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## II Public Comment

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.

## IV Executive Officer's Report

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

**Shasta County Department of Public Works (Lessee):** Continuation of rent at $523 per year for a General Lease - Public Agency Use located on state sovereign lands, Shasta County. (PRC 505)

Tomales Bay Assignment Actions to be taken by the Executive Officer pursuant to the Commission's Delegation of Authority:

No items for this section

## V Consent Calendar 01-57

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
01 LUIS ROBERT UBILLUS ADELMAN (LESSEE): Consider amendment of Lease Number PRC 8644, a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 1590 North Lake Boulevard, near Tahoe City, Placer County; for removal and construction of a pier and catwalk; installation of a boat lift; and removal of one existing mooring buoy. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (PRC 8644; A3271; RA# 2021065) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: J. Holt)

02 LAWRENCE H. BLACK, TRUSTEE OF THE LAWRENCE H. BLACK 2012 QUALIFIED PERSONAL RESIDENCE TRUST DATED DECEMBER 17, 2012; AARON SASSON AND BARBRO SASSON, TRUSTEES OF THE AARON AND BARBRO SASSON TRUST, UTD DATED SEPTEMBER 24, 1998 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 6780 and 6784 North Lake Boulevard in Tahoe Vista, Placer County; for two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8158; A3251; RA# 2021096) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: L. Anderson)

03 JAMES C. BLAKEMORE AND GRACE E. HACKMEIER (LESSEE/APPLICANT): Consider acceptance of a lease quitclaim deed and application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 3790 North Lake Boulevard, near Carnelian Bay, Placer County; for removal and reconstruction of an existing pier and boat lift; and use and maintenance of two existing mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (Lease 5751; A2961; RA# 2021002) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)

04 CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION (PARTY): Consider authorizing staff to file a Record of Survey depicting the meanders of the high water mark and edge of water on the right bank of the Russian River on certain dates in November and December of 2021 and February of 2022 at a site commonly known as Johnson Beach, in Guerneville, Sonoma County. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (I2069) (A 2; S 2) (Staff: D. Frink; N. Lee)

05 CFT CHALLENGE, LLC, A NEVADA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 4250 North Lake Boulevard, near
Carnelian Bay, Placer County; for removal and reconstruction of an existing pier and boat lift. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (Lease 5101; A3348; RA# 2021125) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)

06 CLEAN UP THE CAYES 501(C)3 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Other, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, El Dorado and Placer Counties; Donner Lake and Independence Lake, Nevada County; June Lake, and Twin Lakes, Mono County; Echo Lake and Fallen Leaf Lake, El Dorado County; and Gold Lake, Plumas County; for SCUBA enabled litter removal, data collection, and monitoring to improve lake health, and to promote mitigation of litter accumulation and public enjoyment. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (A2492; RA# 2019213) (A 1, 5; S 1, 8) (Staff: J. Toy)

07 DONNER PINES WEST HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Donner Lake, adjacent to 15825 Donner Pass Road, near Truckee, Nevada County; for a portion of an existing boat dock. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7901; A3211; RA# 2021049) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)

08 BRUCE T. EISENHARD AND NANCY EISENHARD, TRUSTEES, OR THEIR SUCCESSORS IN TRUST, UNDER THE EISENHARD LIVING TRUST, DATED SEPTEMBER 11, 2007 AND ANY AMENDMENTS THERETO (LESSEE); TAHOE VISTA BEACH HOUSE LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Lease Number PRC 8680, a General Lease - Recreational Use: and application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 6790 North Lake Boulevard, near Tahoe Vista, Placer County; for two existing mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8680; A3422; RA# 2021161) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)

09 ROBERT J. ERNST III AND KATHERINE R. ERNST, AS TRUSTEES OF THE ROBERT AND KATHERINE ERNST TRUST, DATED MARCH 27, 2017 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 3310 Edgewater
Drive, Tahoe City, Placer County; for two existing mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8977; A3174; RA# 2020484) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: L. Anderson)

10 JOSHUA R. FLOUM AND MARGARET R. O'DONNELL, CO-TRUSTEES OF THE FLOUM/O'DONNELL REVOCABLE TRUST U/A/D 12/10/2013 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 3328 Edgewater Drive, near Tahoe City, Placer County; for two existing mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8401; A3082; RA# 2020471) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: Logan Anderson)

11 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 (LESSOR); CHARLES C. HENDERSON, MELINDA HENDERSON, ROBERT WALLACE, BRIAN KEATING, AND MARK W. HENDERSON, AS TRUSTEES OF THE FIVE SEPARATE TRUSTS ESTABLISHED UNDER THE HARRIET WALKER HENDERSON IRREVOCABLE TRUST DATED AUGUST 14, 1973 FBO CHARLES C. HENDERSON, JAMES A. HENDERSON, JOAN H. HENDERSON, ELENA D. HENDERSON, AND MARK W. HENDERSON (APPLICANT): Consider rescission of prior lease authorization, and 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 lift, and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4471; A2524; RA# 2019239) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: Logan Anderson)

12 HERBERT H. HOOPER, D.D.S., SURVIVING TRUSTEE OF THE 2007 HOOPER FAMILY REVOCABLE TRUST (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 6073 North Lake Boulevard, near Tahoe Vista, Placer County; for an existing pier, boathouse with boat hoist, sundeck with stairs, and one mooring buoy. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4056; A2405; RA# 2019168) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: A. Franzoia)

13 WAYNE D. JORDAN AND M. QUINN DELANEY, AS TRUSTEES, OR THE SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE OR TRUSTEES, U/A/D APRIL 29,
1996, AS AMENDED, CREATING THE JORDAN/Delaney FAMILY TRUST (LESSEE): Consider amendment of Lease Number PRC 3598, a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 7127 West Lake Boulevard, near Tahoma, El Dorado County; for an existing pier, water intake line, and two mooring buoys; and construction of a pier extension, relocation of an existing boat lift, installation of an adjustable catwalk, and removal of an existing catwalk. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (PRC 3598; RA# 2019275) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: A. Franzoia)

14 MACBRIDE TAHOE MANAGEMENT, LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 3785 Belleview Avenue, near Homewood, Placer County; for an existing pier and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3222; A3013; RA# 2020404) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: L. Anderson)

15 ROBERT D. MAY AND JUDITH T. MAY, TRUSTEES OF THE MAY FAMILY TRUST AS AMENDED AND UPDATED IN 2013 (LESSEE): Consider amendment of Lease Number PRC 8983, a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 8441 Meeks Bay Avenue, near Rubicon Bay, El Dorado County; for installation of a boat lift; and removal of one existing mooring buoy. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (PRC 8983; A3356; RA# 2021130) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: J. Holt)

16 R. DANIEL PUTMAN AND KATHLEEN L. WILLIAMS, CO-TRUSTEES OF THE PUTMAN-WILLIAMS LIVING TRUST DATED APRIL 30, 2015 (LESSEE); ROBERT A. BUCCOLA (APPLICANT): Consider waiver of penalty and interest; void Invoice Number 54181; termination of Lease Number PRC 4145, a General Lease - Recreational Use, and application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 8307 Meeks Bay Avenue, Meeks Bay, El Dorado County; for an existing pier, boat lift, and two mooring buoys previously authorized by the Commission and an existing water intake pipeline not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4145; A3310; RA# 2021122) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: J. Holt)
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17 NORMAN W. SCHLINGER, TRUSTEE OF THE NORMAN WARREN SCHLINGER LIVING TRUST, DATED APRIL 17, 1995 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 5298 North Lake Boulevard, near Carnelian Bay, Placer County; for an existing pier, boathouse with boat lift, and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4878; A3494; RA#2021211) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)

18 LEE J. SCHWEICHLER, TRUSTEE OF THE ANN W. SCHWEICHLER QUALIFIED PERSONAL RESIDENCE TRUST, DATED SEPTEMBER 10, 2009; ANN W. SCHWEICHLER, TRUSTEE OF THE LEE J. SCHWEICHLER QUALIFIED PERSONAL RESIDENCE TRUST, DATED SEPTEMBER 10, 2009; AND SIENNA PARTNERS, LLC (LESSEE); LEE J. SCHWEICHLER, TRUSTEE OF THE ANN W. SCHWEICHLER QUALIFIED PERSONAL RESIDENCE TRUST, DATED SEPTEMBER 10, 2009; ANN W. SCHWEICHLER, TRUSTEE OF THE LEE J. SCHWEICHLER QUALIFIED PERSONAL RESIDENCE TRUST, DATED SEPTEMBER 10, 2009; AND HEIDI K. DELGADO (APPLICANT): Consider amendment to Lease Number PRC 6819, a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land, located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 8375 and 8381 Meeks Bay Avenue, near Meeks Bay, El Dorado County; to remove Sienna Partners, LLC and replace with Heidi K. Delgado as Lessee, revise the rent, and replace the lease exhibits. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (Lease 6819; A3305; RA# 2021093) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)

19 TAHOE SIERRA ESTATES ASSOCIATION (APPLICANT): Consider waiver of rent, penalty, and interest; acceptance of a lease quitclaim deed; and application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 624 Olympic Drive, Tahoe City, Placer County; for an existing pier previously authorized by the Commission; 43 existing mooring buoys and four navigational marker buoys; and removal of two existing navigational marker buoys and one freshwater intake pipeline with conduit not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (Lease 9167; RA# 30318) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)

20 THE GAR WOOD BUILDING, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Other Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 4998 North Lake Boulevard,
near Carnelian Bay, Placer County; for an existing restaurant accommodation pier, 14 mooring buoys, and three marker buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 5402; A3301; RA# 2021183) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: S. Avila)

21 MARGARET MILLER TREMBLEY, TRUSTEE OF THE MARGARET MILLER TREMBLEY REVOCABLE TRUST DATED AUGUST 2, 1993; MARGARET TREMBLEY-GAB; AND THOMAS R. CHRISTIANSON AND ALISON T. CHRISTIANSON, TRUSTEES OF THE CHRISTIANSON FAMILY TRUST UNDER AGREEMENT DATED JANUARY 1, 2008 (LESSEE); ROBERT A. BUCCOLA (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Lease Number PRC 8362, a General Lease - Recreational Use, and application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 8305 Meeks Bay Avenue, Meeks Bay, El Dorado County; for an existing pier, boathouse, boat lift, and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8362; A3299; RA# 2021121) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: J. Holt)

22 UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in the Yuba River, adjacent to Assessor's Parcel Numbers 006-170-141, -140, -139, -126, -119, and -118; and 005-270-176, -140, and -018, near Marysville, Yuba County; for habitat restoration, floodplain excavation and grading, creation of a side perennial channel, and riparian revegetation. CEQA Consideration: Mitigated Negative Declaration, certified by the Yuba County Planning Department, State Clearinghouse Number 2021030284, and adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring Program. (A2982; RA# 2020344) (A 3; S 4) (Staff: N. Lee)

23 CARL M. WARMACK AND PAMELA J. WARMACK, AS TRUSTEES OF THE WARMACK FAMILY TRUST, DATED MAY 4, 2015; CHARLES M. CHEVALIER, JR. AND JOAN C. CHEVALIER AS TRUSTEES OF THE CHEVALIER REVOCABLE TRUST, DATED DECEMBER 20, 2005; WILLOW J. ANSTEAD, CATHERINE A. RAMIREZ (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 8261 Meeks Bay Avenue, Meeks Bay El Dorado County; for one existing mooring buoy. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8319; A3215; RA# 2021082) (A 5; S 1) (Staff: L. Anderson)
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24  WS MARINA, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (LESSEE): Consider amendment of Lease Number 3953, a General Lease - Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 5190 West Lake Boulevard, near Homewood, Placer County; for maintenance dredging. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3953; A3473; RA# 2021200) (A 1; S 1) (Staff: N. Lee)

Bay/Delta Region

25  JOYCE M. BONIFIELD, AS TRUSTEE UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF A TRUST AGREEMENT DATED MARCH 21, 2013, KNOWN AS THE JOYCE M. BONIFIELD REVOCABLE TRUST (LESSEE/ASSIGNOR); JAMES LOUIE CUNNINGHAM AND LORI LYNN CUNNINGHAM (APPLICANT/ASSIGNEE): Consider assignment of a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land in Corte Madera Creek, adjacent to 147 Greenbrae Boardwalk, near Larkspur, Marin County; for an existing boat dock and appurtenant facilities. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (Lease 9261; A3266; RA# 2021062) (A 10; S 2) (Staff: C. Hudson)

26  CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (APPLICANT): Termination of a Public Agency Permit and Right-of-Way Map and approval of a Public Agency Permit and Right-of-Way Map, pursuant to Section 101.5 of the Streets and Highway Code and Section 6210.3 of the Public Resources Code, of sovereign land in the American River, for the American River Bridge Deck Replacement Project, including approval of two Temporary Construction Areas, near Cal Expo, Sacramento, Sacramento County. CEQA Consideration: Mitigated Negative Declaration and Addendum, adopted by the California Department of Transportation, State Clearinghouse No. 2020100388, and adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring Program. (A3187; RA# 2021020) (A 7; S 6) (Staff: A. Franzoia)

27  CITY OF SAN JOSE (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in the historic bed of the Guadalupe River, near Alviso, San Jose, Santa Clara County; for a public street and a
INDEX CONTINUED

portion of a bridge. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4491; A-163; RA# 2021010) (A 25; S 10) (Staff: K. Connor)

28 TONY JOE CONRAD AND MARY FERNANDO CONRAD, TRUSTEES OF THE TONY AND MARY CONRAD REVOCABLE TRUST DATED JULY 27, 2000 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Protective Structure Use, of sovereign tide and submerged land located in the Pacific Ocean, adjacent to 49 Terrace Avenue, Bolinas, Marin County; for an existing concrete seawall. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 5881; RA# 2020051) (A 10; S 2) (Staff: M. Schroeder)

29 CROCKETT COMMUNITY SERVICES DISTRICT (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Permit Number PRC 5420, a General Permit - Public Agency Use, and application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of filled sovereign land located in and along the Carquinez Strait, Crockett, Contra Costa County; for an existing pump house, force main pipeline, equalization tank, and sewage wastewater outfall pipeline. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 2595; RA# 20211146) (A 14; S 3) (Staff: K. Connor)

30 ECO SERVICES OPERATIONS CORP. (LESSOR): Consider revision of rent to Lease Number PRC 7660, a General Lease - Industrial and Protective Structure Use, of filled and unfilled sovereign land located adjacent to 100 Mococo Road, in Peyton Slough and Carquinez Strait, Martinez, Contra Costa county; for a wastewater treatment facility and appurtenant facilities, outfall pipeline, road, railroad spur, utilities, retention pond, fences, sheet pile and rip rap bank protection, groundwater monitoring wells, capped remediated soils in old Peyton Slough channel, and open wetland and marshland habitat. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 7660; RA 08314)(A 14; S 3) (Staff: V. Caldwell)

31 IRONHOUSE SANITARY DISTRICT (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in the San Joaquin River, adjacent to Assessor's Parcel Number 027-050-001; and in Dutch Slough, adjacent to Assessor's Parcel Numbers 0270-040-001 and 037-191-029, at Jersey Island, near
Oakley, Contra Costa County; for an existing treated effluent pipeline, effluent outfall pipeline, diffuser, and rock riprap. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7889; A2701; RA# 2020358) (A 11; S 7) (Staff: G. Asimakopoulos)

32 PHILLIPS 66 COMPANY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of sovereign land located in Pacheco Creek, adjacent to Assessor's Parcel Number 159-140-040, near Martinez, Contra Costa County; for an existing non-operational pipeline. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7859; RA# 2019332) (A 14; S 3) (Staff: M. Schroeder)

33 SANTA CRUZ YACHT CLUB (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Monterey Bay, near Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz County; for the seasonal placement, use, and maintenance of five marker buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (A3530; RA# 2021245) (A 29; S 17) (Staff: D. Simpkin)

34 THE LOST ISLE PARTNERS, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED PARTNERSHIP (APPLICANT): Consider application for a caretaker status General Lease - Recreational, Protective Structure, and Right-of-Way Use, of sovereign land located in the San Joaquin River at Acker Island, adjacent to 11050 Acker Island, near Stockton, San Joaquin County; for existing derelict boat docks, appurtenant facilities, barge and work vessels, and underground power line previously authorized by the Commission; and derelict boardwalk structure and decks, and Sheriff boat dock and ramp not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7080; RA# 2020415) (A 13; S 5) (Staff: M. Schroeder)

35 USGS CALIFORNIA WATER SCIENCE CENTER (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Other, of sovereign land located in Sacramento River, adjacent to Assessor's Parcel Number 002-0010-023, Sacramento, Sacramento County; for an existing 2-pile dolphin. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 2407; RA# 2021032) (A 7; S 6) (Staff: M. Schroeder)
INDEX CONTINUED

36 CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION AND CALIFORNIA COASTAL COMMISSION (PARTIES): Consider acceptance of an offer to dedicate a public lateral access easement adjacent to 31430 Broad Beach Road, Malibu, Los Angeles County. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (W24665, I2523) (A 50; S 27) (Staff: L. Pino)

37 CITY OF DEL MAR (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use and Dredging, of sovereign land in the San Dieguito River and the Pacific Ocean, Del Mar, San Diego County; for dredging of the San Dieguito River Inlet and the deposition of 50,000 cubic yards of sand annually at Del Mar City Beach under the City of Del Mar Sand Compatibility and Opportunistic Use Program (SCOUP). CEQA Consideration: Mitigated Negative Declaration, adopted by the City of Del Mar, State Clearinghouse Number 2020040181, and adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring Program. (A3435; RA#2021179) (A 78; S 39) (Staff: K. Connor)

38 CITY OF PISMO BEACH (LESSEE): Consider revision of rent for Lease Number PRC 6674, a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in the Pacific Ocean, Pismo Beach, San Luis Obispo County; for an existing public pier. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 6674) (A 35; S 17) (Staff: V. Caldwell)

39 ROBERT P. MANIACI, AS A TRUSTEE OF THE ROBERT P. AND MARY M. MANIACI FAMILY TRUST DATED JULY 14, 1993 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in the Main Channel of Huntington Harbour, adjacent to 16642 Somerset Lane, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for an existing boat dock, access ramp, and cantilevered deck. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3173; A3447; RA# 2021188) (A 72; S 34) (Staff: J. Holt)

40 MONTEREY COUNTY WATER RESOURCES AGENCY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in the Old Salinas River, adjacent to Assessor's Parcel Numbers 135-021-005 and 229-041-012, near Castroville, Monterey County; for an existing concrete box culvert with concrete mat, steel slide gate, log boom, riprap bank protection, and appurtenant facilities. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7935,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>MICHAEL S. MORRIS, TRUSTEE OF THE WILLIAM S. BANNASCH LIVING TRUST DATED AUGUST 30, 2002 (LESSEE/ASSIGNEE); LINEAR BANNASCH (APPLICANT/ASSIGNEE): Consider assignment of a General Lease - Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located adjacent to 523-525 Pacific Avenue, Solana Beach, San Diego County; for one seacave/notch fill. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (Lease No. PRC 7128; RA# 2021190) (A 78; S 39) (Staff: D. Simpkin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (APPLICANT): Consider application for General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of sovereign land in the Salinas River adjacent to Assessor's Parcel Numbers 229-011-025 and 229-011-027, near Marina, Monterey County; for an existing natural gas pipeline not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (A2539; RA# 12518) (A 29; S 17) (Staff: L. Pino)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>RTI INFRASTRUCTURE, INC. (LESSEE): Consider adoption of an Addendum to a Mitigated Negative Declaration, State Clearinghouse No. 2020040309, and amendment of Lease Number 9632, a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of sovereign land in the Pacific Ocean, Pismo State Beach, Grover Beach, San Luis Obispo County; for the relocation of installation, use, and maintenance of two 6-inch-diameter steel conduits and one 2-inch-diameter subsea fiber optic cable, amend Section 2, Special Provisions, replace lease exhibits, and revise annual rent and bond. (Lease 9632; A3426; RA# 2021165) (A 35; S 17) (Staff: D. Simpkin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY AND SAN DIEGO GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of sovereign land located in the Pacific Ocean, San Onofre, San Diego County; for two existing non-operational offshore concrete pipelines associated with San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) Unit 1. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
School Lands

45 AT&T CORP, SUBSIDIARY OF SBC COMMUNICATIONS, INC (LESSEE): Consider revision of rent to Lease Number PRC 2984, a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of State-owned school land located within a portion of Section 36, Township 12 North, Range 5 East, SBM, southwest of Baker, San Bernardino County; for an underground cable. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 2984) (A 33; S 16) (Staff: V. Caldwell)

46 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA EDISON COMPANY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, of State indemnity school land located in a portion of Section 1, Township 2 North, Range 5 East, SBM, near Landers, San Bernardino County; for an overhead electric distribution line and installation of two wooden poles. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7528; A3380; RA# 2021139) (A 42; S 16) (Staff: R. Collins)

Mineral Resources Management

47 ALPINE OCEAN, INCORPORATED (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Offshore Geophysical Survey Permit to conduct geophysical surveys on granted and ungranted tidelands and submerged lands statewide, from the mean high tide line to 3 nautical miles offshore. CEQA Consideration: Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring Program, and addendum, State Clearinghouse No. 2013072021. (A3309; RA# 2021246) (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: C. Fox)

48 ARGUELLO, INC. (LESSEE): Consider acknowledgment of a full quitclaim deed for a water injection lease No. 7180, of tidelands and submerged lands offshore Gaviota, Santa Barbara County. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (Lease 7180) (A 37; S 19) (Staff: E. Tajer)

49 CITY OF LONG BEACH (GRANTEE): Consider approval of subsidence monitoring costs for vertical measurements and studies for the 2022-2023 Fiscal Year, City of
INDEX CONTINUED

Long Beach, Los Angeles County. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (W 10443) (A 70; S 33, 34) (Staff: P. Regan)

50 CITY OF LONG BEACH (GRANTEE): Consider acceptance of the First Modification and Supplement of the Long Beach Unit Annual Plan (July 1, 2021, through June 30, 2022), Long Beach Unit, Wilmington Oil Field, Los Angeles County. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (W 17166) (A 70; S 33, 34) (Staff: J. Abedi)

51 CITY OF LONG BEACH (GRANTEE): Consider acceptance of the Long Beach Unit Annual Plan (July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2023), Long Beach Unit, Wilmington Oil Field, Los Angeles County. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (W 17166) (A 70; S 33, 34) (Staff: J. Abedi)

52 ETRAC, INCORPORATED (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Offshore Geophysical Survey Permit to conduct geophysical surveys on granted and ungranted tidelands and submerged lands statewide, from the mean high tide line to 3 nautical miles offshore. CEQA Consideration: Mitigated Negative Declaration, Mitigation Monitoring Program, and addendum, State Clearinghouse No. 2013072021. (A3415; RA# 2021172) (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: C. Fox)

53 GILL RANCH GAS STORAGE, LLC (ASSIGNOR/LESSEE) AND PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (LESSEE); SENSA HOLDINGS, LLC (ASSIGNEE): Consider assignment of a portion of the working interest of gas storage lease No. 8885 (subsurface only), on about 71.6 acres of State-owned sovereign land lying several thousand feet below the San Joaquin River in Sections 2, 22, and 28, Township 13 South, Range 16 East, Mount Diablo Base Meridian, Gill Ranch Gas Field, Fresno and Madera counties. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (Lease 8885; RA# 2021173) (A 25, 29, 31; S 12, 14, 16) (Staff: N. Heda)

54 PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (LESSEE): Consider issuance of a renewal and amendment for gas storage lease No. 2839 (subsurface only), of State-owned sovereign land located approximately 10 miles west of the City of Stockton, San Joaquin County. The tidelands and submerged lands are part of the McDonald Island gas storage field and are located within the
Southwest quarter and Southeast quarter of Section 24; the Northwest quarter, Northeast quarter, and Southeast quarter of Section 25; and the Northeast quarter of Section 36, Township 2 North, Range 4 East; and the Northwest quarter and Southwest quarter of Section 30 and Section 31, Township 2 North, Range 5 East, Mount Diablo Meridian. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 2839; RA #: 2021154) (A 15; S 5) (Staff: N. Heda)

Marine Environmental Protection
No items for this section

Administration
No items for this section

Legal

55 CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION (PARTY): Consider amendment of the Commission's Delegation of Authority to authorize the Executive Officer to take actions on applications where two or more Commissioners have recused themselves from consideration of an application due to a conflict of interest. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (W 9301) (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: W. Crunk, J. Garrett)

Kapiloff Land Bank Trust Acquisition/Expenditure
No items for this section

External Affairs

Granted Lands

56 CITY OF LONG BEACH (TRUSTEE): Review a proposed tideland oil revenue expenditure in an amount not to exceed $5,400,000 by the City of Long Beach for seven capital improvement projects on and adjacent to legislatively granted sovereign land in the City of Long Beach, Los Angeles County. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (G 05-03) (A 70; S 33) (Staff: M. Moser)

57 CITY OF SANTA BARBARA (TRUSTEE): Review a proposed tideland revenue expenditure in an
amount not to exceed $1,200,000 by the City of Santa Barbara for three capital improvement projects located on legislatively granted sovereign land in the City of Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara County. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (G 15-01.5) (A 37; S 19) (Staff: M. Moser)

VI Informational Calendar 58

58 CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION: Report on the continued monitoring of possible subsidence, Long Beach Unit, Wilmington Oil Field, Los Angeles County. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (W 10442, W 16001) (A 70; S 33, 34) (Staff: P. Regan)

VII Regular Calendar 59-65

59 CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION: Consider certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse No. 2021060145), adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring Program and Statement of Findings, and authorization to proceed with Component 1 of the PRC 421 Decommissioning Project. (W30159-4) (A 37; S 19) (Staff: E. Gillies, J. Fabel, P. Regan) 40

60 CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION: Consider the second distribution of port stimulus funding to mitigate negative economic impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic pursuant to the 2021-2022 Budget Act. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: R. Boggiano, B. Johnson) 58

61 CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION (INFORMATIONAL): Update on the status of the existing offshore oil and gas production and pipeline leases managed by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: N. Dozier) 70

62 CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION: Discussion and possible action on state legislation relevant to the California State Lands Commission. CEQA Consideration: not applicable. (A & S: Statewide)
CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION: Consider supporting AB 1832 (Rivas), which would ban hard mineral seabed mining in state waters subject to tidal influence, except as provided. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: S. Pemberton)

CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION: Consider supporting AB 2109 (Bennett and Bloom), which would make it unlawful to use any bait, lure, or chum to attract any white shark or to place any bait, lure, or chum into the water when a white shark is either visible or known to be present except if the activity is authorized by a permit issued by the Department of Fish and Wildlife for scientific, educational, or propagation purposes. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: S. Pemberton)

CALIFORNIA OCEAN PROTECTION COUNCIL (INFORMATIONAL): Presentation by the Ocean Protection Council on the State Agency Sea-Level Rise Action Plan for California, a roadmap for planning and implementing coastal resilience created by the Sea-Level Rise Leadership Team. CEQA Consideration: not applicable. (A & S: Statewide) (Staff: M. Farnum, J. Lucchesi)
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, everyone. This meeting of the State Lands Commission is being resumed after the Commissioners participated in a tour of the Pier 421 decommissioning project site conducted today between 11 a.m. and 12 noon. All representatives of the Commission are present. I'm State Controller Betty Yee, also Chair of the Commission. I'm joined today by Dr. Matt Dumlao, representing Lieutenant Governor Eleni Kounalakis, and Commissioner Gayle Miller representing the Department of Finance.

Ms. Lucchesi, would you like to introduce the others who are present today.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: We do have a quorum present of the Commissioner -- of the Commission. We also have a number of staff joining us virtually, including meeting liaison Kim Lunetta, our Zoom co-host Katie Robinson-Filipp, Mike Farinha, and Phil Schlatter, and a number of State Lands staff who will be making presentations to the Commission virtually.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much.

For the benefit of those joining us in the audience and 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, and
marine oil terminals, and 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 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
acknowledge and express gratitude to the Chumash people on
whose lands this meeting is being held. The Chumash have
maintained a constant presence on the landscape, living on
this coast and fishing in these waters for countless
generations. The Commission takes seriously its trust
relationship with these sovereign governments and
recognize that California's native people are essential
stewardship partners of the State's lands and resources.

I also wanted to take a moment to honor the
California Native American communities all 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're 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.

And I also just wanted to thank Chairwoman Mia
Lopez of the Coastal Band of Chumash -- of the Chumash
Nation who joined us at the Pier 421 decommissioning
project site visit this morning.

I also would like to welcome and introduce Mayor
Paula Perotte who is the great Mayor of the City of
Goleta. We are very grateful that you are hosting us here
today, this meeting of the State Lands Commission, Mayor,
in this beautiful facility to really allow the broadest
public engagement in our Commission's proceedings today.

Welcome. And please, the floor is yours.

GOLETA MAYOR PEROTTE: Thank you so much. It's
my honor to -- as the Mayor of the City of Goleta to
welcome you to the -- welcome the California State Lands
Commissioners. I think this is the very first time you've
had a public meeting in Goleta, so we're very honored and
thank you.

I prepared a few comments that I'd like to share.

Sharing Goleta City Hall with the Commissioners
and staff is particularly relevant today as we combine forces to remove the fast -- last two shoreline oil wells in Goleta, the Piers 421 facilities on Haskell's Beach. The Piers 421 facility straddle the Goleta and State jurisdictional boundaries and the Commission will be considering full removal of these derelict facilities today.

If you don't already know, we have been working hard alongside the State Lands Commission staff to remove old oil works, some dating back to the 1930s, from Goleta's coastline. And we've been working with -- with your staff for at least 10 years now. The successful implementation of Beach Hazards Removal Project is representative of the City of Goleta and State's ability to collaborate, to share resources, and preserve to restore our shared coastline to pre-oil era conditions.

More recently, the Goleta State partnership served to facilitate the successful plugging and abandonment of the 421 wells. The well plugging eliminated the risk the wells posed to oil spills along Haskell's Beach and beyond. Now, it's time to remove the physical features of the -- the Pier 421 facilities. Doing so will make the Haskell's Ellwood coastline safe from the hazards these structures pose to our public and the environment. Complete removal of the 421 facilities
inclusive of wells, caissons, piers, bluffed high endpoints, and an access road that was artificially installed over our sandy beach is evidence of our transition away from fossil fuels.

Indeed, old oil and gas platforms, piers, and wells are leaving our coastal waters for good. Our coastline along Ellwood and Haskell's beaches will ultimately be free of oil and infrastructure for the first time in nearly 100 years. Our community and the environment are safer because of these decommissioning efforts. And for this, we can be proud.

Thank you to Jennifer Lucchesi, the State Lands Commission Chief Executive Officer and her complete staff. The relationship we have developed over these years is fostered by your commitment to the Goleta community and beyond. We are so grateful.

We share a similar vision of a natural Goleta coastline, free from the oil works from the early 1900s, and the meeting today is monumental from that regard.

Finally, as was introduced already, but I want to welcome our State Lands Commissioners. We have representing Lieutenant Governor, alternate, Chief of Staff, Dr. Matt Dumlao; State Controller -- California State Controller Betty Yee, and State Deputy Director of Finance, Gayle Miller. Thank you so much for being here
today. We really appreciate it.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Mayor Perotte, and really have been so fortunate to have this shared partnership with the City of Goleta. And we will continue to make progress together.

Thank you.

The next item of business will public comment. And before I open up 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 meeting. Let me turn it over to Ms. Lucchesi at this time to quickly share some instructions about how we can best participate -- we can best participate in this meeting, so that it can run as smoothly as possible, including my tongue-tiedness.

(Laughter.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: It's hard to get back into the groove of an in-person meeting after taking such a beautiful walk on the coast earlier.

So thank you, Chair Yee, Commissioners. For public comment, we will take those members of the public who are here in person first and then hear comments from those members of the public who are participating virtually.
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, please complete an electronic request to speak from -- form available on our website, our homepage. We will call you in the order in which you submitted the electronic request to speak. For those participating virtually, please make sure you have your microphones or phones muted to avoid any background noise.

To help us call on you through Zoom, please raise your hand during the appropriate comment section one of two ways. First, if you are attending on the Zoom platform, please raise your land in Zoom. If you are new to Zoom, and you joined our meeting using the Zoom application, you can click on the hand icon at the bottom of your screen. When you click on that hand, it will raise your hand.

Second, if you're joining our meeting by phone, you must press star nine on your keypad to raise your hand to make a comment. If you are calling in and want to view the meeting, please include -- including the PowerPoint presentations, please view the meeting through the CAL-SPAN live webcast link. There will be a slight time delay, but it will avoid an echo or feedback from using the Zoom application and your phone. We will call on
individuals who have their hand raised -- who have raised
their hands in the order they are raised using the names
they registered with or the last three digits of their
identifying phone number. After you call -- 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.

Remember, you have a limit of three minutes to
speak on an item, and 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.

The Commission has also established an email
address to compile public comments for our meetings. It's
address is cslc.commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov. We have
received a number of emails 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, along with the other public comment letters and
emails we have already received.

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

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Ms. Lucchesi. So
our next order of business is the public comment period. If anyone wants to address the Commission on any matter not on today's agenda, I will call on those who are here in person first. You will have three minutes to provide your comments. And next, we will move on to those joining us virtually.

    Do we have sign-ups?

    EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: So Katie will --

    yes.

    CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

    EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: So Katie Robinson-Filipp will announce those who are going to comment in person as well as virtually.

    CHAIRPERSON YEE: Very good.

    EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: So she's handling all the public commenting virtually herself.

    CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Katie. Over to you.

    ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. At this time, we have no one signed up in person to provide general public comment, so we'll move on to the in virtual -- to the virtual public speakers. For our first public speaker, we have Susanne Cumming.

    CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon, Susanne. Are you there?
MS. CUMMING: Oh. Yes, I am. Thank you. Good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Please proceed. Yes.

MS. CUMMING: Thank you. Good afternoon, Honorable Chair and commissioners. My name is Susanne Cumming. I'm a lawyer, member of Defend Ballona Wetlands, and Sierra Club. I speak as an individual. California Fish and Wildlife recently released a Request for Qualifications for a contractor to begin work on design and permitting of Sequence 1 and 2 of the bulldozing project planned for the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve.

The area on the map includes significant acreage that's owned by you the State Lands Commission. I ask that you, the State Lands Commission, intercede and say no to the installation of any new fossil fuel infrastructure that the Sequence 1 and 2 would facilitate. Also, please, as a Commission, ask the Governor to withdraw this project and start over, based on new information about methane gas and climate change impacts, and to new information about sea level rise concerns.

Using correct sea level and flood control figures needs to happen before certification, so that people can actually comment on the real project. Again, please ask the Governor to withdraw this project.
Thanks.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Ms. Cumming.

Katie, our next public commenter.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Our next public commenter is Marcia Hanscom.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon, Marcia.

MS. HANSCOM: Hi. Honorable Commissioners, Marcia Hanscom with the Protect Ballona Wetlands.

I want to sort of expand a little bit on -- upon what Susanne Cumming just mentioned. We're very concerned about this new request or new announcement that just came out from California Department of Fish and Wildlife suggesting they're going to be spending some significant State public resources, more than -- nearly $2 million on designing and getting permitting for a partial part of this bigger project that is so controversial and so destructive.

One of our big concerns is that the land that they're looking at doing this on that is on their map that they've put with the Request for Qualifications to a new contractor is land that is owned by the State Lands Commission, not the fresh water marsh, but the other land that is owned by the State Lands Commission adjacent to the fresh water marsh. And that land is very, very
fragile. It is -- and it's also a very important habitat. There -- it's -- it's called non-tidal pickleweed habitat. And there are bird species that come there and use this habitat looking for food on their migrations and they're -- these birds don't go anywhere else in the ecological reserve. It's very fascinating that we've documented numerous species there.

And we're just at a quandary as to why this particular parcel -- or this particular area of the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve would even be considered for bulldozing, and earth moving, and complete habitat alteration. We really wonder if the State Lands Commission has even been questioned about this or conferred with. And we hope that you might be looking very carefully at all the various agreements that your Commission has made over the years with Fish and Wildlife and other State agencies as to what your role is here, because we believe that the State Lands Commission -- you know, we're really grateful for all you've been doing for decommissioning oil wells.

And this particular -- this particular notice says that they will be moving gas infrastructure. And we're very worried about this -- this entire matter and we just want to make sure that you have oversight and that the public has better input to this before they proceed.
We actually don't think they should be proceeding there, but we really would like some better oversight.

So thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Ms. Hanscom.

Katie, our next public commenter.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have three people who are currently signed up to provide a public comment. However, I cannot identify them on the attendee list, so I'll just ask that they raise their hand if they're on, and then I'll come back to them.

Robert Roy van de Hoek, Chris Ku, and Mary Beth Trautwein. And I'll come back to you -- to you, if you're on the attendee list, if you'll just raise your hand.

Thank you.

So for our next speaker, we have Stegink Dan.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon.

MR. STEGINK: Thank you, Chair Yee and commissioners. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, we can hear you, Mr. Dan.

MR. STEGINK: Excellent and thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Please proceed.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Yee, I think he muted himself.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Mr. Dan, you are on mute.
MR. STEGINK: How about now?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: I can hear you. We can hear you.

MR. STEGINK: Apologies.

I'm here today on behalf of a long lost village -- indian village called Timigtac, where the first Native Americans were enslaved to mine limestone for the Pacifica -- sorry, the San Francisco Presidio and Mission Dolores. You can see a PowerPoint I presented at the California Coastal Commission at smcfree.com. Again that's smcfree.com.

I'm going to -- in less then three minutes, I'm going to read a couple quotes from some archaeological studies I reviewed. At one time, I was adept at finding ship wrecks. And it turns out the method of finding long lost Indian villages is somewhat similar.

The first is a 1979 archaeological investigation by Stephen Dietz. And it says, "the Headman of the San Pedro village of Pruristace and one of his co-wives brought two of their children to be baptized in February 1779. Along with them came two girls from Timigtac commonly called la Calera. Calera Valley is now in the location of Rockaway Beach in the City of Pacifica".

The second one I'm going to take -- talk about is USGS San Andreas fault survey Early Mori Point history and
its quarry. And it says, "The Aramai Village of Timigtac, thought to have been in the Rockaway Beach area, may have existed at Mori Point. Whether these Indian people called the place Timigtac or not, an archaeological survey in 1969 recorded a shell midden present leaving no doubt that prehistoric people occupied this site. During the Spanish period Mori Point was within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Padres at Mission San Francisco de Asis", which is Mission Dolores.

From a Golden Gate National Recreation document, "Beginning in 1776, they use indian labor to quarry limestone at Mori Point for their projects at San Francisco".

Also in 1963, caltrans identified two pre-historic sites in the Rockaway Quarry called SMA-268, and SMA-162.

Again, you can take a look at the presentation I gave at California Coastal Commission. Wrapping it up, Archaeologists agree that Timigtac was in Rockaway Beach along Calera Creek, Native Americans were enslaved by the Spanish Missions to mine limestone on that parcel for both San Francisco's Presidio Fort and Mission Dolores, and Native American shellmounds exist on that parcel.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Mr. Dan, for your
comments.

Katie, our next public commenters.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FI LIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. Our next public commenter is Christina Ku.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon, Christina.

MS. KU: Hi. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Barely.

MS. KU: Barely. Okay.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: That's better.

MS. KU: Is this any better?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes. Thank you.

MS. KU: Oh, okay. Great. Yes. Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak here. And basically we really wanted to speak up for the Ballona Wetlands, which is in Southern California. And much of the land is under the State Lands Commission's control.

And, you know, we're just citizens who are living in this beautiful area. And we see every day all the wildlife and the different kind of, you know, native plant species there. I mean, there are over 1,700 different kinds of species of animals and plants there. And we just do not need State Lands to be supporting more of fossil fuel, of gas and oil in this country or on this planet.

And I'm sure you're all aware of all the dangers,
and climate change, and habitat loss, and wildlife loss, and dangers to human. I mean, you all know what happened to the gas explosions in Aliso Canyon a few years ago, a huge disaster. And I know we're all trying to prevent that. And it's going to happen here at the Ballona Wetlands with SoCalGas old storage tanks. We have gone by and see bubbles coming out of water. We have videos of that and we have pictures of them, you know, starting to drill and do all this damage and them wanting to lift up millions of cubic yards of soil from that. And they don't see that as damaging or destroying the wetlands.

So all of this information has been so frustrating. And the California Department of Fish and Wildlife has just not been so forthright with what they're doing and keep calling it restoration. We've got scientists and ecologists who have come on board and said what they're doing -- what the Department of Fish and Wildlife and what SoCalGas what they're planning to do is not restoration at all. They've been able to hire, you know, expert promotion advertising folks to come up with this scheme.

And I till you, the public really sees through this, and that's why the website defendballonawetlands.org, we have thousands and thousands of people, public citizens who live around this area. We
know the truth and we know what they're doing. We've
signed on to not supporting fossil fuel, not supporting
SoCalGas, not supporting Department of Fish and Wildlife
to do any of this and destroying the last wetlands in Los
Angeles.

If you go by there, you'll see all the beauty and
all the nature. And come onto the website and you'll
check out the beautiful photos that our local
photographers have captured to prove to you, to the
public, to all the government entities that this place is
a place to save for humans, for oceans, for all the
residents down here, and all the wildlife. So please say
no to fossil fuel. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Ms. Ku for your
comments.

Katie, our next public commenter.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank
you, Madam Chair. Our next public speaker is Jane
Velez-Mitchell. And again, if Robert Roy van de Hoek or
Mary Beth Trautwein are in attendance, I'd just ask that
you please raise your hand, so that we can call on you
later.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon, Jane.

MS. VELEZ-MITCHELL: Hello. And are you able to
hear me?
CHAIRPERSON YEE: We can hear you.

MS. VELEZ-MITCHELL: Thank you so much. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Jane Velez-Mitchell. I'm a journalist, author, and film maker living near the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve in Playa del Rey and I am speaking today to you to beg you, literally beg you, to use your powerful voices to tell Governor Newsom and other decision-makers not to bulldoze the Ballona Wetlands.

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife wants to start to do work on a portion of the Ballona Wetlands that is apparently owned by the State Lands Commission. Please, say no. The morally and environmentally responsible decision is to shut down the crumbling SoCalGas facility that sits deep under the Ballona Wetlands and not proceed with this greenwashing plan that purports to be a restoration, but is, in fact, a wholesale destruction of the wetlands. Please say no to any new fossil fuel infrastructure. And I just urge you to be on the right side of history.

Engineers who designed this project used incorrect flood risk standards. And that's why the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has not given its final stamp of approval for this controversial project. There are six lawsuits right now against this project. For people like
me living near the wetlands, the flood risk standards are
very important to get right, especially given the concerns
about sea level rise on the coast. It makes no sense to
approve a plan that would involve destroying levees at a
time of rising sea levels.

I just urge you to be on the right side of
history. Now, the bulldozing is going to take an area
that currently absorbs carbon, and through the very active
bulldozing, turn it into an area that releases carbon into
the atmosphere. This, of course, is wildly irresponsible
at a time of climate crisis. The bulldozing plan will
also take an area that is home to 1,700 species, including
threatened and endangered species, and completely destroy
their home and they have nowhere else to go. This is LA's
very last coastal wetlands.

This is wildly irresponsible at a time when we
are in the midst of the sixth mass extinction, and we are
begging other nations like Brazil not to bulldoze their
wetlands and decimate their wildlife. Again, this is
classic greenwashing. SoCalGas, along with developers
eyeing millions of dollars in contracts, thought they
could slap the word "Restoration" on this destructive plan
and get away with it, but the truth has come out. And
again, that's why there's half a dozen lawsuits against
this very destructive plan.
We have also learned that the so-called environmental groups that rubber stamped this bulldozing plan were later revealed to have taken sizable donations from SoCalGas. Indeed, one such environmental group had to go before the LA City Council and promise never to do that again. And the City Council proceeded to vote for a recommendation to shut this facility down, the SoCalGas facility.

The claim that this area is dying is nonsense. I personally can testify in a court of law that I see the wildlife on a daily basis.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Ms. Velez-Mitchell, your time has expired, but please complete your sentence.

MS. VELEZ-MITCHELL: Okay. Thank you. I'll just end by saying I -- why am I here? I see the wildlife on a daily basis. I saw 26 pelicans just the other day and I videotaped them to show proof. I see the egrets. I see the foxes. I see the owls. And they're all timestamped photographs. Why are we killing these animals when they have nowhere else to go, when we're in the midst of the sixth mass extinction. I just -- I just beg you to please, please be on the right side of history.

Thank you so much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much.

Katie, our next public speaker.
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Our next speaker is the Jeanette Vosburg.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon, Jeanette.

Jeanette, can you hear us?

MS. VOSBURG: Good afternoon, Coastal Commissioners. I'm Jeanette Vosburg with Grassroots Coalition, an Outreach Coordinator.

And as you may know, Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve is 533 acres that have been designated as a groundwater-dependent ecosystem. It has three underlying fresh water aquifers. It's fresh water is at or near the surface. Thanks to your support, and Grassroots Coalition -- well, thanks to the Coastal Commission's support and Grassroots Coalition's winning lawsuit, two illegal drains were capped in 2017. And now when it rains, fresh water ponds both north and south of Culver Boulevard in Area B.

Grassroots has advocated for years for a sustainable alternative in the final Environmental Impact Report. In 2021, four different environmental organizations, were alluded to a moment ago, including Grassroots Coalition and, Ballona Ecosystem Education Project, and others. They all filed lawsuits objecting to the absence of a fresh water restoration alternative.

We and many members of the public have been very
vociferous about our opposition to the full tidal creation proposed. And now 15 years after Bolsa Chica had this same in quotes restoration process visited upon them using a full tidal solution, now a new report in 2021 is calling for remediation of the so-called restoration by closing the full tidal solution that they used.

We're advocating learning from Bolsa Chica's mistakes. We need to use, and other -- other people -- other commissioners are saying we need to look at the current sea level rise data. We. Need to acknowledge that California's in the worst drought in 200 years -- or 1,200 years they're predicting. And before we rush into this failed approach, we ask to have the Ballona Wetlands Ecological Reserve Final Environmental Impact Report withdrawn and redone. We urged corrections of the errors and inconsistencies. We use -- we suggest using a paid professional facilitator, where all of us can talk about things that we've objected to over -- you know, right now and all the way back 30 years of time.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Ms. Vosburg.

Katie, our next public speaker, please.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you. Our next public speaker is Robert van de Hoek.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon, Robert.
MR. VAN DE HOEK: Hello. Good afternoon.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon. We can hear you. Please proceed.

MR. VAN DE HOEK: Okay. I recognize your voice. Hello, Betty Yee, Chairwoman of State Lands Commission. Appreciate the time. I had great difficulty through the Zoom and somebody helped me out pretty well through the phone effort, but I'm here now.

Okay. Ready to make a comment. I'm an environmental scientist and my name is Robert van de Hoek. And I wish to tell you and inform you that the three-member -- and I'm not speaking to the Ballona Wetlands like the other people. I'm speaking directly to what's called freshwater marsh, which is actually also officially and legally referred to as a detention, retention pollution basin for freshwater runoff from the Playa Vista development for the last, oh, 20 years, fresh water -- urban fresh water comes into this area, but it immediately turns into brackish and salt water, because the soil is saline. And it's not a sustainable project. And I'm asking the State Lands Commission to revisit the agreement that you've set up there and initially and to have a more public and transparent process.

It's not sustainable and the fresh water that comes there turns salt -- saline, because of the soil
again. And there's an extensive recycled water pipeline that brings nitrogen enriched fresh water, not rainwater fresh water, but nitrogen enriched from the sewage treatment plant. And that suppresses the salts with -- through a hydrology process called capillary action, similar to growing vegetable crops in salty soil. If you put a lot of fresh water on it, you can suppress the salts. And then after a few hours after you stop having the sprinkler running, the salts come back up. And there's all kind of salt marsh plants there. And all the trees that were planted in the State Lands Commission detention basin, the trees are dying that are -- have been planted there, because the roots have reached into the salt soil.

It's not functional and it used to be that the LA City Council and the State Controller had a seat on a three-member conservancy board to manage it. But the City Council and the State Controller has been removed and the State Department of Fish and Wildlife, somehow untransparently with the public not getting to know, became a member of that. And so they are driving the project that you've heard others talking about and they are kind of taking over your juris -- your State Lands Commission land. And I think it's time to have a new revisit. And we are trying an approach to the State
Legislature to have a law amended to change the State Lands Commission direction. But I think you can do the -- you can make the change internally through a vote of your commissioners. Thank you for -- there's so much more I wanted to say, but thank you for the extra time.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much for your comments.

Katie, our next public speaker, please?

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. At this time, we have no other hands raised or no one else on the speaker list to provide public comment.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right. Thank you very much, Katie. Thank you, commissioners.

Our next item of business will be the adoption of the minutes from the Commission's meeting of February 25th, 2022. May I have a motion to approve the minutes and second.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Move approval

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

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Seconded by Commissioner Dumlao.

Any objection to a unanimous vote?
Okay. Hearing none, such will be the order.

Commissioners, before we proceed to the next order of business, which is the Executive Officer's report, I'd like to take a moment of personal privilege to pay tribute to a colleague who departed us recently, and that is former Deputy Controller of Environmental Policy Anne Baker.

Anne was a friend to many of us, a colleague, first and foremost, and a friend as well for many years with many of us in this room. But just a little bit about her life. And I will say that my office has been quite reeling over the news for the last few weeks. It's hard to really put your arms around the impact that she's had as an environmental leader here in California, but I'm going to try to just give it some color, if I can.

Born to parents who really encouraged her and her brother David to follow their passions, Anne chose to apply her strong analytical skills to democratic causes. And in that vein, just known for her brilliance, and her articulateness, and energy, and practicality, pragmatism, she was elected as the youngest member of Maryland House of Delegates. And as a Maryland legislator, a member of the Democratic National Committee. She was an old school Democrat, really focused on getting the work done and serving the people.
And her life would be changed forever when she met her future husband Bill Stall, who was a former Los Angeles Times writer and Pulitzer Prize winner who died in 2008. Their relationship was one that would have been the envy of many. Just following their passions and their causes with just, I would say, wild abandon, because both had just tremendous commitment and dedication to their craft. But Anne, I think for many of us in this room, would agree that she loved her work. She was a true comrade with anyone with whom she worked. And I know she did a lot of mentor -- mentoring of young people who really wanted to get into the environmental policy space. But really just in addition to being a mentor, she just was a great partner to work with. And anything related to how we have improved on protecting our air, water, and lands here in California, Anne Baker had a hand in really helping to do that.

She served multiple Controllers. She has served under former gubernatorial administration, been in every -- every capacity. Was never afraid to take on a challenging policy task. And I felt like her home was really here at the State Lands Commission in so many ways, because she loved this work, because it was never about being knee jerk. It was always about really just buckling down and doing the work, which I think is a hallmark of
this Commission.

And as I think about the legacy that she leaves with this Commission, she started with me as I took off as State Controller, and we both were in her office marveling at the fact that the State Lands Commission didn't have a strategic plan, and never had one since its inception. So we decided that that would be the first order of business during our tenure on the State Lands Commission. And it's really highlighted I think the work of how this Commission proceeds every day, and that is stakeholder based, publicly engaged, and we now have I think a strategic plan that all of us can be proud of. And as we saw this morning during our tour of the Pier 421 decommissioning site, this work is ever evolving.

And what I would say about Anne, and I think all of us knew this too, is that she wasn't the most patient person, but she was impatient about inaction. She was impatient about uninformed action. And what I know she would be particularly proud of in terms of what this Commission continues to do is our continual strengthening of our relationship with our tribal communities and our tribal consultation process, our continuing improvement in the execution of our Environmental Justice Policy, but more importantly, always, always applying the best available science and really having the team here at the
State Lands Commission be world renowned in terms of the work that we are doing and -- but not doing it for the fanfare, doing it because it's tough work and it's work that needs to be done.

And so I'm really just honored to pay a bit of tribute to a dear friend, a dear colleague, and someone who I know we will all miss dearly as we continue this work. And I know her memory will continue to be a blessing for so many of us in this room, that may her life continue to inspire the actions that we take from this day forward.

Rest in peace, Dear Anne.

Let me just open it up to my fellow commissioners to see if there are any comments.

Commissioner Dumlao.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: I did not know her as long as you did, Chair, but from the moment I met her, I think the word tenacity really jumped out at me. And we were fortunate to share some similar former bosses. And her reputation in a very, very good way preceded her. And I cannot think of how those major environmental policies could have gotten done without her work.

She was an incredible policymaker. And, you know, I think staff likes to so often just be in the background and don't get credit and don't want it. And I
think she would probably be the same way in a lot of ways, but she deserves a tremendous amount of credit for everything that she did for this state. So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner Dumlao.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Madam Controller, I think all your words about Anne's legacy, and leadership, and commitment, and understanding of these really important issues really meant the world to me. She was a colleague, and a friend, and a mentor, and her memory is certainly a blessing. And I -- I sincerely hope that I can -- I can manage a career like Anne did with such grace and professionalism, and also hope that she is -- she is resting in peace, and is with Bill and (inaudible)

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Miller.

Let me just make one last note. I know she was particularly proud of this being an all-women Commission. And she was someone who mentored women really without any hesitation. And to think about the women that we now have now in the climate space is just really quite phenomenal and Anne's hand on recruiting many of them. But Ms. Lucchesi, you being really a brilliant star in her -- in her life and for many of the Coastal Commissioners as well, Commissioners Brownsey, Bochco, Shallenberger. I
mean, there just have been so many who have been great partners in this work.

   And I -- as I mentioned, I think the best that we do in terms of paying tribute to Anne is to continue the work -- continue the work that she has started.

   And I think with that, let me turn it over to you, Ms. Lucchesi.

   EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Certainly. Thank you.

   CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Commissioners.

   EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Thank you so much, Chair Yee for the -- that beautiful tribute and Commissioners for your memories. I was one of the lucky ones that got to be mentored by Anne. I learned so much about the inner-workings of how to actually get policy made and how to implement policy. And there were times -- I'm a -- personally, I'm a very reserved person. She taught me to be direct, and ask exactly what you want, and in fact when you know it's the right thing, you demand it. And I can't even begin to think about how much I absorbed in just the space that I was able to occupy with her over the past seven years. She will be greatly missed and she was a wonderful colleague, and friend, and mentor. So thank you for that beautiful tribute, Chair Yee.

   CHAIRPERSON YEE: Commissioners, our next order
of business is Executive Officer's report. Ms. Lucchesi, may we have that report.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Certainly. I would like to update the Commissioners and members of the public about a number of different oil and gas projects we're working on.

First, just an update on the pipeline 0919, Platform Eva to shore pipeline incident. As you remember -- as you may remember on December 22nd of last year, DCOR, Commission lessee and operator of multiple offshore oil and gas operations reported a sheen off the coast of Orange County. An investigations found that pipeline 0919, which transports oil from State -- the state Platform Eva to shore was the source of the discharge. We have been working closely with OSPR, the Fire Marshal, DCOR, and other State and federal regulators to assess the situation and continue to investigate the pipeline to pursue repairs. Platform Eva and the pipeline continue to remain shut-in. Additional pipeline internal and external corrosion surveys are being conducted and analyzed. And DCOR is exploring options to repair or replace the pipeline in consultation with Commission staff and the State Fire Marshal and subject to regulatory review and approval.

Next, I want to update the Commission on the
Rincon Phase II Decommissioning Project. As you know, we completed the plug and abandonment of all 75 wells associated with those leases last year. We have moved on to Phase II, which is the feasibility study for the future disposition of the island, the causeway, and the onshore facilities.

On March 17th, we released a draft feasibility study for a 60-day public review and comment period. On May 4th, we'll be hosting a virtual public meeting to discuss the draft feasibility study and receive comments. We have notified all -- the community, interested parties, tribal governments, and others about the meeting and posted information on our website. After the comment period closes, we will revise the draft feasibility study to incorporate the comments received, finalize it, and then present it to the Commission for your consideration at a public meeting later this year.

The CEQA analysis will begin after the Commission acts on the feasibility study and a proposed project and alternatives are identified for further analysis.

Next, I do want to update the commission on our efforts at Platform Holly. We continue to maintain Platform Holly and onshore facilities to ensure public health and safety. Staff, Exxon, and their subcontractors have continued to plug and abandon the wells on the
platform with nine of the 30 wells sealed and installed with surface plugs. Operations are now proceeding in a phased approach. Six of the remaining 21 wells require more involved abandonment procedure. And those wells have been prepared for final abandonment operations.

We are on track to final -- to complete -- excuse me, complete plugging and abandoning of all 30 wells by the end of this year, which is a huge accomplishment especially given the delays with the COVID pandemic.

We plan later this year or early next year to come to the Commission with a request for authorization to hire a consultant to then conduct a feasibility study on the ultimate disposition of Platform Holly and pursue the CEQA analysis necessary. So we are moving forward with that decommissioning analysis as soon as we can as we complete the plugging and abandonment operations.

And finally as it relates to project updates, in February and March, we performed two diver surveys at Summerland Beach and around Rincon Well 102. And the findings of those surveys indicated that two wells along the Treadwell Pier are leaking, Treadwell 1 and Treadwell 5. We are continuing to monitor and investigate all the wells and seepage reports off of Summerland Beach. And our staff and our contractor InterAct are preparing cost estimates and engineering plans to reabandon those two
Treadwell wells later this year.

And finally, in conclusion, I also want to acknowledge and honor a former State Lands employee who also recently departed us, Jim Trout. Jim Trout was our former Assistant Executive Officer for many careers and he also moved over to the Department of Fish and Wildlife under Governor Gray Davis, and then Executive Director Bob Hight.

He returned to us when he retired and continued to serve the Commission and our work at Bolsa Chica for many years as a retired annuitant. He was an incredible mentor, patient, thoughtful. And one of my favorite memories of him that was relayed to me by one of our other former Assistant Executive Officers, Dave Brown, was what Jim taught Dave and many others at our agency was that if you aren't making mistakes, you aren't trying hard enough.

And that is something that I don't think is said enough in government. It's easy not to do something in government, because you won't get in trouble. Jim believed in something completely opposite of that, that we aren't doing our job as public servants unless we are trying, and pushing the limits, and doing all that we can in the name of public good.

So with that, I want to acknowledge his passing and his incredible legacy to the Commission, to the people
of the State of California, as well.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Ms. Lucchesi for the report. And the Commission expresses our deepest condolences to both the families of Jim and Anne.

Commissioners, any questions or comments on the report?

Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Yee?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: If I may, one last thing on my notes I forget to mention. I also wanted to really extend our heartfelt gratitude to Mayor Perotte and her entire City of Goleta team. We have been hosting a number of town halls pre-pandemic at the City of Goleta Council Chambers since we took over the operations at Platform Holly. And as you can see, the facilities are amazing. The people that work for the city and help support us in these efforts are incredible. And frankly, I couldn't wait to get the Commission here to experience it themselves.

And so this being our first in-person meeting after two years, especially with all the work that we're doing out here in Goleta and the Santa Barbara Channel, I just think it's really great that our first in-person
meeting is with the City of Goleta in their beautiful city
council chambers with their support as hosts.

So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you very much, Ms. Lucchesi. And, yes, thank you, Madam Mayor. This is really a wonderful setting to have our first in-person meeting and very impactful to be here and with the community.

Thank you, Ms. Lucchesi.

Commissioners, our next order of business will be the adoption of the consent calendar. Let me just turn to the commissioners to see if there are any items that you would like to see removed from the consent calendar?

No. Ms. Lucchesi, how about any items from your end?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes, I am -- will be remove -- I have removed consent items 32, 37, and 42 from the agenda. Those will be considered at a future Commission meeting.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Consent items 26, 44, and 56 are removed from the consent agenda and moved to the regular agenda, where they will be considered after our regular agenda items already listed.

And we -- those are removed to the regular
agenda, because we have received requests to speak on those items, and express their concerns about those items to the Commissioners.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Thank you.

So with those items noted removed from the consent calendar and those that are now added to the regular agenda, is there a motion to approve the remainder of the consent calendar?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Move approval of the consent calendar.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair -- Chair Yee, may -- I'm sorry to interrupt. I just want to make sure that we don't have anybody online --

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Oh, I'm sorry. Yes.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- that wants to speak on any of the consent agenda items.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. Let me turn to Katie.

Katie, any members of the public who wish to speak on this item?

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. At this time, we have no public commenters for this item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Very well. Thank you.
We have a motion by Commissioner Miller.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Second that.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Seconded by Commissioner Dumlao.

With objections, such will be the order. Thank you very much.

All right. Let me see, next order of business will be the regular calendar. We will move now to item 59, which is to consider certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report and authorization to proceed with Component 1 of the Pier 421 Decommissioning Project.

So may we have the presentation.

Good afternoon, Joe.

SENIOR ATTORNEY FABEL: Good afternoon.

So good afternoon, Madam Chair, commissioners.

My name is Joe Fabel. I'm a Senior Attorney here with the Commission. It's my honor to be able to present at this first in-person meeting in the last two years. It's also my distinct pleasure to be presenting today Item 59, which is the PRC 421 Decommissioning project.

Now, five years ago, this very month in April 2017, Venoco quit claimed its offshore leases to the Commission deserting its oil and gas facilities both in Platform Holly and the 421 Piers. The Commission, of course, and other agencies stepped up and stepped in to
protect human health and safety and organize the decommissioning of those offshore assets. As well plug and abandoned -- sorry. As well plug and abandonment rather, as the EO reported, moves towards completion, staff is now turning its attention to facility removal.

--o0o--

SENIOR ATTORNEY FABEL: Now, the 421 decommissioning project is the Commission's first major decommissioning in the Ellwood fields. The piers themselves lay in the tidal zone on Haskell Beach and are reached by an access road, which also contain transportation pipelines. Each caisson of the two housed one well each, and neither of which have produced in decades.

Lease 421 produced from a separate reservoir from offshore Holly, and the oil that it did produce historically was sent to the Ellwood Marine Terminal, which was decommissioned in 2012.

--o0o--

SENIOR ATTORNEY FABEL: Now the 421 Piers are the remnants of pier-based oil production in the Santa Barbara Channel. Lease 421 was operated and assigned to various oil companies, the last of which being from Mobil Oil Corporation assigned to Venoco in 1997.

After Venoco's 2017 quitclaim to the Commission,
and as part of its prior obligation, ExxonMobil did agree to plug those two wells on the caissons. Now, they've again agreed to remove the improvements placed within Lease 21 -- 421. To facilitate removal, staff did prepare an Environmental Impact Report, as required under the California Environmental Quality Act. For reasons I'll get to here in a moment, staff analyzed the total decommissioning project that reaches outside the territorial boundaries of lease 421.

The project as analyzed consists of two parts. The first, Component 1, it's the removal of the large caisson and pier structures which rest in the tidal zone. The work requires use of heavy equipment during low tide cycles, which will get down to the beach by a temporary ramp located west of the worksite, which would be removed after the work is completed.

Now, given the age of the structures, the biggest challenge, of course, is the safe removal of the degraded caisson walls, which right now contain soil that is saturated with hydrocarbons just due to years of production. Now, the work is going to be undertaken by Exxon, which right now is in the process of selecting a contractor. And that work overall, once mobilization starts, is anticipated to take about six months.

--o0o--
SENIOR ATTORNEY FABEL: Now, Component 2, it's the removal of a 1,200 foot access roadway that served the oil piers. The pier abutments that interface with the roadway and a six-inch and a two-inch pipeline that run between the piers buried in the roadway and the 12th tee of the Sandpiper Golf Course. Heavy equipment will remove the rock riprap and the underlying soil with a natural grade being left to the cliff face.

Now Component 2 could start near the very end of Component 1. Generally, you need the roadway in order to get the equipment for Component 1 down to the beach, but Component 2 itself is slated to take about six months -- or sorry, three months, my apologies, estimated. Both the road itself and the pipelines are on private land owned by the golf course.

--o0o--

SENIOR ATTORNEY FABEL: Now, CEQA, as we know, it's very procedurally driven. In June last year, staff issued the Notice of Preparation and held a Scoping meeting. Staff formed a joint review panel with the Commission's strategic partners, the City of Goleta, and the California Coastal Commission, which allowed those agencies input very early in the process. In January, a Draft EIR was released for public comment and a Final EIR was published in late May -- March.
SENIOR ATTORNEY FABEL: The EIR identified potential significant impacts in a variety of areas. The main takeaway though is that all impacts will be reduced to less significant with mitigation measures applied. The EIR also analyzed and found this true for both Components 1 and 2 individually, and for both components together as an aggregate project.

SENIOR ATTORNEY FABEL: Now, it's not quite a surprise when decommissioning derelict oil structures, but there are some benefits that staff have identified to undertaking this work, namely by removing the risk of oily soil contained within the caissons themselves, increasing the amount of usable beach, and, of course, the esthetics by removing these old derelict structures.

SENIOR ATTORNEY FABEL: Now, a number of agencies and groups did comment on the EIR. Generally, the comments were in support of the project with many expressing hope that the full project, both Components 1 and 2, are undertaken. All comments were addressed and responded to in the Final EIR.

SENIOR ATTORNEY FABEL: Now, regarding
permitting, we have received the Army Corps permit for Component 1 and staff anticipate other permits to soon follow after certification of this EIR. Staff are hopeful that Component 1 could begin possibly as early as the month of August mobilization.

--o0o--

SENIOR ATTORNEY FABEL: Now, I do want to make crystal clear what staff is asking the Commission for today. Staff is asking that the Commission certify the EIR, which analyzes the environmental impact of both Components 1 and 2, but staff is asking that the Commission authorize work for that part of the project within its jurisdiction, which is just Component 1.

We've been clear in the EIR, at hearings, and in conversations with stakeholders that the Commission is limited to approving the removal of improvements on public lands, in this case the piers and the caissons. And I'll discuss why.

The Public Resources Code in color given to it by the courts, puts the Commission's relevant jurisdiction here waterward of the mean high tide line. Component 2, the roadway and piping sit landward of that line on private uplands, outside of our jurisdiction.

Secondly, ExxonMobil is undertaking Component 1 at its expense. That obligation is contractual and tied
to lease 421, which was an interest in land that sat waterward of the mean high tide line. The roadway and pipeline easement were negotiated, approved, and placed under the authority of land control agencies and private parties outside of the Commission's control. And generally, the Commission cannot force one party to perform the obligations of separate agreements.

And finally, what money has been given to Commission, and there have been appropriations overall for the South Ellwood Field work, are operations and maintenance tied to the plugging and abandonment generally, but not for removal of facilities on private uplands.

Now, as of today, there's no identified funding or responsible party identified for Component 2, but staff are working with agency partners, including City of Goleta and the Coastal Commission to facilitate grant opportunities for coastal remediation, to allow a local agency to undertake that work. The EIR analyzed Component 2 generally at the request of the City of Goleta and the Coastal Commission, given their interest and -- as well as staff's interest in eventually undertaking that work, and as an efficiency measure, because by analyzing this Component 2 now, that saves having to reanalyze it further down the path.
There is still time for the stars to align and start that work soon after completion of Component 1. But because we do have Exxon today willing and prepared to start work, staff believe that Component 1 should be approved and undertaken on its own merits. So we ask the Commission to please affirm staff's recommendation for authorization.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Joe, for the presentation.

Commissioners, any questions or comments at this -- yes. Commissioner Miller, please.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Just -- thank you so much and again thank you to the Commission for the tour. I was really glad to see so many people and learned a huge amount. It really does make a difference to be out there. And you did a great job explaining it.

So because I didn't fully understand this, what I think maybe I hope is helpful for others is just to understand kind of the -- how Platform Holly and the Ellwood site, I know we're not -- we're only dealing today with just the -- just this piece of these -- the two piers and decommissioning them. It's sort of the longer term plan as you look out and you see so many different areas that eventually will need to be decommissioned. So I just
think explaining kind of the cadence of events of potentially what could happen as we consider future EIRs. And then -- and I know as part of that will be also determining the cost for that and who bears that cost.

And then I say this often, but obviously the biggest takeaway and what we've learned from Platform Holly and these -- and as we decommission them is that our bonds -- and I know we're not signing any new leases, but every time we renew a lease just to be really cognizant -- and this is something that State Lands is doing, to be really cognizant of our bonds, so that we actually have responsible parties paying for the work.

And then finally, I don't see our colleague in the audience who was on the tour today, but one -- one of the people said to me that she's been doing this work for 40 years. She worked for Senator O'Connell and said that there's never been a better State Lands team in the entire 40 years in terms of their pragmatic approach to really understanding everything in this area and others. So kudos to the staff and just a huge amount of gratitude for all you're doing.

And if you don't mind sort of setting that landscape. I know it's not all on the agenda. Is that too much?

SENIOR ATTORNEY FABEL: Ms. Lucchesi and I --
absolutely. And would you like to handle that? I know you briefed --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Well, let me take a shot and then you can correct me. How about that?

SENIOR ATTORNEY FABEL: Sounds good. I like it.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: All right. So don't go anywhere, Joe.

So in the broad scheme of things, when Venoco filed for bankruptcy and quit claimed their leases back to the State Lands Commission, those leases included Piers 421, so the piers you saw today, and Platform Holly. So among other things, but as it relates to the offshore of Goleta.

The first project is the decommissioning of Piers 421. We are scheduled to complete plugging and abandonment of the 30 wells at Platform Holly by the end of the year. We hope to bring to the Commission by the end of the year a request to hire a consultant to help us evaluate feasibility -- the feasibility of different options for Platform Holly for decommissioning. So that's keeping it all in place, that's removing some of it, leaving some of it in place, and then completely removing everything. And analyzing not just the physical feasibility, the technical engineering feasibility, but the cost as well associated with that.
But hold that thought for a second. That is for assessments of -- to help inform other types of decommissioning projects. Exxon is responsible for the full cost of decommissioning Platform Holly to the extent that the Commission decides is in the best interests of the state. So whether that's keeping the entire platform and infrastructure in place, or removing some of it, or complete removal. That is the decision the Commission has in its sole discretion and Exxon is required and has agreed to pay for it all.

Now, this is the first State platform in a very long time that's being decommissioned. The last ones were the Chevron platforms back in the 1990s. The federal government BOEM in partnership with BSEE is pursuing an environmental assessment under NEPA to look at the decommissioning of eight federal platforms here in the Santa Barbara channel. So that's going to be -- I think they plan to complete -- excuse me, the programmatic EIS by the end of this year for these eight platforms.

The big moral of the story is that our coast in the Santa Barbara Channel and moving on south is going through a huge transformation in terms of energy infrastructure transitions, from removing not only decom -- oil platforms from State and federal waters and the associated infrastructure, but also the
decommissioning of nuclear power plants, San Onofre, Diablo Canyon as we pivot towards offshore wind, particularly through the recent lease sales announced by BOEM, both on the Central Coast and the north coast.

Does that answer your question?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Yes, that's very helpful.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: I would just add to -- separate from Platform Holly and Piers 421 with Rincon Island, that decommissioning and ultimate disposition of these facilities, the State is financially responsible for that. We do not have -- that was a different, excuse me, chain of events that allowed RILP, Rincon Island Limited Partnership, to take control of those -- those leases through a prior bankruptcy. So when they filed for bankruptcy and ceased to exist, there was no prior operator to go after.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Okay. That's really helpful. Thank you very much. I really appreciate that. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Of course. Thank you, Commissioner Miller.

Any other comments at this time?

Okay. Very well. Thank you.

SENIOR ATTORNEY FABEL: Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Seeing none, let me just see if there are any public comments on this item. Katie, let me turn to you.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have a few public speakers for this item. The first one being Peter Imhoff. And I'm looking for him.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon.

MR. IMHOF: Thank you. Good afternoon, Madam Chair and Commissioners and welcome again to the beautiful City of Goleta. It's an honor to have all of you here today.

I'm Peter Imhof, the Director of Environmental Review and Planning for the City of Goleta. The City of Goleta supports the staff recommendation to certify the Environmental Impact Report. As a responsible agency, the City supports implementation of the project and urges the Commission to certify the EIR as to the entirety of the project both Components 1 and 2. Certification of the EIR for both Components 1 and 2 brings us one step closer to the removal and decommissioning of that last remnants of oil infrastructure along the shoreline of the City of Goleta that.

The EIR is clear that the whole of the action entails both Components 1 and 2, and the City of agrees
and appreciates that the Commission has analyzed the potential environmental impacts of both components of the project.

However, the proposed action leaves unanswered when and how the decommissioning of Component 2 will happen and who will undertake this work. It is not fair to assume, as the staff report does, that Component 2 will be quote, "Carried out by the upland authority with jurisdiction", end quote. Removal of this infrastructure is a shared problem and shared responsibility. The State Lands Commission cannot just wash its hands of the upland area infrastructure. Without a plan to remove Component 2, wave action will gradually erode and expose Component 2 potentially creating beach hazards and resulting in environmental contamination.

Coastal Commission staff also recognized this issue and encouraged State Lands Commission staff to think this problem through. Significant funding will be needed to complete Component 2, whoever undertakes it. State Lands Commission staff provided a cost estimate indicating that it would cost at least $3.9 million, not including permitting and other soft costs. Funding to cover the cost of this work has yet to be identified and the cost of this work vastly exceeds what a small city, the size of Goleta, can manage on its own.
We appreciate the State Lands Commission staff's willingness to help identify grant funding sources for Component 2 removal and we ask that the State Lands Commission also direct its staff to work proactively in coordination with us and collaboration with other parties, including the underlying landowner and the City Goleta to obtain all necessary permits to remove both Components 1 and 2.

We appreciate the collaboration to date and we look forward to our continued partnership.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Mr. Imhof. Katie, our next speaker, please.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you. Our next speaker is also in person and that is Carla Frisk.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon.

MS. FRISK: Good afternoon. Carla Frisk with the organization Get Oil Out and happy to be here today in person, also my first public hearing in a long time.

I want to start by thanking the Commission and the staff for the site visit today. I have to admit, probably embarrassingly, I've never been out to the 421 Piers. And I've been telling myself for years, you've really got to just go on out there. And when I saw this come up, I thought okay, I'm going, and I did. And it was...
very informative. And I just -- I think it's just a
great -- it was really well attended. It was a great
thing for the public to have that opportunity. And as you
said earlier, to -- for the commissioners to see in person
it's -- I think it's really important. So thanks again
for having this -- for doing that and for having this
hearing today, so that people can actually come here, if
they want to, in person.

Get Oil Out has long monitored the ups and downs
of Lease 421 and all the issues that have come up, and
should we remove, and should we not, and what about this,
and what about that. And then it sat idle for so many
years while the pipeline was broken. And it's a long
history, that's for sure. But GOO wants to express its
strong support. Really can't express strongly its support
enough for this decommissioning project and urge you to
approve it today.

Our only concern is and we have to kind of echo
the City's comments is that today's project is only for
Component 1. We want to urge this Commission and its
staff to really continue to work with the City, the
Coastal Commission, the landowner, to try to come to some
conclusion on Component 2 as soon as possible. I mean, I
could cite project after project, one of them being the
pipeline and the removal of the tanks and some of the
infrastructure that's now on UCSB, where we thought that would have been done in, I can't even say how many -- five years ago, just come to a stand still because of the same issues here today with Venoco going bankrupt. So they have no funding.

So anyway, I'll try to just get -- echo some of the things that Peter said. And if Venoco had been the applicant here today, we would be requiring them to do this work and get all of this oil, all of this development done, which served this oil development for so many years. It's an integral part of this project. And we just can't say how important it is to get the permits, move forward, and just find the funding and get this thing done.

So unless you have any questions, thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Mr. Frisk.

Katie, our next speaker, please.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. At this time, we have no other public commenters signed up to speak on this item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Thank you.

Let me just turn back to the Commissioners before we take formal action.

Yes, Commissioner Miller.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Well, I have no
comments. If you're ready for a motion though.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes. Actually, let me make a comment, if I could. I appreciated the public comment here. And this really is a jurisdictional issue, but I can assure you the State Lands Commission is not turning its back on what is going to continue to happen with respect to this project. So although our action today is certification of the entire EIR and approval only of Component 1 of the project, I don't believe there's anyone in this room that is looking to end the conversation there. So appreciate the City of Goleta's capacity issues, but we also would like to enhance our -- our partnership going forward with respect to seeking any and all funding, and obviously, speaking with the -- the private interests that are involved here as well. So just wanted to put that on the record. Our action here today is by no means the end of the Commission's involvement.

So with that, Commissioner Miller.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Madam Chair. And with that, I would move approval of the EIR in Item 59 of our agenda.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: And I second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right. We have a motion by
Commissioner Miller, second by Commissioner Dumlao.

Is that a unanimous vote?

Okay. Such will be the order.

Thank you very much. And thank you to the members of the public who joined us this morning, the City of Goleta, and to our other stakeholders.

Very well. Our next item is Item 60 and this is an item to consider the second distribution port stimulus funding to mitigate negative economic impacts from the COVID-19 pandemic. It is pursuant to the 2021-22 budget Act. And may we have the presentation.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes. Our staff presentation will be provided by Reid Boggiano who's going to be presenting virtually.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Wonderful.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: So he will be -- he is on the screen right there.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: We see you, Mr. Boggiano.

Good afternoon.

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST BOGGIANO: Yeah. Good afternoon, Chair and commissioners.

In May 2021, as you may remember, Governor Newsom announced a one-time 250 million allocation from the Federal American Rescue Plan act of 2021 to California
ports to mitigate the negative economic impacts resulting from the pandemic.

The 2021-2022 State budget appropriates the 250 million to the California State Lands Commission to the allocation for the allocation to ports. The Budget Act requires that ports use these funds to support their economic recovery such as for activities that include avoiding layoffs, restoring jobs and services, and losses due to the pandemic, and supporting safe operations.

At its December 8th, 2021 meeting, the Commission authorized disbursements of $136,239,515 of recovery funds to six California ports. Disbursements for the first round were based on ports 2020 pandemic related losses and direct health emergency costs.

For this second disbursement, staff requested that each port provide its 2021 pandemic related revenue losses and health emergency costs. These metrics help ensure that the Commission direct funds to ports that were most drastically impacted by the pandemic.

All ports, including those that did not apply during the first distribution or that received an amount less than requested, were able to apply for the remaining funds for this second disbursement.

When applying for the second round of disbursements, applicants were required to provide
financial statements, payroll reports, invoices, receipts, cash flow statements, and other accounting documentation for staff's review. Ports were also required to describe the programs or projects they anticipate committing the recovery funds to.

Some of these projects include: major maintenance and repair projects that are necessary to maintain port assets, so that they're safe, accessible, and available as revenue-generating assets in the future; terminal equipment and IT upgrades; infrastructure to strengthen port industries and retain existing tenants; efforts to avoid direct layoffs and fill positions left vacant during the pandemic; loan programs for financially distressed businesses and services that will continue to bring visitors and commercial business to the waterfront such as the installation of electric vehicle charging stations, commercial fishing upgrades, and projects that keep tourism areas safe and clean.

On February 9th, 2022, Governor Newsom signed SB 115, which retroactively modified the source for the Port stimulus funds changing the allocated funds from the Corona fiscal recovery fund of 2021 to the State's general fund. Because of this change, recipient ports are no longer subject to federal ARPA requirements and restrictions, but they remain subject to the Budget Act
requirements.

The Budget Act does not impose the strict use limits provided by -- provided in the ARPA and associated federal guidance. Commission staff is now developing its own reporting requirements to replace the ARPA requirements. The Commission has discretion over the distribution of funds to achieve the purpose of addressing the negative impacts experienced by the ports. The Commission also considers the state's best interest when exercising its discretionary authority.

I'll now go over staff's recommendations for the recovery fund disbursements. The first column here next to the ports lists the Commission's December approval for the first round of disbursements. The second column is staff's recommendation for this second round of disbursements.

To the Port of San Diego, staff recommends distribution of $46,684,903, which represents the amount of revenue loss and health emergency costs for the 2021 calendar year, and an additional $1,605,848 that considers a 4.67 percent growth rate instead of a 4.1 percent growth rate for revenue losses in the 2020 calendar year.

To the Port of San Francisco, staff recommends distribution of $58,200,000, which represents the amount of 2021 revenue loss and is the requested amount in the
Port's application.

To the Noyo Harbor District, staff recommends distribution of $448,808, which represents the amount of 2021 revenue losses and is the requested amount in the Port's application.

To the Oxnard Harbor District, also known as Port Hueneme, staff recommends distribution of $206,724 which represents the District's 2021 health emergency costs and is the requested amount in the Port's application. To the Port San Luis Harbor District, staff recommends distribution of $1,203,639, which represents the amount of revenue loss and health emergency cost for the 2020 and 2021 calendar year.

To the Ventura Port District, staff recommends distribution of $122,979, which represents the District's 2021 health emergency cost and is the requested amount in the Port's application.

The Humboldt Bay Harbor District is requesting $302,929 of funding for revenue losses in certain sectors, but the District's overall financials show positive 2021 revenue gains. So staff recommends applying an equitable -- equitable distribution of funds to ports based on their 2021 revenue losses and emergency costs, and we recommend not disbursing funds to Humboldt Bay Harbor District at this time.
The total amount for the first disbursement as approved by the Commission in December was $136,239,515. The total amount for the second disbursement authorization as recommended by staff is $106,867,053. After approximately two million reserved for staff costs, this leaves $6,893,432 left to disburse. Staff will provide more details and the recommendation at a future Commission meeting.

As a condition of fund disbursement, the ports must also sign a funding agreement. This agreement formalizes the Port's and Commission's role in the ongoing monitoring of the recovery fund expenditures.

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

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Reid, very much for the presentation.

Commissioners, any questions or comments?

No. Okay. Thank you for the presentation. I want to thank the administration for the flexibility of these dollars and the continued attention on our ports, which have been challenged during the pandemic, and seems like just unending numbers of issues that are affecting our ports from supply chain issues, to congestion, certainly the tourism recovery that still is in the midst of happening, but these dollars are really critical for
the rebound and recovery moving forward for our ports.

Let me see if there are any public speakers on this item. Katie.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. For our first public speaker, we have Elaine Forbes.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Good afternoon, Elaine.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Actually, I am not seeing her on the attendee list. So while we wait for her, I'm going to promote our next public speaker who is Job Nelson.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Good afternoon, Job.
Can you hear us, Job?

MR. NELSON: I can.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

MR. NELSON: So I am trying to start video as well, but that's okay. So I may just be -- there I am.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: We can see you. Yes.

MR. NELSON: Let me first start by saying Controller Yee that we are also saddened by the loss of Anne. She was a -- very much a friend to the ports. And I personally consider her not just a colleague, but as a friend. There's a short list of people who you will get up from a meeting when you see their name pop up on your phone, and Anne was one of those people in terms of my
phone, for two reasons. One if she was calling, I knew it was important, and two, if I didn't answer her call fairly directly, I know I would hear from her later. So we are very sad to have lost her.

I wanted to start my time this afternoon with a number of thank yous. As usual, I want to thank your Executive Director, Jennifer Lucchesi. She has been amazing to work with through this whole process. She keeps things moving rapidly, while still seeking to -- our input along the way. Ben and Reid have just been amazing. They work to continue to streamline the process, but I will assure you, Commissioner Miller, they still are making sure that we are accountable as we are doing all that we are supposed to be doing.

And I would also like to thank you, commissioners, again. Madam Controller, you personally made calls to try and help secure this funding in the first place. Commissioner Miller, you helped work through a number of issues. And I know the Lieutenant Governor did -- made calls as well to help land this funding.

This past week we had our budget workshop for our upcoming budget. And in it, multiple times we were able to point back to the first tranche of money as a stabilizing factor as we come out of the pandemic. And this second tranche is equally critical for our viability
coming out of the pandemic.

While our revenues have picked up in a few areas like cruise and vacation visitors, automobile imports and business travelers are still very slow to come back. We are looking at low revenues compared to 2019 and we are getting hit with a double whammy of inflation unfortunately. In fact, we are projecting that we may not be fully back to normal from a budget perspective until 2025.

Without this funding, we would still struggle to do major maintenance, pursue technology upgrades, or move forward on many of our electrification initiatives that will continue to make California ports the cleanest in the world.

We've been putting the money to good use to help California rebound, but we want to come out of it better in so many ways. We have spent our funding on major maintenance on critical piers. We have taken a quarter of the money and put it towards electrification activities that will benefit nearby disadvantaged communities. And we have funding replacements on our dirtiest pieces of equipment and are replacing them with electric versions.

We will also be spending over 15 percent of our funds and engaging projects that benefit disadvantaged communities, communities like National City, Chula Vista,
and Imperial Beach, were some of the hardest hit by COVID.

So I will close like I opened thanking you.

While we are still feeling the impacts of the pandemic, we see hope on the horizon, and these funds will enable us to come out of this time stronger and more resilient, so thank you again.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Job, for our comments. And thank you to the Port of San Diego and to all of our ports for being such great community partners during the COVID pandemic, really serving the communities in ways that were extraordinary in terms of being sure people were receiving PPP, and just whatever needed to be done. So appreciated just the extra steps taken for the community.

Our next public speaker, Katie.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. Our next public speaker is Boris Delepine.

MR. DELEPINE: Good afternoon, Commissioners and Executive Officer Lucchesi. My name is Boris Delepine. I'm the Legislative Affairs Manager for the Port of San Francisco. I'm actually here to represent Executive Director Elaine Forbes who is currently attending our Port Commission meeting.

On behalf of the Port of San Francisco, I'd like
to reiterate what Job and the Port of San Diego just outlined. I want to thank you, commissioners, and your staff for your unwavering support and leadership in helping us to secure these funds on behalf of California's ports. The Port of San Francisco is especially grateful for your advocacy and partnership, which played a pivotal role in providing this funding for our port.

These funds place the Port of San Francisco on stable financial footing as we continue our work to overcome the multi-year structural budget deficit resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. This funding allows us to avoid staff layoffs, backfill positions, fund maintenance, and capital improvements that have been deferred and are now imperative to carrying for our historic piers and key tourist attractions. It allows us to support small businesses that are the backbone of our revenues and restore maintenance, cleaning, and public safety programs.

Our port is adjacent to two of San Francisco's most economically disadvantaged neighborhoods. With these funds, we can continue to support these communities through workforce development, providing well maintained open space, and parks, and assistance to local businesses.

We're beginning the long road to recovery from the economic impacts of COVID-19 and finally seeing signs
of revival on our waterfront after two very difficult years. So again, on behalf of our Executive Director, our commissioners, and the Port of San Francisco, thank you for your leadership, partnership, and support.

And finally I'd be remiss if I did not mention that I spoke with current Port Commissioner and former State Senator John Burton earlier today who explicitly asked me to send his regards and thanks. And when he sends a directive, I make sure that I follow through with it. So thank you, again, Commissioners, and thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Boris. And please give the Senator our best.

Thank you.

Katie, our next speaker, please.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. At this time, we have no other public commenters signed up to speak on this item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very Well. Thank you. Seeing no other public comment, is there a motion to adopt the staff recommendation and a second?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: I move approval of the staff recommendation, please.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Miller.
Motion by Commissioner Miller.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: I second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Second by Commissioner Dumlao. Is that a unanimous vote?

Okay. Without objection, such will be the order. Thank you.

All right. We now will move on to Item 61. And this is an update on the status of our existing offshore oil and gas production and pipeline leases managed by the Commission. And we have our staff presentation from Nate Dozier. Welcome.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER: Good afternoon, Commissioner Yee, Commissioner Miller, Mr. Dumlao, colleagues and members of the public.

My name is Nate Dozier and I'm a Program Analyst with the Commission's Mineral Resources Management Division. And it's my pleasure today to present to you with an update on the status of the existing oil and gas production and pipeline leases managed by the Commission in offshore waters.

Offshore oil and gas development on State tide and submerged lands continues its rapid decline. While the Commission continues to oversee the responsible operation and management of the last remnants of offshore
oil and gas operation under its jurisdiction, staff recognizes that the energy policies crafted in the 1950s and 60s differ greatly from our State's current values and priorities, which are geared towards independence from a hydrocarbon based energy.

However, at this critical point in the conversation, it's important that we acknowledge that these decades old energy policies are what created the framework that continues to dictate the state's oil and gas lease management structure. And they inform our discussions on how to advance a meaningful transition towards renewable energy, alongside the need to mitigate and hopefully avoid the most catastrophic impacts of the climate crisis.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

Currently, there are 11 active oil producing leases operating in the state's offshore waters. Five of these leases are inactive meaning, that for various reasons they are not producing oil and gas. The Commission also manages 13 offshore pipeline leases that originate from federal and State offshore facilities and traverse State waters in route to shore.

This presentation is organized by county and
explores in detail the oil and gas production and pipeline leases I just mentioned, as well as other significant leases that have recently been terminated or quitclaimed, some of which are undergoing extensive plug and abandonment and decommissioning operations.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

This map is of the San Pedro Channel, and it shows the general locations of all existing oil and gas leases, pipeline leases, and oil platforms that exist in offshore ports -- portions of Los Angeles and Orange counties. The Submerged Lands Act of 1953 recognizes the State's jurisdiction as extending to three geographical miles offshore. Operations beyond three miles fall under federal jurisdiction. And in this map, the three bound -- three-mile boundary line is indicated by the blue dotted line.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

This map is of the Santa Barbara Channel and it conveys the same information about oil and gas and pipeline activity that exists in the offshore portions of Santa Barbara and Ventura counties.
ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:
Now, first and very notably, there are no active offshore oil and gas leases in Santa Barbara County. There are two inactive leases that are awaiting a final quitclaim, three previous leases that were quitclaimed and are currently undergoing final plug and abandonment work, three leases that were terminated by the Commission in 2019, and the Commission manages five pipeline leases in the county as well.

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:
Leases 1834 and 3150 are inactive leases and they comprise over 95 -- 9,500 acres of tide and submerged lands. The lease areas are the site of previously removed oil drilling and production platforms, Hazel, Hilda, Hope, and Heidi, known as the 4H Platforms. When the platforms were removed, the mounds of drilling muds and cuttings below the surface remained in place, and the underwater portions of the platforms became colonized with marine life.

Over many years, shells settle all over the mounds and create a layer of shell material that
encapsulates the mud and cuttings. Commission staff is currently processing an application to terminate these two inactive leases and is actively working to complete an Environmental Assessment of the shell mounds below the surface.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

These three quitclaim leases comprised over 7,000 areas located off the coast near the City of Goleta. Leases 3242 and 3120 both produced entirely from Platform Holly, while Lease 421 produced from the two wells located on two artificial piers in the shore zone.

While production from Lease 421 ceased in '94, production from the other two leases continued until 2015 when they were shut in to respond -- to respond to a pipeline incident in May of that same year. The Commission received the lessee's notice of quitclaim for these three leases in April of 2017. While the two wells associated with Lease 421 are successfully plugged and abandoned, plug and abandonment work on the 30 existing wells on Platform Holly is ongoing and is expected to be completed late this year or early 2023. And the public should know that they have some of the most dedicated and knowledgeable public servants overseeing these plug and
abandonment operations, and they're working very hard to ensure that everything is going according to plan.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

These three leases are comprised of nearly 4,000 acres and they produce from the Carpinteria oil field. By '96 all facilities associated with the leases were removed and all wells were plugged and abandoned at the same time. In '96, the Commission approved a signed -- assigning Carone control of the leases with a condition that they come up with a plan to redevelop -- redevelop the lease areas. However, in 2019, the Commissioner terminated the three leases after determining that Carone had failed to meet its obligations to redevelop the leases and it also failed to comply with other lease obligations.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

And the Commission also manages five active offshore pipeline leases in Santa Barbara County that consist of a collect -- that consist of a collection of power cables and oil, gas, water, and utility pipelines that originate from four federal platforms and traverse State waters en route to shore.
For pipeline lease 7163 and 4977, whose terms expired within the past few months, the lessees have submitted renewal applications and staff is currently processing both of those applications.

Next slide, please.

---o0o---

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

And moving to Ventura County. The Commission manages two active producing oil and gas leases, one inactive lease awaiting a final quitclaim and three notable oil and gas leases that were recently quitclaimed. There are also three pipeline leases offshore of Ventura County.

Next slide, please.

---o0o---

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

Now, these two active leases produce from the West Wilmington offshore to field -- offshore field and they collectively consist of over 5,500 acres of tide and submerged lands. There are 18 wells associated with Lease 3314 that are drilled directionally into the offshore lease area by a designated onshore locations, and for Lease 735, there are three wells that are drilled in the same way.

For last fiscal year, the leases collectively
produced nearly 60,000 barrels of oil and pay over $498,000 in royalty to the State.

In 2019, Commission staff secured additional bonding for the -- from the lessee to cover the two leases raising the total blanket bond amount from 2 million to 7 million. And per the lease terms, staff can evaluate the need for additional increases in bonding coverage every five years.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

Lease area 427 consists of 148 acres of tide and submerged lands. And if you look at the map, it's the smaller thatched lease area kind of nestled in between the larger areas surrounding it. The lease has not produced oil and gas since '93 and all wells have been plugged and abandoned. Commission staff is in discussions with the lessee to perform a final analysis and survey of the previously completed plug and abandonment work, after which the Commission can process a final quitclaim.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

These three quitclaim leases comprise over 1,500 acres of tide and submerged lands. There were 25 wells
that were directionally drilled from onshore locations and 50 wells that produced entirely from Rincon Island. In 2016, the lessee filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy and the Commission authorized staff to accept the quitclaim of the leases.

Since then, the Commission and its contractor have plugged and abandoned all 75 wells and the former leases. Phase 2 of the project is currently under way, as staff works with our environmental contractor to develop a decommissioning plan with the disposition of Rincon Island, the onshore facility, and the causeway.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:
The Commission also manages three offshore pipeline leases in Ventura County, which originated from various federal platforms. For Pipeline Lease 4017, Commission staff anticipates that an application to renew the lease will be submitted in the near future.

For Pipeline Lease 3914, which the Commission terminated in 2019 for various violations of the lease terms, decommissioning is pending.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:
In Los Angeles County, significant oil and gas revenue is generated from two granted lands areas in the country, the West Wilmington Operation and the Long Beach Unit. These two operations produced oil and gas under net profit sharing agreements, which established a revenue split between the City of Long Beach, the State, and the operator. The Commission has very limited authority over the day-to-day management of these operations, but we do oversee various engineering and economic aspects to ensure prudent and good oil field practices.

For the Long Beach unit operation, the Commission's authority is limited to a review of the unit's annual and five-year program plans, and ensuring that these plans are consistent with good oil field practice and do not pose a significant safety or environmental risk.

The Long Beach Unit is primary produced from the four THUMS islands that dot the coast of Long Beach and is by far the State's top source of revenue from oil and gas operations, generating 52.9 million in revenue for the State in the last fiscal year.

West Wilmington operation is produced from a reservoir that is located primarily beneath the Port of Long Beach and have generated $16 million in revenue for the State during the same period.
ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

In Orange County, the Commission manages nine active and producing oil and gas leases. There are also two inactive leases in the form of compensatory agreements, three platforms, and one granted lands area, and five pipeline leases.

Next slide, please.

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

For lease 91, 163, 392, 425, and 426, collectively these five leases comprise over 3,500 acres of lease area, off the coast Huntington Beach. The leases produce from 438 wells, 30 of which are drilled from State Platform Emmy, located 1.3 miles offshore and the rest of the wells are drilled directionally into the off-shore lease area from a designated onshore location.

In the last fiscal year, the leases collective produced 1.2 million barrels of oil and generated 14.8 million in royalty for the State. In 2017, the Commission and the lessee negotiated and agreement whereby the royalty rate for the five leases would be tied to the current price of oil on a sliding scale in exchange for a commitment by the lessee to spend $3 million annually.
towards abandoning -- towards abandoning the leases idle
wells and contribute to a sinking fund to fund abandonment
and decommissioning activities when the leases reached
their end.

The sinking fund is in addition to an already
existing $30 million blanket bond. When less than three
million is spent on idle well abandonment annually, the
difference will be paid into the sinking fund. And to
date, 25 idle wells have been abandonment -- aban --
excuse me, abandoned as a result of disagreement. And the
lessee has fulfilled its commitment to spend three million
on idle well abandonment annually.

Next slide, please.

---00o---

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

These three leases collectively cover over 7,000
acres offshore Orange County. The 42 wells associated
with Lease 3033 and 3014 are drilled from Platform Ava,
which is located 2.1 miles offshore. While the 30 wells
associated with Lease 3095 are drilled from Platform
Esther located about one and a half miles offshore of Seal
Beach.

In december of last year, an oil sheen was
reported off the coast of Orange County, and the source
was determined to be a pipeline, which transferred --
transports oil from Platform Eva to shore.

As a result, the Commission ordered all operations on Platform Eva to immediately be suspended and operations continued to be suspended, which means leases 3033, 3413 are not currently producing.

In consultation with Commission staff and the State Fire Marshal, the lessee is exploring options to repair or replace the pipeline subject to regulatory review and approval.

Next slide, please.

---o0o---

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

Lease 187 produces from the Belmont offshore oil field and consists of 1255 acres of tide and submerged lands. There are 35 wells associated with the lease, all of which are located offshore on Island Chaffee. And for my Long Beachers out there, if you're standing on Rosie's Dog Beach and your staring out into the ocean, Island Chaffee is the island on your left.

The lessee maintains a $50,000 bond to cover the cost of Plug and abandonment activities when the lease ends and the current lessee, CRC, is responsible for plugging and abandoning all wells on this operation and the State has no liabilities related to well abandonment on this lease.
Next slide, please.

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

And finally, in Orange County, the State receives royalty from two leases that are administered as compensatory agreements, which means that while there are no actual wells located within the State lease areas, the State receives nominal royalty from independently operated wells that are located near the lease areas and have been deemed likely to be draining state mineral resources.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

Finally, the Commission manages five offshore pipeline leases in Orange County that originated from federal Platform Edith as well as State Platforms Eva and Esther, all of which are active pipelines.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

And the City of Newport Beach owns and operates 16 oil wells that are slant drilled into the tidelands area from an onshore location. There is no revenue sharing with the State and all revenue generated must be used for the purposes of maintaining the tidelands. The
Commission has no approval authority over these granted lands operations.

Next slide, please.

---o0o---

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

And in conclusion, over the last six years, the Commission has facilitated the termination of 10 offshore oil gas leases, returning over 20,000 acres to the coastal sanctuary. We are actively working with our State agency partners and lessees to abandon idle wells ahead of CalGEM's regulatory requirements. We are ensuring the State is adequately protected through bonds, sinking funds, property liens, and other mechanisms. We are decommissioning major offshore oil and gas facilities, such as Platform Holly and Rincon Island, and for all the oil and gas operations mentioned in this presentation, Commission staff continues to execute robust and comprehensive spill prevention and inspection programs.

The State Lands Commission understands its place in both California's history of fossil fuel supply independency, and it's obligation for responsibly pursuing a clean energy future. The Commission is committed to a just transition, while responsibly managing the State's existing oil and gas operations, and ensuring the State is protected from liabilities associated with the decline of
these offshore operations.

Next slide, please

--o0o--

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:
And that concludes my presentation. I would love to hear your comments and I'm free to answer any questions that you may have about the presentation.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Nate, for the update. This is your first time presenting to the Commission, yes?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:
It is, yes.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Well done.

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:
Thank you.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Commissioners, questions or comments?

ACTING COMMISSIONER Dtmlao: A quick comment.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, please, Commissioner Dtmlao.

ACTING COMMISSIONER Dtmlao: I think it was incredibly helpful to have this overview, between this presentation and the presentation for Piers 421, it's very
clear we've gone from numerous piers protruding from the coastline with oil operations to, you know, where we are today. In that last slide you presented with the future of, you know, trying to clean up all of these legacy wells, abandoning what we have, you know, transitioning away from fossil fuel extraction. It's just -- you know, it's really helpful to have this overview today for the Commission for the -- and for the public to see, you know, every -- how far we've come and how far we still have to go.

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:
Sure.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Thank you very much.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Dumlao.

I agree, I think this presentation was extremely helpful just to put the entire picture in place. And to Ms. Lucchesi's earlier comment, the State is undergoing a tremendous energy transformation and in the works as we speak, but also more to come. And I just feel like at this moment we're at the convergence of so many things that are affecting, you know, that transition, including events from across the globe.

And I'm wondering if what we could do with this information -- and certainly heighten legislative interest by the way in all of this as well after the spill last
year -- is the bill that we had considered regarding the strategy for ending State offshore production leases that was before the Commission during our last meeting, certainly puts us on a footing to begin to do some planning ahead of time to look at some of the risks and certainly financial impacts involved. But I also wanted to just explore, if I could, Nate and to Jennifer, whether there's more that we could be doing, and knowing that there's a lot of concern about just the price of gas and all of that, which I don't discount by any means, but I do think that we are looking still to, you know, move towards our termination of oil production by the State by 2045, pursuant to the Governor's Executive Order.

Certainly, given our climate policies of the State of California and the direction that we are all -- all State agencies and departments are moving towards, you know, this Commission has always been grounded in just, you know, having data and information. And then what will be coming -- what will be coming before the Commission are some of the -- federal pipeline leases that have -- in terms that will need to be brought back before this Commission for renewal. And in that vein, I wanted to just see what the feasibility would be to begin working with our pipeline lessees, and the federal operators, and probably even BSEE to better understand what some of the
expectations are going to be, rather than kind of reacting
when we're doing a bill analysis for something else that's
become more, you know, kind of in the moment.

We have a -- we have some time here, not a lot.
We have obviously broader considerations than just the
state of California, but I do think that those discussions
aren't not necessarily premature, particularly because we
don't know much about the infrastructure, their life
expectancy, you know, the risks that may be attendant to,
you know, continuing operations or not. And so, I --
maybe Jennifer you can comment on that if this request is
too premature.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: No, I think that if
I'm understanding you correctly, I think it's the exact
right time. So as you mentioned between the Bill the
Commission supported and Controller Yee you sponsored, AB
2257 --

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Fifty-seven, um-hmm.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- that is focused
on our offshore production leases and looking at the costs
and other impacts associated with the responsible end to
offshore production leases, taking also a fresh look at
our pipeline leases that connect federal operations to
shore through State waters I think is an important first
step in terms of looking at what the future is as it
relates from the operator's perspectives, from our pipeline lessee's perspective, the job impacts, the economic impacts, and also looking at it within the prism of potential incidences and risks to our marine environment, but really taking a holistic and pragmatic approach, and learning from our operators, learning from our lessees, learning from our stakeholders.

And so if I'm understanding you correctly, we, as staff, can take this direction back and look at how we might approach a policy, or a regulatory framework, or some sort of approach to balancing the existing pipeline operations, our existing responsibilities through those leases, working with our federal counterparts, working with our lessees along with our stakeholders that are looking and really prioritized protecting our marine environment to see what a responsible policy approach is for our offshore operations.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Right. Yeah. And that's exactly the request. And I think certainly looking at the economic impacts, we saw the broad geographic swath of these operations. And there will be economic impacts to the local regions as well. So just to get a little bit ahead of the curve on many of those issues I think might be appropriate at this time.

So other questions or comments, commissioners?
Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: I will just commit to updating the Commission on maybe a framework to be responsible and accountable to the direction in my Executive Officer's report at the next meeting, and --

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- you know, will look forward to feedback, and we'll work through this, but our primary first step will be to outreach to our operators, and our lessees, and our State and federal partners.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Sure. And I think what might be interesting too, Jennifer, is if you could bring back any information about, you know, just in terms of our overall production, like how much of that, you know, really is kind of for domestic supply versus, you know, supplying other -- other parts of the world. This has become kind of a global conversation, but I'm also very much focused on, you know, California's future here, and so -- and very sanguine about the fact that we've got inflation staring at us, and also, you know, consumers really feeling a big part of the pinch right now. This is just trying to be proactive. Okay. Great.
Mr. Dozier, any final thoughts?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

No, I appreciate your feedback and I appreciate, you know, my Commission's leadership and just how they're handling everything that is being thrown at us at this point in time? And yeah, I definitely thank you for listening to me today.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you so much.

You're a terrific ambassador for the Commission.

Thank you.

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENTAL PROGRAM ANALYST DOZIER:

Perfect. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right. All right. Thank you.

Do we have any members of the public who wish to speak on this item?

Katie.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. At this time, we have no members of the public signed up to speak on this item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Thank you.

Let me just see.

Okay. Why don't we move on to -- actually, before we get into the legislation part, I'm mindful of
our meeting recorder, so why don't we take a 10-minute break, and then we will return at -- how about we return at 3:10. Okay. Great. Thank you.

(Off record: 2:56 p.m.)

(Thereupon a recess was taken.)

(On record: 3:10 p.m.)

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right. Let's reconvene the State Lands Commission meeting.

Commissioners, I think, at this point, why don't we return to the items that were pulled off of the consent agenda earlier. And those would be Items 26 -- excuse me. Hang on one second -- 26, 44, and 56.

So we will begin with item 26. So why don't we start there and why don't we have the staff presentation. This relates to the American River Bridge Widening and Deck Replacement Project.

Good afternoon.

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Good afternoon Madam Chair and commissioners. My name is Brian Bugsch and I'm Chief of the Land Management Division.

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Waiting for the presentation here.

I'm here to present on Item 26, which is the Caltrans proposed 101.5 permit -- public agency permit and
right-of-way map for the American River Bridge Deck Replacement and Widening Project.

--o0o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: The project will be located over the American River between levees near Cal Expo and River Park in Sacramento.

--o0o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: The bridge was originally constructed in 1954. The deck was the existing bridge -- the deck of the existing bridge has been repaired several times since its construction. The deck is covered with a thin asphalt concrete overlay this has warn off.

--o0o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: The latest Caltrans needs -- bridge needs report states that the bridge deck has cracks and needs major deck rehabilitation to help preserve the deck and provide a better wearing surface. The proposed work will repair, protect, and extend the service life of the deck and install sheet piles around the piers. Construction is expected to last approximately two years.

--o0o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Caltrans proposes widening the existing bridge to continue to allow
vehicular traffic during construction. The following -- following replace -- the replacement of the bridge deck, the added width will be converted into a Class 1 pedestrian and bicycle path.

During construction, public access to the project location will be prohibited due to safety concerns. The existing bike trail will be temporarily detoured to follow the top of the right levee adjacent to Cal Expo. Additionally, the project will be constructed using barges to eliminate the need for the installation and removal of pilings for a trestle bridge along the entire width of the river.

--o0o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: While the construction will temporarily impair the public's right to navigation, staff believes in the long term the project will not substantially impair or interfere with public trust uses. It adds multi-modal access adjacent to the highway and it improves public access to the American River and the parkway.

--o0o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: So staff recommends that the Commission terminate the existing 101.5 permit and right-of-way map and approve the new 101.5 public agency permit and right-of-way map, including
the two temporary construction areas.

--o0o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: That concludes staff's presentation. I think there are members of both Caltrans and the environmental justice group ECOS that are ready to speak on this item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Very well. Thank you very much. And I know this item was pulled off of consent. There have been some discussions. Any more update with respect to those discussions?

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: (Shakes head.)

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Any questions or comments from commissioners at this point?

All right. Then let's turn to members of the public who are here to address this item. And Katie, our first public speaker, please.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. Our first public speaker is Clark Perri.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon.

MR. PERRI: Good afternoon, Chair Yee and commissioners. We do have a PowerPoint presentation that we sent to staff earlier.
(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes. We'll pull that up right now.

MR. PERRI: And some of that information will -- will be a repeat of what Brian just stated, but we'll go ahead and go through it in just a little more detail.

My name is Clark Perri. I'm Office Chief for Project Management in Caltrans District 3 and here to discuss the American River Bridge Deck Replacement Project.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. PERRI: The location of the bridge is just east of Sacramento in the downtown area at the American River, a little bit north of Elvas underpass structures and terminates at the Tribute Road undercrossing near Cal Expo.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. PERRI: The main purpose of the project is to repair or replace the concrete bridge deck due to concrete cracking, and deterioration, and also construct a Class 1 bike path on the widened portion of the bridge.

Next slide.

--o0o--
MR. PERRI: This is an aerial view of the existing bridge, just to give you an idea of the -- what the bridge is carrying traffic-wise right now. There's three lanes in the southbound direction and three lanes in the northbound direction. It also consists of minimal shoulder width in -- both inside and outside.

Next slide.

--o0o--

MR. PERRI: As Brian mentioned, the bridge is -- was built in 1954 and widened in 1966. This picture here gives you a view of the cracks in the deck both longitudinal and transverse. The black area that you see is an asphalt overlay to protect the deck that's been -- we do that periodically on bridges. This particular one has started to come off and expose the concrete deck.

Next slide.

--o0o--

MR. PERRI: This view shows several concrete patches that we've had to install in order to keep the bridge intact and continuous life, but it's -- it's at -- at the end of its life, based on the number of patches that we have to do this -- at this time.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. PERRI: This is the underside of the bridge.
You can see the green bridge girders. The white areas that you see are actually cracks in the concrete, which -- in the bottom of the concrete deck, which indicates the cracking has gone through the entire thickness of the concrete deck.

Next slide.

--o0o--

MR. PERRI: This is a photo of the foundation that is currently being washed away. It's undermining and exposing the steel foundation piles. So that's a repair that we'll make with this project as well.

Next slide.

--o0o--

MR. PERRI: For the construction staging, we'll start with widening on the northbound side, that's the green line towards the bottom there. That will allow us to shift the northbound traffic to that line and replace the deck in -- that's currently in yellow -- the yellow line there. Once that work is completed, we can shift the southbound traffic over to that line and replace the southbound deck that's in the red line.

Next slide.

--o0o--

MR. PERRI: So the construction activities that we've done to date and what we're planning to do. We've
been out there since January clearing vegetation near the
bridge in order to prepare for the next portion of the
work, which starts June 1st and will run through December.
That's the bridge foundation work that we'll start with
the in-water work to construct the foundation. From there
we'll continue on with the rest of the project to shift
traffic on the actual bridge deck to construct the deck
itself, and construct the bike path on the northbound
side.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. PERRI: So over the last year to year and a
half, we've worked with multiple permitting agencies to
obtain our permits. That work has almost concluded.
We've got all but one of the permits where the Central
Valley Flood Protection Board has the project on their May
25th agenda for a hearing to get our 408 permit. That's
the last remaining piece.

Next slide, please.

--o0o--

MR. PERRI: With that, I'll open it up to any
questions. I do have a several members from our project
development team on the Caltrans side. So if there's any
questions, they're here to backup the project and answer
any details that may come up.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you very much, Mr. Perri. And let me just ask you could you just walk us through -- obviously, there's been some concerns about bike access. Can you just speak to kind of the status of bike access now and what the project proposes relative to either enhancing that or -- and then what will happen during construction.

MR. PERRI: Yes. There is currently an existing Class 1 bike path through the middle of the American River Parkway that crosses underneath the bridge and continues on. For safety reasons, we need to close a portion of that bike path intermittently. It won't be closed for a continuous time. But as we're building around that and getting construction equipment access there, we will fence off a portion of that.

Brian had a very good view on his presentation there that showed the green hatched area of the work area that we will be doing within the river channel. If you extend that line up and cross the bike path there, that's about the width that we would use or length of the bike path that we would close off intermittently.

The bike path will be open up to that point. So in case people want to take that, they can get to the fence and turn around and go back. If that's not conducive to folks using the bike path, we will have a
detour at all times that Brian showed on that as a blue line that will run traffic -- bike traffic on the top of the north levee, if you see that area --

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes.

MR. PERRI: -- at the north levee there. So there will be continuous bike access throughout construction, but it will be -- the main bike path closer to the river channel will be closed intermittently.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. And then after construction, we will be seeing a wider bike lane, yes?

MR. PERRI: Not within the parkway. The bike lane within the parkway itself will remain the same width

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

MR. PERRI: We'll reopen that after construction is complete. The Class 1 bike path that I mentioned as part of the project will actually be on the bridge itself --

CHAIRPERSON YEE: I see.

MR. PERRI: -- that will be accessed from both levees. It will run from the south levee to the north levee and have success to both directions.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Uh-huh.

MR. PERRI: So that's a new -- new bike path that will provide additional connection.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you, Mr. Perri.
Questions or comments by commissioners at this point?

Okay. Thank you very much.

Katie, let me turn to you to see about another public speakers.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Yes. Thank you. Our next public commenter is George Delano.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon.

MR. DELANO: Unmute here. I'm going to defer my time to the rest of the team. I -- in the interests of the very short time that we have.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

Katie, are there others.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Yes. Our next -- I'm just going through the list to find them.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Our next public commenter is Scott Edwards. I'm looking to see if he's here. I don't see him.

MR. PERRI: Excuse me. I'm sorry to interrupt, Katie. Several of the folks that we put on as public speakers are part of the Caltrans team, so --

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Mr. Perri, maybe you can help --

MR. PERRI: -- they're not necessarily here to
answer public -- or, I'm sorry, to make public statements per se, but they're here to answer any questions that may come up.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Mr. Perri, do you mind identifying who those may be, so that we can get through.

MR. PERRI: Yes. George was one of them Scott Edwards is another, Candice Longdeck -- Longnecker, Jordan Main, Andrew Huang, Janel Wilson, Shelly Darwazeh, and I'm sure I'm missing some there.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: If I may, Katie, maybe we -- if I'm looking at our list of public speakers, I think it's safe to move directly to Mr. Propper and Mr. Mooney, Katie.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you. So our next public commenter is Ralph Propper. And I'm just identifying him on the list at the moment. While I look for him on the list, actually we'll move on to Don Mooney.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right.

Good afternoon, Don. Are you on?

MR. MOONEY: There. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, we can. Thank you.

MR. MOONEY: Okay. Even though we've been doing this for a couple years now, I still forget to hit unmute. And usually my best comments are the muted ones.
MR. MOONEY: My name is Don Mooney and I'm an attorney for Environmental Council of Sacramento. And just -- we asked for this to be brought off the consent calendar, just be -- in part because Caltrans actually received a notice from -- or ECOS received a notice from Caltrans asking for input on this, and particularly with regards to the environmental justice matters, which we -- which we provided a brief letter explaining some of our concerns about bike path access and safety associated with the environmental justice community.

And the other thing we wanted to bring out to the Commission's -- bring to the Commission's attention that ECOS has filed litigation over this project. And the -- it's not that ECOS doesn't support the bridge being replaced and -- or safe bridges, but it's the type -- it's the type of environmental review that they did, and the timing of that environmental review, and the piecemealing of that environmental review.

This is -- they are not -- Caltrans is not just replacing the deck, they are creating the infrastructure for also another project of a bridge widening project and a highway widening project that is under environmental review. And so our objection to this project and our objection to the State Lands approving this at this point
in time would be that this is part of a larger project that they have piecemealed the environmental review.

While a bridge repair is good, ECOS is concerned that the -- what they're doing in terms of the structure of the bridge that they're going to build up, the footings, are being designed for the other project. And then ECOS is concerned about the impact to vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions, because all of the evidence indicates that when you build roads wider, yes, traffic speeds up and congestion decreases maybe a little bit initially, but usually it ends up -- the cars end up filling up that space and the vehicle miles traveled increase and the greenhouse gases increase. So our concern is Caltrans is not dealing with that issue at this point in time. We wanted to bring that to their attention.

I'd also note -- and I know I'm close to being out of time, but I just -- if you'd give me a few minute -- an extra 30 seconds or so. I also noted that in the staff report, although you all asked us to -- about environmental justice issues, I noticed that in your findings or the proposed findings and approval documents, there is no finding or determination that Caltrans is making about any environmental justice issues, including the ones that we have -- the ones that we have raised as
potential issues.

So it -- or not Caltrans, but the State Lands Commission's approval -- proposed approval documents don't include any such findings. And so it may be something that you would want to consider. But again, we wanted to make the Commission aware of the underlying issues that we have here with this -- with not just the bridge replacement, but the bridge widening, and increasing -- and road widening that are all related and increasing capacity, which is going to -- which is what really we need to be working against if we're going to re -- if we're going to be reducing VMT and greenhouse gas emissions.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you very much for your comments. Appreciate that.

Katie, our next speaker, please.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Our next speaker is Ralph Propper.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon, Ralph.

Ralph, can you hear us?

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: I'm not sure if Ralph --

MR. PROPPER: Can you hear me?

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Oh,
here we go.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, we can hear you.

MR. PROPPER: Okay. Thank you. Sorry.

Turn yours down, please.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: You do have an echo.

MR. PROPPER: Turn yours off, please.

Can you turn yours off, please.

Thank you.

Okay. I'm the immediate past president of ECOS and I chair the Climate Change Committee. And we have the concerns that Don Mooney has expressed on this. I'm past president of the engineers union section and I've asked for details as to why the construction -- the rebuild of the bridge needs to be done at this time. I haven't been given any technical details of the -- of any sort that I can analyze. I don't see this on the list of any projects that are in danger of -- you know, that has a bad grade, that it's in need of repair.

Caltrans says that even though they'll widen it by more than 50 percent, and the statistics in the report are inaccurate, it's much wider expansion than is proclaimed there. This will -- as Don said, this will -- this is a widening project and that it's part of the larger project. I would foresee that once Caltrans gets this bridge widened, they'll say, well, we've done the
hardest part. You know, we might as well let us do the rest.

The plan is to expand this freeway from three lanes each way to five lanes each way. This would definitely induce travel. Under SB 743 regulations that took effect last summer, this means that -- that Caltrans would need to show that this would not increase vehicle miles traveled. The only way that that could occur is if there's funding for public transit or various other ways that -- that this could be done. So Caltrans is basically tying to accomplish this bridge widening and road expansion without having to go through the new regulations based on SB 743 that have been put in place to make sure that we don't have road projects that worsen our greenhouse gas emissions, and climate change, and make the air quality worse.

So I think this requires a lot more attention to detail. We do have a lawsuit, as I mentioned, against Caltrans for this project and the piecemealing basis. They promised this Environmental Impact Report five years ago. Instead of producing the Environmental Impact Report, they've proposed this project without any environmental review.

So we ask that -- this is a project that should not go forward without the Environmental Impact Report.
looking at the impacts of this project on a larger basis.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Ralph for your comments.

Katie, our next speaker, please.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. Our next speaker is John Deeter.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon, John.

MR. DEETER: Okay, yes. Yeah. Okay. I'm -- I'm sorry we had two computers in the same room. Sorry about that.

So yeah -- so I defer -- I raised my hand, because Ralph wanted to speak and we were having problems deciding which computer to use. So I won't add anything -- anything to what Ralph said.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you.

Katie, our next speaker, please?

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. At this time, we have no one else signed up to provide comment on this item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Thank you. Questions or comments, commissioners?

Yes, Commissioner Miller.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you, Chair.
Just -- I do think the confusion on the bridge widening and the update on the EIR from Caltrans I do think would be useful, if we could just reiterate the two answers to those questions, because I think they were referenced in the presentation.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Certainly. We can ask the Caltrans representative to respond to that.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Mr. Perri.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you.

Katie, could we get Mr. Perri back on the line?

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Yes. I am promoting him now.

MR. PERRI: Hi. Thank you. Can you hear me?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, we can hear you.

Did you hear the question by Commissioner Miller?

MR. PERRI: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

MR. PERRI: Let me clarify. This particular project that we are discussing right now was cleared Environmentally with a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The project that was referenced as needing an EIR is the larger widening project of the full freeway, which the project limits are from downtown Sacramento to Arden Way.

That project is going through its EIR right now. That work is not complete. We are continuing to work on
that. This -- that is an expansion project. They're correct. But that's a completely separate project than this bridge maintenance project. As I mentioned and showed in my video there -- or not video, but the PowerPoint, this project is needed from a bridge maintenance standpoint to keep the bridge intact and continue working.

The reason that we're widening is so that we can facilitate the construction of the bridge deck replacement. There was mention of widening to add vehicles to the lane. I mentioned earlier that the existing bridge has three lanes in the northbound, three lanes in the southbound, and that is going to remain even after this project is complete. So again, the only reason that we need to widen the bridge is to facilitate the construction -- construction and shift traffic in order to allow the construction equipment to work.

If we -- if we narrowed those lanes down to one or two lanes in each direction, we'd have back up for 10 miles given the amount of volume on this freeway. This is the most congested freeway in the Sacramento region. And any construction that we do we've got to leave all three lanes open during that construction. And the only way to do that is to widen it to make that shift of traffic.

One more point of clarification, if you don't
mind. There was a comment made about -- mentioned Caltrans discussion of environmental justice. The response on the environmental justice that was sent to State Lands from ECOS was sent because State Lands staff submitted a request for input from ECOS, because of the action on the Board's agenda today. So I just wanted to clarity that. It was not Caltrans that made that request. It was State Lands made the request to ECOS.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Perri, for the clarification.

Okay. Other questions or comments, commissioners?

Okay. Seeing no other public speakers on this item, is there a motion on this item?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: I move the staff recommendation on this item, please.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. We have a motion by Commissioner Miller to move the staff recommendation on this item.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: And I second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Seconded by Commissioner Dumlao.

Is that a unanimous vote?

Hearing no objection, such will be the order.
Thank you.

   All right, commissioners. Let's move on to Item 44 at this point. This is the -- relating to the general lease for the two existing concrete pipelines associated with the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station.

   And we do have a presentation on this item.

   Please.

   (Thereupon a slide presentation.)

   LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: Yes.

Good afternoon --

   CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon.

   LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: -- Madam Chair and members of the Commission. Brian Bugsch, Chief of Land Management, and I'm here to present on Item 44.

   --o0o--

   LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: The lessee, which is comprised of Southern California Edison and San Diego Gas and electric is requesting that the Commission consider approval of a new general lease right-of-way use.

   The proposed lease is for maintenance of two existing non-operational concrete intake and discharge conduits associated with the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, or SONGS, Unit 1. The proposed lease would not result in any construction or other ground-disturbing or
in-water activities. The applicant requested that the lease term of the proposed lease coincide with the lease for Units 2 and 3, so that both leases will expire at the same time in 2053.

--o0o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: SONGS is located approximately 50 while -- 50 miles northwest of San Diego in San Diego County along I-5 offshore from Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base, and approximately two miles south of San Clemente.

The onshore components of SONGS lie landward of the ordinary high water mark on two parcels entirely within the boundaries of Camp Pendleton and on land owned by the U.S. Navy and outside of the Commission's jurisdiction. The proposed lease facilities are located in the Pacific Ocean offshore and waterward of the ordinary high water mark.

--o0o--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: The SONGS Unit 1 began operations in 1968 and permanently ceased operations in 1992. In '93, SONGS Unit 1 was placed in a condition known as Safe Storage or SAFSTOR by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. In SAFSTOR, fuel is removed from the reactor and systems are retired that are no longer needed to maintain safe cooling of the
In 2000, SoCal Edison began decommissioning Unit 1 removing structures, equipment, and sending them to a disposal facility. The NRC issued a license amendment in February 2010 releasing the offshore conduits in place for unrestricted use. Decommissioning on the upland is not complete, but all above-ground structures have been demolished and removed. Unit 1 will retain in SAFSTOR configuration until permanent retirement of Units 2 and 3, and until this spent fuel has been moved off-site and plant's independent spent fuel storage installations are demolished.

As part of the decommissioning process for the offshore conduits, the lessee sought an amendment of its lease with the Commission. At its October 2005 meeting, the Commission certified a Final EIR for disposition of Offshore Cooling Water Conduits Project and authorized amendment of the lease to install mammal exclusion barriers with openings to allow sand migration into the intake and discharge conduits and to abandon the two unit one intake and discharge conduits.

The EIR was analyzed full -- or the EIR analyzed full removal of the water conduits, but did not identify full removal as the environmentally preferable option. Pursuant to the Commission's lease amendment in 2005, the
The lessee completed the partial removal work as contemplated in the EIR and authorized by the Commission. Offshore, the conduits are covered with approximately four feet of sand and sediment in an average water depth of 25 feet. At the beach, the conduits are buried beneath approximately four feet of sand and sediment and do not have an impact on navigational or recreational uses.

Through several inspections and surveys, the depth of cover of the conduits has not changed during their 50 years of existence. The mammal exclusion barriers are designed to allow the conduits to fill naturally with sand. It is unknown how much sand has entered the conduits. Substantial work to remove the grates would be required to evaluate the sand volume.

Full decommissioning of the SONGS -- of SONGS is scheduled for completion in 2051. And any future decommissioning activities on lands under the Commission's jurisdiction will require a lease application and Commission approval.

--000--

LAND MANAGEMENT DIVISION CHIEF BUGSCH: So as detailed in our staff report, staff recommends to authorize the issuance of a general lease right-of-way use for the applicant for the maintenance of two non-operational conduits, a term of 13 years beginning on
March 21st, 2022, annual rent of $126,629, insurance of 5 million and 10 million aggregate, or staff's self -- staff-approved self-insurance and a surety bond of $44,938,000.

That concludes staff's presentation and we're available to answer questions. I think a representative from SONGS is available to speak.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you, Brian, very much.

Why don't we hear from the representative from SONGS before we turn it over to our commissioners.

Good afternoon.

MR. PONTELLE: Good afternoon, Chair Yee and fellow commissioners. My name is Robert Pontelle. I'm an attorney with Southern California Edison. I just wanted to say thank you as always for staff's great help. We've done a number of these leases. Staff is always fantastic to work with. And unlike the one that we most recently did in 2019 for the Units 2 and 3 decommissioning project, that one, as staff mentioned, has no active development working going on with it. This is purely for maintenance of the existing facilities that are no longer operational.

And decommissioning -- or disposition of those was completed in the 2014 time frame per the EIR that was certified in 2005. And as a result of that work, the NRC
did issue, as was mentioned, a license amendment releasing the conduits for unrestricted use. And the reason that's important is because part of the basis for that was the very radiological conditions in the conduits. We are -- we have seen a couple of much public comments question the radiological standard for this. And I would just like to mention why this is not the appropriate forum or time to get into that review, because first and foremost, the NRC has already signed off on the NRC -- the radiological conditions.

In fact, in 2007, a study was done both by SCE and another one confirmatory by the NRC showing that the radiological conditions were less than one millirem within the conduits themselves. And study was actually based on a very conservative methodology that assumed somebody would go into those conduits physically for the -- every day during the lobster harvesting season for 173 days, harvest shellfish, ingest the shellfish, be exposed to radiation. And that we know is no longer possible considering that the conduits have been plugged. They're non-operational. The mammal exclusion barriers are in place.

Not to mention, that over the 15-year time frame since those 2007 studies were done, radiological conditions have improved even more due to radioactive
decay over time for the various isotopes that may have been found in there.

So in sum, we appreciate again your consideration of this new lease as we continue decommissioning for the entire plant. Thank you to staff for all the work. We're available to answer any questions. I also have I believe on Zoom remotely two of my colleagues who have more scientific expertise than I, Dave Asti and Ronald Pontes. But if you have any other questions, we appreciate very much the opportunity to address them.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you, Mr. Pontelle.

Let me move to Katie to see about our public speakers for this item.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair, our next public commenter is Laura Walsh.

MS. WALSH: Hi. Can you hear me?

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

MS. WALSH: Good afternoon. I'm Laura Walsh. I'm the California Policy Manager for the Surfrider Foundation. I appreciate this item is a rather routine permit extension for the existing ocean conduits. But
just given the high stakes of nuclear radiation, we just want to echo the formal written request of the Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility, and that's around strengthening the proposed lease terms. We think the Commission should add language that requires SCE to perform radiological cleanup and achieve the lowest possible radiological dose achievable as a condition of the lease. Based on what's been said, it sounds like that's more than achievable.

We agree that Southern California deserves the same level of project -- protection as has already been achieved in Humboldt Bay and on the east coast and that's the strict standard of at least 10 millirem.

And this lease is an opportunity to set the expectation with SCE for stringent site remediation upon lease termination and really should be included as a condition of approval.

Thanks so much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you so much.

Excuse me.

Our next speaker.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Our next speaker is Jill Zamek.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon, Jill.

MS. ZAMEK: Hi. Jill Zamek. I'm speaking on
behalf of the San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace.

        Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, we can.

MS. ZAMEK: We are unopposed to the lease extension, but only with the added stipulation that final radiological cleanup be more stringent than NRC minimum requirements. We recommend inclusion of the statement, "Radiological cleanup shall achieve the lowest dose based levels measured by millirems per year, previously approved by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in a licensee termination plan for a commercial nuclear plant in the United States.

This means that SONGS Unit 1 conduits will be subject to 10 millirems per year rather than the general 25 millirems per year standard the NRC applies when not stipulated in an agreement. This is an achievable standard and has been accomplished at Humboldt Bay. Facilities in Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont, and New York have also agreed to this 10 millirem standard.

        Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker, Katie.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: My next speaker is John Geesman.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon, John.
John, can you hear us?

MR. GEESMAN: Hello.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes. Good afternoon.

MR. GEESMAN: Good afternoon, Chair Yee and members of the Commission.

This is a fairly straightforward question. I'm the attorney for the Alliance for Nuclear Responsibility. We submitted language to you for suggested inclusion in the lease. In our judgment, the lease should have a quantified, measurable standard to be applied when it terminates, and that's going to be either in 2035 or quite likely extended until 2051 when Edison currently projects their decommissioning project will be complete.

No reason at all why Edison cannot meet the standard that the states of New York, Massachusetts, Vermont, and Maine have all successfully applied through the NRC process.

Now, in California, at Humboldt Bay where the decommissioning has been completed, even PG&E was able to establish -- or to accomplish a 6 millirem standard. Edison has told you this afternoon that in 2010, the NRC determined that they had achieved a standard less than 1 millirem for these conduits. So they're well on the way to being in compliance. In our judgment, you should approve the lease, but it should be conditioned upon
Edison meeting the standard that the NRC has previously approved in a license termination plant at any commercial nuclear power plant in the United States.

There's no reason why Californians should not receive the same level of protection radiologically that residents of New York, or Massachusetts, or Vermont, or Maine already experience. In our judgment, this is a straightforward question. Edison hasn't given you any good reason why they couldn't comply, so we suggest that you include that language in the lease.

I would remind you that this site is at the epicenter of one of the most popular beaches in the State Parks system. California beachgoers deserve just as much radiological protection as residents of other states do, and it's within your authority to accomplish that.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you for your comments. Katie, our next speaker, please.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you Madam Chair.

At this time, we have no other speakers signed up to speak on this item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Thank you. Commissioners, questions or comments?

Maybe I -- Jennifer, if I could, I just want to
pose maybe a question. I appreciate the testimony we've
heard this afternoon, but it appears that -- I mean, I
feel like -- I feel like we have kind of a mismatch
between the concerns raised and the venue in which they're
raised. This is a standard lease renewal for the two
pipelines associated with Unit 1. But it seems to me --
and certainly I'm happy to see that with respect to all of
the facilities, that the safety levels are coming in
beyond expectations of safe levels. So that is good news.

But I guess I'm just wondering, one, if we even
have jurisdiction to impose such a condition on the lease.
And then secondly, if we did, how the heck would we
enforce it?

(Laughter.)

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Well, those are very
good questions, Chair Yee, and ones we struggled with as
well after receiving the comment letters that reflected
the comments that you just heard.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: And the NRC has
already acted on this. And the Commission is -- and we
dealt with this numerous times over the discussion and
deliberation over the Unit 1 decommissioning as well as
Units 2 and 3. We are federally preempted from requiring
additional terms and conditions as it relates to nuclear
fuel beyond what the NRC has already dictated and required.

And so our hands are tied a bit on the request that's before you to modify the lease terms. And from a practical standpoint, the -- the levels are below what anyone expected. And so we don't think as a staff that requiring that additional condition as proposed, A, is within our authority and jurisdiction, and B would result in anything practically better than what's already being achieved out there.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Um-hmm. Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: And I would just add to your last question or -- that we do not have the staff expertise in-house to be able to adequately enforce that. We would be relying on the NRC --

CHAIRPERSON YEE: NRC, yeah.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- to help us do that and they have already acted on this.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. All right. That -- thank you for the clarification. So it looks like there have been multiple opportunities in the past to look at pursuing this provision. And this is something that is properly within the jurisdiction of the NRC rather than this Lands Commission.

Okay. Any other comments?
If not, is there a motion on the item?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Move approval of staff recommendation.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Second it.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: We have a motion by Commissioner Miller to approve the staff recommendation, seconded by Commissioner Dumlao.

I believe that is a unanimous vote. Without objection, such will be the order.

Thank you very much, Commissioners.

We'll now move to Item 56, which was also pulled off of the consent agenda. And this relates to the proposed tideland oil revenue expenditure by the City of Long Beach for seven capital improvement projects. And do we have a presentation on this one?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: We do. Reid Boggiano is joining --

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Wonderful.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- us virtually once again today.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right. Reid, back to you again.

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST BOGGIANO: Good afternoon again, Madam Chair and commissioners.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you.
(Thereupon a slide presentation.)

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST BOGGIANO: The City of Long Beach is a trusty of sovereign tide and submerged lands granted by the Legislature. The City's statutory trust grant authorizes the City to spend tideland oil revenue for specified uses, and requires the city to notify the Commission of proposed expenditures. Revenues must be expended for uses and purposes consistent with the City's granting statutes and be for statewide purposes as opposed to purely local interests.

The City is required to file a detailed description of any proposed expenditure exceeding $100,000 with the Commission 60 days before disbursement. The Commission typically reviews several City expenditures like this every year.

In February, the City notified staff of proposed expenditures of tideland oil revenue to fund seven projects located on and adjacent to the City's granted lands for the Commission's review. It's important to note that the granting statute limits the Commission's role in its review to only the consistency of the expenditure with the statutory trust grant, and that the expenditure is in the best interests of the State. The Commission does not have approval authority, but rather its role is to ensure that the proposed expenditures are not inconsistent with
the statutory trust grant.

This slide lists the proposed expenditures before the Commission for a review. The first expenditure is for the junior lifeguard facility. The existing junior lifeguard facility is outdated and is unable to accommodate the expanding junior lifeguard program.

The project involves demolishing an existing facility and returning the area to a Sandy Beach. The City will replace the facilities with one-story building with a viewing deck, stingray response room, lockers, and meeting space. The City is notifying the Commission of an addition $1.2 million expenditure to fully fund the construction of this project.

The second expenditure is for the convention center area improvement project. The City is notifying the Commission of $550,000 expenditure to complete general maintenance and improvements for repairs, upgrades, and signage throughout the convention center complex.

The third expenditure is for the beach restroom door replacement project. This project will replace one-third of the restroom doors at various beach restroom facilities throughout the City's waterfront. The City is replacing the fiberglass doors and frames with metal doors to repair damaged doors, reduce vandalism, and prevent the unlawful entry that's occurred after hours when the public
restrooms are not in operation. The City requests that
the Commission review $150,000 expenditure for this
project.

The fourth expenditure is for the one Junipero
basketball skating area. The project will add basketball
courts and a new skating area at Junipero Beach. The City
states that these facilities are popular and often at
capacity, and requests that the Commission review a
$350,000 expenditure for the planning, design, and
outreach effort -- engagement efforts for this project.

The fifth expenditure is for the irrigation --
irrigation system improvements. This project involves
landscaping improvements along the waterfront as intended
to meet water conservation efforts and will replace 60
irrigation control cabinets and install a centralized
irrigation controller. The city requests that the
Commission review a $400,000 expenditure for the first
phase of this project.

The sixth expenditure is the Belmont Veterans
Memorial Pier Replacement Project. The City has completed
a preliminary feasibility study and the public engagement
process for the proposed replacement of the Belmont
Veterans Memorial Pier. The City is ready to initiate the
conceptual design and engineering studies and requests the
Commission review a $2 million expenditure to begin this
The seventh and final expenditure is for the Alamitos Bay Water Quality Enhancement Project. The Alamitos Energy Center, also known as AES, draws ocean water from Alamitos Bay and discharges the water to the San Gabriel River as part of their once-through cooling pumping systems.

AES is -- AES is a natural gas power plant that provides electricity to Long Beach and the region. This power generator uses ocean water to cool power plant turbines. And these pump activities create currents that pull ocean water into the bay improving circulation and water quality.

Since 2019, City staff has been engaged in an engineering feasibility study to evaluate the effectiveness of new environmental friendly pumps at different locations within the bay. The City employed a consultant Moffatt and Nichol to identify alternative pumping systems that would minimize the potential water quality impacts within the bay due to pump cessation. Moffatt and Nichol was charged with conducting an engineering study to identify pumping options that could be -- that could be feasibility -- feasibly constructed on the AES site to develop design concepts illustrating those options.
Additionally, Moffatt and Nichol was asked to identify related permit and regulatory requirements design and construction schedules, and cost estimates for each alternative. This effort began with engagement of the Regional Water Quality Control Board to determine whether pumping and transfer of water from the Bay into the San Gabriel River could continue once-through cooling systems -- without once-through cooling systems.

After several months of discussion and study, the Regional Water Quality Control Board identified an approach that would require a new -- new city permit to install fish-friendly pumps on the AES property and continue the transfer of water from the bay to the San Gabriel River.

The City and Moffatt and Nichol began collaborating with AES to identify the most suitable location for the new pumps among the six existing pump intake wells associated with six AES power plant units.

In the spring of 2020, the City and AES identified four conceptual design alternatives for the installation of the new fish-friendly pumps. The City and AES have preliminary selected a preferred design alternative. It requires the least amount of new piping and infrastructure.

The preliminary cost estimate for construction of
the preferred design alternative is 35 million and
operating and maintenance costs are estimated to be two
million annually. The next steps are for the City to work
with AES to continue the design of the project.

Environmental review will be initiated once the
preliminary design is complete and the city has an
adequate description of the project, which is required for
CEQA.

In 2019, the Commission reviewed a $200,000
expenditure for an initial feasibility study and to begin
the conceptual designs. In 2020, the -- in the 2020 the
City -- the Commission reviewed an additional $300,000
expenditure to continue with studies of the preliminary
designs. The City is now requesting the Commission to
review an additional $250,000 to continue the design work
for the Alamitos Bay Water Quality Enhancement Project.

This concludes staff's presentation. I'm
available -- I'm available to answer any questions. And
I'll note that we also have representatives from the City
of Long Beach here. So after public comment, your welcome
to ask any questions that are more appropriately directed
to the City.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you very much,
Reid, for the presentation.

Questions or comments by Commissioners at this
Okay. Seeing none, Katie let me turn to you for public speakers, please.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. For our first public speaker, we have Charlene Angsuco. I just saw her on the list, but she might have dropped off.

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST BOGGIANO: It might be helpful, Katie, if -- to start with -- isn't maybe Elizabeth on the line. I think she had the -- Charlene is with the City of Long Beach.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Okay. Elizabeth Lambe?

PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT SPECIALIST BOGGIANO: Yes.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Okay.

Yes. All right. There we go.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Good afternoon Elizabeth.

MS. LAMBE: I was muted. So I had some comments to make. Can I start with those comments?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, please. You have three minutes.

MS. LAMBE: So I want you to know that I'm the Executive Director of the Los Cerritos Wetlands Land Trust. And we are concerned about the City of Long
Beach's plan to replace the pumps at the AES power plant, pumps that the State has compelled AES to quit pumping water through.

We have raised concerns with your staff and with the Long Beach City Manager's Office about this proposal. In response to our concerns, the City did set up a conference call for us with their consultants, the same ones mentioned here who prepared the circulation modeling studies.

We shared that we were concerned that the pumps may not really be a pollution abatement technique, that they would be merely be pumping polluted water from the bay and wetlands, and discharging it into the San Gabriel River. And why that might be attractive to people who recreate in Alamitos Bay, it wouldn't be for people who surf in the river mouth and the downcurrent beach.

So for the purposes of the State Lands Commission, my question to you is how much statewide interest is there in moving polluted water from one water body to another, since both are in equally popular recreation sites? We're also trying to determine the value of fish-friendly pumps and what fish-friendly pumps means that are apparently needed to move the bay water into the river.

Even assuming that marine organisms, both plants
an animal offspring, survive the trip through the pumps and pipes, they are still removed from the wetlands and possibly exposed to a natural predation when they are discharged into the river and swept into the ocean. This concerns us, because it would continue the removal of wetlands organisms, something that is now outlawed for the power plant. So my question is to you is, is there a statewide interest in such a plan?

But then later we were told by the City's consultants that the project isn't so much about pollution abatement, but it's more habitat protection, at least that's our best understanding, and that without the circulation provided by the pumps, that eelgrass could not survive in the bay. We've been very involved in the wetlands restoration planning for the area and we talked to experts we know, and they don't agree. There are similar coastal wetlands in San Diego with less circulation, but they had healthy seagrass beds.

We do appreciate the City putting us in touch with their consultants. However, the next logical step would be to provide us with their studies and data, so we can do an independent review. And we've made repeated requests for those studies and have never heard back.

We think we've raised legitimate questions that we haven't received any answers to. In our view, without
seeing the underlying studies and allowing the peer review, it is impossible for the State Lands Commission to determine if there is a statewide interest in this project.

We request that you deny approval of this one part of the bundle that the City is asking you for funding for, on the grounds that they haven't provided a statewide interest. They should either fund their project with their own money or provide these studies to State Lands and the public.

Thank you so much for your time.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Ms. Lambe for your comments.

Let me see if there are any other public speakers before we address some of your issues that you've raised.

Katie, any other public speakers?

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. At this time, we have no other speakers for this item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Thank you.

Let me turn back to you, Reid, and the representatives from the City of Long Beach maybe to address the particular project that Ms. Lambe commented about.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Controller Yee, I will attempt to address it --
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Oh. Oh, good. Okay. Good.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- if that's okay?
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Please.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: And then if you have technical questions about the project --
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- we can bring the City on. I just wanted to clarify that in normal -- or in the traditional approvals that the Commission gives in authorizing leases, the Commission is making specific findings as it relates to the statewide best interest and other Public Trust findings.

The statutory framework that governs the City's grant and management of the Public Trust tidelands and the revenues that are generated from those and being reinvested in those tidelands, which is the subject of this item, the Commission's review authority is significantly more limited and restricted. And that's due to the specific statutory direction that the Commission has in reviewing these expenditures.

So the Commission's review is really solely -- it's narrow in terms of does the proposed expenditure, is that inconsistent with the uses outlined in the City's statutory trust grant. So it's a very different approach and level of discretion in this particular instance. So I
just wanted to clarify that, because the Commission isn't
making findings relating to the statewide best interests
about this particular project or these expenditures. It's
is the expenditure inconsistent with the statutory trust
grant?

And that's the analysis and recommendation in the
staff report. And staff does not believe it is
inconsistent.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: I will also -- I
just want to also address the concerns raised about the
project itself and the benefits or the impacts. It's our
understanding -- you know, the City is in the design phase
element. They will be pursuing environmental impact
analysis consistent with CEQA. We will be looking at that
project as a trustee agency through that analysis, other
regulatory agencies will, the public will have ample
opportunity to review all the data and science that the
City is using to analyze a proposed project, once they
finalize the project description.

And so we'll know a lot more as they enter into
that phase of the project. And as a staff, we will be
looking at that analysis as well to ensure that our
trustee responsibilities are being implemented in the
oversight of these granted lands.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Yeah, that's very helpful, Jennifer. It's so unique from the perspective that our decision here is really a consistency determination with the granting statutes and not with respect to the statewide benefit or for our purposes as was alluded to by the -- by the commenter.

Okay. That makes sense. And then obviously this is just a -- for a project of that -- of that character, there will be many other opportunities to weigh in -- for the public to weigh in.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: (Nods head.)

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well.

Other questions or comments, Commissioners?

If not, is there a motion?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: I'll move approval of the staff recommendation. And thank you for that explanation.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: I'll second it.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. We have a motion by Commissioner Miller, seconded by Commissioner Dumlao.

Without objection, that is a unanimous vote, such will be the order.

Thank you.

All right. Thank you very much, Commissioners.
I believe that takes us back to the items on the agenda. Item 62, I believe, is where we are picking up. And this is our discussion and possible action on State legislation relevant to the Commission.

And Sheri, good afternoon.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Good afternoon. Thank you, Madam Chair and commissioners. This is an informational item that summarizes California's legislation that the Commission has adopted a position on or that staff is tracking this year.

We're not making any recommendations at this time for the Commission to act on any of the legislation enumerated in the staff report, but there are a lot of significant policy changes embedded in these bills on topics that are impactful to the Commission. They range from carbon capture and sequestration, sea level rise, equity, abandoned vessels, and many other issues.

As you know, the Legislature is in the midst of their busy season, and the year is almost halfway over. The Legislature will adjourn for summer recess or interim recess in early July and return in April before adjourning August 31st.

I just wanted to highlight a couple of bills the Commission is in support of. AB 2257 by Assemblymember Boerner-Horvath. That bill is going to be placed on the
Appropriations suspense file tomorrow.

And then the other bill I wanted to highlight is AB 353 by Assemblymember O'Donnell, which relates to the Long Beach Oil Trust Fund and the Commission also has a support position on that bill.

That bill will be referred to a policy committee sometime in the next month or so and have a hearing later in June.

Before I end, I just wanted to highlight a couple of bills that staff is tracking a little more carefully. Senator Eggman has introduced SB 1065 that would require the State to create and abandoned commercial vessel program and task the State Lands Commission with administering this program and the series of steps that it would have to take including inventorying commercial abandoned vessels, and making recommendations to the Legislature on how to prevent vessels from being abandoned.

The second bill I wanted to just highlight is SB 953 by Senator Min, which would require the Commission to conduct an amortization study related to its offshore oil and gas leases and seek to -- seek to achieve voluntary relinquishments of those leases or terminate those leases if the voluntary relinquishments are unsuccessful. And that bill passed out of the Senate Natural Resources and Resources.
Water Committee today on a mostly party line vote and goes to Senate Appropriations. It does not account for funding or include the Long Beach oil and gas operations.

And that is it. Staff will continue to monitor these bills and other bills especially as bills are amended in the coming months up until the August deadline, bring back to the Commission any bills that we recommend the Commission consider or are important to note.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you very much, Sheri. Any questions or comments, commissioners?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: No, thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Very well. Thank you. So now on to item -- oh, I'm sorry. Is there any -- Katie, any public comment on this item?

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. At this time, we have no public speakers on this item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Thank you.

So we'll move on to Item 63. And this is relating to taking a position on AB 1832 by Assemblymember Rivas.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair and commissioners. This item recommends that the Commission adopt a support position on AB 1832 by Assemblymember Rivas. This bill would ban
mining the seabed for hard minerals and define hard
minerals. The bill is modeled on legislation the State of
Washington enacted last year and also reflects a wider
call for a seabed mining moratorium from scientists,
academics, and countries around the world.

You may recall that when the Commission was
adopting its five year strategic plan, Pew Charitable
Trusts repeatedly urged the Commission to include a seabed
mining ban in the plan, and the Commission declined to
include the banned and -- ban and recommended
instead that Pew pursue this change legislatively.

The Commission is currently permitted by law to
issue seabed mining leases, when it appears that the
leases and associated operations will not interfere with
the trust. AB 1832 would change that and prohibit the
Commission or a local trustee of granted public trust
lands from issuing a lease or permit to extract or remove
hard minerals.

The bill does not prevent scientific research or
collections conducted by or on behalf of an educational or
academic institution if authorized.

The seabed has been called the largest untouched
ecosystem in the world. The International Union for
Conservation of Nature, the global authority on the status
of the natural world, and the measures needed to safeguard
it has called for a global moratorium on deep sea mining. Many companies Google, Patagonia, BMW, and others have called for a temporary ban and over 600 marine, science and policy experts have called for a pause.

Deep seabed mining can irrevocably destroy marine ecosystems and has been characterized as taking a giant backing to the seabed floor. We think seabed is at -- is at odd -- seabed mining is at odds with California's role as an environmental leader, and its many policies, and statutes, and Executive Orders. The Pacific Ocean is already facing a number of challenges, acidification, overfishing, and pollution, and a myriad other -- other challenges.

The Natural Resources Committee approved AB 1832 unanimously on an 11 to 0 vote. The Monterey Bay Aquarium and the Surfrider Foundation are co-sponsoring the bill, and it's pending in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much. Questions or comments, commissioners?

Okay. Seeing none, let me turn to Katie for any public comment on this item.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FI LIPP: Thank you Madam Chair. At this time, we have no public speakers for the item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. No public speakers for
this item, Item 63?

Hearing and seeing none, is there a motion on this bill?

And, Commissioner Miller, you're staying off?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: I'm abstaining, yes.

So thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Thank you.

I will move to approve a support position on this bill by the Commission.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: And I second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Dumlao.

So with that, Ms. Lucchesi, may I just have you call the roll for the record.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Sorry. We were just checking the public comment list to make sure.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commission Dumlao?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner Miller?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Abstain, please.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Yee?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: The motion passes with two votes and one abstention.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Than you very much.
I had to do a double take on the public speakers too.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.
All right. Moving on to Item 64. This is also consideration of support of legislation on AB 2109.

Sheri.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Yes.
Thank you, Madam Chair and commissioners. This item recommends that the Commission adopt a support position on AB 2109 by Assembly members Bennett and Bloom. This bill would make it illegal to use bait or chum to attract a white shark or to place bait or chum or another attractant into the water when a white shark is present, except if authorized by a permit from the Department of Fish and Wildlife for scientific or educational purposes.

Ocean activities have increased in the past few decades, because of the growing population and the greater populate -- popularity of ocean activities. Wildlife tourism has also grown in popularity. Cage diving and viewing great white sharks works by boats are examples of wildlife tourism and are a growing business in California.

It has been reported that some individuals operating white shark viewing tours by boat have used
attractants like chum, or bait, or a decoy for cage diving operations in areas with an abundance of white sharks potentially putting the public at risk. Boat operators may attempt to use some form of attractant to bring white sharks near the vessel to increase the likelihood of a successful view.

It's illegal under State law to catch, pursue, hunt, capture, or kill a white shark. White sharks are also protected by federal regulations and must be immediately released, if caught accidentally. But existing law is defined in terms of a taking. It's unlawful to take any white shark. Although attracting white sharks with bait or decoy is considered an attempt to pursue the animal. When excursion companies use attractants or decoys to lure sharks, they're technically not taking the shark. They are -- it is therefore unclear whether existing white shark protections prohibit attracting white sharks for entertainment purposes. This bill would remove that ambiguity and make it explicit that this practice is illegal.

One of the most important responsibilities of the Commission is to preserve and increase public access to the tide and submerged lands, including those that run along California's shoreline. Great white sharks are important to the marine ecosystem, and using bait or other
attractants in areas where there is human activity increases the likelihood of a shark attack occurring.

AB 2109 will make it clear that it's illegal to use bait or decoys to attract great white sharks. The bill is designed to make the ocean safer for human use, and ocean activities, and for sharks. And this aligns we think with the Commission's public access and Public Trust responsibilities.

The Assembly Water, Parks, and Wildlife Committee approved AB 2109 on a 10 to 0 vote with 5 abstentions. The bill supported is by California Fish and Game Warden supervisors and managers, Defenders of Wildlife, Monterey Bay Aquarium, and Oceana and it has not received any opposition.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you, Sheri. Questions or comments, commissioners?

Commissioner Dumlao.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: It just seems like a smart move.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: It does. I can't believe we've had this ambiguity for so long.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.
ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: And, Madam Chair, despite that, I will be abstaining.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner Miller.

Let me turn to you, Katie, for any public comment on this item.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. Our first public commenter is Laura Walsh. And apologies, I also missed her and Amy on that last item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: You may also provide a comment on that last item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Thank you.

Laura, Good afternoon.

MS. WALSH: Hey. Hi again. Thank you so much.

This is Laura Walsh California Policy Manager for Surfrider Foundation. And I don't want to take away from this item. I'm registering my support for the last item regarding AB 1832 and really appreciate the passage of the item. Thanks so much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Sure.

Okay. Katie, our next speaker.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank
you, Madam Chair. Our next speaker is Amy Wolfrum.

Good afternoon, Amy.

MS. WOLFRUM: Good afternoon. Thank you for letting me have the ability to get logged on here.

So I had also intended to register my strong support for the last item and I want to commend you on your decision to pass it. So thank you very much. And I also am here -- my name is Amy Wolfrum and I'm the California Ocean Policy Senior Manager for Monterey Bay Aquarium.

And I'm also here in support of this legislation, because we do appreciate the attention and the staff report on this, as well as the support to ban the use of any bait, lure, or chum to attract a white shark in California waters. We also think it's a smart decision.

So I'm here on behalf of Monterey Bay Aquarium, along with Oceana and the California Fish and Game Warden's Supervisors and Managers Association, and all of us are in support of this bill and we urge the Commission to vote in favor of this item.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Amy, very much for your comment.

Katie, our next speaker.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Our
next speaker is Michelle Sevilla.

    CHAIRPERSON YEE: Good afternoon, Michelle.
    MS. SEVILLA: Thank you so much, Commission members and staff, for your consideration of this important bill. It was a pleasure to see some of you earlier at the Piers 421 tour.

    Again, my name is Michelle Sevilla and I am one of Assemblymember Steve Bennett's field representatives here in the district. And I cover water, parks and wildlife, and other environment-related policy areas.

    Assemblymember Bennett requests the California State Land Commission's support for AB 2109, which would prohibit the use of bait or animal decoys for the purpose of attracting or viewing white sharks.

    As climate change continues to warm our oceans, drawing sea creatures like white sharks closer to our shores. These creates understandably draw the fascination and interest of the general public. However, white shark tours are often in areas with an abundance of both white sharks and ocean users, potentially putting members of the public at risk.

    In the past 52 years, there have only been 202 reported shark-human incidents. And we do not want that number to rise, further risking both species.

    Assemblymember Bennett again respectfully
requests your support of AB 2109. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Michelle, for your comments.

Katie, our next speaker, please.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. At this time, we have no other speakers for this item.


Seeing no other public comment on this item, I will move support on AB 2109 by the Commission.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: And I second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Seconded by Commissioner Dumlao.

Ms. Lucchesi, will you call the roll.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Certainly. Commissioner Dumlao?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner Miller?

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Abstain.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Yee?

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: The motion passes with two votes and one abstention.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Great. Thank you very much, commissioners.

All right. Now, we will move on to Item 65, and this is an informational item. And we will be receiving a presentation by the Ocean Protection Council on the State Agency Sea Level Rise Action Plan for California. And this is a really wonderfully collaborative effort. And I just want to thank the Ocean Protection Council, Ella, you for being here for the presentation and look forward to having you share it with us. Good afternoon.

MS. MCDOUGAL: Good afternoon.

ACTING CHAIRPERSON MILLER: Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Yes, please.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm going to apologize if I have to leave a little bit early before your presentation is over.

MS. MCDOUGAL: No problem. Nothing at all.

Thank you.

ACTING COMMISSIONER MILLER: Thank you so much

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Miller.

Thank you.

MS. MCDOUGAL: I certainly understand.

Thank you so much, Chair Yee and commissioners for having me today. Do I have slides?

(Thereupon a slide presentation.)
MS. MCDOUGAL: Oh, fantastic. Look at that.

Good afternoon. My name is Ella McDougal and I am the Climate Change Program Manager with the Ocean Protection Council. And today I will be presenting the recently released State Agency Sea Level Rise Action Plan for California. And Chair Yee is quite familiar with this, because I believe she was present when we passed it -- or when we publicly released it in February.

In a few words, the action plan is a collaborative roadmap to help California achieve coastal resilience and sea level rise adaptation. And I'm just going to share a little bit of the history of sea level rise in California as well.

So, slide please.

--o0o--

MS. MCDOUGAL: Great. So seas -- see levels will continue to rise at an accelerating rate. This is something that we know and they will threaten our coastlines, our communities, our coastal habitats, and critical infrastructure. The impacts we may face include flooding, erosion, extreme high tides, and worsening coastal storms. And two specific examples that we already see today are King tides and bluff collapse. And these impacts really jeopardize our safety and our livelihoods along the coast of California.
That said, the State of California has sound science and guidance to begin planning for sea level rise and coastal resiliency. There is a lot of doom and gloom in this presentation, but there's a lot of silver linings as well, just to warn you

(Laughter.)

MS. MCDOUGLAL: Slide, please.

--o0o--

MS. MCDOUGLAL: As you all may know, there was a national report released on sea level rise in February of this year. And it reiterates -- reiterates the need for urgent and ambitious action. Projected sea level rise over the next 30 years could rise as much as was observed in the past 100 years showing remarkable acceleration.

The updated likely projections in this report, which is from NASA, NOAA, USGS, U.S. EPA and a number of other agencies, show just under 1 foot of sea level rise by 2050 and around 3.5 feet by 2100. The report presents a reduced range of uncertainty for protections allowing us to be more confident in our planning targets.

And perhaps more critically, we expect a rapid increase in the rate of sea level rise and the number of sunny day floods by the year 2035 as is shown in this graph of La Jolla, and that will, of course, cause repetitive and very costly damage.
Slide, please.

--o0o--

MS. MCDOUGAL: One of the easiest ways to measure the benefit of addressing sea level rise early and robustly is by understanding how much money we will save on future damage and repairs. There's a lot of studies outlined on this slide, but most critically, one analysis found that with 1.7 feet of sea level rise, $17.9 billion of commercial and residential Buildings will be at risk of inundation. Another study found that San Elijo State Beach loses $59,400 of revenue a year, and that results in 4,320 visitors who are annually no longer coming to the beach due to those eroding beaches.

And near Gleason Beach, a one-mile section of roadway is subject to chronic bluff erosion and that is costing $40 million to elevate and realign.

We can also quantify impacts in terms of our coastal habitats and natural areas. It's possible that one-third to two-thirds of Southern California beaches could erode by 2100 if no intervention is performed. And a study done by State Parks and the Coastal Conservancy found that with five feet of sea level rise and a hundred year storm, there will be 593 State Park structures, 150 parking lots, 93 camp grounds, and 65 miles of access roads at risk.
MS. MCDOUGAL: We know for sure that underserved, low-income, and marginalized communities, which we collectively refer to as communities entitled to environmental justice, carry more of the burden of climate change than others.

Toxic Tides is recent study from UC Berkeley and UCLA that analyzed how sea level rise will impact contaminated sites. And it found that 440 hazardous facilities, which include power plants, refineries, industrial facilities and hazardous waste sites are at risk of coastal flooding by 2,100 under a high emissions scenario.

These toxic sites are five times more likely to be located within one mile of a community entitled to environmental justice, meaning that these communities bear much heavier consequences of climate change and sea level rise than their neighboring wealthy communities.

So with this data in mind, we are working to ensure that coastal resilience and sea level rise adaptation efforts are equitable and just especially from the funding and community outreach approach.

Slide, please.

--o0o--
MS. MCDUGAL: This is, of course, a major call to action and so we're here to act. In the past few years leading up to this effort, the State has made impressive strides towards sea level rise, planning, and adaptation. In 2018, OPC released the sea level rise guidance to guide local decision-makers and planners on how to prioritize for coastal resilience. And this is being updated in the next year.

In 2021, the Coastal Commission put together a comprehensive guidance for adapting critical infrastructure to sea level rise with a focus on two sectors, transportation and water. State Parks released the sea level rise adaptation strategy to address the urgency of sea level rise planning for their coastal State Parks units, and which, by the way, accounts for a quarter of our coast.

BCDC also recently released their Bay Adapt Joint Platform, an initiative to establish regional agreement on sea level rise action. And I would be remiss not to mention AB 691, which created the call for sea level rise vulnerability assessments for all public State coastal lands. And that would set amazing precedence for setting sea level rise vulnerability along the coast of California.

And in late 2021, exciting sea level rise
legislation known as SB 1 was passed and signed into law by Governor Newsom. And this legislation prioritizes sea level rise through planning, education, and technical assistance.

And in that same year, significant funding was allocated to coastal resilience in the State budget, which includes a hundred million to OPC for coastal and ocean projects, 500 million to the Coastal Conservancy for coastal adaptation and resiliency, 30 million to the Coastal Commission for planning, and 11.5 to State Parks to implement their sea level rise adaptation strategy.

Slide, please.

--o0o--

MS. MCDouGAL: So to make these collaborative efforts work, widespread input and participation is needed. And this occurred through the OPC facilitated sea level rise leadership group, an energetic and hard working group of 17 State agencies, one of which is the State Lands Commission, with quarterly working groups and bi-annual executive committee meetings, this group guides state -- statewide sea level rise action and policy for California.

Slide, please.

--o0o--

MS. MCDouGAL: In 2020, OPC published the,
"Principles for Aligned State Action", to address sea level rise. These principles were forward-thinking and pushed the envelope on action and funding, and they're up on the screen, and they are as follows: Best available science, number 1, most importantly; partnerships; improving communications; supporting local leadership and local conditions; strengthening alignment around coastal resilience; coastal projects; and integrating and prioritizing equity and social justice.

Slide, please.

---o0o---

MS. MCDUGAL: After the adoption of the aforementioned sea level rise principles, the executive team -- or the sea level rise leadership team executive committee tasked the working group with the creation of an action plan that would show exactly how to implement those principles. With leadership from OPC, and a year's worth of working group meetings, lots of one-on-one agency meetings, which we're very grateful for the staff in this room for participating in, and several sets of comments, the action plan was developed. And in my mind, it's truly an example of how to take science and research and turn it into policy, and then continue to turn it into statewide action.

Slide, please.
MS. MCDOUGAL: In this action plan, you'll find around 80 agency-specific actions that span all seven sea level rise principles. They include items such as research, how to prioritize nature-based solutions, various policy initiatives, and community -- communication efforts that are already and will be underway.

Overarching goals were pulled from the developed -- from the development of the action plan to help us guide and focus our efforts. And they include items such as coast-wide adaptation plans, funding mechanisms, preserving and restoring habitat, and ensuring equity and justice.

And in order to show accountability and success, the actions in this plan are tied to trackable metrics. These include what type of deliverable or outcome is expected with each action, such as a newly adopted policy, or report, or guidance, which agency will lead or support the completion of the action, and when. And these measures will help keep us on track and accountable for the things that we set before ourselves.

Most actions in this action plan apply to a statewide scope, but some were developed specifically with regions in mind, such as the Bay and Delta. And as you see in the principles, an entire section of the action
plan is designated to equity and social justice actions pertaining to sea level rise.

To designate which actions, because there are 80 of them, our highest priority, about 20 of them were listed as critical. And this helps us understand what is most vital to pushing the envelope on coastal resilience. And these actions are either already funded or will be funded with the upcoming budget.

Slide, please.

--o0o--

MS. MCDOUGAL: Following the release of the action plan, we have been open for public comment, which will be -- which will conclude on June 3rd. If you would like to submit public comment, you may do so through the email at the bottom of the slide.

We're also working on our social media awareness campaign, which we've already initiated and we are working on ensuring that outreach is complete and total with the -- this action plan. We are also embarking on a tribal consultation process to ensure that California Native American tribes have their voices heard and integrated.

And this is, of course, a living document, so we will be accepting comment and updating as we see changes that need to be made, but over time, as agencies progress
on their actions, we'll adjust timelines, we'll adjust outcomes, et cetera. So we'll continue to meet and assess our progress as a leadership team and share a new and updated document as is fit.

Thank you so much. That's all I have. And I'm keen to take any questions you may have.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you very much, Ella, for the presentation. And thank you to OPC for its leadership of what I think is probably a historic coordinated -- coordination and collaboration effort by our various State agencies.

I did have one question and that is with respect to this period of getting feedback, specific measures that were taken to be sure that we are engaging our communities entitled to environmental justice. This obviously has the most significant impacts on them, but can you just describe maybe some of that work in progress? And I -- this is definitely a living document, and we want to be sure their voices are incorporated into this.

MS. MCDougAL: Sure. We've done as much outreach as we can, and that includes public hearing, specific outreach to those community leaders, news letters, social media campaigns to make sure that we hit those communities that are, you know, targeted to ensure that they're fairly being included. And we're also doing our tribal
consultation as a parallel track to make sure that tribes are aware of the effort. And we've bundled that effort with a couple other consultations on our tribal engagement strategy.

So it's an ongoing process and it is not bound by that deadline of June 3rd. The tribal consultation will extend until -- until it's needed, so, you know, we're trying to make sure that we're as accommodating as possible.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. And I know we've had limitations in terms of being in those communities, but to the extent that we can meet them where they are, I hope we have more opportunities to do that.

MS. MCDOUGHAL: Absolutely. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: All right. Thank you.

Commissioner Dumlao.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: I just wanted to say thank you to OPC, to you, Chair Yee, for your leadership. This is an incredibly daunting task and it does require a whole-of-government approach, and bringing everyone together on these regular meetings breaking down the silos is so important. So thank you for all of your work. This is really, really important.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you.

Let me turn to Katie to see if there are public
comments on this item.

Katie.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. We have no public commenters for this item.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. All right. Thank you. I know this is probably one of the first or early State entities hearing this presentation since the --

MS. MCDouGAL: Yeah, third or fourth.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. All right. Good. Good. But thank you for coming down and really taking what has been just really I think a great effort, and challenging effort, and continuing to make it the best work-product and getting the feedback from members of the public and look forward to continuing to make progress.

Thank you.

MS. MCDouGAL: Thank you. And as Commissioner Dumlao said really thank you, Chair Yee, for your leadership as well. You know, the creating of the workplan is one thing, but implementing it will be another step, so we appreciate your partnership on that and look forward to --

CHAIRPERSON YEE: And to this Commission -- the State Lands Commission, I mean, this is from the AB 671 work to my Deputy Controller for Environmental Policy
Kristina Kunkel who sunk her teeth into this more than I think she ever expected at this point, but now to the solutions part, right?

MS. MCDOUGAL: Right.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: And so really excited about the work ahead.

MS. MCDOUGAL: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Thank you. All right, commissioners, thank you. So let's see, Ms. Lucchesi, what's our next order of business?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Our next order of business is our second public comment period.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. So at this time, if anyone wants to address the Commission on any matter that is not on today's agenda, please either come up to the podium or raise your hand. I will call on those who are here in person first, and next we'll move on to those who are joining us virtually.

And Katie, I'll turn to you, when you're ready, to see who the first person maybe who wishes to make a public comment at this time.

ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENTIST ROBINSON-FILIPP: Thank you, Madam Chair. Virtually, we have no public commenters raising their hand to provide comment at this time.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. All right. And I don't
see anyone in the room wishing to address the
commissioners.

So, at this time, Commissioner Dumlao, any other
comments or questions?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO:  (Shakes head.)

CHAIRPERSON YEE:  Thank you for your
participation throughout today, really a spectacular day.

Ms. Lucchesi, our next order of business.

Oh, I'm sorry. I believe -- is that the entire
agenda. There's no closed session today?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI:  Right. I was just
going to mention that.

CHAIRPERSON YEE:  All right.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI:  So our next order of
business would typically be closed session, but we do not
have items to discuss in closed session today. So through
the Chair, I recommend we adjourn the meeting until
tomorrow, where the meeting will be continued at Rincon
Island for our second site visit.

CHAIRPERSON YEE:  Okay. Great. So that's -- we
are now -- having concluded the matters before us, we will
adjourn this portion of the meeting until roughly 11 a.m.
tomorrow, April 27th, at Rincon Island, located at Mussel
Shoals, Ventura County. And the purpose of that meeting
will be a tour and presentation or tour and inspection of
the active work site at Rincon Island. As noticed in the
published agenda, the public is welcome to attend.
However, there is limited parking, so please carpool or
ride share, if possible. The terrain is uneven and proper
attire, including sturdy closed toe footwear should be
worn. Rincon Island and the causeway is used to -- is
used to -- Rincon -- Rincon island and the causeway -- I'm
sorry, I'm not reading this --

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yeah, they're both
active worksites.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Are they active?
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yeah.
CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Okay.
EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: And so we want to
make sure that members of the public that attend sign a
liability waiver.

CHAIRPERSON YEE: Okay. Alrighty. Great. So
any members of the public who wish to attend will need to
sign a liability waiver, will need to stay with the group,
and must follow all safety instructions while present. So
we look forward to members of the public participating,
but there are -- those will be the conditions for
tomorrow. And I will remind the Commissioners and their
staff to avoid discussing any official business until we
resume the meeting.
So with no other business to come before the commission, we will continue the meeting tomorrow at Rincon Island at Mussel Shoals, Ventura County at 11 a.m.

Thank you very much, everyone.

(Thereupon the California State Lands Commission meeting adjourned at 4:44 p.m.)
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