COMMISSION MEMBERS:
Ms. Betty T. Yee, State Controller, Chairperson
Ms. Eleni Kounalakis, Lieutenant Governor, also represented by Mr. Matt Dumlao
Ms. Keely Bosler, Director of Department of Finance, represented by Ms. Gayle Miller

STAFF:
Ms. Jennifer Lucchesi, Executive Officer
Mr. Colin Connor, Assistant Executive Officer
Mr. Seth Blackmon, Chief Counsel
Mr. Brian Bugsch, Chief, Land Management Division
Ms. Nicole Dobroski, Assistant Chief, Marine Environmental Protection Division
Ms. Grace Kato, Assistant Chief, Land Management Division
Ms. Sheri Pemberton, Chief, Legislative Affairs Division
Ms. Katie Robinson-Filipp, Sea Grant Fellow

ATTORNEY GENERAL:
Mr. Andrew Vogel, Deputy Attorney General

ALSO PRESENT:
Mr. John Berge, Pacific Merchant Shipping Association
Ms. Lisa Beutler, Stantec
Ms. Ruth Bley
ALSO PRESENT:
Ms. Anna Christensen, Los Cerritos Wetlands Task Force, Sierra Club
Mr. Francis Coats
Ms. Casey Cruikshank, Northcoast Environmental Center
Ms. Abigail Edwards, Kaufman Edwards Planning & Consulting
Mr. Garry George, National Audubon Society
Mr. Larry Hanson, California River Watch
Mr. Gerald Hasson
Mr. Brian Holt, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Loca 428
Dr. Lee Kindberg, Maersk
Mr. Scott Kuhlke, EDF Renewables
Ms. Patricia Miller
Ms. Katherine O'Dea, Save Our Shores
Mr. Ken Owen, Channel Islands Restoration
Mr. Eric Ronning
Mr. Tom Rudolph, The Pew Charitable Trusts
Ms. Jennifer Savage, Surfrider Foundation
Mr. Mark Welther, Redwood Forest Foundation, Inc.
Public comments will be heard at 1:00 pm for items not on the agenda, for no more than 30 minutes. At the discretion of the Chair, speakers will be given up to 3 minutes. For those unable to attend the early public comment period, there may be additional comment time available later in the day. Note: Comments made during the general public comment period regarding matters pending before the Commission do not become part of the official record for those matters.

Continuation of Rent Actions to be taken by the Executive Officer pursuant to the Commission's Delegation of Authority:

- Southern California Gas Company (Lessee): Continuation of rent at $42,968 per year for a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use of eight parcels of State school land in portions of Section 36, Township 10 North, Range 13 East, SBM; Section 36, Township 10 North, Range 14 East, SBM; Section 16, Township 7 North, Range 1 East, SBM; Section 16, Township 7 North, Range 10 East, SBM; Section 16, Township 7 North, Range 13 East, SBM; Section 16, Township 7 North, Range 21 East, SBM; Section 16, Township 8 North, Range 20 East, SBM; and Tract 41, Township 8 North, Range 20 East, SBM, San Bernardino County. (PRC 1801)

- Southern California Gas Company (Lessee): Continuation of rent at $545 per year for a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use of sovereign land in and adjacent to the San Dieguito River, near Del Mar, San Diego County. (PRC 8896)
Tulare County Resource Management Agency (Lessee): Continuation of rent at $223 per year for a General Lease - Public Agency Use of sovereign land in the Kings River, near Dinuba, Tulare County. (PRC 8900)
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The following items are considered to be noncontroversial and are subject to change at any time up to the date of the meeting.

Land Management

Northern Region


Consider delegating authority to the Executive Officer to accept a lease quitclaim deed for Lease No. PRC 8271, a General Lease - Recreational Use; delegating authority to the Executive Officer to accept a lease quitclaim deed for Lease No. PRC 8976, a General Lease Recreational Use; and application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 8778, 8780, 8782, and 8796 Brockway Vista Avenue, Kings Beach, Placer County, for three existing mooring buoys previously authorized by the Commission; construction, use, and maintenance of a joint-use pier with four boat lifts; and removal of three existing mooring buoys and one double personal watercraft lift. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (Lease 8271; A2342; RA# 2019118) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)
02 JOHN D. BRADY, TRUSTEE OF THE JOHN D. AND JUDY V. BRADY 1980 REVOCABLE LIVING TRUST AS AMENDED AND RESTATED DECEMBER 13, 1990 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, near 4310 North Lake Boulevard, Carnelian Bay, Placer County; for an existing pier and boat lift. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 5405; A2235; RA# 2019197) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: L. Anderson)

03 BROCKWAY SPRINGS OF TAHOE PROPERTY OWNERS ASSOCIATION I AND II, INC. (LESSEE); BST III OWNERS ASSOCIATION, INC. (APPLICANT): Consider amendment to Lease No. PRC 7939, a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 9680 Brockway Springs Drive, near Brockway, Placer County; to add the Applicant as a Lessee and consolidate the use and maintenance of an existing pier with floating dock and gangway, hot springs deck and breakwater, swim area with swim line and float, and 15 mooring buoys previously authorized under Lease No. PRC 1691. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (PRC 7939; RA# 08717) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: A. Franzoia)

04 FRANK CASALE AND TERESA M. CASALE (LESSEE); DANIEL S. HAAS, AS TRUSTEE OF THE DANIEL S. HAAS TRUST DATED DECEMBER 21, 2004 (APPLICANT): Consider waiver of rent, penalty, and interest; termination of Lease No. PRC 8643, a General Lease - Recreational Use, and application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 720 West Lake Boulevard, near Tahoe City, Placer County; for two existing mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8643; A2102) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: J. Toy)

Homewood, Placer County; for an existing pier, boat lift, and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3512; A2219; RA# 2019046) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: J. Toy)

06 WELLINGTON S. HENDERSON, JR., AS TO A LIFE ESTATE; AND WELLINGTON S. HENDERSON, JR., AND RICHARD L. GREENE AS TRUSTEES OF THE HARRIET WALKER HENDERSON IRREVOCABLE TRUST U/T/A DATED AUGUST 14, 1973 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 8901 Rubicon Drive, near Meeks Bay, El Dorado County; for an existing pier, boathouse, boat hoist, and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4471; A2524; RA# 2019239) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: L. Anderson)

07 MEGANNE G. HOUGHTON-BERRY (LESSEE); LAURENTINUM LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, A DELAWARE LIMITED PARTNERSHIP (APPLICANT): Consider acceptance of a quitclaim deed for Lease No. PRC 9038, a General Lease - Recreational Use, and application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 9101 Highway 89 and 9120 South Lane, Tahoma, El Dorado County, for two existing mooring buoys previously authorized by the Commission and one existing mooring buoy not previously authorized; removal of one previously unauthorized mooring buoy; and construction of a joint-use pier, adjustable catwalk, boat lift, stairs, and ladders. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (Lease 9038; A2521; RA# 2019230) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: M.J. Columbus)

08 DAVID WILLIAM JESKE, TRUSTEE OF THE DAVID W. JESKE TRUST UDT DATED 8/20/2009 (LESSEE): Consider amendment of Lease No. PRC 8266, a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 1780 North Lake Boulevard, near Tahoe City, Placer County; for construction, use, and maintenance of a pier, boat lift, catwalk, and ramp, and removal of one buoy. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (PRC 8266; A2522; RA# 2019226) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: A. Franzola)
09 LAKELAND VILLAGE OWNERS ASSOCIATION (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 3535 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County; for an existing pier and three mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 5490; A2467; RA# 2019285) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: L. Anderson)

10 M. DAVID PAUL AND DIANE B. PAUL (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 2020 West Lake Boulevard, near Sunnyside, Placer County; for an existing pier, boat lift, and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4284; A2254; RA# 2019067) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: J. Toy)

11 JONATHAN D. RUGGIERO AND LAURIE L. RUGGIERO, AS TRUSTEES OF THE RUGGIERO TRUST DATED 4/1/2013; AND GREGORY H. ST. CLAIRE AND ANNE L. ST. CLAIRE, TRUSTEES OF THE ST. CLAIRE FAMILY TRUST (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 3135 and 3145 West Lake Boulevard, near Homewood, Placer County; for an existing joint-use pier and four mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 5529; A2288; RA#18714) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)

12 STEVEN J. SELL AND MARGARET D. WILLIAMS, TRUSTEES OF THE STEVEN J. SELL AND MARGARET D. WILLIAMS REVOCABLE INTER VIVOS TRUST (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 4590 North Lake Boulevard, near Carnelian Bay, Placer County; for an existing pier, boat lift, and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8341; A2611; RA# 2019297) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)

13 M. RICHARD SMITH AND REBECCA W. SMITH, AS TRUSTEES OF THE SMITH 2002 FAMILY TRUST, AMENDED AND RESTATED MAY 2, 2007 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 8227 Meeks Bay Avenue, near Meeks Bay, El Dorado County; for an
existing pier, boat lift, and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7315; A2306; RA# 2019180) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: L. Anderson)

14 TAHOE LLC, A SOUTH DAKOTA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 6820 West Lake Boulevard, nearTahoma, Placer County; for an existing pier and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3548; A2362; RA# 2019135) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: J. Toy)

15 WSC INVESTORS, LLC (LESSEE) HOMEWOOD VILLAGE RESORTS, LLC (SUBLESSEE): Consider revision of rent to Lease No. PRC 8052, a General Lease - Commercial Use, of sovereign land in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 5160 West Lake Boulevard, near Homewood, Placer County; for an existing restaurant accommodation pier. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 8052) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: N. Lee)

16 RANDOLPH K. YACKZAN AND LYNNNE U. YACKZAN, TRUSTEES OF THE YACKZAN FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST DATED OCTOBER 15, 1997; AND UNGER ENTERPRISES LP, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, near 4330 North Lake Boulevard, near Carnelian Bay, Placer County; for an existing pier, boathouse, and boat hoist. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 5267; A2415; RA# 2019175) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: L. Anderson)

Bay / Delta Region

17 27 GEISSBERGER LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Corte Madera Creek, adjacent to 1341 South Eliseo Drive, near Greenbrae, Marin County; for an existing boat dock and appurtenant facilities. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4495; A2406; RA# 2019169) (A 10; S 2) (Staff: G. Asimakopoulos)
18 805 SOUTH ELISEO HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT MUTUAL BENEFIT CORPORATION (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in Corte Madera Creek, adjacent to 805 South Eliseo Drive, near Greenbrae, Marin County; for existing bank protection, and installation of additional bank protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (Lease 8838; A2180; RA# 2019205) (A 10; S 2) (Staff: G. Asimakopoulos)

19 BERT E. BLACKWELDER AND ARAMINTA D. BLACKWELDER (LESSEE); STEPHEN C. SPENCER AND PATRICIA M. SPENCER, TRUSTEES OF THE SPENCER FAMILY TRUST, DATED OCTOBER 22, 2002 (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Lease No. PRC 5564, a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, and an application for a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 175 Edgewater Drive, Rio Vista, Solano County; for existing concrete stairs, pilings, and bank protection; and proposed construction of a floating boat dock and gangway. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (Lease 5564; A2587; RA# 2019282) (A 11; S 3) (Staff: V. Caldwell)

20 CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (APPLICANT): Consider application for a Public Agency Permit and Right-of-Way Map pursuant to Section 101.5 of the Streets and Highways Code, of sovereign land located in the Tolay Creek, adjacent to 4100 Sears Point Road near Sonoma, Sonoma County; for an existing bridge. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4625; A2537; RA# 2019256) (A 10; S 3) (Staff: D. Tutov)

21 CHRIS CARLINO, TRUSTEE OF THE CHRIS CARLINO TRUST DATED 02/22/2012 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 6333 Garden Highway, near Sacramento, Sacramento County; for an existing boat dock and appurtenant facilities previously authorized by the Commission and an existing boat lift and personal watercraft float not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA
Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7224; A2632; RA# 2019321) (A 7; S 6) (Staff: J. Holt)

22 CITY OF SACRAMENTO (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River at Garcia Bend Park, Sacramento, Sacramento County; for an existing boat launch ramp and appurtenant facilities, and maintenance dredging. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (Lease 5021; A2410; RA# 2019184) (A 9; S 6) (Staff: M. Schroeder)

23 COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in Sutter Slough at its confluence with the Sacramento River, adjacent to 11919 Sutter Slough Bridge Road, near Courtland, Sacramento and Yolo Counties; for an existing swing bridge. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3699; A2580; RA# 2019280) (A 11; S 3) (Staff: J. Holt)

24 EAST BAY MUNICIPAL UTILITY DISTRICT (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in the Mokelumne River, adjacent to 800 East Woodbridge Road, Woodbridge, San Joaquin County; for two existing conduits. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7452; A2460; RA# 2019286) (A 9; S 5) (Staff: J. Holt)

25 EAST BAY REGIONAL PARK DISTRICT (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in Carquinez Strait at Eckley Cove, near Crockett, Contra Costa County; for an existing public fishing pier. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7834; A2545; RA# 2019259) (A 14; S 3) (Staff: J. Holt)

26 ROBERT L. HULBERT AND ZULIMA O. HULBERT (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 673 Brickyard Drive, near Sacramento, Sacramento County; for an existing boat dock with boathouse, and appurtenant facilities
previously authorized by the Commission, and electric and water utility outlets not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8513; A2407; RA# 2019173) (A 9; S 6) (Staff: G. Asimakopoulos)

27 JOHN C. LAING AND ELIZABETH A. LAING, AS TRUSTEES OF THE 2000 JOHN C. LAING AND ELIZABETH A. LAING REVOCABLE TRUST DATED AUGUST 23, 2000, AS AMENDED AND RESTATED ON APRIL 22, 2013 (ASSIGNOR); LAGOM PROPERTIES LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (ASSIGNEE): Consider assignment of Lease No. PRC 8793, a General Lease - Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Pacific Ocean, adjacent to 4610 Opal Cliff Drive, near Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz County; for an existing stem wall. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 8793; A2349; RA# 2019303) (A 29; S 17) (Staff: G. Asimakopoulos)

28 LARKSPUR ISLE CONDOMINIUM ASSOCIATION, INC. (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in Corte Madera Creek, adjacent to 625 Larkspur Plaza Drive, near Larkspur, Marin County; for the installation, use, and maintenance of bank protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (A2644; RA# 2019319) (A 10; S 2) (Staff: D. Tutov)

29 OLS HOLDING, LLC (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 5311 Garden Highway, near Sacramento, Sacramento County; for existing bank protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4655; A2414; RA# 2019254) (A 7; S 6) (Staff: J. Holt)

30 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (LESSEE): Consider rescission of prior Commission authorization of an amendment to Lease No. PRC 5438.1-B and consent to abandonment-in-place of a natural gas pipeline, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, near Isleton, Sacramento County. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (PRC 5438.1-B) (A 11; S 3) (Staff: A. Franzoia)
31 RANCHO MURIETA COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT (LESSEE): Consider revision of rent to Lease No. PRC 7429, a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of sovereign land in the Cosumnes River, near Rancho Murieta, Sacramento County; for a water line within a casing. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 7429) (A 8; S 8) (Staff: N. Lee)

32 SAN FRANCISCO SAILING WHALEBOAT ASSOCIATION, INC. (LESSEE): Consider revision of rent to Lease No. PRC 5437, a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of sovereign land located in White Slough at Empire Tract, adjacent to Assessor's Parcel Number 069-080-15, near Terminous, San Joaquin County; for pilings and a walkway. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 5437) (A 13; S 5) (Staff: N. Lee)

33 STARBIRD MARICULTURE, INC. (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in Tomales Bay, adjacent to 18225 State Highway 1, near Marshall, Marin County; for a proposed mooring buoy. CEQA Consideration: Negative Declaration, adopted by the California State Lands Commission, State Clearinghouse No. 2012082074. (A2386; RA# 2019207) (A 10; S 2) (Staff: D. Tutov)

34 SUISUN RESOURCE CONSERVATION DISTRICT (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in Goodyear Slough, near Benicia, Solano County; for an existing boat dock and walkway previously authorized by the Commission, and five existing mooring poles not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8781; A2616; RA# 2019176) (A 14; S 3) (Staff: M. Schroeder)

35 THE SPHERE INSTITUTE (LESSEE): Consider amendment to Lease 9596, a General Lease - Other, of sovereign land located in the historic bed of the San Francisco Bay, at 410 Airport Boulevard, Burlingame, San Mateo County; to extend the lease term and all associated submittal deadlines. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (Lease 9596; A2617; RA# 2019060) (A 22; S 13) (Staff: M. Schroeder)
36 CABRILLO POWER I LLC (ASSIGNOR); POSEIDON RESOURCES (CHANNELSIDE) LP (ASSIGNEE): Consider assignment of Lease No. PRC 8727, a General Lease - Industrial Use, of sovereign land in the Pacific Ocean, adjacent to Agua Hedionda Lagoon, Carlsbad, San Diego County; for existing seawater intake and outfall structures comprised of four groins protecting two open water channels associated with the upland Carlsbad Desalination Plant. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 8727; RA# 2019294) (A 74; S 38) (Staff: C. Hudson)

37 VINCENT COBURN AND SUSAN COBURN (LEESSEE): Consider amendment of Lease No. PRC 9210, a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Colorado River adjacent to 1198 Beach Drive, Needles, San Bernardino County; for the installation, use and maintenance of a new boat dock, walkway, and access ramp. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (PRC 9210; RA#2019306) (A 33; S 16) (Staff: L. Pino)

38 GENERAL PETROLEUM DBA MAXUM PETROLEUM (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Lease No. PRC 3265, a General Lease - Commercial Use, and an application for a General Lease - Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in Sunset Bay, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for a commercial fuel dock facility. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3265; A2503; RA# 2019235) (A 72; S 34) (Staff: D. Simpkin)

39 BARBARA GENTILE-CRARY; CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION (PARTIES): Consider acceptance and authorize the placement of a memorial plaque in remembrance of the 34 individuals who lost their lives aboard the MV Conception, on sovereign land in the Pacific Ocean, Platt's Harbor, Santa Cruz Island, Santa Barbara County. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (A2651) (A 37; S 19) (Staff: D. Simpkin)

Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in the Midway Channel of Huntington Harbour, adjacent to 3585 Courtside Circle, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for an existing boat dock and access ramp not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (W27002; A2594; RA# 2019287) (A 72; S 34) (Staff: K. Connor)

HUNTINGTON MARINA ASSOCIATION (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Huntington Harbour, adjacent to Assessor's Parcel Numbers 178-581-02, 03, 04, and 05, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for multiple boat docks with dinghy docks and access ramps. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3288; A2627; RA# 2019302) (A 72; S 34) (Staff: K. Connor)

GERALD A. JONES, TRUSTEE OF THE GERALD A. JONES AND MARILYN L. JONES REVOCABLE TRUST, DATED SEPTEMBER 12, 1985 (LESSEE); NICOLE RUELAS, TRUSTEE OF THE STEVEN A. LOVATO AND KAREN L. LOVATO REVOCABLE TRUST, DATED FEBRUARY 22, 2001 (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Lease No. PRC 3079, a General Lease - Recreational Use, and an application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in the Midway Channel of Huntington Harbour, adjacent to 3442 Gilbert Drive, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for an existing boat dock, access ramp, and cantilevered deck. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3079; A2472; RA# 2019188) (A 72; S 34) (Staff: K. Connor)

NAGY KHALIL AND ALICE KHALIL TRUSTEES OF THE KHALIL TRUST DATED APRIL 25, 2019 (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Lease No. PRC 3253, a General Lease - Recreational Use, and application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in the Main Channel of Huntington Harbour adjacent to 16542 Somerset Lane, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for an existing boat dock, access ramp, and cantilevered deck. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3253; A2525; RA# 2019243) (A 72; S 34) (Staff: L. Pino)

MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public

J&K COURT REPORTING, LLC  916.476.3171
Agency Use, of sovereign land located in the Salinas River and Old Salinas River channel, near Castroville, Monterey County; for four existing reclaimed water distribution pipelines previously authorized by the Commission; and two existing culverts and an existing public access road not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7818; A2388; RA# 2019191) (A 29; S 17) (Staff: L. Pino)

45 NRG CALIFORNIA SOUTH LP (ASSIGNOR); ORMOND BEACH POWER, LLC, A SUBSIDIARY OF GENON HOLDINGS, INC. (ASSIGNEE): Consider assignment of Lease No. PRC 4196, a General Lease - Industrial Use, of sovereign land in the Pacific Ocean, offshore Ormond Beach, near Oxnard, Ventura County; for one seawater intake conduit and one discharge conduit. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 4196; RA# 2019308) (A 44; S 19) (Staff: C. Hudson)

46 SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY (LESSEE); TURTLE COVE MARINA, LLC DBA PIRATE COVE RESORT & MARINA, LLC (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Lease No. PRC 3321, a General Lease - Commercial Use, and an application for a General Lease - Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in the Colorado River, near Needles, San Bernardino County; for an existing regional park, and construction, use, and maintenance of the Pirate Cove Peninsula Master Development Plan Improvements; and authorization to file and record a record of survey. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption and Mitigated Negative Declaration, adopted by San Bernardino County, State Clearinghouse No. 2012121047, and adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring Program. (PRC 3321; A2325; RA# 2019120) (A 33; S 16) (Staff: R. Collins)

47 SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (LESSEE): Consider revision of rent to Lease No. PRC 8895, a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of sovereign land in and adjacent to the San Dieguito River, Del Mar, San Diego County; for retention, use, and maintenance of a natural gas pipeline attached to the Camino Del Mar Bridge. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 8895) (A 78; S 39) (Staff: K. Foster)
48 SANTA CATALINA ISLAND COMPANY (LESSEE): Consider amendment to a General Lease - Commercial Use of sovereign land located in the Pacific Ocean, near Pebble Beach, Santa Catalina Island, Los Angeles County; to replace a concrete ramp. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7332; A2314 RA# 2019273) (A 70; S 26) (Staff: D. Simpkin)

49 JEREMY SLOAN AND TANNER SLOAN, TRUSTEES, UNDER THE 2005 NORTON SLOAN INVESTMENT TRUST DATED JANUARY 3, 2006; NORTON SLOAN; AND GRETCHEN SLOAN (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located adjacent to 201 Pacific Avenue, Solana Beach, San Diego County; for a seacave/notch fill. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8184; RA# 2019288) (A 78; S 39) (Staff: D. Simpkin)

50 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY (APPLICANT); CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION AND CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION (PARTIES): Consider application from the U.S. Department of the Navy for a General Lease - Public Agency Use and authorization for staff to negotiate and enter into an Agreement for the Transfer of Control and Possession of State-Owned Real Property with the California Department of Parks and Recreation, of sovereign land located along Silver Strand State Beach, near Coronado, San Diego County; for use and maintenance of Silver Strand Training Complex North. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 6319; A2488; RA# 2019253) (A 78; S 39) (Staff: D. Simpkin)

School Lands

51 PLUMAS-SIERRA RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE, INC. (LESSEE): Consider revision of rent to Lease No. PRC 7458, a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of State-owned school land in a portion of Section 36, Township 24 North, Range 17 East, MDM, near Doyle, Lassen County; for an electrical distribution line, transmission line, overhead fiber-optic cable and appurtenant facilities. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 7458) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: N. Lee)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAGE</th>
<th>SECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>CITY OF LOS ANGELES DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND POWER (APPLICANT): Consider application for a Non-Exclusive Geological Survey Permit to collect geological and geotechnical information by hollow stem auger drilling, on up to 49 shallow 6- to 8-inch diameter borings, less than 15 feet deep, on State sovereign land, located on Owens Lake, Inyo County. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (A2600; RA# 2019307) (A 34; S 18) (Staff: R. B. Greenwood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
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CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon. I call this meeting of the State Lands Commission to order. I'm State Controller Betty Yee and welcome to our completely virtual State Lands Commission meeting.

Ms. Lucchesi, will you please call the roll of the Commissioners in attendance?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes.
Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis?
COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Here.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Gayle Miller representing the Department of Finance?
I believe that she is trying to log in now, Chair Yee.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. We'll recognize her when she joins us.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Actually, I think she just joined us right there.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Wonderful.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Gayle Miller representing the Department of Finance?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Here.
Sorry.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Wonderful welcome.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair and State
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Here.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Madam Chair, we have a quorum present and in addition, I would like to identify the staff of the Commission and the Attorney General present for this meeting.

Executive -- I am Executive Officer Jennifer Lucchesi. I am joined by Chief Counsel Seth Blackmon, meeting liaison Kim Lunetta, Assistant Executive Officer, Supervising Deputy Attorney General Andrew Vogel, and our Zoom co-hosts Katie Robinson-Filipp, Grace Kato, and Phil Schlatter.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Ms. Lucchesi. Before I provide my opening introductory remarks, I just wanted us to all just take a moment to obviously place at the top of our thoughts those who are on the frontlines just battling the fires throughout the State of California. If there was any ever doubt -- every any doubt of the severe weather events that we've been experiencing, and the relationship to climate change, and all of the attendant impacts that it's having, our hearts go out to the communities that have been affected, particularly those who have lost property, and homes, and cherished possessions, and, of course, to our firefighters who are doing their best to protect lives and property.
So for the benefit of those joining us virtually, the State Lands Commission manages State property interests in over five million acres of land, including mineral interests. The Commission also has responsibility for the prevention of oil spills at marine oil terminals at offshore oil platforms and for preventing the introduction of marine invasive species into California's marine waters. Today, we will hear requests and presentations involving the lands and resources within the Commission's jurisdiction.

We recognize that the lands we manage have been inhabited for thousands of years by California's native people and take seriously our trust relationship with these sovereign governments. I want to take a moment to honor the California Native American communities across the State for persisting, carrying on diverse cultural and linguistic traditions, and sustainably managing the land that we now share.

Native people have maintained a constant presence on the landscape for thousands of years and they are essential stewardship partners, whether along the coast, along our rivers and valleys, or in our fragile deserts. We thank California Native American communities for participating in this Commission's activities and for their essential role in maintaining and adding to our
State's rich cultural legacy.

The next item of business will be public comment. And before I open the public comment period for items not on the agenda, first, let me thank everyone, especially our stakeholders and members of the public for taking the time to join our virtual meeting. While these virtual meetings are becoming more routine, this is still a relatively new experience for most of us and we appreciate your support and patience as we work together in this new medium.

Now, let me -- actually, Ms. Lucchesi, before I turn it over, let me just turn to my fellow Commissioners to see if there are any opening remarks at this time.

Okay. Seeing none. Ms. Lucchesi, do you want to just quickly share some instructions in how we can best participate in this meeting, so we can have it run as smoothly as possible.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Of course, thank you, Chair Yee. First, everyone, please make sure you have your microphones or phones muted to avoid any background noise. For members of the public, if you would like to speak either during our open public comment period or during a public comment period that is part of an agenda item, you will need to do so in one of two ways. First, if you are attending on the Zoom platform, please
raise your hand in Zoom. If you are new to Zoom and you joined our meeting using the zoom application, click on that hand icon at the bottom of your screen. When you click on that hand, it will raise your hand.

Second, if you are joining our meeting via phone, you must press star nine, not pound, but star on your keypad to raise your hand to make a comment. If you are calling in and want to view the meeting, including the PowerPoint presentations, please view the meeting through the CAL-SPAN live webcast link that's located on our agenda. There will be a slight time delay, but it will avoid an echo or feedback from using the Zoom application and your phone.

If you mailed -- emailed us with a request to speak, please also raise your hand, so we don't inadvertently miss you. We will call on individuals who have raised their hands in the order that they are raised using the name they registered with or the last three digits of the identifying phone number. After you are called on, you will be unmuted, so you can share your comments. Please also remember to unmute your computer or phone and identify yourself.

You will have a limit of three minutes to speak on an item. Please keep your comments respectful and focused. We will mute anyone who fails to follow these
guidelines or at worst dismiss them from the meeting.

Finally, every now and then, you will hear me refer to the meeting host. Our Commission staff are acting as hosts for the meeting behind the scenes to ensure that the technology moves the meeting forward smoothly and consistently. The Commission has also established an email address to compile public comments for our meetings. Its address is cslc.commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov. We have received a number of emails and letters from parties that have been shared with all the Commissioners prior to the meeting.

If we receive any emails during the meeting, they will be shared with the Commissioners and be made available on our website at www.slc.ca.gov, along with the public comments we have already received.

Chair Yee, that concludes my virtual meeting instructions. We are ready to move to the general public comment period.

Chair Yee. Chair Yee, you are muted.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Lucchesi.

Our next order of business is the public comment period. So if anyone wants to address the Commission on any matter not on today's agenda, please raise your hand and you will have three minutes to do so.
Grace, will you please call on the first person who would like to make a public comment.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
Thank you, Chair Yee. The first person making a comment during general public comment will be Jennifer Savage followed by Gerald Hasson.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon.
MS. SAVAGE: Hi. Just checking to make sure you could hear me.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, we can.
MS. SAVAGE: Thank you. I'm Jennifer Savage, Surfrider Foundation. Good afternoon, Chair Yee, Commissioners.

I apologize in advance for the bleak opening I'm about to deliver. But as you are all clearly, keenly aware, we are in very bleak times at this particular moment, in the throes of a year in which the only certainty seems to be ongoing instability and increasing challenges, many of which have already visited just terrible consequences on California's residents, our families, friends, and neighbors with more suffering sure to come.

The health and economic crisis COVID has wrought has already appropriately narrowed attention in projects to emergency response, and now with much of the state
again on fire, including the mountains just north of Santa
Cruz where my younger daughter lives, continuing to talk
about non-immediate threat feels frankly kind of bizarre
on some levels.

But we still must plan for other emergencies
we're aware are coming in hopes of preventing an ever more
painful future, which brings me to the August 10th report
by the Legislative Analysis[SIC] Office that just came
out, "What Threat Does Sea Level Rise Pose to
California?". The report notes that among all of our
other challenges, California still faces the looming
impacts of climate change and rising seas, noting that the
COVID-19 pandemic and resulting economic impacts have
rightly drawn the focus of the Legislature's attention
since March, but that the threat of encroach --
encroaching seas and waves continue to threaten
California's coast.

And the report, in its section about vulnerable
communities, also notes that future sea level rise
flooding could affect more than 56,000 people who earn
less than 30,000 annually, putting them at greatest risk.

So, in short, the report outlines how the State
and its coastal communities cannot afford to defer all
preparation efforts until economic conditions have fully
rebounded from the recent crisis. I know that you all,
and your staff, have been very attentive to the risks coming from sea level rise, and we are very grateful for that.

I would recommend taking a deep look at that report and the ideas that are outlined for how the State can engage, even with limited fiscal resources. And I would suggest that in efforts to look toward doing another survey of the mean high tide line, perhaps identifying some of the most vulnerable communities and organizing multi-agency participation, and at least some discussions of what that might mean would be a step that the State Lands Commission could take.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Jennifer. Grace, our next speaker.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Our next speaker is Gerry Hasson.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon, Jerry.

MR. HASSON: Hi. Can you hear my okay.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, we can.

MR. HASSON: Okay. Well, I appreciate this opportunity. I have a simple question for the California State Lands Commission regarding the property identified as the Boat Repair Facility, which is at the very southern tip -- southwestern tip of the Port of L.A. I've actually
emailed you a map, so you can take a look at the property I'm talking about.

I'm actually inquiring on behalf of a major developer who may be interested in investing in excess of $300 million in a high rise residential development on that property. This development would allow for up to 20 percent of the residences to be low cost, homeownership for senior citizens requiring financial assistance and include a program to provide that financial assistance.

Naturally, such a development would feature substantial open grounds, gardens, pools, lavish landscaping, barbecue areas, an exercise club, even some small retail facilities, such as a convenience store, a small restaurant, and a barbershop salon.

All of this would, of course, require a massive investment of money by a vastly experienced high rise residential developer, and take several years to complete during what appears to be extremely unstable times in our economy. I understand that the Port of L.A.'s trust with the State of California currently does not allow housing on port property, but I'd like to ask the Commission to consider granting an exception to the Port of L.A. for following reasons:

First of all, there are dozens of examples where housing is currently available within the Port of L.A. In
fact, this particular property at the very southwestern
tip of the port is within a thousand yards of the
DoubleTree Hotel.

Such a proposed development would require an
investment of approximately $300 million, which would
provide a tremendous contribution to the local economy.

In addition, a high rise luxury condo simply
makes economic sense for this property, not only for the
developer, but also for the Port of L.A., Los Angeles
City, the County of Los Angeles, and the State of
California, because in addition to the massive $300
million development, this would provide annual property
tax revenues in excess of $6,400,000 a year, despite the
fact that the property would be on lease-held lands still
owned by the Port of L.A.

Also, because of the tremendous infrastructure already
in place, we're confident that there would be very little
or no adverse environmental impact to the
development, including traffic, the obstruction of ocean
views by anyone, the nature of the property, and its
location wouldn't restrict anyone's access to public
beaches.

And finally, a large residential property --
project of this size would provide that low-income,
financially-assisted home ownership that would be a tremendous benefit to the community.

And here's my question, would the State Lands Commission -- are there any circumstances in which they would consider granting an exception to the no housing condition, thereby freeing the Port of L.A. in granting their 99 -- a 99 year lease that would allow the development as described.

I appreciate your time and consideration. If any of you have any questions, I'd be happy to address them. And if you would like to know more of the location, I'd be happy to share some maps that I have on my screen, if you wanted to make my screen available.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Gerry. Thank you for coming forward during our public comment period. The issue you raise is not properly agendized, but we would welcome certainly your following up with providing any materials, so that we can provide a response back to your question.

Thank you.

Grace, do we have another speaker?

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: We do, Anna Christensen has provided a speaker slip.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Good afternoon, Anna.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Yes. Anna Christensen, Los Cerritos Wetlands Task Force of the Sierra Club. We're requesting that the State Lands Commission take a more hands-on approach to the Los Cerritos Wetlands. The Commission does own a parcel within the wetlands, as well as have some ability to monitor oil and gas operations throughout. There's four companies operating within the wetlands and the impact which is severe on the wetlands and local waters and the community.

One, we would like you to encourage and possibly help fund. Not sure how to do it. We need a stationary air quality monitor in the Los Cerritos Wetlands. We recently saw the 2018 survey about -- that stated that the wetlands -- the Los Cerritos Wetlands had the worst air quality in the area, as high as the port, the freeways, and there's no air quality monitoring going on. Citizens, residents of across the street are rushing to close their windows. We think it's primarily one company that is operating and polluting waters. We're not sure, but we need your help with that.

Second, you do own a property, which the Los Cerritos Wetlands Authority wants to turn into a second visitors center building. There's an old foundation on your property, but there are also over 50 palm trees,
which are housing owls and other endangered species or important coastal birds as well. We would like you to absolutely reject that as part of the FEIR, the project EIR, for the Los Cerritos Wetlands Restoration and take a very hard look at that -- at that plan, which involves building giant berms on the wetlands and flooding significant areas with salt water.

And finally, recently, in Seal Beach, the city took a bulldozer and dug pits in the hill above the wetlands in their public park and disturbed tribal burial sites -- or possibly disturbing burial sites, tribal culture area, well known, shell everywhere. This goes to the heart of your introduction, which we really appreciate, which is consideration for tribal concerns.

There seems to be a lack of knowledge and consistently with respect for tribal peoples. And we hope -- we know that you have a good relationship and we ask that you help the cities and the city staff and -- be more aware, and more considerate, and more careful, because of -- it's gone now. This area has now been disturbed and we're sorry about that.

All right. Thank you very much. Have a good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Anna, for coming forward today.
Grace, our next speaker.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
Chair Yee, we have speaker identified by RFFI.

MR. WELTHER: This is Mark Welther. I'm the President and CEO of the non-profit Redwood Forest Foundation, Incorporated. I was making a comment as part of item number 59. Is this the proper time to do that?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: No. Actually, we will plug you in when we take up that agenda item. So --

MR. WELTHER: Okay. It might have been because I raised my hand and sent in a speaker card.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. All right. No problem. So we will note you for Item 59 when we take up that item.

MR. WELTHER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you.

Grace, any other --

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
Chair Yee.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Any other speakers? Yes.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
Yes. Thank you. We have Patricia Miller who has raised her hand to speak.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right.

Good afternoon.

MS. MILLER: Hi. Good afternoon. I wanted to
touch bases with the Commission. I came in in January and
presented an issue up here in Lakehead, California. The
State Lands Commission has a parcel here behind me, I
think 250 acres. It did burn up in the Delta Fire.

I have been working with Randy Collins and trying
to get -- he's been trying to get someone to chip the
wood, because they put it out for logging and it -- it was
too far gone being over a year old at that time for
loggers to have any interest in it.

So a chipper was interested, but apparently that
may fall through. And I sent photos of trees that are
beginning to fall. Now, these are big Mother Trees. And
it's very dense back there. And I sent pictures to
Jennifer Lucchesi and to Kenneth Foster the other day.
And then I spoke to Kenneth at length.

My concern is if we can't get a chipper to come
up here and take care of these trees, with the vast fire
hazard at hand that they present, because there was
recently a fire at Pollard Flat, which could have been
another catastrophic wildfire just one exit down from us
right off the freeway on the eastside of the freeway.
We're on the westside of the freeway. And I can see
their -- their property from our road coming into our
property.

Fortunately, they got that all pretty much in
control before that happened. But the fear and the risk is high, because the trees here are now almost two years old. As of September 5th, they'll be two years completely dead. And they're starting to fall. And the one picture I sent yesterday took out five trees up there. The big mother tree took out many others on the way down and I sent pictures of that.

So the dangers are real. And I just want to find out mostly if -- if this chipper won't come and do this, what do we do from that point. I'm just very concerned about the trees and need to know that there will be some kind of resolution. And all I'm asking for is just to clear 200 feet back from my property line, just so they don't fall on our property, or fall on somebody on my property, or give me a little fire space.

And that's -- that's what I'm just reiterating today that I'm still very concerned. And we're still working on it. I just wanted to give everybody an update about where it's going at this point.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you, Ms. Miller. With all of the public commenters during this session, we are taking your comments under submission and we'll be responding to them.

Ms. Lucchesi, any comments at this point in time?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: I just wanted to
share Ms. Miller's frustration. We have been working
diligently to try to get a contractor out there to take
care of the trees. You may remember Ms. Miller came to
the meeting earlier this year when we were still meeting
in person.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: And so like I said,
we share her frustration and her very serious concerns.
Unfortunately, the contractor we were able to retain did
go out there and was interfered with with another property
owner and is not willing to go back out there. So we're
working on different plan Bs and Cs, including hopefully
trying to get some assistance maybe even from the
Sheriff's Department to go and conduct the work that we
need to do in order to be responsible neighbors.

So we are continuing to work on this problem and
we will continue to be in close coordination with Ms.
Miller. And I just really appreciate her reaching out to
us during this week to let us know the status of
everything and make sure this is still a priority for us.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you.

MR. MILLER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Ms.
Miller. Thank you, Jennifer.
Grace, anyone else in the queue for public comment?

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
The last hand we have raised at this point is from Francis Coats.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Great. Good afternoon, Mr. Coats.

MR. COATS: Hello. I just received a response from my concerns about providing the public with the information about where lands subject to public fishing rights are located. I just received it yesterday afternoon and it indicates that the staff is not willing to provide the public -- the public with the lists of State lands owned beginning in September 1st, 2015.

The Surveyor General provided lists of vacant State-owned lands several times between 2000 -- 1915, sorry -- 1915 and 1928. And there -- they're Surveyor General publications. They provide precise descriptions of 813 acres of land on the first list throughout the state. And they are accompanied by information regarding how you go about purchasing the land, including the expressed statement that any purchase is going to be subject to fishing rights.

Their -- it's your document. You know, they're your documents. They're your plans. They're official
documents. I got my copies out of the California State Library. There is really no question that they're authentic. If your people question they're authentic, they can go to the State Library and look at your agency's documents in the library.

There's no question that they were compiled by the Surveyor General's employees and staff for the purpose of facilitating the sale of these lands. They were compiled carefully and they were formerly printed in formal pamphlets. And there's really no question -- you know, there are about six or eight reasons why it's pretty clear that practically every single one has an expressed reservation of the fishing rights. And even if they didn't have an expressed reservation, the case law seems to indicate that the courts would always read in the reservation.

So I really don't see -- you know, the reasons for not making these available to the public through the Commission are silly. And I guess maybe -- maybe I'll put them on my Google drive and make them available to the public. I've got them sitting on my computer, because they were available online from the California State Library.

Thank you. Take care.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Mr. Coats.
Okay. Grace, any other speakers?

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
Chair Yee, we have no other hands raised for public comment at this time.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you, Grace. Ms. Lucchesi, any other comments during this before I conclude this part of the public comment?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Not at this time.

Thank you,

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Thank you.

Thank you very much.

So let's move on to our next item of business, which will be the adoption of the minutes from the Commission's meeting of June 23rd, 2020. May I have a motion to approve the minutes and a second.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: So moved, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. We have a motion by Commissioner Miller.

Second by Commissioner Kounalakis.

COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Ms. Lucchesi, please call the roll.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Of course.

Commissioner Kounalakis?
COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner Miller.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Yee?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: The motion passes unanimously.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you.

Alrighty. Next order of business is the Executive Officer's Report. And, Ms. Lucchesi, may we have the report.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes, I'm happy to provide that. Good afternoon. I have a number of things to update the Commission and the public on relating to items and initiatives the Commission staff is working on, but not agendized for this meeting, except for the first one I will talk about.

As you may remember, on September 2nd, 2019, the dive boat MV conception tragically (inaudible) and sank resulting in the loss of 34 human lives. On today's consent agenda is an item to accept a bronze plaque attached to a granite rock that will be placed on the ocean bottom at the site of this tragedy offshore Santa Cruz Island near Platts Harbor in -- off -- in Santa Barbara County. The plaque will include the names of the
victims and will honor the lives lost and serve as
memorial for the victims' families, friends, and those in
the diving community to visit and reflect.

I next want to update the Commission on a recent
fire along the Crockett waterfront in Contra Costa County.
At midnight on August 3rd, staff learned that structures
located along the town of Crockett's waterfront were on
fire. Luckily the Crockett-Carquinez Fire Department
responded swiftly and the Nantucket Restaurant and the
neighboring Bass Club pier sustained only minor damage.

Staff was part of a coordinated emergency cleanup
response team that included the Crockett-Carquinez Fire
Department, the California Department of Oil Spill
Prevention and Response, Union Pacific Railroad, Contra
Costa County HAZMAT Team and the county's building
inspector, and the Commission's lessee, the Dixons. Staff
has contracted with experts to conduct the emergency
demolition and hazardous material cleanup at the site,
including removal of the boathouse fire debris, the pier,
rock and concrete pilings along the shoreline.

Nine 55-gallon barrels of hazardous waste were
transported off-site and disposed of. The Commission has
spent roughly $80,000 on the debris removal and site
cleanup so far. We are now working with the San Francisco
Bay Conservation and Development Commission, the U.S. Army
Corps of Engineers, and the regional water quality control board to obtain permits to remove other in-water facilities.

Next, I want to acknowledge that staff is debuting an updated modernized staff report template at this meeting. Readers will note a change in the way the information is laid out. And we are using a new font for optimal readability and website accessibility to persons with disabilities. The updated template is a major step in website accessibility because our staff reports are the most detailed source of information about the Commission's decisions.

The new template is part of a broader staff effort prompted by AB 434 and related website accessibility laws to make Commission information more accessible to persons with disabilities.

Next, I want to update the Commission on our various oil and gas well and decommissioning projects. First, we are making steady progress in abandoning the wells at the former Rincon leases in Ventura County. On the island, 42 of the 50 offshore wells have been plugged. Onshore, 24 of the 25 have been abandoned. The removal of the wellheads and concrete well cellars is complete and the surface areas has been graded. Total project costs are estimated at $33.7 million, which is about $4.4
million, or 11.5 percent, below plan.

Altogether, 66 of the 75, or 88 percent, of the state's well abandonments are complete and project completion is expected by June of next year.

Item 56 on the Commission's consent agenda today requests authority to retain consultants to assess the feasibility and conduct the environmental review of decommissioning options and the ultimate disposition and future of the island at that site. So we are at the cusp of moving on to the next stage of this major project, which is really exciting.

And due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the Commission and ExxonMobil have determined that further plugging and abandonment work of the wells on Platform Holly is untenable, given the physical distancing requirements and continued personnel and idle equipment costs.

On July 26th, the preservation, cold stack, and demobilization of the platform rig equipment was completed to prevent degradation from the marine environment and ExxonMobil personnel have left the platform. The Commission, through our contractor Beacon West, will continue to secure the platform and monitor and staff the offshore operations in compliance with State regulations.

The Commission and ExxonMobil will have quarterly meetings to assess the potential for restarting work based
on the evolution of the pandemic and State guidance. The Commission and ExxonMobil are proceeding with decommissioning the shore zone PRC 421 Piers. A soil removal test was postponed to next month, because of bird nesting on the access road and at the piers. Once the test is complete, staff will draft a comprehensive project description and collaboration with our sister agencies begin preparing the environmental document to finally remove the infrastructure in the surf zone and on the beach.

Next week on August 27th, we will be hosting a virtual town hall from 6:00 to 8:00 p.m. to update the public about the status of the Platform Holly Piers 421 decommissioning projects, including the upcoming CEQA process associated with removing the 421 piers.

The town hall will be recorded and aired live on channel 19 and rebroadcast through the week. The public can watch it live online or view a recording after the meeting on the commission and city websites.

Finally, under the category of legacy wells, oil and gas wells, the Commission's Legacy Well and Coastal Hazards Program, which was codified in 2013 -- '17, excuse me, through F -- SB 44 by Hannah-Beth Jackson and provides up to $2 million per year to properly remediate legacy wells and coastal hazards, we are making significant
progress on starting to remediate additional wells.

In June, following a competitive selection process, we selected Interact to plug and abandon up to eight legacy wells, depending on costs and available SB 44 funding located offshore Summerland Beach in Santa Barbara County. Permitting is underway, including with the Santa Barbara County Planning and Parks Departments, the Coastal Commission, Army Corps of Engineers, the air pollution control district, U.S. Coast Guard, and the Office of Oil Spill Prevention and Response. We anticipate beginning plugging and abandonment work in the fourth quarter of this year.

And finally, I want to conclude by expressing Commission staff's thoughts and prayers for those evacuating their homes right now, and express how grateful we all are for the State, local, and federal firefighters and first responders on the frontlines. Fires continue to ravage throughout the state. There are currently, based on information I was provided yesterday, 367 fires burning 23 of (inaudible).

And I want to encourage everyone participating in our meeting today to take a moment to visit the Cal Fire Ready for Wildfire website. This readyforwildfire.org website provides resources to help individuals plan for wildfires, as well as prepare their response in the event
of a wildfire. This includes learning about defensible space, hardening your home, and building an emergency supply kit.

Over the past several days, California has experienced a historic lightning siege that resulted in over 10,000 lightning strikes across the state causing more than 367 new fires. And over 6,900 fire personnel from State, local, and federal agencies remain assigned to these incidents. The size and complexity at which these incidents are burning is challenging all aspects of emergency response and it is absolutely critical that individuals and communities heed the warnings of law enforcement and remain prepared to evacuate at a moment's notice.

That concludes my report. Thank you very much, Chair Yee.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Ms. Lucchesi. Lots of great information. And thank you for the direction to the Cal Fire website.

Let me just turn to my fellow Commissioners Kounalakis and Miller to see if there are any comments or questions?

COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: No. Thank you very much for the report. And, yeah, we've got a lot going on in this state right now, but have made some great progress
over the last few years to be able to handle these really
catastrophic events that are unfortunately part of our
modern reality in the state as a result of the impacts of
cclimate change. And it just gives more reason for us all
to continue to do our work to prepare for the future and
the changing environmental conditions in our state.

So thank you, Ms. Lucchesi.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you Commissioner Kounalakis.

So let's move on to our next item, which is the
 adoption of the consent calendar. Let me just turn to
Commissioners Kounalakis and Miller. Are there any items
that you would like to see removed from the consent
calendar?

COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: No.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: (Shakes head.)

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Seeing none, let me call
on Ms. Lucchesi to indicate which items, if any, have been
removed from the consent calendar.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Of course. Consent
item 25 is removed from the agenda altogether and will be
considered at a later time.

Consent items 1 and 55 are moved from the consent
agenda to the regular agenda for discussion.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right. Very well. So we
have item 25 removed from the consent calendar to a later date. Items number 1 and number 55 moved from the consent calendar to the regular calendar. And then let me see if there is anyone who is joining us virtually who wishes to speak on any item remaining on the consent calendar. If so, please raise your Zoom hand or dial star 9 if joining by phone now.

Grace --

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:

Chair Yee, we have no -- we have no hands raised --

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:

-- for public comment on the consent agenda.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you. Thank you. So seeing and hearing none, we will now proceed with the vote. May I have a motion to adopt the consent calendar and a second.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: So moved, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. A motion by Commissioner Miller.

Seconded by --

COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Second.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: -- Commissioner Kounalakis.
Great. Ms. Lucchesi, please call the roll.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner Kounalakis?

COMMISSIONER KOUNALAKIS: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner Gayle -- commissioner Miller, excuse me.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Aye. No worries.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Yee?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: The motion passes unanimously.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you. All right. Let's then proceed to our next order of business, which will be the regular calendar.

Item 59 is an informational update on efforts to develop the Commission's 2021 to 2025 strategic plan. Let me turn to Ms. Lucchesi for the presentation.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Of course. Thank you. Your staff Katie Filipp-Robinson[SIC], along with our consultant, Lisa Beutler will be providing the staff presentation today.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right. Thank you.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

MS. ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair,
Commissioners. My name is Katie Robinson-Filipp and I'm a SeaGrant Fellow at the Commission. In April 2020, the Commission awarded the strategic plan consulting contract to Stantec Consulting. Immediately, Commission staff began working with the Stantec team to identify stakeholders for a series of stakeholder interviews. These interviews are just one component of the Commission's engagement and outreach to develop the strategic plan.

Commission staff are currently preparing a series of tribal government roundtables, as well as one-on-one consultations. We will continue to work with Stantec to engage the public, our stakeholders, staff, and government partners. Today, Stantec will present the key topics and intersecting themes from the stakeholder interviews, followed by an update from Executive Officer Jennifer Lucchesi on next steps before opening for comments and questions. And now I'd like to welcome Lisa Beutler from Stantec to provide her presentation.

MS. BEUTLER: Thank you, Katie. My name is Lisa Beutler from Stantec and I'll be providing an overview of the results from our stakeholder interview series. Go to the next slide, please.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: During the discussion, I'll cover
the stakeholder interview series, just the general approach, the planning process, the update process, and discuss the results.

Moving to the next slide.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: So this is a little overview of what we did. Interviews were conducted between June 17th, which was a test interview. We tested the questions with several stakeholders, went final with them, and then about six weeks altogether was -- resulted in an interview process. We were able to interview 79 people, out of a list of about 149. I'll talk about that in a second.

Our method of reaching out was an initial email from your Executive Officer. We followed up to check on people's availability. We confirmed everyone had actually received the emails. If not, we went back and cleaned up the list. And then we did waves of follow-up to try to get as many people as possible in the time frame we were discussing.

So with that, there was 13 people not available for interview during the time frame and 12 declined. Some of them declined just because they felt they didn't have enough information to participate and some just begged off, because given the current circumstances with COVID and everything else, it was just -- just more than they
could manage.

Altogether, we were not able to reach 45 people. And there are a variety of reasons for that, which are not terribly relevant to this.

We'll go to the next one.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: We -- these are the participants that we talked to by the stakeholder sectors. There was an environmental justice community, an air quality and public health community. And I'll let you go ahead and read. But these are the interests, the kinds of -- the topics that the particular stakeholder groups were known to be interested in and active in conversations.

So as you can see -- and some of these were individuals we had -- you yourself had already talked to, for example, the port and the port interests.

So going to the next slide.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: Our planning assumptions in going in and forming the questions for the interviews process were that the plan was just being updated. Generally speaking, people felt pretty good about the existing plan. This was really about updating the plan to reflect the current situation. Our understanding was that -- and belief was that we could learn from the past and see how
well the last plan had gone, that the stakeholders were very much valued partners. And whatever it is they had to say would be very helpful to the update process, and that we were operating under some really unique pandemic circumstances, so that are outreach would reflect a point in time that was quite specific to what was occurring in the rest of the world.

Moving down.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: One of the things that we want to really caution on is there are always limitations and outreach at this point. We did our very bust working with the staff to make sure we had good representation of all the sectors, but it was sample representation. There were certainly individuals that might have been missed. There were types that we can't guarantee that that particular group of people we spoke to completely represented everyone. So that -- that's always a limitation.

The other one is the hazardous summary. When I gave this original presentation to staff, it took two hours, and I'm spending about 10 to 12 minutes with you today.

So moving down.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: So our interview themes. This is
what we heard when we talked to people. So once again, the things that we talked to people about -- and I'll move to the next slide.

---o0o---

MS. BEUTLER: We asked them to give us feedback. We asked them to tell us their big ideas. We asked them what kinds of things should be considered in the next update and we asked for advice.

So one of the things that always happens in interviews like this is people oftentimes ignore the questions and go straight to the things that they're concerned about. And this particular interview session was no different. We did hear lots of things over and over again, things like the importance of considering climate change, the need to collaborate, convene, mediate, build alignment. Lots of conversations about equity and environmental justice.

In fact, I've been doing these types of interviews for a number of years and I have never heard the urgency in conversations like the urgency I heard in this set.

Lots of discussion about the post-petroleum economy, the evolving nature of the public trust, and what constituted appropriate use. I noticed an earlier speaker talking about housing. We did hear that. We did hear
questions like that during the interview process.

Moving down to the next slide.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: So when people talked about climate change, it was really interesting to us, because most of them actually didn't refer to it as climate change. They talked about it in the context of how they experienced it. So they were very concerned about sea level rise. There was some discussion of heat island, urban and forestry. So when people talked about heat, they were talking about how hot things were and what a problem that was, the fire season for example.

There was an interest in looking what the Commission could actually do to correct climate change and a sense that the Commission did have a role in that. And then also the fact that some ultra weather patterns like flash extreme water events could possibly change, even beyond just the sea level rise, but that could all of a sudden create some really unusual Public Trust issues in riverways that were flooded.

Some moving down to the next slide.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: Something we heard over and over again was what people thought the Commission could do in terms of building alignment. They didn't use the word
"Switzerland", but they talked about the Commission as a really wonderful neutral place to have a really honest broker, a place where people could bring ideas and they would be considered in a larger way than they might be in other types of venues.

There was a clear interest in having ongoing stakeholder engagement, that the Commission was a great place to bring the parties together that didn't otherwise have a natural venue, and that the Commission could really create an important leadership role. They wanted the Commission to create some clarity of direction on some of the big topics of the day.

Moving down.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: Once again, equity and environmental justice. A lot of conversation about things that needed to be done about racial disparities. One of that -- one of those things had to do with representation, representation in the workforce, representation in the advisory bodies, every place where decisions were made making sure that people were adequately represented.

We heard about access, and access meant a lot of different things. One of them was pure language. Do I understand what you're saying? And that doesn't necessarily mean different languages. It might mean are
you speaking with too much of a science focus that is really not assessable. I don't really understand how that might make it result in a decision.

A very interesting thing that we heard and this was -- this was one part of the sector that we talked to was the idea of the extraction of wealth. So things are happening in some communities. Some communities are overly impacted by what happens. And the wealth is created by those activities that's not returning to that community. So there was interest in trying to find an equity equation for that and create some form of a social license to operate.

Moving down.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: A lot of discussion about the post-petroleum economy and a lot of excitement about what the Commission could do in terms of a blue and green economy, looking at renewable energy. There were concerns also about liabilities with stranded infrastructure, particularly with oil and gas facilities. And also, the fact that when you start doing new kinds of energy production or new types of activities -- so, for example, say you went with aquaculture and brought in some new types of activities with kelp farming, how would that impact the existing fishing industry or if we decided to
look at doing more wind or wave generation, how would that
displace something else? So questions about how you would
really weigh the importance of those different activities
and the costs of conversion.

Moving down.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: Lots of discussion about the Public
Trust and it was not remotely consistent. So we heard
people talking about the ports and what was the
appropriate use for the ports. Some people asked, and
they believed strongly, that in the time of COVID, it was
unlikely that things would go back to the way they used to
be. So when you thought about public access in terms of
retail access, restaurants, those types things, is it
going to look the same and should your decision making
about public access be based on what we understand to be
the way people gather today.

There was a question about rising sea level and
where does the Trust actually exist? So if there are
barriers that are constructed, and that water is
displaced, and the beaches go away, what is happening
there? Is there actually a trespass on the Trust? The
fact that that stuff has been lost, should that be
replaced in some way by the people who are preventing
natural sea rise, or conversely, what -- what are the
obligations to -- is there some form of compensation that
needs to go to the people that have lost their land?

And then finally, once again, access is not just
physical, that we need to think about access. Also, in
terms of education, that people may not even know they
have a right to be able to access their Public Trust.

Next.

---o0o---

MS. BEUTLER: We heard some other things that
these were repeated, but they weren't consistent across
the sectors. So the things that I talked to you about
before were things every sector talked about. Here, we
heard people with a focus on land management. We're very,
very interested in taking a look at how adaptive
management was done and really encouraging the Commission
to promote innovative tactics as they were looking at the
ways they wanted to look at projects.

Lots of discussion about the need to be flexible,
that things are changing so rapidly, so some of the old
ways that things were done maybe are no longer going to be
as effective. And perhaps, we should be more flexible in
how we look at that. Of course, and I hear this and have
for many years in almost all the projects I do like this,
but a lot of questions about can we do some permanent
streamlining, and that's a constant, particularly when
multiple agencies are involved in their conflicts and what agencies are requiring.

Always an interest in improving technology. And some -- a subset of the people are really, really interested in how you are going to define success. They wanted you to have good metrics.

Moving to the next slide.

--00--

MS. BEUTLER: Lots of discussion about money. There was a real interest in optimizing revenue, making sure that you had on-time collection, new funding tools to be available, and that you really looked at securing funding that was aligned with your program.

So with that, I have one more, I think. A couple more.

--00--

MS. BEUTLER: We ask -- the last thing that we asked for was advice. And so some of the advice that people gave us was, once again, to think about COVID-19, how that was going to fundamentally alter the world. And they encouraged us to take into account all the new technology and ways people are interacting and see if we can really expand that. In some ways, it would increase access, but also that barriers may exist in doing that.

They also encouraged the sort of 360 look. There
was wide, wide compliments that were offered for the fact
the staff is wanting to hear and the Commission was
wanting to hear from the stakeholders. And they really
encouraged a continuing conversation.

They felt that the Commission had a role to both
listen and teach, once again, that people may not know the
full clarity of what the Commission could do or what its
responsibilities are.

A very strong interest in presence in the
community. What that meant was is that staff did come to
where things were happening, that there was a place based
understanding. It wasn't a theoretical understanding of
any particular project or activity. People did ask for
the Commission to do more clarity around their authority,
goals, and purpose, and once again, this idea of staff
flexibility.

So moving down.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: Our next steps. And just for quick
overview, I'll cover this very quickly.

So next slide.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: Based on what we heard, we wanted
to let you know what we thought you might want to revise
in the actual planning process. And this is just a fairly
high level overview. But we knew that the amount of effort we as the consultants would be doing would be very low with regards to the message from the Commissioners. Clearly, that's going to come from you.

You also have a strong vision and mission. The things that you say about your partnership, some of the appendixes[SIC] are in great shape. So we really don't look at a lot of refresh there, except maybe making it pretty. We thought -- we wanted to go back and fine-tune the principles and values a little bit. That was mostly around the language and updating it a little bit.

And then the place where the vast majority of the work will be to take all of the advice that we received, go back, take a look at the strategic goals, the workplan, and how we would approach each of these various items that you have in your existing plan and just update it. And that's going to probably be where the bulk of the work is.

So moving on to the next slide.

--o0o--

MS. BEUTLER: I'll turn this back over to Jennifer.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Great. Thank you so much, Lisa, for the incredible presentation and for your entire team's hard work to complete these interviews in such a short period of time and under very unusual and
unprecedented circumstances.

As you know, as you can see, this presentation reflects the key topics and important themes from a series of stakeholder interviews across various field interests. The Commission continues to work with our stakeholders and partners to ensure robust engagement process. And I really want to highlight that the staff are working to prepare a series of dedicated tribal government roundtable sessions and one-on-one consultations.

So in Lisa's -- one of her previous slides, where she listed out the various stakeholders that we interviewed with, I want to just clarify that we -- her and her team and our staff conducted interviews with some Native American nonprofit organizations, but we are conducting a very separate and intentional outreach effort with our tribal governments and consultation one-on-one meetings.

So we are continuing to (inaudible) to conduct internal outreach amongst Commission staff. And we expect, in working towards a draft plan for review for the August -- excuse me, the October 22nd Commission meeting.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: And before I get to
the traditional, you know, we want to hear from you discussion, I do want to share just a brief story. A couple days ago, I was on a bike ride with my youngest son. He's nine years old. His name is Harrison. And he asked, he said, "Mom, can -- when we get home, can we cut up an avocado"? And I said, "Sure. You know, we can make a salad, or a sandwich, or quesadillas, or even make a smoothie out of it". And he turns to me and he said, "Mom, I don't want to eat it. I want to make a face mask".

And I share that story, because we're very genuinely interested, I think -- if I may speak for the Commissioners and for staff in really hearing from our stakeholders and the public, at least from the Commission staff's perspective, we -- there is no doubt that we live a lot of times in our own bureaucratic State government bubble. And we have a long history date -- going back 80 years of how we do business. But as a staff, we are incredibly open to different and new ideas, because we understand we are at an incredible inflection point. It is so different than what we are used to and it's going to be changing very fast as we move forward.

And so while we may look at things in a way or our traditional way of doing business leads us down one path, we need to hear from the public, and our
stakeholders, and our partners to teach us, to show us, to
advise us on how we can look at things differently and
take different alternative paths, so that we can advance
the State's policy goals, that we can really serve all the
people of California in the most effective and efficient
manner.

And so with that, next slide, please.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: I just want to thank
you and we are -- our entire team is available to answer
any questions.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you, Ms.
Lucchesi, and Ms. Beutler, and to Katie. Wonderful
presentation and update.

Let me just turn to Commissioners Kounalakis or
Miller with anyone questions or comments.

Okay.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thanks, Madam Chair.
I just -- you, know I sit on a lot of these boards and I
just -- huge kudos to the team that this is the most
robust, and thoughtful, and open strategic plan I've seen
done in a really long time. And it's a huge testament to
your work and your open-mindedness of making avocados as
face masks that has really gotten us there. So thank you
for that.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you. Thank you. I do want to just reiterate just the fact that we do want to hear from people. This is a time where I'm going to say that government doesn't have all the answers, and the challenges especially that all of us have experienced with the pandemic, certainly the impacts of what's happening with our economy. I think many of the stakeholders probably are beginning to think with much more future orientation, but at the same time, we know, for example, that just the very nature of the work that's being done with many of our -- within our own organization and certainly with our trustees is likely going to change going forward.

So these are all the things that we hope will be part of the strategic plan process about just how we really can have this guidance that is responsive to just how fluid things have become, and certainly how uncertain they are going forward. So I do also want to just welcome any thoughts or suggestions from the general public.

Let's see. I'm going to just turn to Grace now, because I knew we had a public speaker earlier who did sign up for this particular item and there probably are others. So, Grace, will you just queue them up and we are ready to hear from those who want to comment on Item 59.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
Chair Yee, thank you. We have seven speakers that have requested time to speak. We'd like to start with Larry Hanson and followed by Jennifer Savage.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Wonderful. Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr. Hanson.

MR. HANSON: That's the word I was looking for. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, we can.

MR. HANSON: Okay. That's great. So I'm Larry Hanson. I am representing California River Watch, which has a deep concern for the impacts caused by seabed mining. California River Watch is a nonprofit organization, just to give you a little better bit of a background, with a stated mission to strengthen the ability of citizens to protect water quality in rivers, tributary watersheds, oceans, bays, wetlands, surface and groundwater in California.

And we do this through education, pollution prevention, legal enforcement, and preservation. We work with many California agencies applying Clean Water Act, the Endangered Species Act, and many California laws to protect waters of the state. We have a site where citizens can contact us about water pollution issues. And we are -- we are one of the many environmental organizations that have signed on to the recent letter,
seabed mining would harm the marine ecosystem and should be addressed.

How to address this is to prohibit it. To be clear, this prohibition would apply to phosphorite -- phosphorite -- phosphorite -- is that how you say it -- metals and metal-enriched sands as stated in the letter.

The issue is extremely important at this time. Instead of combating significant impacts in current industries, with minimal effects because, in part, they play the economic's card. We have an opportunity here to not allow that to happen. Even with restrictions and industry to get a foot in the door is ripe for expansion.

Moreover, many extraction industries will go beyond making under -- making under-staffed enforcement try to catch them with excesses, or misprocessing, or, we've seen it many times, they pay the fines as a cost of doing business.

The ocean ecosystem is already struggling with Dead zones, dying coral reefs, mercury pollution, plastic acidification and overfishing. Adding further extraction processes, as well as removal of ocean components, will add to the problems and not take us in the right direction, which is ceasing or restricting certain ongoing activities, as well as restoration and preservation. That's the right direction.
Finally, climate change is an overall compelling reason that is exacerbating the imbalance of everything. Especially our oceans. I'm sitting here at a place where I have been evacuated from my home due to wildfires in Sonoma County that are ravaging.

So the climate change has been delineated for decades by scientists. These warnings have been virtually ignored and we're seeing some of these. So if I could create a metaphor here. The ocean too can burn like we're having landscapes burn due to the climate change impacts. This is a time to do something. Let's go in the right direction.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Mr. Hanson. And we wish you all the best in your situation with the fires.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Chair Yee, our next speaker is Jennifer Savage followed by Ken Owen.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Good afternoon, Jennifer.

MS. SAVAGE: Hi. Good afternoon. Jennifer Savage, Surfrider Foundation. With regards to the draft strategic plan, first, thank you for striving to ensure the development of a thoughtful, robust, stakeholder-informed plan. We really appreciate the
presentation and the effort driving it. With regard to the identification of key intersecting themes, Surfrider believes that the inclusion of emerging issues and proactive protections reflects these areas where multiple
concerns overlap.

Specifically, including within the draft strategic plan, the revising of the Commission's policies and regulations to preclude the possibility of seabed mining for hard minerals applies to at least one identified cross-cutting theme, the evolving nature of the Public Trust Doctrine in land and resources management.

We know that the Commission does not yet have a comprehensive analysis of the potential impacts of seabed mining, primarily because you have yet to receive an application that would facilitate such an analysis, but we do have sufficient information to show that seabed mining for hard minerals in nearshore areas is incompatible with a sustainable ocean economy.

We also know that seabed mining is a destructive act that harms fragile, critical ecosystems. And we should therefore not wait for a harmful practice to threaten the Public Trust, but instead proactively protect California's submerged tidelands.

We also believe that as the Commission continues to align with California's goal to shed dependence on
fossil fuels and move toward clean energy, the need to
ensure staff has adequate time and resources to focus on
what will all -- move us all forward will be better served
by preempting what we know to be harmful.

Along with our partners, we submitted a letter in
advance of this meeting outlining our recommendations and
thoughts in greater detail. We appreciate your staff's
willingness to discuss this issue and the conversations
we've had so far. And we look forward to continuing to
work towards the shared goals of safeguarding California's
Trust land and resources far into the future.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you.

Okay. Next, we have Mr. Owen.

MR. OWEN: Are you able to hear me okay?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes.

MR. OWEN: Great. Good afternoon, Chairman Yee
and members of the Commission. My name is Ken Owen. I'm
Executive Director of Channel Islands Restoration. We're
a nonprofit organization and we do restoration for native
plants and animals, primarily in Santa Barbara and Ventura
County. We restore in multiple habitats but also in
coastal marshes wetlands. And so we too are concerned
about the issue of seabed mining as you consider your
update to your strategic plan.
We're advocating that the state close our waters to seabed mining. The state really needs a policy that will protect fragile ecosystems that make up our coastal waters. There have been huge advances in the last few years in seabed mining extraction technology. This could create a second gold rush on the California coast as companies compete to extract valuable minerals. But seabed machinery -- mining machine -- seabed mining machinery will directly destroy countless amounts of marine life. It will create sediment clouds, which will smother other marine life for long distances and impact all marine life from plankton all the way up to fish and marine mammals.

As others have noted, the State of Oregon has addressed threats to seabed mining in their waters and we believe that California should do so as well. Also, in thousands of places on our coast, particularly in the Channel Islands region, sea level rise, since the last ice age, has covered important archaeological sites. Undersea archaeology is a thriving science and our nearshore seabed is rich in archaeological and culturally significant sites. Seabed mining would destroy these sites, which could be an immeasurable loss to Native American cultures and to science.

We're concerned that laws that are meant to
preserve ecological, archaeological, and cultural resources may not be adequate to protect these yet undiscovered sites and marine life.

So again, we urge that as you consider your strategic plan that you work to protect our waters by closing them to seabed mining.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you Mr. Owen.

Grace, our next speaker.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:

Thank you. Our next speaker is Mark Welther, followed by Casey Cruikshank.

MR. WELTHER: Good afternoon. My name is Mark Welther. Thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today. I'm the President and CEO of the non-profit Redwood Forest Foundation. We work to establish community-driven acquisition, protection, restoration and management of forest lands in the redwood region for the long-term benefit of the surrounding communities.

We own and operate the 50,000 acre Usal Redwood Forest in the lost coasts or Northern Mendocino County, a property that includes critical salmonid watershed habitat, each of which -- two critical watersheds, each of which has a recovery -- coho recovery plan written in collaboration with the California Department of Fish and
Wildlife.

Our organization and the State have invested heavily in the health of these coastal riparian zones in order to protect habitat for coho and other threatened aquatic species. As you know, our state is blessed with amazing ancient forests. These ecosystems provide critical habitat, increased biodiversity and regional economic vitality for the long term.

California is also blessed with equally amazing ancient ecosystems on the seafloor just off the coast. These extremely fragile habitats, as slow growing as the redwoods, provide vital shelter for fish, and help regulate the climate by sequestering methane. The seafloor is also a huge carbon sink in certain areas that store methane that will be -- may be rapidly released if disturbed by mining equipment.

It's worth -- it's not worth risking these critical areas for the short-term economic gains. And it doesn't make sense for California to leave itself in the position of having to fight one dangerous seafloor mining proposal after another. It would be better to stop it before it starts.

I encourage you to include a precautionary policy prohibiting seabed mining in your strategic plan to guide your future work.
Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Mr. Welther.

Our next speaker.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Our next speaker is Casey Cruikshank followed by Tom Rudolph.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you.

Good afternoon, Casey.

MS. CRUIKSHANK: Hi there. My name is Casey and I'm speaking on behalf of the Northcoast Environmental Center in Humboldt County. We also signed on to the seabed mining letter.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today about the potential threats seabed mining poses for California communities and our fishing and tourism industries. Based on the rapid growth of the seabed mining industry globally, we believe it's not a matter of if this extremely harmful activity comes knocking on California's shores, but when. We encourage you to please lead the way by preventing seabed mining before this destructive activity begins off our coast.

The mission of the Northcoast Environmental Center is to promote understanding of the relations between people and the biosphere and to conserve, protect and celebrate terrestrial, aquatic and marine ecosystems.
At the NEC we recognize that California seeks to position itself as a leader in the blue economy of the 21st century, but sea mining is the opposite of the blue economy. We have fought many dangerous industrial proposals over the years and stand ready to oppose seabed mining. But Californians shouldn't have to fight to prevent something so obviously harmful to our state.

Again, please work proactively to prevent seabed mining off our treasured coast. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Casey.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Our next speaker is Tom Rudolph follows by Anna Christensen.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right.

MR. RUDOLPH: Thank you. Good afternoon, Chair Yee and members of the Commission. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, we can. Thank you. Good afternoon.

MR. RUDOLPH: My name is Tom Rudolph and I'm here today on behalf of the Pew Charitable Trusts. First, I want to express our appreciation for the Commission's work to develop your new strategic plan, even as a very difficult 2020 has continued to unfold.

Pew is new to your public process and we've
greatly appreciated the thoughtfulness and commitment you and your collective staffs have been investing in this new plan, as well as the collaborative hand that's been extended to us as new participants asking you to consider a new approach to a new issue. Specifically, we again ask you to include a review of your policies and procedures for consideration of mineral leasing on State submerged lands as an element of the new strategic plan.

In the letter we submitted in conjunction with partners earlier this week, we tried to begin exploring some structural questions about how to appropriately address this issue within the framework of a Commission's strategic plan. In this effort, we were aided by some helpful discussions with Commission and Commissioner staff, and I'd like to thank the Commission for those conversations as well.

My letter suggests prioritizing a broad effort to identify and, where appropriate, address emerging issues that could potentially impact Public Trust resources, including, but not limited to, potential interests in hard minerals like metals and phosphorite found on or under the seabed on submerged State lands.

I'd like to suggest today that this emerging issues examination could fit logically under one of the potential themes teased out by the staff and Ms. Beutler
in their work to date, specifically the evolving nature of
the Public Trust Doctrine and the appropriate uses of
Public Trust resources.

As I mentioned to you the first time I came to a
Commission meeting, I found the use of the word "evolving"
in this context in the year 2016 to 2020 strategic plan
and the concepts that embodied to be innovative and
refreshing and we very much support continued work toward
that end.

Finally, I've mentioned to you all before that it
seems like every week there's compelling new information
on this topic in the scientific literature or popular
press, and that we would like to try and highlight some of
these for you all whenever possible. Earlier this week,
there was an article on a mining industry news site
focused on phosphorite, one of the minerals potentially
found off California.

Our letter to the Commission in June took a deep
dive on phosphorite, including the fact that three large
marine phosphorite mining proposals had emerged in other
countries in recent years, and all had triggered
contentious and lengthy debates. One of the projects we
studied is a proposal from a U.S. company to mine seabed
phosphorite in the Mexican Exclusive Economic Zone.

And on Tuesday, it was reported that the company,
despite two previous denials by the Mexican government, has no intentions of giving up and is, in fact, pursuing a multi-billion dollar claim through arbitration under the North American Free Trade Act.

To us, this represents a cautionary tale of warning that an open door to seabed mining will eventually invite interested parties to enter and they won't easily take no for an answer.

To us, the science is quite clear that this activity is incompatible with a sustainable ocean economy in the nearshore area managed by the State. And a clear preclusion on the development of a seabed mining industry would be a sensible step towards long-term stewardship of not only Natural Resources Agency, but also Commission resources, because it will avoid lengthy debates over individual mining lease applications in the years ahead.

Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Mr. Rudolph.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
Chair Yee, we have Anna Christensen and then followed by Katherine O'Dea.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right. Thank you.

Good afternoon, Anna.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Hello. I'm not sure how I got on this link -- this list of speakers, but I'm happy to
address the issue of the Public Trust and also the precautionary principle, which is these are -- these are terms that are big. They have a lot of history. They're somewhat legal.

But they're also very, very much open to a common sense interpretation. So what is trust? The public trusts you to care for resources as did the Roman public that were inevitably, cannot be privatized. You cannot privatize the air or the water. But there are corporations who believe they have, let's say, more equity, more right than others to the use of these resources. They get leases, mineral leases. They get laws passed like a mining law in the 1800s, which pretty much gives them free rein to go here, there and everywhere and wreak havoc on the health and the welfare of the land and the community.

And this we need to acknowledge. If we are going to be proceeding with caution when it comes to the future, as we have not done in the past, we need to understand that we have many laws, and we have decided to change some and limit others, and then create new laws, because we want to make a better world. We need to act and understand that -- I just heard a gentleman earlier in the meeting say, well, what about the mineral leases? I mean, nobody wants to get sued, you know. But what is the right
of any company, as this gentleman just spoke, especially a
global company or any individual to do something that
is -- it's going to totally destroy our water, the ability
of people even to breathe. How much right can any -- any
business have?

And I would -- I would just state that undersea
mining, no. Mining the moon, no. Let's be just very real
about this. We need to shut down this -- this
exploitation of oil, gas, and minerals in favor of our
ultimate survival. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Anna.
I believe next we have Ms. O'Dea.

MS. O'DEA: Good afternoon. I assume you can
hear me.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes.

MS. O'DEA: My name is Katherine O'Dea and I'm
the Executive Director of an organization called Save Our
Shores. Since 1978, we have been protecting and
conserving the marine ecosystems of a significant portion
of California's central coast. Our first task was to stop
oil drilling or the threat of oil drilling in our Monterey
Bay. We were successful at that, but not satisfied with
what we had accomplished. We were worked hard with others
in our region, in our meters, in the federal
administration at the time to have the Monterey Bay
designated as a National Marine Sanctuary with its largest proposed boundaries from just south of San Francisco to just north of San Luis Obispo in Cambria.

More recently, with our colleagues at Surfrider, and specifically Monterey Bay Surfrider Chapter, as well as the statewide organization, we, with the support of the State Lands Commission, negotiated closure of the last coastal sand mine in the United States. We are therefore opposed to seabed mining. And we would prefer not to have to fight the fight to prevent it from happening on our coast and to protect one of our most important economic industries, which is tourism that brings millions and millions of dollars into our economy, but we will do so, if necessary.

Instead, we ask that you take preemptive measures and prohibit seabed mining from becoming a policy in California, and continue to protect our most gorgeous coastline. It has got to be one of the most gorgeous in the world. Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Ms. O'Dea for coming forward.

Grace, our next speakers.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:

Chair Yee, we have no other hands raised for comment on this item.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well Thank you. Let me just -- actually, let me took to Jennifer, if you have any comments in response to any of the public comments?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Not at this time.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: There were a number of comments around seabed mining. And I want to thank all the members of the public that spoke on -- on that issue. We are conducting our independent research on that, and how we will fit that into the strategic plan. We also really appreciate everyone who spoke providing additional information that we will incorporate and help inform our draft. So with that, I'll turn it back to you, Chair Yee.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. Thank you. And I also want to thank all of the public speakers. And, you know, the strategic planning process is going to be very public, so there will be other opportunities down the road. The iterative nature of this, we're just very appreciative of all the public input along the way. So thank you again to those who took the time to make comments today.

I want to be mindful of the agenda -- the rest of the agenda, so Ms. Lucchesi, I'm thinking maybe we should maybe move to Item 61, if that's okay.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes, and I would --

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Does that make sense?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes, that makes sense at this point. I would like to, for the record, acknowledge that Commissioner Kounalakis did have to step away and her alternate, her Science Policy Advisory, Matt Dumlao, has stepped in as her alternate for this portion of the meeting.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: And onto Item 61 sounds great.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. So we are moving now to Item 61. This is considering adoption of a resolution recognizing October 7th, 2020 as California Clean Air Day. And let me look to Sheri Pemberton for the presentation. Good afternoon.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: You're on mute, Sheri.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON:

Sorry. Okay.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: So I'm just having a little bit of technical difficulties. I'm sorry. Could we reverse the PowerPoint or is that not

Sorry. We can start the PowerPoint. Thank you Madam Chair and Commissioners. This item recommends that the Commission adopt a resolution recognizing October 7th, 2020 as Clean Air Day.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Clean Air Day is an initiative developed by the Coalition for Clean Air.

AGP VIDEO: Ms. Pemberton?

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Yes.

AGP VIDEO: Sorry, we can't see you PowerPoint.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Oh.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Bill, is bringing it up, Sheri. Just hold on tight.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. There you go.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: You're on slide two right now, Sheri.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Okay.

Great. Sorry.

--o0o--

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: That's okay.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Clean Air Day is an initiative developed by the Coalition for
Clean Air to draw attention to the importance of clean air and share ways that everyone can be part of the solution. California Clean Air Day is on October 7th, 2020. And the goal of this day is to raise awareness about sources of air pollution, educate people how to reduce their air pollution footprint, and start conversations about improving air quality across California.

By raising awareness and actively working to reduce air pollution, everybody can help ensure that every breath we take is a breath of clean air. One of the ways that the Commission can support Clean Air Day is by adopting a resolution to proclaim October 7th as Clean Air Day, and encourage residences, businesses, employees, community members, and other governmental entities to take the Clean Air Pledge and participate in this year's Clean Air Day.

The Commission's Vision is to be a recognized leader that champions environmentally sustainable public land management and balanced resource protection for the benefit and enjoyment of current and future generations. Adopting this resolution is consistent with this vision and our Environmental Justice Policy.

Recognizing and participating in Clean Air Day reflects the Commission's commitment to addressing disproportionate impacts on low-income communities and
communities of color, recognizing that harmful air quality significantly impacts and burdens marginalized and disadvantaged communities.

Many cities in California rank among those as having the worst air quality in America and climate change is manifesting in the hottest years in history, as we've seen this week, increasing high ozone days and contributing to devastating wildfires. Despite these challenges, we can all do our part to improve air quality.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON:

Scientists, government agencies, businesses, ports, and many others have all committed to participate in this year's Clean Air Day. And the Commission can do its part by joining this effort.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Given the pandemic, the activities to facilitate clean air will look different this year. But what the Commission can do is encourage employee engagement by announcing its participation in Clean Air Day through its newsletter and Internet, adopting the attached resolution, and promoting California Clean Air Day on social media and among its...
sister State agencies.

Next slide, please.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Staff therefore recommends that the Commission adopt the proposed resolution recognizing October 7th, 2020 as Clean Air Day.

Thank you. And I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you, Sheri.

First, let me just thank the Coalition for Clean Air for, I think, just really the broad outreach to many of our State agencies. And I can't think of a more timely topic, given what we've experienced this past period, and really look forward to certainly engaging my staff team and it's -- there's so many things that we each can do on an individual basis to really contribute to the overall goals. So really appreciate the presentation and certainly, the State Lands Commission's resolution adoption item on the agenda today.

Are there comments by Commissioners Miller or Dumlao?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Nothing from me.

Do we have -- oh, do we have any public comment on this particular item, Grace, Item 61.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
Chair Yee, we have no hands raised for public comment on this item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Then may I have a motion to adopt the staff recommendation and a second.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: So moved.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Motion by Commission Dumlao, seconded by Commission Miller.

Ms. Lucchesi, will you call the roll.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes, certainly.

Commissioner Dumlao?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner Miller?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Yee?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: The motion passes unanimously.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Wonderful. Thank you.

Okay. Then let's see, our next item shall we move -- I'm thinking how about the --
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Item 55?
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, uh-huh, that we removed from the consent calendar. Let's move to Item 55.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Excellent. Our staff presentation will be provided by Nicole Dobroski, Assistant Chief for our Marine Environmental Protection Division.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: And I believe she has a PowerPoint as well that Phil will be bringing up.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.
(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION

ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and Commissioners. My name is Nicole Dobroski. I'm an Assistant Chief of the Marine Environmental Protection Division and Manager of the Commission's Marine Invasive Species Program. I'm here today to recommend your approval of a proposed amendment to the Article 4.8 regulations that involve the management of vessel biofouling in State waters.

Next slide.

--o0o--
ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: As a bit of background, Article 4.8 requires vessels to submit the Annual Vessel Reporting Form, known as the AVRF, at least 24 hours in advance of the first arrival at a California port for each calendar year. The form collects information about a vessel operational and maintenance practices that influence the accumulation of biofouling on vessel surfaces.

Commission staff used these data to assess the risk of a vessel introducing nonindigenous species into California waters.

Next slide.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION

ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: Vessels may currently submit the AVRF to the Commission via our online portal at misp.io, as a PDF attachment to an email, or by fax. Most forms are received as a PDF attachment to an email. Processing these attachments involves printing the form, date stamping it, and then manually entering the form data into a Commission database.

After the AVRF is entered into the database, an equality assurance review is conducted. Staff files retain these....(inaudible)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Nicole, we lost your
volume.

MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION

ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: Next slide, please.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Nicole, we lost your volume for a bit. Do you mind repeating that. I'm sorry.

MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION

ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: Sure. After the AVRF is entered into the database an equality assurance review is conducted. Staff files and retains these forms based on the Commission's record retention schedule. Altogether, staff spends approximately 1,700 hours processing 1,800 forms reach year.

Next slide.

--o0o--

MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION

ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: The proposed amendment to Article 4.8 would require that all AVRFs are submitted via the Commission's online portal, misp.io. Submittal through the online portal allows vessel owners and operators to directly submit the form to the database and to save copies of the form on the online portal for future use.

The online portal has automatic rules built in to help ensure the data are entered in an appropriate format, which helps cut down on errors during form submittal. If
all AVRFs were to be submitted through misp.io each year, staff estimates that the total annual form processing time would drop from 1,727 hours to 154 hours per year. This equates to approximately $57,390 in savings that could be redirected to other high priority program needs, including compliance assessment and enforcement.

Next slide.

--o0o--

MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION

ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: The process to amend the Article 4.8 regulations began with publication in the notice register on May 7th, 2020. The proposed amendment was open to public comment through June 23rd, 2020. If approved by the Commission, staff expects to submit the completed rulemaking file to the Office of Administrative Law in October. And if approved by OAL, the proposed amendment would take effect on January 1, 2021.

Next slide.

--o0o--

MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION

ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: During the public comment period, staff received 22 comments from five individuals and organizations. The major concern was that vessels do not have reliable broadband Internet access while at sea and would thus have difficulty accessing the online portal...
to submit the AVRF and comply with reporting requirements. Furthermore, some vessels are routed with short notice to California ports and combined with unreliable Internet access would have trouble complying with the requirement to submit the AVRF at least 24 hours in advance of arrival.

Commenters requested that alternative submission methods, including submission of forms....(inaudible)

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Nicole, your audio has gone blank again.

CHIEF COUNSEL BLACKMON: Her feed may have frozen.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: All right. So with that, let me see if I can pull up her presentation really quick.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yeah.

MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: I'm -- can you hear me again?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes, we can hear you.

MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: I apologize for the connection difficulties.

Next slide, please.
ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: Staff appreciates the time that commenters took to identify concerns about the proposed amendment. Staff's response is three-fold. Vessels must submit the AVRF at least 24 hours in advance of the voyage. But there is nothing precluding a vessel from submitting the form a week or more in advance of arrival at a time when Internet access is available.

Shore-based personnel who work for the vessel, vessel owner or operator are able to submit the form via misp.io. There is no requirement that the vessel itself submit the form, so long as someone submits it on behalf of the vessel.

And third, Article 4.8 includes a provision in section 2298.9 that allows any person subject to the regulations to submit a request for an alternative to the provisions in Article 4.8. Therefore, vessels that are unable to access misp.io due to operational or technical difficulties could email Commission staff and request to submit the form as a PDF attachment to an email. If the alternative is approved, the vessel would meet the regulatory requirement to submit the form.

Next slide.
ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: Staff believes that the alternative request process.....(inaudible)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: So I can finish up for Nicole.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: So staff believes that the alternative request process addresses the concerns -- oh. Hi, Nicole.

ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: I'm sorry.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: That's okay.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: It's all right.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Why don't you finish up real quick.

MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION DIVISION

ASSISTANT CHIEF DOBROSKI: We'll engage in extensive outreach and stakeholder meetings with the vessel owners and operators. And we'll ensure that they understand the misp.io portal.

So thank you for your time. I apologize for the Internet connectivity issues and I'd be happy to take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you Nicole very much for the presentation and also very much appreciate staff
working through some alternatives for compliance with the
form submittal. Let me just see if any -- my fellow
Commissioners have any questions or comments on the
presentation?

Okay. Seeing none. Let me turn to you, Grace,
to see if we have any speakers on this item. This is Item
55.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
Thank you, Chair Yee. We have two speaker
requesters.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
First is from Lee Kindberg and followed by John
Berge.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Very good.

Good afternoon, Lee.

DR. KINDBERG: Good afternoon. I hope my sound
is adequate.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, it is.

DR. KINDBERG: Thank you for this opportunity to
speak briefly today. I'm Lee Kindberg. I'm head of
Environment and Sustainability Maersk for North America.

Maersk vessels make over 500 port calls in
California each year. And as I mentioned in our written
comments yesterday, we appreciate the constructive
relationship with State Lands Commission staff and the responsiveness to industry questions and concerns.

Now, on today's proposal to require annual vessel reports be input on a web portal, the staff report on this proposal states that 97 percent of vessels use the emailed PDF form versus three percent on the web form. That's a really low adoption rate. Now that may partly be awareness, but it also reflects the challenges in using web-based tools at sea.

We surveyed some of our vessel captains on web-based reporting and the captains do detailed forms like this, by the way, while they're at sea, because they're extremely busy while they're in port. Now, unfortunately some vessels only have satellite email and not full Internet connectivity. Our captains told us Internet connection quality is unreliable at sea and web forms are very time consuming. They also tell us that an offline form or tool is much more efficient for them, because it can be done as time allows and with interruptions and provides easy delegation of various sections. They also mention cost and cybersecurity concerns.

Now, going from three percent to a hundred percent web-based reporting is a big change. And to try to make this more successful we recommend the following.
First, let's delay or phase in the web tool requirement over one to two years, and during that period not issue violations or warnings. These poor masters don't need a black mark on their records for something that they don't have the equipment to do.

During this period, let's work with industry and the agency to conduct a web tool awareness campaign to try to increase web tool use and do whatever education is needed. And let's also identify technical barriers that might be getting in the way of web reporting.

We should also ensure that the process for requesting alternative submissions - and thank you for that process by the way - minimizes workload for both agency staff and industry, by doing things like, for example, allowing you to bundle multiple vessels rather than a single vessel. And I believe that is what is planned.

So again, we think that these three items, if modified into what's proposed to you, would greatly improve the success of this proposal. And thank for your time.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much.

Mr. Berge, you're next.

Grace, do we have Mr. Berge on queue?

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
Yes, Mr. Berge, you may be muted.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Maybe while we're waiting for him, let me turn back to Nicole to at least comment. Is there anything precluding -- well, I guess I'm -- I was a little confused, because it seems like there are several alternatives that have been put forth and -- the option that was presented about, you know, bundling form submittals, is that something that we would actually accept as an alternative?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Yee, let me step in.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yeah.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: And yes -- the short answer to your question is yes, of course. And just to provide maybe a little bit more context and perspective --

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yeah.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- we really, really appreciate Lee's comments today, also the public comment letters that we've received over the past couple days on this. This is a form that is required to be submitted annually, so once a year only. And it also -- the only requirement in terms of timing is that it be submitted 24 hours prior to the vessels arrival -- first arrival in that calendar year. So it can be submitted any time before that 24 hours, a day, two weeks, six months, when
they under -- when the -- when the vessel knows what the
schedule is going to look like, and maybe it could be
submitted through the online portal from the headquarters
office, where Internet service and connection is more
reliable.

But even with all of that, you know, we
understand that routes can be -- can change without a
whole lot of notice. And so there are a number of
alternatives that a vessel can -- and a company can
leverage to meet the requirements, including requesting an
alternative submittal, including the traditional or former
way to submit the form, which is through a PDF or fax.

So there's a number of different ways that a
vessel can comply with this that we think provides the
ultimate amount of flexibility. Although, you know, in
all honesty, this will require vessels to change their
process, slightly. But in terms of the overall benefit to
not only the program, but the efficient and effective use
of industry fees that fund the program, we -- we see this
as a real monetary savings, and highly efficient use of
staff time to convert to this type of data submittal.

The last thing I just want to conclude on is that
our practice -- and we're -- we plan to do it here and I
just want to assure the regulated community and the
Commissioners -- is not to jump right into enforcement
after a regulation package like this. We work hard and are very proud of our effort to not only put a lot of effort and focus into education and awareness, which we plan to do starting immediately next month, but also not pursue enforcement for at least a year, until we can conduct that education, conduct that awareness campaign, work with the vessel operators and the regulated industry, and then reevaluate at the end of the year, because the ultimate goal here is not to -- to play catch-a-game, it's really to facilitate the efficient capture of data, so that we can implement the Commission -- the State's Marine Invasive Species Program more effectively and efficiently. And so with that, I'll turn it back over to you, Chair Yee.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. Yeah, really appreciate that. And certainly the ongoing engagement with respect to just the education and outreach before actually implementing any kind of an enforcement provision. Let me turn to Grace and see if we have our other public speaker on this item on board.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Chair --

MR. BERGE: Can you hear me now?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, we can.

MR. BERGE: Oh. Yeah, my apologies. I had a
wrong setting. This is John Berge, Chair Yee and Commissioners, with the Pacific Merchant Shipping Association. I'll be brief.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Uh-huh.

MR. BERGE: I concur with what Ms. Kindberg said. She outlined the issues that we're concerned about. We support the effort to go forward with this process. Our only concern is that this is a new system. It's entirely different for what 97 percent of the ships are doing, and that there will be a learning period in terms of just understanding it and also dealing with the technical issues.

And I might add it's somewhat ironic, I think, that the presentation made for this particular item suffered from those connectivity issues that we're concerned about.

We do appreciate the alternatives, and, you know, I think staff has been great at trying to outline those. One thing, for instance, though I see a problem with in terms of petitioning, a vessel might be coming into port and trying to complete the form, only to find out too late that it is not able to get the proper connectivity past the period when it would have to actually petition for a -- you know, for an alternative. So, you know, that's just one example of, I think, some of the myriad technical
issues we might face.

So anyway, in some -- you know, based on our past experience with the Commission staff, and provided that there could be some sort of phased-in approach without violations issued for a period of time, you know, we think this can be a win-win for everyone involved.

So thank you for entertaining my comments. And I apologize for my technical difficulties.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: That's all right. I'm glad you were able to connect back in.

Thank you for the comments. You know, I think certainly the alternatives that were developed were in response to just some of the difficulties we had heard about the submittal of the form on vessel. And to the extent that we know this will require a bit of an educational period to be sure there's full compliance, I feel confident that we can move forward and continue to engage.

I think it's really difficult to talk about hypotheticals that may come up and -- but certainly want to be responsive to any real potential challenges that are on the horizon. And as Ms. Lucchesi says, this is an annual reporting. And so we, I think, have built in enough options to really make this as flexible as possible to achieve the efficiencies.
Any comments from Commissioners before we move on?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: (Shakes head.)
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. This is an action item. So is there a motion?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: So moved.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. Thank you.

Commissioner Dumlao moves staff recommendation.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Second, please.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Seconded by Commissioner Miller.

Ms. Lucchesi, will you call the roll, please.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Of course.

Commissioner Dumlao?
ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner Miller?
ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Yee?
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: The motion passes unanimously.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Perhaps, we should move to Item 1, I think that was the other --
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: And Brian -- Brian Bugsch of our Land Management Division will be providing staff's presentation today.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: There's a PowerPoint and so I guess Phil will put that up.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH:

Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Brian Bugsch. I'm Chief of the Commission's Land Management Division and I'll be presenting today on Item 1. Is the presentation up?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Not yet.

It is right now.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Okay.

We'll leave it there for a minute. This item recommends authorization of a lease for the applicants: Michael Akatiff and Christy Akatiff, trustees; Mark Gilmartin trustee; and Henry Telfeian and Elizabeth Stage. My apologies if I'm mispronouncing names.

The application is for the use and maintenance of three existing mooring buoys, the construction use and
maintenance of a joint-use pier with four boat lifts, and
removal of three existing mooring buoys and one double
personal watercraft lift. This proposed pier will be
located adjacent to properties on Brockway Vista Avenue on
the north shore of Lake Tahoe directly east of Kings
Beach.

Next slide.

--o0o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: As brief
background, the Commission issued a lease to the Akatiffs
in 2015 for three mooring buoys and a personal watercraft
lift. The Commission issued a lease to the Gilmartins in
2012 for two buoys. And the Commission also received an
application from Telfeian and Stage for one mooring buoy
in 2020, but a lease was never authorized by the
Commission.

The three applicants own littoral parcels
adjacent to the leased premises. The Tahoe Regional
Planning Agencies, TRPA, approved the applicants' permit
for the project that is now before you here today.

When the project is completed TRPA will transfer
the current mooring registra -- registrations from the
removed buoys to the installed boat lifts.

Next slide.

--o0o--
LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: All right. This slide right here is the site plan for the proposed pier overlaid on an aerial image, so you can see it in perspective to the surrounding area. There will be people speaking after this, so it's important to take in.

The proposed pier extends 362 feet out into Lake Tahoe. The proposed pier will run parallel to the existing piers to the northwest as you can see, and a little different angle than the one below it there.

Next slide.

--o0o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Okay. This slide is a little bit zoomed in with some pictures of the buoys. The -- it shows the four moorings that are -- that they are removing in yellow, the three buoys and the jet ski rack. Those four yellow ones will be taken out and those will be -- as I mentioned, will be removed in exchange for the four boat lifts you can see on the pierhead there. And then the three mooring buoys that the applicants will be retaining are highlighted in blue there.

Next slide.

--o0o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: I'm going to go through a little bit of a kind of a timeline for
this project. So in 2007, two of the applicants, I think
Akatiff and Telfeian applied for a TRPA permit to build a
pier. In March 2009, TRPA issued a permit for pier
construction. However, before construction started,
TRPA's shore zone ordinance was vacated by the U.S.
District Court in 2010.

The effect of the vacated ordinances was a
moratorium on all pier construction in Lake Tahoe for a
decade.

So, next slide.

--o0o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: After new
shore zone ordinances were adopted in October of 2018, the
applicant applied for -- to TRPA for a joint-use pier. On
May 28th, 2020, TRPA approved a conditional permit for the
proposed pier. The applicants also received authorization
from Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board on
February 21st, 2020, so earlier this year, and then
permission from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers on March
16th of this year. And authorization from the California
Department of Fish and Wildlife on April 15th of this
year.

The applicant applied to the Commission for a
lease in October of 2019. The applicant has obtained all
necessary approvals from all the other permitting agencies
as I mentioned. And the final requirement for this project was a Tahoe yellow cress survey, which was completed on July 13th. And now we're bringing this to you today.

    Next slide, please.

    --o0o--

    LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: So in conclusion, staff's recommendation -- or staff recommends the Commission authorize the Executive Officer to accept lease quitclaim deeds for the two existing leases and authorize a new general lease recreational use for three existing mooring buoys, construction of the proposed joint-use pier with four boat lifts, and removal of the three existing mooring buoys and one double personal watercraft lift.

    That concludes staff -- staff's report and we're available to answer any questions.

    CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you very much. Let me see if our -- my Commissioners have any questions or comments of staff?

    Okay. Seeing none.

    Let me turn to Grace. Any public comments or those who have signed up to comment on this item, Item 1?

    LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Thank you, Chair Yee. We have Eric Ronning
followed Ruth Bley.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. I'll have Eric start.

Good afternoon.

MR. RONNING: Yes. Good afternoon. My name is Eric Ronning. I'm speaking to the honorable Commissioners in opposition to the Akatiff pier.

If you can put up the satellite view. Look at Chipmunk Street there in red and look at the angle of the pier coming off the shore there at a 45 degree angle. The problem with this area right here is that the parcels on Brockway Vista Avenue meet at a 90 degree angle to the parcels on Chipmunk Street.

Now, while TRPA is the lead agency on this pier, it failed to complete their homework when it comes to the necessary compatibility findings, that TRPA fast-tracked this pier with a site plan that precluded Chipmunk Street and its shoreline. So I had to have this made to get reference to what's going on here.

So the site plan being incomplete, and that along with the 90 degree angle of the parcels coming together, and with the TRPA's brand new untested shore code being applied for the first time to a multi-use pier, the proper considerations were not given here.

Prior to the TRPA's vote -- the Board vote, no one from TRPA visited Chipmunk Street, or the shoreline
there, or anywhere on this project area to consider it. TRPA said that they visited last year by boat, but that wouldn't give anywhere near the view from the land, which is most people's stationary perspective.

Of the required compatibility findings, Section 80.4.3, TRPA must find that the project is compatible with existing structures in the immediate vicinity. And here is the rationale provided by the pier applicant. There are multiple piers in the vicinity that are approximately 250 feet long. Well, the reality is the proposed pier is 362 feet long with four boat lifts, while piers in the vicinity have no more than one boat lift. So the pier doesn't meet that compatibility finding.

And in the minutes of the TRPA hearing, where the staff is discussing the pier with the voting Board, the staff says that the piers in the vicinity are quote, "not quite as long as this one, although the homeowners association pier to the south is almost as long". So you can see the one at the bottom left, that's 232 feet long. The applicants' pier is 362 feet long. Plus, it's at an odd angle as well, so -- and then the pier to the -- the pier just above the Akatiff pier is 272 feet long.

So, you know, California State Lands has their own pier application and it's lacking in accuracy. And I think it's a trickle down from the TRPA accuracy.
Quotes from the California State Lands application. Question, will there be a change in pattern, scale, or character of the land use in the general area of the project? The applicants answer, no.

Question, will there be a change in scenic views? Applicant answer, yes, but then there's no description. I asked and there's no description following up to that yes answer.

Please don't allow the industrial grade pier to ruin the shoreline and lake use in front of Chipmunk Street area.

Thank you so much for your consideration.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you.

Okay. Our next speaker, Ruth.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Ruth, your mic may be muted.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Grace, maybe we can move on to the next public speaker and then return to Ruth.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Thank you, Jennifer. Our next speaker is Mark Gilmartin.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Go ahead, Mark.

MR. GILMARTIN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Can you hear me all right?
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, we can.

MR. GILMARTIN: Okay. I appreciate you all taking the time to hear the other side of the story here. I am obviously one of the applicants for this lease. And as staff pointed out, we applied for a pier all together. It was actually all four parcels ten years ago. And we were granted the okay to go ahead before the environmental agencies and many other things, the district court, stopped it. We've been in a holding pattern for ten years.

And during those ten years, I've sure you're all aware, but I'd like it -- to once again bring it to everybody's attention that every single agency in the Tahoe basin, the TRPA, the League to Save Lake Tahoe, the homeowners associations, all the agencies over the course of the last ten years, and dozens and dozens of public meetings, which I attended many of, got together to write a set of rules, a set of shore-zone ordinances that everybody would be happy with, so -- including Cal State Lands. Cal State Lands did participate in those meetings diligently for the last ten years.

When the new rules were published and adopted by the TRPA and all the other agencies, we once again reapplied, spending, as you can imagine, tens of thousands of dollars to do so. We fit within all the
specifications, so the size, and design, and length, and width, and everything of our pier that we're proposing, that's all within the rules and regulations of the new shore-zone ordinances that were written by all the agencies in the Tahoe Basin. We didn't write the rules. We just abided by them.

So we were once again granted the right to move forward with a new pier unanimously by the TRPA. And as staff once again pointed out, that all the other agencies that require approval have given us their approval. Cal State Lands is the last agency.

And I just think that I'd like to ask you all to seriously consider that -- to approve this lease, and for the main reason, if not any, that you, along with everybody else, for the last ten years has worked diligently to define these design specifications and the new rules. And it seems to me it would be a shame at the last second to -- to -- to disallow a pier that everybody for the last ten years worked so hard to write rules to adopt, so there is no favoritism, there is no one-off complaining. The rules are the rules. And our pier does not hinder any of the complaining party's ability to have their own pier.

And that's all I have to say. Thank you very much. And if there are any questions, I'm obviously
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Mr. Gilmartin. Grace, do we have another speaker?

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: We do. I'd like to try to call on Ruth Bley again to see if we can get her mics going.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Okay. It looks as though we're still experiencing some technical issues.

I'd like to call on a phone number, last three digits 228, to speak on this item.

MS. BLEY: Hello. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes. Uh-huh. Would you please state your name for the record?

MS. BLEY: This is Ruth Bley.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Oh. Oh.

MS. BLEY: I'm on the phone. I've been trying to star nine.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Great. Thank you, Ruth.

MS. BLEY: Thank you for allowing me to speak on this matter.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Sure.

MS. BLEY: I understand, you know, both sides of this, but unfortunately, I'm -- I feel that as owners of
the Chipmunk properties, we weren't able to weigh in on any of this. So I'm not saying that there shouldn't be a pier. It just seems that there should be some sort of compromise, so that it's not -- it doesn't affect us as substantially as this one does, because where my property is located, this pier comes right in front of it, I mean, literally broadsides it.

So my view of the lake, everything else is affected by this pier, especially that it's huge and has four boat lifts. So once it has four boats on it, it's a massive thing.

And also, what never came into consideration is the fact that I have two buoys out there and the location of this pier is right on top of my buoys. So I'm not sure what the plan is around this. It goes directly over one of the buoys and the second buoy is impacted. And my buoys are close-up buoys that I like to use to put the kayaks and the paddle boards on, so that I'm not always launching over the rocks. And it's also a route that the paddle boarders and kayakers take.

So I don't think the issue is so much that there shouldn't be a pier. It's just the why is this pier that already has sort of a -- an unfortunately bad location in respect to the other properties, why is it allowed to be so big to affect all of these other properties?
And I guess what we were kind of hoping was to find some sort of compromise, where it's not such a visual impact or an impact to the use of the lake and the use of my buoys, which I'm not sure what the man is for my buoys. So I think Ron had come up with some modifications that would help reduce this. And it was our thought that maybe that would be taken into consideration, so that what was actually constructed would be something that was beneficial to all. So not saying that these -- these people can't have a pier. It's just because of the location of their property, this type of pier is not the best installation. It's not the best use of what should be put there, because of this 90 degree convergence of these properties. And I don't know if that got across. So I very appreciate the ability to talk to you. I know this has gone really far and it happened without any of us really knowing. So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Ruth. Grace, are there any other speakers on this item?

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: We have own additional hand raised from Abigail.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Abigail, you may be muted.

MS. EDWARDS: Hello.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes. Hello.

MS. EDWARDS: Great. Okay. Thanks for the opportunity to comment today. My name is Abigail Edwards, and I work for Kaufman Edwards Planning and Consulting. And I've worked for -- I've represented the property owners, all four of them -- or all three of them since about 2007 when we were planning on coming together for a multiple-use pier.

TRPA has been, for the past ten years, providing incentives on projects -- new pier projects that involve more -- that involve numerous littoral parcels. So they prioritize the new pier allocations based on the number of parcels that submit. So back in 2009, we were chosen as the top ranking parcel, because we had four properties sharing. And then again, in 2019, we were chosen as the top ranking pier application.

So the reason why our pier is proposed in the location that it's at is because the TRPA projection lines and setbacks are from the low water line of Lake Tahoe. And if you take a look at the site plan, if you have time to read it, our pier goes down the center of our projection lines. It goes right down the middle of all four parcels. The orientation of the pier is basically dictated by the parcel to the west and all of the other piers to the west.
The reason why we have four boat lifts and the length of the pier is it is allowed based on the TRPA code, but they provide additional length incentives and they're allowing you to trade buoys for boat lifts, up to four -- up to one per parcel, rather than -- you know, so you would have one pier with four boat lifts rather than potentially two shared piers or four single-use piers. So how TRPA sees it is they will be deed restricting three of the four parcels from future shore developments for additional piers.

I just wanted to bring up a comment on Ruth Blay's piers -- or buoys. Her buoys are not permitted, I believe, with TRPA currently. She did provide coordinates in 2009 for her buoy application with TRPA. And the coordinates are actually further out than where she's showing the -- where she's saying the buoys are. And they're not showing on any of the aerials or surveys that we've had done. We would be very happy to move her buoys if they do -- if they are in the area of the new pier.

But thank you for your time. Basically, we are meeting the TRPA code and all the other agency codes. And the location basically was dictated based on the code.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Abigail.

Grace, any other speakers on this item?
LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
We have no other hands raised to speak on this item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Thank you. So maybe -- could I just have staff, because this has been through obviously a very lengthy public process. And I just wanted to just clarify just specifically what's before the Commission now. And it does look like there have been perhaps -- maybe not enough opportunity for some of the parties to be before some of the other agencies prior to this. But we do have the item before us now with respect to the lease quitclaim deeds and the general lease.

So, Jennifer, do you want to just describe what we have before us?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes, of course. So maybe I can just provide a little bit more context and clarification. I believe, as the applicant and the applicants' representative alluded to, this -- TRPA, the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency for the past, you know, five, six years has been engaged in a very robust update to their shore zone ordinances, due to the fact that their prior ordinances were vacated by the federal district court.

The State Lands Commission, through myself and
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our Assistant Executive Officer, Colin Connor, sit on a steering committee, along with a number of other agencies and stakeholders to help identify the policies of the new shore zone ordinances and also to help inform the specifics of the code drafting, as well as the environmental analysis that went along with it.

And so as it relates to this particular application, one of the major policy goals of those shore zone ordinances was to incentivize less development, but still provide the opportunity for property owners and public agencies to have piers -- new piers constructed in the lake. And so one way that that -- that broad objective was implemented was through incentivizing joint-use piers, so -- and that's really what's in front of you today.

And just to reemphasize what the applicants' representatives stated that four littoral parcels owners -- or properties have combined under three owners to apply for a joint-use pier. Technically, they could all -- all four property owners could apply for their own pier. And so a joint-use pier is technically going to be a little bit longer, not only to accommodate the moorings of the littoral property for their vessels, but also to adapt to low lake levels, which was also a policy goal due to climate change. And so it does go out a little bit
further, because of those -- those objectives.

And so what's before you is this joint-use pier that includes four boat hoists and also three mooring buoys. And this -- the alternative worst case scenario could be four individual piers and eight moorings. And so there -- the real goal is to consolidate ultimate new construction within the lake.

With that said, this is also located in an area of Lake Tahoe where it's in a cove. And so the projection lines that were referred to earlier, where you would normally think that the projection lines going out for new piers, would go perpendicular to the shoreline, in coves like this -- and this is all based on the regulations and ordinances of TRPA, sometimes those projection lines go at angles.

And so if you noticed, and if we can pull it up, but in some of the prior slides, other piers that are located in this same area are also at a 45 degree angle because of those projection lines. So it really just follows the layout essentially that TRPA has adopted for this area of Tahoe.

And then finally, I want to just address Ms. Blay's comments about her own buoys. Unfortunately, she does not have a lease with us for her two buoys at this time, so we can't independently confirm where her existing
buoys are, because we have no records of that under our own leasing program.

However, we have independently conferred with TRPA and identified what her 2009 permit -- under her 2009 permit where those buoys should be located versus where they're -- they are actually located, based on the information she provided. And they are about 60, 70 feet apart. And so that is something that we are going to be -- that hopefully, TRPA and Ms. Bley can work together to fix, to locate her buoys in the area that is covered under her permit. And then that can be confirmed through a lease application with us.

With that said, overall, like I -- I mentioned in the beginning, the idea here is really to facilitate new pier construction, but in a very responsible and less impactful way. And as a number of state, and local agencies, and stakeholders that were involved in that shore zone process identified as a priority was to really incentivize these joint-use piers.

And so with that, I'll turn it back over to Chair Yee and the Commissioners for any additional questions.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you, Jennifer, for the clarification and just a little bit more elaboration about the specifics of the proposal that we have before us.
Again, any questions from Commissioners?

Okay. If not, then we do have a staff recommendation before us, which is to authorize the Executive Officer to accept lease quitclaim deeds for the two existing leases and then to authorize the general lease, which is for recreational use for three existing mooring buoys and the proposed joint-use pier with the four boat lifts and the removal of the three existing mooring buoys and one double personal watercraft lift. So that is the staff recommendation. Is there a motion?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: I move the staff recommendation, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Commissioner Miller. We have a motion. Seconded by Commissioner Dumlao?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Am I -- yeah, I second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much.

Ms. Lucchesi, may we have the roll?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Certainly.

Commissioner Dumlao?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner Miller?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Yee?
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: The motion passes unanimously.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. Thank you very much and really appreciate all the speakers coming forward on this item.

Okay. Ms. Lucchesi, what is our next item?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Our next item of business is Item 60.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Let's move to Item 60 and this is to consider an application for a new solar energy facility in Kern County. And we do have a staff presentation by Brian Bugsch. Welcome back.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Thanks. I thought I was getting out of here for a second.

(Laughter.)

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I hope everybody is having a good day.

My name is Brian Bugsch and I'm Chief of the Commission's Land Management Division and I'm presenting on Item 60.

Next slide.
This item is an application from BigBeau Solar, LLC to construct, use, and maintain, and decommission a new solar energy facility on school lands in Southern Kern County, west of the City of Rosamond.

I'll digress a little bit here and say staff is pretty excited. If approved, this would be the first solar energy project on school lands managed by the Commission. It's kind of a big deal for us. The overall project site is about 2,125 acres of generally undeveloped range land, of which 120 acres is on State school lands.

The BigBeau Solar Project proposes to develop a photovoltaic solar facility and associated infrastructure necessary to generate a combined 128 megawatts of renewable electrical energy and up to 60 megawatts of a battery energy storage system.

Next slide.

Of the proposed 128 megawatt capacity system, up to 17 megawatts of solar PV modules would be on school lands. The project has an anticipated operational life of up to 35 years, after which the project proponent -- proponent may choose to either update the site technology and recommission or
to decommission the site and remove the system from -- and their components.

Next slide.

--00o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: The parent company for this project, EDF Renewables, is one of the largest renewable energy developers in North America with more than 16 gigawatts of wind, solar, storage and electrical vehicle charging projects developed throughout the United States, Canada, and Mexico. EDF owns and operates over 1,000 megawatts in California (inaudible) wind projects in the area near the proposed project.

The applicant has already secured a 20-year purchase power agreement for the energy to be produced by the facility. And at full capacity, the electricity generated by this project would be enough to satisfy the annual electrical -- electricity needs of 64,000 California homes, and offset more than 315,000 metric tons of CO2 emissions annually, which is equivalent to a year's worth of greenhouse gas emissions from 67,000 passenger vehicles.

Next slide.

--00o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Kern County was the lead agency for the CEQA process. And the
EIR was prepared and certified by the county on June 2nd, 2020. The county also adopted findings, a Statement of Overriding Considerations and a Mitigation Monitoring Program. The project will minimize impacts to threatened and endangered species and reduce other environmental impacts by using existing infrastructure.

In conjunction with the EIR process, the county did extensive tribal consultation as well. The contacted tribes include those listed on this slide, the 29 Palms Band -- 29 Palms Band of Mission Indians, San Manuel Band of Mission Indians, Tejon Indian Tribe, and Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians.

While no significant subsurface archaeological deposits were found during the archaeological testing on 28 different sites, the project will completely avoid construction or operational activities in any potentially significant cultural sites. The Mitigation Monitoring Program also requires that the applicant retain full-time Native American tribal monitors during project construction.

As part of the application process, staff also conducted environmental justice outreach. Letters were sent to several environmental justice organizations in the area. No comments on the project were received as a result of the outreach. And staff, at this time, is not
aware of any opposition to the project.

Next slide.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: In addition to helping fulfill one of the Commission's strategic plan goals, this lease will contribute to achieving California's clean energy policy goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions to 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030 and sourcing 60 percent of California's energy from renewable sources by 2030 and 100 percent by 2045.

In addition to meeting the annual electricity needs, I've mentioned, 4,000 California homes and offsetting a lot of CO2 emissions annually, the proposed Big Bear -- BigBeau Solar Energy Project would generate revenue for the California Teachers -- State Teachers' Retirement System, would create -- create up to 12 full-time jobs, and support an estimated 220 construction jobs, and support the economic development of Kern County, L.A. County, and the State of California.

The proposed lease is also consistent with, and in furtherance of, the values and strategic goals prioritized in the Commission's strategic plan and the Commission's 2008 resolution on renewable energy as well.

Next slide.
LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: I missed one there. But in conclusion, staff recommends that the Commission authorize issuance of a general lease industrial use to the applicant beginning August 20, 2020, for a term of 40 years for a construction, use, maintenance, and decommissioning of a new solar energy facility on State-owned school land.

That concludes staffers -- staff's report.

Representatives from both the applicant and Kern County are here to speak on this item and answer any specific questions the Commission may have.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Thank you very much, Brian. Let me just turn to Scott Kuhlke from EDF Renewables and Craig Murphy with Kern County to see if they have any other comments to offer on the item.

Mr. Kuhlke, I believe you're on mute.

We still can't you hear, Mr. Kuhlke.

MR. KUHLKE: Hi. Can -- can you hear me now?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes. Thank you.

MR. KUHLKE: All right. I do have a presentation to provide that was provided to staff. I'm happy to do it now.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Sure.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: It's being pulled up
now, yes.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was
Presented as follows.)

MR. KUHLKE: Okay. Great. Well, thank you,
Commissioners and thank you State Lands Commission staff.
My name is Scott Kuhlke. I'm Associate Director of
Development at EDF Renewables headquartered in San Diego,
California. I'm here to present to you the BigBeau Solar
Project.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. KUHLKE: EDF Renewables as a subsidiary of
the EDF group, a global leader in low carbon energy, is
focused on delivering renewable solutions to transition to
a sustainable future. We're a vertically-integrated
company, leading the project siting, origination,
development, construction and finally the long-term
operation of renewable energy projects.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. KUHLKE: In North America, we consider
ourselves homegrown in California. Our roots of our
business started in 1987 as an operations and maintenance
contractor for the wind farms outside of Palm Springs.
And now roughly half of our North American employees are
located in California with nearly a thousand megawatts of renewable energy projects owned and operated in the state.

Of all the counties in the U.S. we're most familiar with is in eastern Kern County. We own and operate four projects in a compact footprint west of the community Rosamond. BigBeau Solar will be our fifth project, 128 megawatt solar facility with up to 60 megawatts of battery energy storage.

Siting projects close together provides numerous benefits, including a light development footprint, use of existing roads and transmission infrastructure to access the projects and interconnection points, and few year-round neighboring residents.

As you can see, the location of the State parcel is ideally situated within BigBeau's project footprint.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. KUHLKE: BigBeau has garnered tremendous support. We have a terrific relationship with Kern County going back to 2010. Both the planning commission and board of supervisors hearings were passed with unanimous consent. Earlier this year, we executed a project labor agreement with numerous unions, which will provide hundreds of good paying, local jobs during the project's construction. And we've also worked closely with
conservation groups, such as Defenders of Wildlife, local and national Audubon societies, with a recently announced partnership concerning conservation efforts of the Swainson's Hawk in the Antelope Valley.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. KUHLKE: As mentioned previously, BigBeau is a contracted project with an expected commercial operations date of December 2021. We're well underway in design and we'll be initiating site preparation and pre-construction activities in early September, applying for our construction permits in October, and we anticipate full project mobilization in January of next year.

In conclusion, our strong working relationship with Commission staff and their dedication to this project over the past couple years has been integral to bringing us here today. We see this as a great partnership and a chance for us to realize not only the first solar lease on State lands, but also help meet California's renewable energy goals of 60 percent by 2030.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Mr. Kuhlke.

Mr. Murphy, are you on?

Craig Murphy with Kern County.

Okay. Maybe not.
If he comes on board, we'll be sure to put him on.

I have one question for Mr. Kuhlke and that is the project schedule that you just outlined, is that in consideration of just obviously some of the restrictions of work during the pandemic and any of the public health directives that will need to be observed at the worksite.

MR. KUHLKE: Our schedule builds that into account. And we've been working closely with our contractors to make sure that we have good and safe operation characteristics on-site.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. All right. Thank you. Let me ask my fellow Commissioners if there are any questions or comments?

Okay. A very exciting project.
Let me turn to Grace. Grace, are there any public comments on Item 60?

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: We do. Thank you, Chair. I'm going to see if Mr. Murphy is able to speak first as a --

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: -- to be one of the presenters.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: That will be great.
Mr. Murphy, you may have your line muted.

All right. I'm going to go ahead and move on to the public comments.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Our first speaker is Garry George followed by Brian Holt.

MR. GEORGE: Good afternoon. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, we can, Mr. George.

MR. GEORGE: Okay. Good afternoon Chair Yee and Commissioners. Thank you for this opportunity. I'm Garry George. I'm the Director of the Clean Energy Initiative with the National Audubon Society, and I'm located here in California.

Audubon science that's hosted on climate.audubon.org reveals that 389 species of North American birds are seriously threatened with climate -- with extinction if we can't keep warming below 1.5 degrees Celsius. So we support a national clean energy goal of a hundred percent and we support State Lands permitting of renewable energy. Congratulations on your first solar project. And we'll be making comments on that in the strategic plan and we thank you for that opportunity.

I'm here today to support the commitment of EDF Renewables to work collaboratively with Audubon and the
Defenders of Wildlife on the BigBeau Solar Project on State and private lands in Kern County. This collaboration resulted in an agreement that provides funding for research and a conservation fund to support acquisition of lands or easements for conservation of Swainson's Hawk in the Antelope Valley in the area of the project.

This agreement is voluntary. It's not mitigation for the project's impacts, as Kern County required no mitigation for the impacts on Swainson's Hawk. It's a fine example for us of conservation and clean energy going hand-in-hand. And we support that collaboration and EDFR's commitment to it on the BigBeau -- BigBeau Solar Project.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Mr. George. Okay.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
Next, we'll have Brian Holt.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon, Mr. Holt.

MR. HOLT: Good afternoon. My name is Brian Holt. I'm Assistant Business Manager of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 428. And we are the electrical workers union serving Kern County and we represent nearly a thousand hard working men and women,
150 of which are State indentured apprentices. We stand in strong support of this project.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much.

Grace, any other speakers?

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Chair Yee, we have one additional speaker, a phone number, last three digits 743.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: You'll need to unmute.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Grace, why don't we try Mr. Murphy again.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Mr. Murphy, are you available to speak at this time?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Maybe one last time with the speaker on the telephone three digits of 743.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Speaker 743, it looks on our end as though your phone is muted.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Hello. Good afternoon.

Looked like they may have dropped off, Grace.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Correct, Chair Yee. Thank you. We have no other
speakers at this time.

    CHAIRPERSON YEE:  Okay. Well, hopefully, Mr. Murphy, if he's still with us, will chime in. But I think very exciting project. And I can just sense the excitement of all the parties this afternoon around this. So hearing no other comments from Commissioners, this item is before us. Is there a motion?

    ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER:  I'll move, Madam Chair. And I agree it's very exciting.

    CHAIRPERSON YEE:  Thank, Commissioner Miller.

    Okay. Motion by Commissioner Miller.

    Seconded by --

    ACTING COMMISSIONER Dumlao:  And I'll second it.

    CHAIRPERSON YEE:  -- Commissioner Dumlao. Thank you.

    Ms. Lucchesi, please call the roll.

    EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI:  Commissioner Dumlao?

    ACTING COMMISSIONER Dumlao:  Aye.

    EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI:  Commissioner Miller?

    ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER:  Aye.

    EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI:  Chair Yee?

    CHAIRPERSON YEE:  Aye.

    EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI:  The motion passes unanimously.

    CHAIRPERSON YEE:  Thank you very much. Thank
you, everyone

I just want to do a little bit of a time check. We're down to I think the last item, are we?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes. Yes, Item 61 -- or excuse me, 62.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Sixty-two.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: And this should go fairly quickly.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very good.

So we are now on Item 62, Commissioners. And that is to consider adoption of a support position on certain provisions of federal legislation HR 7608 by Representative Lowey. And this is a bill that would ban new offshore drilling leases and seismic testing.

So let me have Sheri Pemberton present the -- present on this item.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Thank you, Madam Chair and Commissioners.

This item recommends that the Commission adopt a support position on provisions of HR 7608, a federal appropriations bill that would ban new offshore drilling leases and seismic testing.

As background, in 2018, the federal government released a five-year national oil and gas lease proposal that would open the entire Pacific outer continental shelf
to new offshore oil and gas drilling. Shortly thereafter, the Commission, noting that it has opposed new offshore oil development for over 30 years, sent letters to the federal government urging them to withdraw California from their proposed leasing program.

Last month, the House of Representatives approved HR 7608, with amendments that would ban new offshore oil leases and seismic testing. Further offshore oil and gas development is unnecessary and it's incompatible with the State's Energy policies, transitioning energy markets and vision for the future.

The Commission has adopted numerous resolutions in past years opposing the resumption or expansion of offshore oil and gas development. The resolutions convey the Commission's view that additional offshore oil and gas leasing and development threatens the environment and the economy, prevents the nation from reducing its dependency on fossil fuels, contributes to greenhouse gas emissions, and adversely affects critical California industries, like tourism and fisheries.

As Oceana, one of the many organizations that support the amendments in HR 7608 stated after the House vote, quote, "This legislation is an important step towards stopping the President's plans and protecting those who rely on a clean and healthy ocean. We applaud
House members for working to protect our coasts from new
dirty and dangerous drilling. For nearly three decades,
Congress blocked offshore drilling through similar funding
measures. We're counting on Congress to once again enact
a moratorium on new offshore drill", end quote.

A support position from the Commission on the
amendment in HR 7608 is consistent with the Commission's
past actions, and protects California's cherished
national -- natural resources.

Staff, therefore recommends that the Commission
adopt a support position on the amendments in HR 7608 to
ban new offshore oil drilling and seismic testing.

Thank you and I'm available to answer any
questions.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Sheri.

Any comments by Commissioners on this?

Thank -- yes, Commissioner Dumlao.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Yeah. Just a quick
comment. I know the Lieutenant Governor is passionately
against new offshore oil drilling. And I think, you know,
the Commission has done a very good job of being very
vigilant the last few years in ensuring that every
opportunity that we have to push back against the federal
government, we take it. So I really appreciate staff
keeping an eye on federal legislation....(inaudible)
CHAIRPERSON YEE: You're fading out, Commissioner.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Oh, just very thankful for the Commission monitoring federal legislation and bringing it forward for us to support today.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Very well. Thank you.

(Laughter.)

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Move on.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON YEE: That's okay. Let me turn to Grace and see if there are any speakers on this item, on Item. 62

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO: Chair Yee, we have no hands raised for public comment on this item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Thank you. So we do have the item before us. Is there a motion to adopt the staff recommendation to support the amendments to HR 7608.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: So moved.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Motion by Commissioner Dumlao. Seconded by Commissioner Miller?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yes, please.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Ms. Lucchesi, please call the
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner Dumlao?
ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Aye.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner Miller?
ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Aye.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Yee?
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Aye.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Motion passes unanimously.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much.

Let's see, I think, Ms. Lucchesi, what is our next order of business?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Next order of business is our second public comment period.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. So this is the time if anyone wishes to address the Commission on -- excuse me -- on any matters that -- on any matter that is not on today's agenda. You may raise your hand and you will have three minutes to -- to do so. And so I'm going to look to Grace and see if we have any -- any members of the public with their hand raised who wishes to address the Commission.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION ASSISTANT CHIEF KATO:
Chair Yee, I have no hands raised for public comment.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Thank you, Grace. And thank you for monitoring that throughout the meeting.

That concludes our second public comment period. Let me just check-in again with Commissioner Dumlao and Commissioner Miller. Any other comments or questions?

ACTING COMMISSIONER Dumlao: (Shakes head.)

ACTING COMMISSIONER Miller: (Shakes head.)

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Ms. Lucchesi, what is our -- what's our next order of business?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER Lucchesi: Our next order of business is closed session. We will be conducting closed session via a traditional conference call. So Commissioners, please email me or call my cell phone if you need the call-in information. It was emailed a couple days ago, but it might be hard to find. I'm sure everybody receives a ton of emails.

For the Commissioners and staff participating in the closed session, upon adjournment, please mute your microphone, turn off your webcam, and, if possible, go into a different room. That will ensure confidentiality of our discussions.

And at the conclusion of our closed session, we will return back to the public session in order to report
anything out and then adjourn the meeting.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. So we will put audio --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes.

(Off record: 3:44 p.m.)
(Thereupon the meeting recessed into closed session.)
(Thereupon the meeting reconvened open session.)
(On record: 3:56 p.m.)
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: There we go.
AGP VIDEO: And we are recording now.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. I call this meeting back to order. Ms. Lucchesi, is there anything to report from closed session?
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Not at this time.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.
AGP VIDEO: Okay. Mr. Chair, we are -- Madam Chair, we are back in session. You may continue.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: So I -- Chair Yee, you have to call it back to order.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes. So I do call this meeting back to order. Ms. Lucchesi, is there anything to report from closed session?
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: No.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. That concludes the open meeting. And seeing no other business coming before the Commission, we are adjourned. Thanks, everyone. Be safe.

(Thereupon the California State Lands Commission meeting adjourned at 3:56 p.m.)
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