. Thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Would you agree that there
13 is capacity to handle the production from Point Arguello
14 Producers between now and the end of the year through
15 your pipeline?

16 MR. SECUNDY: Through just my pipeline?

17 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Or existing pipeline
18 capabilities between here and Los Angeles.

19 MR. SECUNDY: It depends upon the destination
20 of choice of the producers and the people that are
21 buying their production.

22 In terms of Line 63, it would be my best guess,
23 we probably have between 40 and 50,000 barrels a day
24 of capacity that we could move to Los Angeles. There's an
25 additional 20,000 barrels a day that can go to the

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Santa Maria's refinery, Unocal's refinery. It's about
2 5,000 barrels a day that can go to Bakersfield. There
3 some that can go east; there's some that can go north.
4 It depends on who wants to purchase it.

5 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I guess, at least
6 conceivably, the capacity exists, but people would have
7 to route the oil in different directions.

8 MR. SECUNDY: Well, again, yes. What you're
9 saying is correct. But it does depend upon the refinery
10 of choice by the producers, who wishes to purchase the
11 oil.

12 If everyone in Los Angeles wishes to purchase
13 all of the PAPCO production, there is not enough
14 capacity to go just to Los Angeles. The only way that
15 you could accommodate all of the current production of
16 PAPCO producers is to have some go to the Unocal
17 refinery, which it's currently doing; some going to
18 Bakersfield, and some going to other destinations.

19 Our pipeline also, Line 63, for a fairly nominal
20 amount, can be expanded by about 10,000 barrels a
21 day. So, we can put on some additional capacity on an
22 interim basis. But we've received no indication that
23 anyone's interested in that at this point in time.

24 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Yes, Mr. Shamas?

25 MR. SHAMAS: We need to straighten out some

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 misconceptions. The total production could go by
2 pipeline if you wanted to send it to Texas at a loss of
3 two to three dollars a barrel. But nobody wants to.
4 In April and part of March, Gerry's pipelines were
5 prorated, because they were full. So, when you stand up
6 and say that all of it can go out now, yes, we can take
7 20 a day to Martinez and tanker down the shore to L.A.,
8 and that went out by pipeline. You can't move all this
9 crude right now by pipelines. That's not a true
10 statement.

11 Gerry said the right thing. You try to give
12 all that crude to him, he's going to back out all the
13 San Joaquin Valley crude and all the independent
14 producers' testimony you heard, where they had crude to
15 go to L.A.? That all gets backed out.

16 So, it's not true that you can ship everything
17 today. We've been throttling back production there
18 because there isn't room in all the pipelines to go to the
19 markets where that crude makes the most sense.

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Okay? Thank you,
21 Mr. Secundy. Other questions of Linda Krop?

22 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Thank you. Let's see.
23 That's all I have.

24 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Any questions? Thank you
25 very much.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 MS. KROP: Thank you very much.

2 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Next we hear from
3 Jana Zimmer, American Oceans Campaign, special
4 counsel. Welcome.

5 MS. ZIMMER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
6 Commissioners, and good afternoon.

7 My name is Jana Zimmer, and I represent
8 American Oceans Campaign, which is a national ocean
9 protection advocacy organization with offices in
10 Washington, D.C., Seattle, and Santa Monica.

11 I want to stress the connection to the
12 Los Angeles area, because the constituencies in
13 Los Angeles were not included in the facilitation
14 process that was organized by the Resources Agency,
15 neither the environmental groups from Los Angeles
16 nor the local governments in the Los Angeles area.

17 Our position in this has been consistent
18 throughout, and that is that the only way that we could
19 accept interim tankering would be if we were assured that
20 we were not, in effect, on the slippery slope to
21 permanent tankering from the Gaviota Marine Terminal.

22 And, unfortunately, everytime we try to
23 dot the "i's" and cross the "T's," we hear equivocation
24 and resistance from the producers.

25 One of the first things I want to clarify today

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 is the record, as I understand it, as to the history
2 of the parties legitimate expectations in this regard.

3 The staff report reports at page 18 that
4 Texaco has claimed that they relied, when they invested
5 their millions of dollars in the interim terminal,
6 on an expectation of an ability to continue to use that
7 terminal on a long-term basis.

8 And that simply does not square with the facts.
9 It does not square with the lease that was issued by
10 this Commission in 1987. That lease, at page 2, the
11 term provision acknowledges that GTC may wish permanent
12 tankering, but clearly indicates that additional
13 environmental analysis may be required, and I quote
14 here: "The Commission in any decision to convert the
15 marine terminal to permanent use may deny such
16 conversion."

17 That lease, I'm sure, is already in your
18 record. So, the concern here is that GTC did apply
19 for a permanent terminal. It was only after we and
20 other groups raised objections to the adequacy of the
21 environmental document for that terminal that that
22 application was withdrawn and they reapplied or
23 resubmitted for an additional interim term.

24 Our concern, of course, is that, given the
25 economics of the situation, they will continue to

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 attempt to gain permanent use of that terminal at that
2 site.

3 So, there's no basis in the permits that
4 were in the lease that was given by this Commission for
5 GTC to assert any sort of legal right or vested right
6 to continue use of that permit -- of that terminal.

7 In addition, the Coastal Commission permit that
8 was issued in 1987, specifically states that -- I'm just
9 going to read this little sentence -- "Circumstances
10 may develop such that GTC may desire to continue
11 marine terminal operations beyond the interim period,
12 but GTC acknowledges that the Commission has made no
13 commitment to the approval of a new permit. GTC further
14 acknowledges that the expenditures it will undertake in
15 connection with the knowledge that the terminal has been
16 permitted for an interim period only, and that the
17 Commission may, but shall not be required to consider
18 these expenditures in evaluation of compliance with the
19 Coastal Act on any subsequent proposal for continued
20 operation."

21 So, from the permits that were accepted by
22 GTC, it's clear that the investment that they made was
23 made with the knowledge that that was an interim use and
24 that they could not claim those expenditures to assert a
25 right to a continued use.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Now, the economics of the situation have not
2 turned out to be what the producers and GTC had
3 expected originally. And we can all sympathize with
4 that. But the question here is not whether we sympathize
5 with their economic situation, but whether this
6 Commission has to bail them of that sorry economic
7 circumstance. And the fact is that the problem here
8 has much more to do with the fact that oil is selling
9 for about \$20 a barrel, rather than the \$40 that they
10 expected it to be selling for, than it does any other
11 factor or issue.

12 The second area that I'd like to cover --
13 Ms. Krop has already told you why the environmental
14 document that you're using is inadequate under CEQA.
15 And we believe that there's a problem with the lease
16 approval today because that would violate additional
17 specific provisions under the Public Resources Code
18 that are directly applicable to your leasing
19 activities.

20 And those provisions include Section 6873,
21 6873.2, and 6873.5. The two latter provisions -- and I
22 have copies to distribute here -- involve a requirement
23 of holding a hearing on at least 30 days' written notice
24 on the environmental document that supports your permit
25 release action.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Although the Environmental Coalition requested
2 a hearing in Santa Barbara -- and that statute does
3 require that the hearing occur in the area, the
4 geographic area where the leasing is to occur -- that
5 has not happened.

6 In addition, under 6873.5, consultation is
7 required, specifically with the Department of Fish &
8 Game, the National Marine Fisheries, and representatives
9 of local fishermen who fish in the area.

10 Mr. Dunn will be testifying after me. He's
11 the representative of the local crab and lobster
12 fishermen, and he will tell you that no such consultation
13 has occurred.

14 Finally, under 6873.5(b)(3), in considering the
15 lease, the Commission needs to consider the cooperative
16 efforts that have been made to mitigate the effects of
17 the operation of the marine terminal on fishing
18 activities. And to our knowledge, that has not been
19 done. There's no reference to it in the staff report.

20 These failures to comply with these provisions,
21 we think, are especially prejudicial to this process,
22 because staff has recommended and GTC has insisted that
23 they're entitled to 100,000 barrels a day capacity for
24 that marine terminal. None of the hearings before the
25 County, none of the hearings before the Coastal

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Commission contemplated that this -- that the capacity
2 of the terminal would be 50,000 barrels a day. In both
3 cases, the public was repeatedly reassured that the
4 use of the terminal by Exxon was a separate issue and
5 involved additional considerations which would be
6 given serious consideration.

7 So, we believe there's some serious procedural
8 problems with proceeding with an approval today on that
9 basis.

10 The third area that I would like to stress --
11 and this has to do with commitment and making sure that
12 we dot the "i's" and cross the "T's" on the producers'
13 commitment and GTC's commitment to absolutely stop
14 tankering on January 1, '96.

15 Ms. Krop mentioned AB 591, which was co-authored
16 by Terry Friedman and our Assemblyman in Santa Barbara,
17 Jack O'Connell. All that statute would do is put into
18 the Coastal Act the final cessation date for tankering.

19 At the March 29th hearing before the Assembly
20 Natural Resources Committee, industry representatives,
21 including Mr. Mihalik for GTC, the Western States
22 Petroleum Association, and also Mr. Van Buskirk for the
23 producers, vigorously opposed this provision in the
24 Coastal Act.

25 Now, I might agree that, in general, it's not a

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 great idea to codify permit conditions through
2 legislation. But given the history of this project
3 and the ten years of failed commitments, we thought
4 and Assemblymen Friedman and O'Connell also thought that
5 it was appropriate to provide that additional guarantee
6 that under no circumstances would tankering continue
7 beyond that date.

8 Mr. Van Buskirk testified on behalf of the
9 producers that if this bill became law, that that, by
10 itself, would force the producers to go back to court
11 and to reject the permit.

12 And we've discussed -- you've discussed good
13 faith several times in this hearing. And we cannot
14 imagine why a bill that would merely codify their
15 promise would lead them to reject the permits that have
16 been offered to them.

17 This concern relates additionally to a condition
18 that we have proposed and, if you do issue a lease,
19 that under no circumstances can there be any holdover.
20 Your standard lease forms have a holdover provision.
21 And the lease that was issued to GTC in 1987 was in
22 holdover status for almost two years. And we think, given
23 the policy concerns and this Commission's concerns about
24 not extending tankering under any circumstances, that if
25 you do issue a lease, you should direct that it be

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 explicit that there can be no administrative holdover
2 under any circumstances.

3 I just want to summarize and attempt to
4 respond to some of the comments that were made with
5 regard to the fairness of this process.

6 In addition to the claim that they have a
7 vested right to continue using this interim terminal,
8 the producers have asserted in testimony to the
9 Assembly Natural Resources Committee and also here
10 today that this process represents an example of the
11 unfair way in which businesses are being treated in
12 California and, in some great measure, have contributed
13 to the lack of economic recovery in this State.

14 Their assertion is that the rules have been
15 changed on them in the course of the process, and that's
16 simply not correct. The County's coastal policies have
17 been the same since 1984. The permits that I'll be
18 putting into your record have been in existence, the
19 conditions haven't changed. The only thing that has
20 changed here is the economics of the project. The
21 project was an expensive project to begin with, the
22 rate of return -- even in 1990, when the County did
23 a crude oil transportation analysis -- was a minimal
24 positive rate of return.

25 So, whether they received tankering -- a permit

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 for tankering or not, this project has not been what
2 it was intended to be economically.

3 So, the problem is not regulation, overregulation,
4 or changing conditions. The problem is that the worldwide --
5 worldwide price of oil is not what the producers had
6 anticipated.

7 So, in answer to the speaker earlier who asked
8 what the message is to the business community if this
9 Commission adheres strictly to the resource protection
10 policies of the Coastal Act and under the Public
11 Resources Code generally? The message is that businesses
12 who comply with the rules and who adhere to their
13 commitments will be well treated. But, as in this case, if
14 you have a ten-year history of failed commitments,
15 then there are going to be problems.

16 And we don't believe that the coastline should
17 be put at risk in order to solve those problems. Thank
18 you. Do you have any questions?

19 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you very much. Any
20 questions of Ms. Zimmer?

21 Thank you very much.

22 MS. ZIMMER: Okay. I'd like to put these exhibits
23 that I've referred to in the record.

24 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Commissioner Davis.

25 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yeah, I thought your point

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 on administrative holdovers was a good one. Do we
2 have the authority, Bob, to write that into a lease, to
3 say that, basically -- because this particular
4 lease was kaput and it's still going on. How can we
5 legally do that?

6 MR. HIGHT: You can put it in the lease, but
7 a subsequent Commission could change it. So, you can
8 put it in and it gives -- it creates a condition today,
9 but that condition can be changed later.

10 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Well, how can -- then any
11 subsequent Commission could change the term -- all the
12 terms of the lease.

13 MR. HIGHT: Correct.

14 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: But not without consent
15 of the other party.

16 MR. HIGHT: Correct.

17 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you very much.

18 MS. ZIMMER: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Steve Dunn, Santa Barbara
20 Trap Fishermen. Mr. Dunn, welcome. Thanks for your
21 patience.

22 MR. DUNN: Thank you very much, members of the
23 Commission. My name is Steve Dunn. I'm a local
24 commercial fisherman from Santa Barbara. I was born and
25 raised there. I've been fishing crab, lobster, and/or

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 fishnets for the last 17 years. I fish in the area of
2 the Gaviota Marine Terminal as well as other areas in
3 our channel.

4 Today, to my knowledge, I'm the only permitted
5 commercial fishermen coming before you here today. I'm
6 also here in representation of the Trap Fishermen of the
7 Joint Oil/Fisheries Committee. I'm also here in
8 presentation of eight of approximately 12 gill net
9 fishermen who fish in the Gaviota area, as well
10 representation of members of the Central Coast Hook & Line
11 Commercial Fishing Association.

12 As the permit exists today, or the idea of the
13 permit to tanker oil out of Gaviota, our group is opposed
14 to that permit on the grounds that the conditions that
15 have been specified, if they still stand, are inadequate
16 to address our issues.

17 In August of 1992, the Santa Barbara County
18 designated the impacts to commercial fishing in the area
19 in relation to tankering as Class 1 impacts. This is
20 based primarily on the fact that the voluntary vessel
21 traffic corridor program in relation to us is a failure.
22 The Joint Oil/Fisheries Committee originated some ten
23 years ago as a result of devastating losses of said
24 fishing gear by commercial fishermen at the hands of
25 the seismic exploration industry as well as other oil

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 service vessels. The trap fishermen were at major loss
2 of all the fisheries here. And finally, after many
3 years -- or several years of trying to reach some sort
4 of an agreement, some sort of method of coexistence
5 in the channel, we sought legal remedy. The permits
6 for seismic testing were issued using a negative
7 declaration. We sought legal means to have those permits
8 withheld, and they were, pending further economic
9 review -- excuse me -- environmental review.

10 At this time, we face much the same situation
11 with the vessel traffic corridor program. Since it
12 doesn't work, we're asking for relief. We've been
13 asking for relief from the County, we've been asking for
14 relief from the Coastal Commission, and we're following
15 up today asking for relief from you.

16 We have in the last several months sent copies
17 of letters to your staff and to the Commissioners, letters
18 that were originally addressed to the California Coastal
19 Commission. These letters -- I have copies today that
20 I'd like to submit for the record if they're not in your
21 possession today. I'd like to digress a little bit --
22 being a little unprepared here -- the small boat trap
23 fishing industry in Santa Barbara generally considers the
24 full range of their operations to be in the Gaviota area.
25 The representation here today is for all of those

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 fishermen who fish traps and gill nets inside 3 miles,
2 which will be terminated at the end of this year; as
3 well as outside of 3 miles, which will continue.

4 The jobs involved probably on the magnification
5 of 10 to 1 after the fish hits the dock, we've just
6 been subjected to the full beginning of another El Nino
7 situation similar to the 1982-1983 storms. We have a
8 large body of warm water moving into our area. A lot of
9 species of fish are harder to catch right now than they
10 normally are.

11 We've gone through about 12 weeks of some
12 severe weather conditions, where fishermen have a hard
13 time getting out of port to get to their fish.
14 I've come up here today -- I'm not paid to come here.
15 I'm representing those of us who are at a loss here and
16 feel that tankering will create more of a loss and more of
17 a hardship for us. We don't come here today to suggest
18 that there are jobs waiting for us from tankering. We're
19 here to tell you that we have jobs now. We don't want to
20 lose them.

21 The economic loss is certainly something that,
22 in our community, we really can't afford to have. And
23 we're quite frustrated, in that the conditions that we've
24 proposed following this permit process have not been
25 addressed. The County, as I say, defines our impacts as

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Class 1. I'd like to know from the Commission -- actually
2 from the Director (sic) perhaps -- in relation to
3 establishing a mandatory traffic corridor program, can
4 the Commission enact civil penalties for noncompliance?

5 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Well, let me answer.
6 We have explored that opportunity available to the
7 agency, and we could through the means of liquidated
8 damage provisions in our leases and contracts. But
9 beyond that type of approach, I'm not at all sure we're
10 in a position to impose penalties. I'm willing to be
11 corrected if legal staff can suggest another answer.

12 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: That's the answer.

13 MR. DUNN: Correct. I would like to continue
14 to -- actually, I have another question. The State
15 Constitution in 1925 defined fishermen as having a right
16 to fish in State waters from State waters in State waters
17 from State lands (sic). And that right, to our knowledge,
18 has never been usurped or withheld. Currently, we have
19 fishermen -- I'm among them -- who have had direct
20 conflict with either debris from oil exploration,
21 conflict with site specific fishing and oil company
22 operations. And I'd like to know, since the State Lands
23 Commission leases the sea floor to the oil companies, how
24 does that relate to our right to fish?

25 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: The Public Trust Doctrine,

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 which the State Lands Commission has the obligation
2 to uphold, includes the people's interest in the
3 commercial fishing and recreational values of the waters
4 within our jurisdiction.

5 From time to time, we have to reconcile
6 conflicts -- and you've just pointed out one -- that arise
7 in pursuing these interests. We have imposed during the
8 years I've been on this State Lands Commission
9 innumerable restrictions on the pursuit of oil so that it
10 did not unfairly interfere with the commercial and
11 recreational fishing industry.

12 It is not possible to have a perfect world, given
13 the statutory and constitutional mandate that we have,
14 as I've just described within the Public Trust Doctrine.
15 But we do the best we can in trying to protect your
16 interests. And we, on many occasions, have attached
17 conditions to leases, exploration, drilling leases to
18 try to protect commercial fishermen.

19 MR. DUNN: Thank you, Commissioner. I'm aware of
20 some of the efforts we've all made in those regards.
21 I would like to ask here today that, in relation to
22 the local contingency fund in the Santa Barbara Channel
23 area -- actually, it's in the Tri-County area, I believe --
24 which are funds that are set aside from oil revenues to
25 be directed to mitigating gear loss of set fishing gear,

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 I would ask that rather than those funds being directed
2 to the areas where the fishing and -- excuse me --
3 rather than being directed to the areas where the oil
4 companies have already set equipment -- that is, drill
5 rigs, sea floor completion units, pipelines, so on, and
6 so forth -- I would like to ask, in relation to this
7 tankering permit, if it is issued, if the Gaviota Terminal
8 lease is issued, that the local contingency fund be
9 extended to cover gear loss as well as production loss
10 by a set formula in those areas which are generally
11 considere to be oil company areas.

12 I'm maybe not expressing myself fully. In the
13 Gaviota area, we rely on the traffic corridor area as
14 fishing grounds for all the fishermen who I've just
15 described. Since we're talking about reauthorizing an
16 existing lease, it's important to note that there's been
17 little or no activity relative to what we're talking about
18 coming over the horizon in this area.

19 And so, fishermen who have gear that gets hung up
20 on a pipeline or gear hung up on the remains of an oil
21 rig that perhaps wasn't removed, any debris, I would like
22 to ask that the contingency fund be extended to cover
23 those circumstances. Right now, there is a claim by one
24 of our hook and line fishermen for gear loss on a piece of
25 oil equipment that is charted and, therefore, it is not

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 382-2345

1 covered.

2 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Let me get an answer.

3 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: That contingency fund
4 is a County-administered fund. We have no jurisdiction
5 over its creation or its use.

6 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: You've got another target,
7 Mr. Dunn.

8 MR. DUNN: I understand, and I started with
9 that.

10 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: We'll be happy to support
11 your reasonable request.

12 MR. DUNN: Thank you. Thank you. I understand,
13 and I need to make note that we did start with those
14 previous targets some months and some years ago.
15 And we need very much to have State Lands consider these
16 issues. I would like to submit the two letters that went
17 to the Coastal Commission that have already been received
18 by State Lands and the conditions that we've asked for
19 be considered if the permit will be extended.

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you very much.

21 MR. DUNN: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Any questions? Thank you.

23 MR. DUNN: Are there questions?

24 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: No, thanks. Mr. Robert
25 Klausner? And after this, Joy Piazza. Would you both

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 please come up? Mr. Klausner representing himself, and
2 Ms. Piazza representing the Greater Santa Barbara Lodging
3 Association.

4 Yes, sir.

5 MR. KLAUSNER: Commissioners, it is refreshing
6 to have a staff present the options, which didn't happen
7 at the Coastal Commission. And I want to compliment your
8 staff for at least giving you your four options.

9 Now, it appears that industry's only interested
10 in one of those options and has told you the other three
11 will not survive or fly. So be it.

12 I appreciated your comment, and I think you made
13 the key question today, which said, "What can we do to
14 make it happen, to get pipelines," which is essentially
15 State policy and it's County policy.

16 And that's what we've been wrestling this for a
17 long time. And the reason we're here is because the
18 assumptions we made back when -- and we go back a long
19 time -- were that it would be in the economic interest of
20 industry, because there was enough volume to get pipelines,
21 certainly to L.A. when Arco was going to be producing
22 and when Chevron was going to be producing, and there
23 would be pipelines to Texas.

24 Well, it didn't work out that way. And the net
25 result is, there's a lesson to be learned. And the
lesson to be learned is that you cannot regulate that

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 decision. That decision is an economic decision.

2 So, the key question then is what can you do
3 in the equation to make it happen? I don't think there's
4 anybody here, including industry, that knows whether
5 it's in their economic interest at this stage of the
6 game to increase capacity to Los Angeles so that they can
7 produce the field as fast as they want to produce the
8 field. It may not be worthwhile increasing capacity and
9 may be more economical to phase the field and use what
10 capacity there exists.

11 We won't know that, and we certainly won't
12 know that if we allow them at this stage of the game,
13 for the next three years, to ship by tanker. Because the
14 volume, the key volume, the biggest volume is at the
15 front end. It's not at the back end. And when Lou tells
16 you that within three years, they can guarantee they won't
17 tanker, they can guarantee that, because by that time,
18 they will have passed their peak and they'll be down in
19 figures that they'd have a tough time arguing there weren't
20 pipelines to go to L.A. to carry.

21 And we certainly can't accomplish what we're
22 trying to do by not maximizing the use of the pipelines
23 that already exist, because that would be counterproductive.
24 So, the number three option that industry wants you to
25 accept and pursue doesn't even take advantage, truly, of the

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 pipeline capacity that has been demonstrated here -- is
2 here over and above what the Coastal Commission required
3 them to put into the line.

4 So that doesn't really make sense to me either.
5 If, on the other hand, there is no pipeline, then we
6 really are going to test whether or not there is enough
7 capacity between what Chevron has with Point Arquello and
8 Exxon has coming down to justify a pipeline that both
9 of them want to be in. Because what I can foresee is that
10 there's a fight for turf here. There's only so much
11 capacity down there for refining. And these guys are
12 after getting as much as they can and getting as large a
13 share of the pie as they can, and there's no love lost
14 between Exxon and Chevron or anybody else.

15 That's just plain business. And I accept that.
16 Figure this one. Southern Pacific comes in, permitted,
17 and Chevron lives up to their agreement. They offer them
18 an unconditional T & D to ship their full production or
19 whatever it will be through Southern Pacific. And Exxon
20 says, gee, why are we facilitating a pipeline for Chevron.
21 We'll go the other way, because we want to go to Texas,
22 and we want to go to L.A., and it's more to our interest
23 to go by Four Corners. And we can't get the volumes
24 together. Are you going to hold Chevron responsible
25 for the whole industry lining up to go one place?

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 You can't hold them accountable for something
2 they can't produce. So, what we've got here is a
3 situation where you think you're doing something through
4 a regulatory process to produce a result. And I guarantee
5 you it won't produce the result, unless it's in their
6 interest economically. And we don't know that.

7 So, I think that what's happening here is your
8 best shot, truly, at finding out whether it's economically
9 in everybody's interest to increase the capacity to go
10 down there, is to deny the permit without prejudice. And
11 I think you have a very legitimate reason for denying
12 that permit without prejudice. And this gets down to
13 process.

14 If you had somebody walk in here with a hundred
15 acres -- one-acre zoning -- and tried to develop that on
16 the basis of going for a lot split, three one-acre
17 parcels and 97 is left over, and then come back a while
18 later, we've got 97 acres, we want to lot split, and
19 try to get through the process of a subdivision by lot
20 splits, you wouldn't allow that.

21 Now, we agreed back when, and we went through
22 this -- and I may not like all the policies, but by golly,
23 we worked those policies out and we accept those policies
24 that industry had a right to interim tankering while they
25 took time to build that pipeline both to Texas and to L.A.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 And this has been going on long enough to get a pipeline.
2 And the reason we did that was we didn't want to hold
3 them ransom to the pipeline not being able to be built
4 in a timely fashion and hold up their production.

5 But this interim is not interim anymore. This
6 interim is essentially a permanent tankering. And if it
7 is a permanent tankering, then they should come in and
8 apply for a permanent tankering. When you said no oil
9 tankering after '96, that's contrary to our policies.
10 Our policy says that there shall be a permanent tankering
11 facility, which means that there can be tankering under
12 certain conditions. And I expect that we should live up
13 to those policies. And they'd have every right after '96
14 to have a terminal there that could handle oil under
15 certain circumstances.

16 Now, I appreciate staff trying to lay out a
17 protocol, which essentially they did for a permanent
18 tankering facility. Yet they're coming in and asking
19 for an interim and only doing what an interim tankering
20 facility and terms and conditions -- for all the talk of
21 the number of conditions requires (sic). And we're
22 saying, "You're entitled to a permanent tankering
23 facility. Go for it."

24 Do it right, and under what terms and
25 conditions we will then determine how you can have a

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 final permanent tankering facility in Santa Barbara.
2 Not "There will be no tankering after '96." That's
3 making policy through a condition. That's not the way we
4 do it, nor would we want to do it, because it violates
5 the integrity of the process. Once you've got those
6 policies, that's what should be controlling everything.

7 And what they're trying to do is they're trying,
8 through the guise of interim, in effect, they are going
9 for a permanent tankering facility.

10 And that's why you start to get -- you say,
11 "No, Lou. It's not the way to do it. I disagree with
12 you."

13 So, I've covered the point about maximizing
14 the pipeline use that's there already. The timeliness
15 of those time frames, I don't honestly believe that you
16 can hold these people responsible for something they
17 can't control. You have no guarantee you're going to get
18 everybody together to go on the same pipeline. And,
19 therefore, you have no guarantee that the volumes will be
20 large enough for them to accept the tariffs. The net result
21 is, you'll get nothing.

22 Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you very much for your
24 testimony.

25 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Mr. Klausner?

CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I'm sorry. Commissioner Davis.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Sorry that my falling
2 blood sugar forced me to leave for a short time. I missed
3 part of your beginning of your testimony; so, I apologize
4 if I'm asking you to repeat yourself.

5 But I think all of us here want a result that
6 you mentioned in the part of the testimony I heard, which
7 is -- which may be contrary to Santa Barbara's policies,
8 but which are that all the oil humanly possible be shipped
9 to Los Angeles by pipeline.

10 MR. KLAUSNER: That's certainly consistent with
11 our policy.

12 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I understood you to say
13 that Santa Barbara has basically established a policy
14 that would allow Gaviota Terminal to operate as a
15 tankering facility, you know, in perpetuity.

16 MR. KLAUSNER: No, I said this. Way back when,
17 and we had to deal with it in the early eighties -- and
18 you folks were involved then also -- we had to set in
19 policies about transportation. And one of the policies
20 that the transportation element said -- there were a couple
21 of things. First of all, aside from the consolidations
22 in the transportation, we said we would allow an interim
23 facility to bridge the gap against the time in case they
24 couldn't get that pipeline onstream as fast as their
25 production was coming up. That interim terminal was

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 supposed to be for a certain length of time. You've
2 already heard testimony about that.

3 I mean, now they're asking for an interim
4 terminal that, in reality, almost becomes ten years
5 by the time you get through with what Exxon's asking
6 for. That's not interim. You could have had a pipeline
7 before this.

8 The second thing that we had in the
9 transportation policies was that we would allow
10 and permit, which we did, a permanent terminal. And
11 Gaviota and Exxon fought for who was going to get it
12 and decided that the Las Flores was a better, more
13 environmentally practical site, and Las Flores got the
14 blue ribbon or whatever it was.

15 Subsequently, Las Flores has turned it down (sic)
16 and said -- they quitclaimed it. They don't want to
17 bother doing it.

18 So, now what you really have is a tanker
19 facility there where there's a lot of money been spent
20 already. So, the odds are, and they already came in
21 here a while back and ultimately withdrew because of some
22 logistics and trying to get through the hoops as fast
23 as possible, which hasn't worked out -- it appears that
24 Gaviota will be the terminal -- the permanent terminal.
25 And it's consistent with our policies. We have to allow

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 a permanent terminal. And there are conditions under
2 which that would operate.

3 One, in case of emergency, a breakdown. You
4 wanted to ship something to a place that had no pipeline.
5 And they talked at that time -- I remember the
6 testimony. We might want to take a shipment up to
7 Washington. Okay. Fine. Pipeline.

8 If there was no pipeline to destination of
9 choice; at that time, we had no pipelines, or at the
10 time that was going through we had no pipeline to Texas,
11 nor did we have what we thought was a reasonable pipeline
12 going to L.A.

13 Well, so, all I'm saying is that you can put
14 these time frames in and say, "We're going to stop
15 comes the year 1996." Yes, you're going to stop the
16 interim tankering. Is anyone here under the impression
17 that there will be no tanker facility there? I can't
18 conceive of that, at least not the way they made the
19 case back then that they had to have a backup system
20 in case, and those were the conditions under which we
21 set the policies.

22 And we're not about to -- I don't think we're
23 about to change those policies.

24 So, it may sound a little crazy. I mean, I'm not
25 happy about it, but it's a policy.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: If we were to take your
2 advice and deny the lease, how would that facilitate
3 at least the State Lands Commission's objective, which is
4 to get a, you know, greater pipeline capacity?

5 MR. KLAUSNER: I'll tell you how I see it.

6 If you deny the lease at this time, then there
7 is no interim tankering. So now, they're faced with some
8 permits coming through by Cajon, Four Corners, Southern
9 Pacific. That'll all be known within the next six months.
10 Certainly, at that time, if it's in their economic interest,
11 they will give T & D's jointly, or however, to get a
12 pipeline to relieve the compression that you've created
13 by having no tankering and their having an ability to
14 produce more than they can ship out with the lines that
15 exist right now.

16 And you will be able to test the economics of
17 the deal within the next six months to see whether it's
18 practical. If it is practical and they go ahead with
19 it, well, what the hell. Let 'em interim tankering
20 during the construction period, which is what the County
21 called for anyway.

22 But if you allow tankering for the next three
23 years -- and what's going to happen Chevron comes in here
24 in January, we gave a T & D to Southern Pacific, but,
25 you know, the volume wasn't large enough to get it at a

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 price that, you know, that we could afford, and they're
2 not going ahead with it.

3 You're going to say to them, "Well, gee, you
4 haven't lived up to your bargain." They've lived up to
5 their bargain, but that hasn't produced the economic
6 result we're looking for. The best way to produce that
7 result is to test it by changing that equation as to
8 what their options are.

9 Now, if after that, it doesn't pay to build that
10 pipeline and they can produce more, what will happen
11 under your policies, you will no doubt end up with a
12 tankering facility, and you'll have to decide at that
13 time under what conditions you'll allow tampering and
14 how much more -- whether you want to accommodate for
15 the next couple of years their phasing in at maximum
16 rates, or whether you want to phase them so that they
17 don't have the need to go above and beyond.

18 And I'll tell you something. I can't for the
19 life of me figure out how you're going to handle the
20 Exxon deal.

21 Exxon predicated -- I mean, those guys back there
22 predicated over \$800 million of investment on the fact
23 that Exxon's destination of choice was Texas. You say now
24 it's not Texas? What happens next Tuesday?

25 If you get a pipeline to L.A., they'll say, "Well,

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 we want to go to San Francisco"?

2 I mean, you can't allow that. I mean, that
3 wasn't what the policy was meant to do. The policy was
4 meant to establish where they wanted to go and then get
5 pipelines built there. And since they're not building
6 it themselves, this is the problem we have -- we didn't
7 know that then. We should have tied the whole thing
8 together and said, no. "Unless you build the pipelines
9 yourself, it's no deal."

10 But we didn't do that. So, we have to live
11 with it the way it is.

12 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you. Ms. Piazza?
13 No?

14 MS. KROP: Now I'm Joy Piazza.

15 Joy asked me to read this letter
16 into the record.

17 (Thereupon, the reporter requested the
18 speaker to identify herself.)

19 MS. KROP: I'm Joy Piazza.

20 (Thereupon, the reporter replied she
21 was not.)

22 MS. KROP: Okay. I'm Linda Krop, K-r-o-p,
23 presenting this letter on behalf of --

24 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: She looks like Linda Krop.

25 (Laughter.)

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 MS. KROP: Same outfit, too.

2 Joy Piazza's the President of the Greater
3 Santa Barbara Lodging Association and was unable to make
4 this hearing, and asked me to read this letter.

5 "Dear State Lands Commission:

6 "I regret that I or a Board member
7 of the Greater Santa Barbara Lodging
8 Association are unable to attend the
9 scheduled hearing concerning the issue
10 of oil tankering in the Santa Barbara
11 Channel by Chevron Oil Company. The
12 Greater Santa Barbara Lodging Association
13 represents the local hospitality industry --
14 the hotels, motels, inns, and tourist-
15 related businesses. Our purpose is to
16 create and maintain tourism in Santa
17 Barbara County. We monitor issues pertaining
18 to the hospitality industry, tourism, and
19 our environment. Our association supports
20 the ruling which states that Chevron Oil
21 may tanker up to 17 months with the signing
22 of a contract to build a pipeline. I
23 recall the last local oil spill in 1967. . . ."
24 I think that was 1969, editorial comment.
25 ". . .It was devastating to our community

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 and our economy. Travelers still recall
2 the ugly black goo on the beaches, the
3 suffering wildlife. It takes many years
4 for those mental images to fade, let alone
5 the devastation to the environment to
6 disappear and at what loss? The tourism
7 industry cannot afford to run even the
8 slightest risk of a diaster like Valdez
9 or the one suffered by the Shetland Islands.
10 Santa Barbara County has been plagued with
11 a major fire, a major drought, a toxic water
12 spill via Southern Pacific Railroad, and
13 the Los Angeles riots, which affected our
14 economy due to our close proximity to
15 Los Angeles.

16 "Tourism is the number one industry
17 in our area. We are one of the major
18 employers in Santa Barbara County. The
19 City and County depend on our TOT taxes
20 to provide the many services our community
21 enjoys. We cannot take a chance that an
22 accident would happen. By being dependent
23 on the tourism market, the jobs lost,
24 the loss in revenue to the City would be
25 devastating. Building a pipeline would

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 provide more local jobs. Using tankers,
2 the jobs are limited and there's no need
3 for labor to reside in the County where
4 the production is located. With tankers,
5 we gamble with the chance of disaster.
6 Chevron Oil cannot guarantee that there
7 will be an accident in the channel. And
8 if there is one, the clean-up time is
9 greater than one on land.

10 "The Greater Santa Barbara Lodging
11 Association urges the State Lands
12 Commission to uphold the decision to
13 stipulate that Chevron sign a contract
14 to build a pipeline within a designated
15 date before tankering is allowed to
16 commence.

17 "Cordially, Joy Piazza, President,
18 Greater Santa Barbara Lodging Association."

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you. That completes
21 the list of witnesses. I think we've had a fairly
22 flexible give and take, back and forth. Is there anyone
23 on either side that feels there has been some
24 outrageous misconception of the truth that they must
25 rescue us? Or have we had a chance to air this out?

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 All right. Step forward, sir. You want to
2 hang on for just a second, Mr. Mihalik, and I'll give
3 you a shot.

4 Are you together? You want to come up?
5 Anybody that hasn't testified yet is what I was looking
6 for here.

7 You want to give your name and identify
8 yourself? With the mike, please.

9 MR. MOORE: My name is Tom Moore. I'm with the
10 Chevron Corporation. I'm the Vice President of
11 Chevron Shipping Company.

12 And there's been a lot of talk about terminals,
13 permits, pipelines, tanks. But an issue was raised
14 regarding tanker safety by Linda Krop, and I just felt
15 that I'd like to add some clarity to --

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER IN AUDIENCE: Can't hear
17 you.

18 MR. MOORE: I'd like to add some clarity to the
19 document that was submitted.

20 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Use the mike. Just aim
21 right at it, please.

22 MR. MOORE: I'll lean forward. I have
23 responsibility for our worldwide tanker operations at
24 Chevron, some 40 ships that we own and operate and an
25 average of 40 others that we operate in worldwide trade.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 The GT vessels as we call them -- you call them
2 the Oregon Class vessels. A point of information, there
3 are five of this class, not four. Three of them have been
4 named as those which were intending to be permitted for
5 Gaviota Marine Terminal operations.

6 These were built beginning in the mid-seventies
7 through the late seventies as a modernization project.
8 They were state of the art, very modern tankers, and
9 actually continue to be so today with the facilities
10 and the details and equipment that was put on them.

11 At that point in time, they were built as
12 double-hulled tankers, not required by law. In fact, they
13 have been the model of the current law that is
14 requiring the double-hulled tanker construction today.
15 Our Oregon Class tankers are, in fact, one of the models
16 behind that law and were sought after by the Federal
17 commission that did the research.

18 The issue raised by Linda Krop -- and I believe
19 it was submitted in your packet -- was a newspaper
20 article of last Sunday in the San Fernando Valley
21 Daily News. And the inference was that these tankers
22 are -- our Oregon Class tankers are unusually accident
23 prone or perhaps unsafe for the service that we're
24 intending to put them in.

25 I'd just like to cite the four accidents

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 that have been mentioned in this article, and comment
2 a little bit for those of you that were reading this,
3 perhaps after the fact.

4 One incident was cited by the vessel that
5 lost steering while on trial run in 1975 in the
6 Willamette River, and impacted a bridge, having a
7 collision of sorts.

8 This accident occurred -- and it did occur,
9 but it was actually before the vessel was commissioned.
10 It was out on what we call the builder's trials. The
11 vessel was not complete, but the builder was taking the
12 shakedown run, and it was under the operation of the
13 shipyard and the technicians of the equipment they had
14 installed. And, yes, there was a control failure, and
15 there was a slight impact brushing with absolutely no
16 damage, and had no impact in the sense of consequential
17 damage.

18 I assure you that the conditions that caused
19 that control failure have been corrected. But the point
20 is, it was taken out of context that this is a failure
21 that exists today. It was actually corrected well
22 before the delivery. And it was the purpose of the
23 shakedown cruise to find these kinds of problems under
24 a controlled environment at a very, very controlled speed.

25 The second item was -- that was noted was an

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 accident that occurred in 1989, by, again, another of the
2 Oregon Class tankers.

3 This accident did occur and it was very, very
4 serious. We were headed upbound with a full cargo
5 of oil. And southbound, another ship ran into us.
6 We were hit. This happens. It happens in the open
7 oceans, and it happened in the Columbia River, which
8 is a particularly confined waterway. But it happened
9 with both vessels under the con of a pilot, a mandatory
10 State pilot in this case. The point I want to make
11 about this is that the Coast Guard investigation found no
12 fault of the ship or of the personnel handling our ship
13 in their findings. In fact, through subsequent recovery,
14 we were found exonerated and we were fully recovered
15 for the damage to our vessel.

16 The point, though, is that this was a double-
17 hulled vessel. The outer hull was not creased -- I'm sorry.
18 It was not punctured or ruptured. It was a dent. But
19 it leads to show that it could have been a rupture. And,
20 in fact, had it been, it would have been protected by
21 the inner hull. It was a clear case of a case where
22 double-hulled tankers were a benefit and would have
23 provided and did provide that extra ounce of protection.

24 The third reference was an accident that
25 occurred in 1983. This was not an accident. The

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 382-2345

1 reference was that we had a vessel that lost steerage
2 in Los Angeles and had to be towed to San Diego for
3 repairs.

4 We have a very, very disciplined approach
5 with regard to steering. Steering and propulsion are the
6 two primary conditions of tankering. And before any
7 vessel departs any safe mooring or berth, we go through
8 a very, very rigorous checklist, much like a flight
9 control list, of testing all of the steering gear. And,
10 in fact, it was during one of those tests that we found
11 a rudderstock movement that was more than usual on the --
12 inside the bearing in the engine room. And it was
13 reported, and it was -- the decision was made by our
14 office that we would not proceed as planned, but we would
15 go directly to the shipyard and make the repairs.

16 We were not towed. The ship went under its
17 own power, under its own steerage with a tug escort
18 as an extra precaution of safety. This was no accident.
19 This was accident prevention.

20 The last item that was referenced in this
21 article was the oil spill in 1977. An Oregon Class
22 vessel spilled over the side a hundred barrels of fuel
23 oil while loading. It was operator mishap. There's no
24 excuse for it. We were embarrassed, and it was -- it
25 happened. That's all I can say. But I can also follow

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 through to say that it had insignificant short-term
2 impact -- no long-term impact. The oil was cleaned up
3 responsibly, quickly, and the conditions that led to
4 that oil spill, operator error, have been relieved.
5 And, in fact, there has been further mitigations and
6 defenses against this similar happening (sic).

7 I'd like to point out, that happened 15
8 years ago, 16 years ago. I would like to reference th
9 performance of these ships.

10 The suggestion is that these are perhaps unsafe
11 ships. I would like to maintain that these are, in fact,
12 very, very safe ships; in fact, about the best that you
13 could ever expect, if you're concerned about tanker
14 safety, to be calling at a port in California. That was
15 the basis on which these ships were designed, double-
16 hulled tankers.

17 The three ships in question -- the Chevron
18 Oregon, the Chevron Washington, and the Chevron Louisiana
19 that we're considering for the utilization at the Gaviota
20 Marine Terminal have for the last four years combined,
21 these three ships have caused one gallon overboard the
22 side average per year. That's a three-ship combination.

23 I'm a small boater, and I'm looking at these
24 boats out here. I would maintain that the average boat
25 here is responsible for more than one gallon overboard.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 But we do have a zero spill policy, and we enforce it
2 rigorously.

3 I can go back many other years. If we go back
4 the fourth year, we had a one-barrel spill, so that
5 raises the average up to 10 gallons for these three
6 ships.

7 I consider that an impeccable record. But
8 those one gallons, by the way, weren't spills or mishaps.
9 Much of that was reported operational spills as a result of
10 minor hydraulic leak or a minor whatever. But one gallon
11 per year for those three ships, I would ask any tanker
12 operator to try and match that.

13 And that's not luck. We operate 41 ships --
14 40 ships today -- we just sold one -- worldwide. I'm
15 going to switch now from gallons -- let me reference
16 another point. Those three ships -- that one gallon
17 overboard? We carried more than a billion -- the math
18 gets too high -- more than a billion gallons in the
19 course of one year. So, that's one out of a billion.

20 And I think the number's many, many billions.
21 But the number that does stick in my mind, because we
22 use barrels, is that our worldwide fleet carried 600
23 million barrels last year. And we caused three and a half
24 barrels to go over the side in a number of very small,
25 minor incidents. And, again, that's not luck. If I look

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 back, our ten-year average history, the averages are
2 in the under five barrel per year spill.

3 This is a discipline of our company, and it's
4 a mandate of all those people that serve on our ships.
5 It's a culture, it's a commitment, but it's also
6 economic reality. We cannot afford -- we cannot afford
7 what Exxon could. Yet we are forced to operate on the
8 West Coast -- the most rigorously regulated arena,
9 as we're seeing here, and I tell you, gentlemen, my
10 company's job -- my company's on the line. We risk
11 this with unlimited liabilities, and I risk personal,
12 criminal liability, my career, my family's welfare. This
13 is all on the line. We have a priority for absolutely
14 safe tankering.

15 Just to close out. This article also refers
16 to a rating system of tankers. It suggests that one of
17 these Oregon Class tankers is not very highly rated.
18 The Marine Tanker Advisory Center has this system whereby
19 they use published reports. We don't give this
20 credence, not many people in our industry do, but
21 Mr. McKenzie does find himself in the news a lot,
22 because when people want to get a rating of the tanker,
23 he's willing to give one.

24 I think I've perhaps categorized some of these
25 situations that were publicized in the press. I would

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 invite you to consider referring to your State Lands
2 Commission inspectors who, under statutory authority,
3 frequently -- every port call -- board our ships. And
4 save for a few administrative interface problems in the
5 startup of this statutory inspection, find that our
6 ships are, in fact, at the top of the list with regard
7 to compliance and with regard to performance. And I
8 would also invite you to look at the Coast Guard
9 records.

10 We -- the question of risk management is
11 a very real issue. And it's what -- it's what really
12 controls us. And, as I mentioned, the exposure that we
13 have, and we're not going to manage that exposure without
14 full consciousness of the risks, and the risks are
15 extreme.

16 The environmental risk, the public concern are
17 indelible in our minds, but we're looking at the financial
18 risks, and we can't afford to do anything but the
19 absolute, most prudent, proper, fault-free, spill-free
20 operation.

21 But there are risks. And we can't guarantee
22 no spills. But what I can guarantee and what we stand by
23 is the excellent performance that these ships have had
24 through the years and, furthermore, we'll stand by our
25 commitment to maintain and improve that performance and

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 our commitment to providing the operation here that
2 satisfies the expectations of zero spills.

3 But, again, we can't guarantee a risk free
4 operation, but we can guarantee the maximum commitment
5 to make that performance work to everybody's
6 expectations. Any questions?

7 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Any questions? Thank you
8 very much. Mr. Mihalik?

9 MR. MIHALIK: I'll be very brief, Mr. Chairman.
10 My name is Dan Mihalik, representating the Gaviota
11 Terminal Company. And I would just like to briefly
12 respond to several of the speakers. The County brought
13 up a new condition. We believe the condition's
14 redundant. It's already carried in the County and Coastal
15 Commission permits.

16 As far as the Daily News that Ms. Krop mentioned,
17 I just want to make it clear that this was an area that
18 was thoroughly studied in this recent EIR -- types of
19 spills from moorings, especially spills that could occur
20 at a mooring like Gaviota, was extensively studied.

21 Another topic brought up by Ms. Krop was taxes
22 and the tax assessor. And I think the facts are that
23 \$1.5 million per year are being lost to Santa Barbara
24 County due to the fact that these facilities are not
25 running at capacity.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 Jobs was another topic brought up. And I think
2 it was a sad level of insensitivity to our employees and
3 to our contractors in this area. We've had facilities
4 here since the late 1800s. We've had three, four
5 generations of families as employees and as contractors,
6 and there literally are over a hundred jobs involved
7 with contractors in this facility all the time.

8 Size of tankers, this tanker's one-tenth of
9 that, or approximately, I guess, of the Valdez. The
10 proposed conditions by the -- brought up by Ms. Krop
11 I think are extreme and unreasonable. She also
12 mentioned the Mariposa project. And I think it should be
13 clear or made clear that the County and Coastal
14 Commission recognize that the Point Arguello project
15 cannot operate without the storage at the Gaviota
16 Terminal. You can't operate the project with simply one
17 tank being installed at Mariposa. No one has ever
18 made the conclusion in any of these hearings -- none of the
19 agencies have -- that this results in a dollar-per-
20 barrel savings in pipelining. That's simply untrue.
21 And it's totally unrealistic.

22 I think it continues to be important for your
23 Commission to, you know, make a clarification between
24 the producers and the Gaviota Terminal Company. We are
25 not privy to a lot of the work that's going on with

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 pipelines and producers and that sort of thing.

2 We're in the business of operating the terminal.
3 Just quickly, Jana Zimmer made a comment on the
4 permanent terminal application. It was withdrawn because
5 of some environmental opposition. It was withdrawn
6 because Santa Barbara County asked us to withdraw it.
7 And this was part of the process. They didn't want
8 two terminals there, an interim terminal and a
9 permanent terminal, and all of that sort of permitting
10 going on as the producers were trying to get through their
11 permit.

12 And it's been made clear, and the State Lands
13 Commission staff made clear to us, call it what you will --
14 permanent, interim -- it's always going to have conditions
15 that really make this an interim terminal. That's
16 always been the understanding. The permanent terminal
17 concept was something we went forward with at one time
18 to attempt to increase the capacity of this facility from
19 100 to 125; that doesn't seem necessary under the
20 circumstances, so we withdrew the application.

21 Jumping then to the next speaker, Steve Dunn on
22 fisheries. I think it's important to note that -- I
23 think it's this year or next year, we're contributing
24 roughly \$200,000 a year to a coastal resources enhancement
25 fund. We contribute to a fisheries contingency fund, and

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 a fisheries enhancement fund, and the EIR again thoroughly
2 studied this area. And the conclusion was that the
3 impacts on fishermen are much less than the payments
4 we're making to these various funds.

5 And the topic of vessel lanes and mandatory
6 lanes is very, very stringently been controlled by the
7 Coastal Commission.

8 Those are all the comments I have. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Thank you very much.

10 Now, is there anybody remaining in this
11 audience -- it's been a long hearing. Is there anybody
12 remaining that thinks that an outrage has been committed
13 that they have to redress? If there isn't, does the
14 staff have any summing up that it wants to do before the
15 Commission takes the matter?

16 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Just a brief few
17 comments on process. There were some references to
18 staff's compliance with the Environmental Quality Act
19 and with a number of cited statutes. And insofar as the
20 leases are concerned, we've been aware of those
21 contentions. Staff has carefully reviewed them and is
22 content that the issue is properly before you and in
23 compliance with CEQA and all statutory sections relating
24 to -- or at least provisions. We are prepared to go
25 into them, if you wish, but I did want to assure you that

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 we feel that the issue is procedurally and
2 appropriately before you.

3 Insofar as the terminal is interim or permanent,
4 it seems to me that the key question here is that the
5 witnesses seem to be putting particular stress on the
6 timing of a throughput and deficiency agreement. Many
7 say that that agreement should be signed now before
8 tankering can commence. The Coastal Commission has
9 said, "Well, you can commence tankering, but you have to
10 have a throughput and deficiency agreement signed by
11 February 1, 1994, and if you don't by that time, then
12 you stop tankering."

13 The question, I suppose, goes to the good
14 faith of the parties. I can understand why some of those
15 who've been dealing with this issue for as long as it
16 has lasted and have met disappointments are not comfortable
17 by waiting a period of 10 months in order to see to it
18 that that way point can be established.

19 I do not find that unreasonable. And with the
20 provision that it is clear and explicit that, if no
21 throughput and deficiency agreement is signed by February
22 1, then tankering will stop and the further use of that
23 terminal will be discontinued.

24 We will now within the tenure of this particular
25 Commission whether or not there will be a throughput and

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 deficiency agreement, and whether or not tankering on
2 an interim basis -- that is, until January 1, 1996 --
3 will be contemplated.

4 Insofar as the difference between the full
5 pipeline -- so-called full pipeline option is
6 concerned and the Coastal Commission's condition that
7 designate 25,000 barrels per day through Pipeline 63
8 to Los Angeles, it occurs to me, in listening to the
9 testimony, that the Coastal Commission's actions were
10 a part of a process between it, the industry, and the
11 administration, and could well have been the result of
12 some compromise developed in the course of that process.
13 And one can only speculate what consideration -- what
14 benefit the Coastal Commission obtained by the
15 designation of that 25,000 barrels per day minimum.

16 I would like to say, unfortunately, neither the
17 existing pipelines nor this agency were participants
18 in that facilitation process. I think because of that
19 it was flawed, but we can only speculate whether or
20 not the agreements reached as a result of that process
21 would have been otherwise.

22 It should also be pointed out that, whereas,
23 the environmental community and the County of Santa
24 Barbara were part of that facilitation process, they did
25 not agree to the results of that process. So, it was not

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 a unanimous -- it was not a consensual agreement.

2 The fact that we were not -- that we were
3 either overlooked or prohibited from participating in
4 that facilitation process only encourages me to urge that
5 in the event you go with the Option 3, that you authorize
6 us to put in the Coastal Commission's conditions
7 specifically in the lease.

8 When I was asked earlier, am I confident about
9 the actions of the Coastal Commission -- well, I had the
10 dubious honor of serving on that Commission for four
11 years and, therefore, I paused. I have more confidence --
12 frankly, I have more confidence in this Commission
13 on this issue than I do in the Coastal Commission. Its
14 members change rather quickly, and I think that these
15 matters should all -- should be reviewed if they're to
16 be reviewed again by this particular Commission.

17 That's all I have to say, Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: The matter's before the
19 Commission.

20 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I have just a couple
21 observations.

22 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Commissioner Davis.

23 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: First of all, I find this
24 to be one of the more difficult decisions I've had to make
25 in public office. I'm on 62 boards and I make a lot of

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 decisions. I think Bob Klausner may have captured
2 part of my dilemma, because we can't control what other
3 Commissions do.

4 It's very clear to me that the original purpose
5 in allowing this terminal was to -- the original
6 condition was that oil be transported by pipeline. And,
7 yes, we needed tanker facility, but it was really not
8 designed to be used as anything but a backup or in
9 emergency conditions.

10 And I have a little trouble thinking how we're
11 going to get a throughput agreement in January or
12 February when we can't have one yet. I mean, I would like
13 to find a way to vote in favor of this. But I have to --
14 I need another sign of good faith. I need another
15 miracle here. Why can't the proponents support either
16 AB 591 or -- it just seems -- and why do they resist
17 our efforts to codify the Coastal -- I mean to incorporate
18 the Coastal Commission conditions? And I guess I have
19 a little problem believing that come January 1, 1996,
20 that there won't be tankers moving around. I guess I'm
21 looking for a way to vote yes, but I'm not getting much
22 help.

23 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Well, has there been a
24 specific objection to incorporating the Coastal Commission's
25 conditions?

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. What was that
3 objection?

4 MR. SHAMAS: Not by us.

5 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Well, the applicant
6 objected, as I understood their testimony, and I also
7 believe the applicant represented that the producers
8 also objected to our -- to the February 1, 1994 date
9 and the January 1, '96.

10 Except our lease terminates on that date, so
11 there's no big -- you know, there's no need to deal
12 with that way point, but there is the need to deal with
13 that February 1, 1994 way point.

14 And we would -- staff would urge that that be
15 an express condition of the lease.

16 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Do you have a problem with
17 that, Mr. Shamas? Dan?

18 MR. SHAMAS: Now we've got a real attorney.

19 (Laughter.)

20 MR. KIRBY: I'm Steve Kirby, counsel for GTC.
21 There's no objection to the February, '94 date in the
22 lease, nor to the January '96 date in the lease. The
23 objection was to having another level of review on the
24 adequacy of the agreement. That was all.

25 COMMISSIONER BURTON: That's what I heard.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Well, that's an
2 incidental responsibility to the date.

3 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: We covered that in the
4 discussion, the 20-day limit we would impose --

5 MR. KIRBY: I think you've given a lot of
6 comfort on that score.

7 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: All right. All right.
8 Okay?

9 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Okay.

10 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: So, one of the two issues you
11 raised is addressed. Mr. Warren suggests that those
12 dates be specifically included and they will be included
13 without objection by the members of the Commission.

14 COMMISSIONER BURTON: That's fine. I was the
15 one who raised the question about our review, which I
16 still consider to be redundant, our review of the
17 T & D agreements. It seems to me that one State agency
18 reviewing T & D agreements should be sufficient, and
19 having the Coastal Commission staff do that is fine.

20 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: You would think so if
21 one State agency worked and cooperated or involved another
22 State agency. But as I just pointed out, on this
23 particular issue, we were excluded from any of this
24 participation, from participating in this process. So,
25 our exclusion may continue in the future. That's my fear.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 COMMISSIONER BURTON: I understand what you're
2 saying, and my point remains. It may be just my point.
3 I have concerns about what I consider to be redundant
4 processes in government, and it seems to me that if the
5 Coastal Commission has imposed on their staff a
6 requirement that they determine that the T & D
7 agreement is adequate and they've defined what adequate
8 is, that they should be able to do that, and not have
9 another State agency do the same thing.

10 Now, if --

11 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Well, we're going to get
12 a staff view on the point, and I think my sentiment on
13 this, if it is material -- materially consistent with our
14 purposes and views in the fulfillment of our
15 responsibilities, that'll be satisfactory.

16 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Right. It seems to me
17 the point of concern, to me, are the dates. And the
18 dates are meaningful only in the fact that they show
19 progress toward the objective of getting out of
20 tankering completely.

21 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I quite agree.

22 COMMISSIONER BURTON: And the details
23 associated with how you get through those dates should not
24 be the subject of dissension among the ranks among various
25 staff agencies.

 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: And I don't think we have to

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 be, Commissioner, if we get a copy of the T & D
2 agreement promptly from the applicant and we get the
3 opportunity to review that T & D and get word back to
4 them as to whether it's our opinion that there is --
5 there are material differences between the intent we're
6 expressing today in taking this action and what's in the
7 T & D agreement.

8 I, at least, have made the argument that we're
9 trying to get past redundancy wherever that's possible
10 to reach the main objective of stopping oil tankering
11 and putting it in the pipeline.

12 So, as one vote out of the three out here,
13 I'm going to try very hard not to do things that get in
14 the way of that objective.

15 On the other hand, we're trying to build good
16 faith here. We've talked about lawsuits and about other
17 things, and I think maybe we call need to take a few
18 steps here that help build that chemistry of good
19 faith.

20 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: Well, Mr. Chairman, what
21 about the lawsuit against the Coastal Commission? Why
22 do you guys need this lawsuit against the Coastal
23 Commission? It's not been satisfactorily explained to
24 me and it casts doubt on this good faith issue.

25 MR. KIRBY: That was filed because the time

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 within which to file the lawsuit was running, and the
2 companies asked for an extension from the Coastal
3 Commission so they wouldn't have to file that lawsuit.
4 We didn't know and don't know just yet what your
5 Commission's going to do. You're the last piece in the
6 puzzle. So, the lawsuit was filed as a protective
7 measure. It has not been filed -- excuse me. It has
8 not been served, and it will be dismissed if this
9 compromise comes together the way everyone hopes it will.

10 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I haven't read the lawsuit.
11 I'm not, at this point, interested in the lawsuit, because
12 I don't want it to affect my judgment on the issue before
13 us.

14 I am driven by the central point of whether
15 we go away from oil tankering to a pipeline, and what we
16 need to do to get there. Now, we have -- we have other
17 bites of the apple here that we can take if this gets
18 ugly in some way. But we don't need to talk like that,
19 because we're trying to build a positive chemistry with
20 good faith. We're trying to forget whoever's to blame
21 or not to blame for the sequence of events over the past
22 decade.

23 We're trying to look where we are today and see
24 how we get in the time frame we've outlined here into
25 pipeline construction or expansion and utilization. That's

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 where we want to be. So, you can make your judgments
2 and understand that, if there are lawsuits and other
3 things, that obviously colors the view of the human beings
4 that are part of the process. So, those are risks that
5 you can accept on your own behalf.

6 Now, to get back to Commissioner Davis' point.
7 I think we've addressed the issue of dates.--

8 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: -- being included.

10 EXECUTIVE OFFICER WARREN: I hope so.

11 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: They'll be incorporated.

12 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: What about my other point
13 about AB 591? Why are you opposed to supporting that
14 bill where all it does is codify the Coastal Commission
15 conditions?

16 MR. KIRBY: I can't speak to that subject.

17 MR. MIHALIK: Dan Mihalik again. Much of our
18 objection was on the process. When a statute's enacted,
19 like the Coastal Act, the Coastal Commission is given
20 charge to look at permits like Point Arguello and come up
21 with permit conditions. But I don't think there's ever
22 been a case that anyone ever saw where somehow a permit
23 condition that an agency came up with was -- an attempt
24 was made to codify it. There just doesn't seem to be any
25 need for it.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 In addition to that, one of the objections
2 that was raised by the Gaviota Terminal Company was
3 that the proponents of that statute said they were
4 trying to codify something the Coastal Commission did,
5 but it was -- the statute clearly goes to shippers other
6 than the Point Arguello Producers. It goes towards, for
7 example, Exxon, who has not gone through the permitting
8 process, in an attempt to codify something for them.

9 So, it was both the process that was going on
10 and the fact it really wasn't codifying what the Coastal
11 Commission did. It was doing more than that.

12 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I don't understand why it was
13 doing more than what the Coastal Commission did.

14 MR. MIHALIK: Well, for example, Exxon and any
15 other shippers that might be out there, they haven't gone
16 through the Coastal Commission and gotten a shipper's
17 permit. This particular bill attempted to codify dates
18 for future shippers. And there aren't any permit
19 conditions for future shippers yet, at least from the
20 Coastal Commission.

21 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: All right.

22 MR. MIHALIK: Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: The matter's before the
24 Commission. Do I have a motion?

25 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Let me back up first. And

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 after picking on staff, say thank you to them for what I
2 consider to be an extremely well-presented document for us
3 to work our way through, and to all the people who made
4 presentations. I know this is a tough issue to prepare
5 for. Some of us have been more involved than others in
6 these matters, but I appreciate the thoughtful way in which
7 you've approached this matter.

8 And I'd like to put before the Commission for
9 its consideration that we adopt what's been listed
10 as Option 3, with the understanding that all of the
11 comments that we've been made be taken into consideration.
12 And that is that the purpose of imposing the conditions
13 that are also outlined in the pages that follow and
14 the staff's recommended conditions, the purpose of
15 taking this is to continue to show good faith efforts
16 toward progress toward getting us away from tankering.
17 And it is not our intention to make people jump through
18 hoops just for the sake of jumping through hoops; that we
19 will be thoughtful in the way we approach the
20 implementation of these conditions.

21 So, with that, I move that we approve the lease
22 as consistent with Item 3.

23 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Second?

24 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: I'm reluctant to second
25 that. As I said, I would like to find a way to vote yes.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 I have a feeling my vote is not necessary, but I just
2 feel that there have to be other ways that we can achieve
3 the certainty that a pipeline is going to be built.
4 And I have a little trouble believing that come February,
5 that those throughput agreements will be signed, or come
6 January, 1996, that all tankering will stop. I have a
7 lot of empathy for the companies. I think -- I have no
8 quarrel with Chevron's safety record. I think they do
9 an excellent job. Texaco's a first-rate company. And
10 I wish I could control the whole process, because then
11 I could say, we'll give you the pipeline in February,
12 and you can tanker up to then, and I'd feel confident
13 that there would be no slip between the mouth and the lip.

14 I can't second it.

15 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: I will second the motion
16 and speak briefly to it. By my questions, I revealed
17 what my thinking is on this. If we can stop oil
18 tankering off the California Coast, I think we achieve a
19 major environmental goal. There are doubts in many
20 environmentalists' minds based on a ten-year history of
21 whether this is really going to happen or not.

22 In addition, if a pipeline is going to be built,
23 whether it's a significant expansion of Line 90 or if
24 it's a new Pacific Pipeline, a lot of jobs are going to be
25 created in a State which has 1.5 million unemployed
people.

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

1 It's not very often in my history in California
2 where I think you can achieve a major environmental goal
3 and do a good hit for a lot of working people that are
4 in fairly desperate shape right now.

5 I don't know if this is all going to come together
6 or not. But I think we're moving in the right
7 direction if we act on this motion, and I'm going to
8 support it.

9 You want to abstain?

10 COMMISSIONER DAVIS: No. I'll be recorded as
11 no on that.

12 COMMISSIONER BURTON: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN MC CARTHY: Two aye votes, one no vote.
14 The matter is concluded. Thank you all very much.

15 (Thereupon, the meeting was adjourned
16 at 4:05 p.m.)

17 ---oOo---

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION

3336 BRADSHAW ROAD, SUITE 240
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95827
TELEPHONE (916) 362-2345

