MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION

ZOOM PLATFORM

PORT OF LOS ANGELES

HARBOR ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

425 S. PALOS VERDES STREET

SAN PEDRO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 2024 12:00 P.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER LICENSE NUMBER 10063

J&K COURT REPORTING, LLC

JPETERS@JKREPORTING.COM

APPEARANCES

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Malia Cohen, State Controller, Chair, also represented by Kristina Kunkel

Eleni Kounalakis, Lieutenant Governor, represented by Matthew Dumlao, PhD

Joe Stephenshaw, Director, Department of Finance, represented by Michele Perrault

STAFF:

Jennifer Lucchesi, Executive Officer

Seth Blackmon, Chief Counsel

Jalal Abedi, Petroleum Resources, Engineer, Mineral Resources Management Division

Cathy Chan, Associate Government Program Analysist

Sheri Pemberton, Chief, External Affairs Division

ATTORNEY GENERAL:

Sahar Durali, Deputy Attorney General

ALSO PRESENT:

Chris Benzen

Eileen Boken, Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee, Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods

Brady Bradshaw, Center for Biological Diversity

Cory Biggs

Marcus Bush, Councilmember, City of National City, San Diego Air Pollution Control District

J&K COURT REPORTING, LLC

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

ALSO PRESENT:

Ann Cantrell, Sierra Club, Los Cerritos Wetlands Taskforce

Jessie Fleming

Barbara Griffith

Peter Kaz

Adam Leverenz

David Libatique, Port of Los Angeles

Luz Molina, Councilmember, City of National City

Jacqueline Moore

Jonathan Ullman, Pacific Merchant Shipping Association

Laura Wilkinson Sinton

Adam Wilson, San Diego County Local Agency Formation Commission

Wade Womack

J&K COURT REPORTING, LLC

JPETERS@JKREPORTING.COM

	INDEX	PAGE
I	Open Session	1
ΙΙ	Public Comment	5
	Public comments will be heard 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.	
III	Confirmation of Minutes for the February 26, 2024 meeting	40
IV	Executive Officer's Report	42
	Continuation of Rent Actions to be taken by the Executive Officer pursuant to the Commission's Delegation of Authority:	
	- Delta Bay Club, LLC (Lessee): Continuation of rent at \$4,817 per year for a General Lease - Commercial Use located on State sovereign land in the San Joaquin River, near Isleton, Sacramento County. (PRC 7067)	
	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 01-49	4 6
	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 L. TIM ROCHFORD AND CAROL ROCHFORD (LESSEE); MICHAEL U. ALVAREZ AND NANCY L. ALVAREZ, TRUSTEES OF THE MICHAEL AND NANCY ALVAREZ 1999 FAMILY TRUST DATED SEPTEMBER 15, 1999 AS AMENDED AND RESTATED SEPTEMBER 21, 2001 (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Lease Number 7277, a General Lease - Recreational Use; and an application for a General Lease -Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 1340 West Lake Boulevard, near Tahoe City, Placer County; for an existing pier, two boathouses, three boat lifts, and boat hoist. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7277; A4465; RA# 2023181) (A 1; S 1, 4) (Staff: M. Harless)
- DARBARA C. THORTON, TRUSTEE OF THE BARBARA C. THORTON TRUST DATED SEPTEMBER 18, 2009 (LESSEE); SANDRA H. BARRETT AND JOHN P. BARRETT (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Lease Number 5316, a General Lease Recreational Use and an application for a General Lease Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 8748 Brockway Vista Avenue, Kings Beach, Placer County; for one existing mooring buoy and the installation and use of one additional mooring buoy. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (Lease 5316; A3809; RA# 2022089) (A 1; S 1, 4) (Staff: M. Waldo)
- DOUGLAS ROBERT BRIEN AND RAMIAH SHANTI BRIEN, TRUSTEES OF THE DOUGLAS ROBERT BRIEN AND RAMIAH SHANTI BRIEN 1998 TRUST DATED MARCH 20, 1998, AS RESTATED (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 200 Pine Street, near Tahoma, Placer County; for use of two existing mooring buoys, removal of an existing boat ramp, and construction and use of a new pier and installation of a boat lift. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions.

(A4331; RA# 2023083) (A 1; S 1, 4) (Staff: M. Sapunor)

- JOSEPH P. COLMERY AND LAURIE W. COLMERY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 632 Olympic Drive, near Tahoe City, Placer County; for two existing mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8624; A4443; RA# 2023163) (A 1; S 1, 4) (Staff: M. Haflich)
- USESTER, ALIDA C. LATHAM, AND ALVIN T.

 LEVITT, TRUSTEES OF THE DAVID D. BOHANNON AND OPHELIA E. BOHANNON 1988 IRREVOCABLE TRUST FOR ISSUE DATED OCTOBER 22, 1988 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease Recreational Use of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 3655 Idlewild Way, Homewood, Placer County; for an existing pier and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4311; A4271; RA# 2023047) (A 1; S 1, 4) (Staff: M. Pelka)
- O6 BRIAN A. FAHEY AND LAUREN KONDO (APPLICANT):
 Consider issuance of a General Lease Recreational Use, of sovereign land located
 in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 10461
 Garden Highway, near Sacramento, Sutter
 County; for a boat dock and appurtenant
 facilities. CEQA Consideration: categorical
 exemption. (Lease 7736; A4375; RA# 2023167)
 (A 3; S 6) (Staff: M. Harless)
- O7 PETER MARTIN GLICK AND LYNNE MARY GLICK,
 TRUSTEES OF THE GLICK REVOCABLE TRUST;
 MICHAEL D. GLICK AND BARBARA J. GLICK,
 TRUSTEES OF THE GLICK FAMILY LIVING TRUST
 DATED MARCH 7, 2003 (LESSEE); DAMIAN DOUGLAS
 GLICK; STEVEN J. DRENNAN AND TRISTINE B.
 DRENNAN, TRUSTEES UNDER THE DRENNAN LIVING
 TRUST DATED APRIL 14, 2021; MATTHEW
 PENNINGTON AND ELIZABETH PENNINGTON, TRUSTEES
 OF THE PENNINGTON FAMILY TRUST DATED MARCH
 10, 2017; HEATHER LYNEE ZOOK, TRUSTEE OF THE
 HEATHER ZOOK FAMILY TRUST DATED JUNE 4, 2021,

AS RESTATED ON MAY 22, 2023 (APPLICANT):
Consider acceptance of a lease quitclaim deed and issuance of a General Lease Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 849 Stateline
Avenue, South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County; for an existing pier and one mooring buoy previously authorized by the Commission, and the installation and use of an additional mooring buoy not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (Lease 3544; A4156; RA# 2022345) (A 1; S 1, 4) (Staff: M. Waldo)

- O8 ELIZABETH GRIFFITH, TRUSTEE OF THE ELIZABETH GRIFFITH 2019 TRUST DATED FEBRUARY 15, 2019 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 6966 West Lake Boulevard, near Tahoma, Placer County; for an existing pier, boat lift, marine rail, and two mooring buoys previously authorized by the Commission; and for one existing mooring buoy not previously authorized by the Commission. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4926; A4093; RA# 2022368) (A 1; S 1, 4) (Staff: D. Romero)
- 0.9 PHILIP D. CHAPMAN AND SARAH D. CHAPMAN, TRUSTEES OF THE CHAPMAN FAMILY LIVING TRUST (LESSEE); NICHOLAS HAEMEL AND ANNA HAEMEL, TRUSTEES OF THE N & A HAEMEL FAMILY TRUST DATED SEPTEMBER 12, 2022 (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Lease Number 3674, a General Lease - Recreational Use; and an application for a General Lease -Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 3890 North Lake Boulevard, near Carnelian Bay, Placer County; for an existing pier, boathouse with boat lift, sundeck with stairs, and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3674; A4382; RA# 2023129) (A 1; S 1, 4) (Staff: M. Harless)

- HUMBOLDT BAY HARBOR, RECREATION AND CONSERVATION DISTRICT (LESSEE/SUBLESSOR); NORDIC AQUAFARMS CALIFORNIA, LLC (SUBLESSEE): Consider endorsement of a sublease under Lease Number PRC 3186, a General Lease Right-of-Way Use, of sovereign land located in the Pacific Ocean, near Samoa, adjacent to Assessor's Parcel Number 401-111-006, Humboldt County; for an existing outfall pipeline. CEQA Consideration: Environmental Impact Report, certified by Humboldt County, State Clearinghouse No. 2021040532. (PRC 3186; A3254; RA# 2021069) (A 2; S 2) (Staff: M. Schroeder)
- 11 KRUGER TAHOE PROPERTIES, LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (APPLICANT):
 Consider application for a General Lease Recreational Use of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 1040 West Lake Boulevard, near Tahoe City, Placer County; for an existing pier, boat lift, and two mooring buoys. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 6937; A4397; RA# 2023148) (A 1; S 1, 4) (Staff: M. Pelka)
- ARTHUR GRANT BURTON AND KATHLEEN KEANE
 BURTON, TRUSTEES OF THE BURTON FAMILY TRUST
 (LESSEE); LAKE OF THE SKY, LLC (APPLICANT):
 Consider termination of Lease Number 8739, a
 General Lease Recreational Use; and
 application for a General Lease Recreational Use, of sovereign land located
 in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 3216 Edgewater
 Drive, Tahoe City, Placer County; for an
 existing pier and two mooring buoys. CEQA
 Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease
 8739; A4407; RA# 2023140) (A 1; S 1, 4)
 (Staff: M. McGough)
- LCOF LAKE TAHOE INVESTMENT, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY AND LCOF LAKE TAHOE OPERATING, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (CO-LESSEES/CO-APPLICANT); COMMUNITY BANK N.A. (SECURED PARTY-LENDER): Consider an Agreement and Consent to Encumbrance of Lease Number 3981, a General Lease Commercial

Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 3411 Lake Tahoe Boulevard, South Lake Tahoe, El Dorado County; for an existing commercial marina. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (Lease 3981; A4366, RA 2023117) (A1; S 1, 4) (Staff: J. Holt)

- PEC TAHOE PROPERTIES, LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (LESSEE/APPLICANT): Consider acceptance of a lease quitclaim deed and issuance of a General Lease Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 7181 West Lake Boulevard (Highway 89), near Tahoma, El Dorado County; for use of an existing pier, water intake line, and buoy; and installation and use of one additional mooring buoy. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (Lease 7634; A4404; RA# 2023138) (A 1; S 1, 4) (Staff: M. Haflich)
- 15 6980 WEST LAKE, LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (LESSEE); TAHOE CEDARS ASSOCIATION, A CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT CORPORATION (APPLICANT): Consider acceptance of a lease quitclaim deed and application for General Lease Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 6980 West Lake Boulevard, near Tahoma, Placer County; for a pier and five mooring buoys, and removal of two water intake lines. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (Lease 3637; A4295; RA# 2023090) (A 1; S 1, 4) (Staff: D. Romero)
- PATRICK WILSON AND MONICA PEDRAZZINI

 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a
 General Lease Recreational and Protective
 Structure Use, of sovereign land located in
 the Sacramento River, adjacent to 10800
 Garden Highway, Sacramento, Sutter County;
 for an existing boat dock, ramp, appurtenant
 facilities, and bank protection. CEQA
 Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease
 8750; A4130; RA# 2022314) (A 3; S 6) (Staff:
 L. Anderson)

17 WS MARINA, LLC, A DELAWARE LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (LESSEE/APPLICANT); EQUITRUST LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY (PREVIOUS SECURED PARTY-LENDER); AUGUSTAR LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY, AN OHIO CORPORATION (SECURED PARTY-LENDER): Consider termination of a previous Agreement and Consent to Encumbrance of Lease Number 3953, a General Lease -Commercial Use and application for a new Agreement and Consent to Encumbrance of Lease Number 3953, a General Lease - Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in Lake Tahoe, adjacent to 5190 West Lake Boulevard, Homewood, Placer County; for an existing commercial marina. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (Lease 3953; A4530, RA 2023215) (A 1; S 1, 4) (Staff: J. Holt)

Bay/Delta Region

- 5 BROS MARINA LLC (LESSEE): Consider a continuation of rent and a revision of bond and insurance to Lease Number PRC 6855, a General Lease Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in Seven Mile Slough, adjacent to 1200 West Brannan Island Road, near Isleton, Sacramento County; for a commercial marina. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 6855) (A 11; S 3) (Staff: V. Caldwell)
- JOSHUA CHRISMAN AND SHAWNA CHRISMAN, TRUSTEES OF THE SHAWNA AND JOSHUA CHRISMAN LIVING TRUST (APPLICANT): Consider voiding invoices 55098 and 55245, waiving any penalty and interest due, and issuance of a General Lease Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 3001 Garden Highway, near Sacramento, Sacramento County; for an existing boat dock, appurtenant facilities, and bank protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8630; A4450; RA# 2023176) (A 6; S 8) (Staff: L. Anderson)
- 20 GOLDEN GATE BRIDGE, HIGHWAY, AND TRANSPORTATION DISTRICT (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease Public

Agency Use, of sovereign land located along the south bank of Corte Madera Creek, adjacent to Lots 29 through 81 at Greenbrae Boardwalk, and the Larkspur Ferry Terminal, near Greenbrae, Marin County; for maintenance of an existing rock riprap revetment. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7187; A3661; RA# 2022106) (A 12; S 2) (Staff: G. Asimakopoulos)

- K.M.C., INC., A CALIFORNIA CORPORATION
 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a
 General Lease Other, of sovereign land
 located in San Francisco Bay, adjacent to
 Assessor's Parcel Numbers 038-460-37,
 038-460-38, 038-201-59, and 038-201-60, near
 Tiburon, Marin County; for an existing public
 park, breakwaters, navigational pilings, and
 maintenance dredging. CEQA Consideration:
 categorical exemptions. (Lease 2148; A3917;
 RA# 2022219) (A 12; S 2) (Staff: G.
 Asimakopoulos)
- DANIEL MCKELVEY AND HOLLY MCKELVEY
 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a
 General Lease Recreational and Protective
 Structure Use, of sovereign land located in
 the Sacramento River, adjacent to 3963 Garden
 Highway, Sacramento, Sacramento County; for
 an existing covered boat dock, appurtenant
 facilities, and bank protection. CEQA
 Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease
 6157; A4367; RA# 2023114) (A 6; S 8) (Staff:
 M. Waldo)
- MILLBRAE HIGHLANDS CO., L.P. (APPLICANT):
 Consider application for a General Lease Recreational Use, of sovereign land located
 in Corte Madera Creek, adjacent to 1005 South
 Eliseo Drive, near Greenbrae, Marin County;
 for one existing boat dock. CEQA
 Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease
 5211; A4401; RA# 2023142) (A 12; S 2) (Staff:
 M. Haflich)
- 24 KATHERINE G. DANA OSTERLOH (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease -

Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Tomales Bay, adjacent to 12916 Sir Francis Drake Boulevard, near Inverness, Marin County; for an existing pier. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8483; A4225; RA# 2023172) (A 12; S 2) (Staff: M. Harless)

- BRADLEY H. SMITH, TRUSTEE OF THE SMITH FAMILY 2001 TRUST, UTD AUGUST 13, 2001 (LESSEE/ASSIGNOR); PORT ISLETON MARINA, LLC, A CALIFORNIA LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY (APPLICANT/ASSIGNEE): Consider assignment of Lease Number PRC 7699, a General Lease Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in the San Joaquin River, adjacent to 822 West Brannan Island Road, on Andrus Island, near Isleton, Sacramento County; for an existing commercial marina. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 7699; A3338; RA# 2021113) (A 11; S 3) (Staff: J. Holt)
- PORT OF STOCKTON (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in the San Joaquin River, adjacent to Assessor's Parcel Numbers 145-020-040, -090, and -130; and 162-030-070 in Stockton, San Joaquin County; for the construction, use, and maintenance of a new railroad bridge; and the demolition and removal of the existing railroad swing bridge. CEQA Consideration: Mitigated Negative Declaration, adopted by the Port of Stockton, State Clearinghouse No. 2021060578, and adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring Program. (A4018; RA# 2022283) (A 13; S 5) (Staff: M. Schroeder)
- SELENA RAY AND BILLY RAY (CLIFF'S RIVER MARINA) (LESSEE): Consider a revision of rent and bond to Lease Number PRC 3264, a General Lease Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 8651 River Road, near Freeport, Sacramento County; for a commercial marina. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 3264) (A 9; S 3) (Staff: V. Caldwell)

- WILLIAM R. SCHOMBERG AND KAREN M. SCHOMBERG (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Sacramento River, adjacent to 3099 Garden Highway, near Sacramento, Sacramento County; for an existing boat dock, appurtenant facilities, and bank protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 5935; A3370; RA# 2021164) (A 7; S 6) (Staff: L. Anderson)
- DAN S. SMITH, TRUSTEE OF THE DAN S. AND CARLA DILLARD SMITH LIVING TRUST (APPLICANT):

 Consider application for a General Lease Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in Steamboat Slough, adjacent to 3416 Snug Harbor Drive, near Walnut Grove, Solano County; for an existing boat dock, appurtenant facilities, and bank protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7146; A4360; RA# 2023106) (A 11; S 3) (Staff: M. Sapunor)
- 30 STOCKON MARINA PROPERTIES LLC (OWL HARBOR MARINA): Consider a revision of rent and surety bond to Lease Number PRC 4049, a General Lease Commercial Use, of sovereign land located in Seven Mile Slough, adjacent to 1550 West Twitchell Island Road, near Isleton, Sacramento County; for a commercial marina. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (PRC 4049) (A 11; S 3) (Staff: V. Caldwell)
- JUNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
 (LESSEE/APPLICANT): Consider amendment of
 Lease Number PRC 8993, a General Lease Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located
 in the Napa River and Dutchman Slough, near
 Vallejo, Solano County; for one additional
 temporary sediment offloading facility, one
 additional dredged material slurry pipeline,
 and use of one additional work zone. CEQA
 Consideration: Environmental Impact
 Report/Environmental Impact Statement and
 Addendum, certified and adopted,
 respectively, by the California Department of

Fish and Wildlife and the California State Lands Commission, State Clearinghouse No. 2007092004, and Mitigation Monitoring Program and Statement of Findings. (PRC 8993; A4185; RA# 2022360) (A 11; S 3) (Staff: J. Holt)

32 UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY (LESSEE): Consider amendment of Lease Number PRC 7650, a General Lease - Public Agency Use, of sovereign land in the Old River, Middle River, San Joaquin River, Holland Cut, False River, South Fork Mokelumne River, North Fork Mokelumne River, Little Potato Slough, Three Mile Slough, Sacramento River, Sutter Slough, Steamboat Slough, Georgiana Slough, Miner Slough, Cache Slough, and Suisun Bay, in Contra Costa, San Joaquin, Sacramento, Yolo, and Solano Counites; for the installation and use of pilings and monitoring stations, and removal of existing pilings. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemptions. (PRC 7650; RA# 2023040) (A 7, 9, 11; S 3, 5, 6) (Staff: M. Schroeder)

Central/Southern Region

- CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION (PARTY):
 Consider approval of the 2024 Category 2
 Solana Beach Benchmark rental rate for
 sovereign land in Solana Beach, San Diego
 County. CEQA Consideration: not a project.
 (W27262) (A 77; S 38) (Staff: C. Wong)
- 34 CITY OF SAN CLEMENTE (LESSEE): Consider amendment to Lease Number 9753, a General Lease Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in the Pacific Ocean, near San Clemente, Oceanside, and Surfside Sunset Beach, Orange and San Diego Counties; for the dredging of an additional offshore borrow site near Surfside Sunset Beach for the City of San Clemente Coastal Storm Damage Reduction Project/San Clemente Shoreline Protection Project. CEQA Consideration: Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report and Addendum, certified and adopted, respectively, by the City of San

lemente, State Clearinghouse No. 2010084002.
(Lease 9753; RA# 2023203) (A 73, 76; S 36)
(Staff: K. Connor)

- KHANH DAO AND TIFFANY LOAN PHAM (APPLICANT):
 Consider application for a General Lease Recreational Use, of sovereign land located
 in the Main Channel of Huntington Harbour,
 adjacent to 17021 Bolero Lane, Huntington
 Beach, Orange County; for an existing boat
 dock, access ramp, and cantilevered deck.
 CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption.
 (A4415; RA# 2023149) (A 72; S 36) (Staff: M.
 McGough)
- JANE P. KING AND EARL C. KING, AS TRUSTEES OF THE JANE P. KING FAMILY TRUST DATED SEPTEMBER 3, 1986, AS AMENDED APRIL 11, 2016 (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease Recreational Use of sovereign land located in the Main Channel of Huntington Harbour, adjacent to 16662 Somerset Lane, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for an existing boat dock and access ramp. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 3243; A4463; RA# 2023193) (A 72; S 36) (Staff: M. Pelka)
- JPMORGAN CHASE NA AS SUCCESSOR TRUSTEE TO FIRST REPUBLIC BANK OF THE BARON FAMILY TRUST ORIGINALLY ESTABLISHED AUGUST 4, 1983, AS AMENDED (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Main Channel of Huntington Harbour, adjacent to 16611 Carousel Lane, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for an existing boat dock, access ramp, cantilevered deck, and bulkhead protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 4099; A4435; RA# 2023159) (A 72; S 36) (Staff: M. Harless)
- DEL B. BRAULT AND ANDREA MARGARETTE BRAULT, CO-TRUSTEES OF THE BRAULT FAMILY TRUST, DATED MAY 31, 1996, "FAMILY" TRUST (EXEMPTION TRUST) (LESSEE); JAN H. NGUYEN (APPLICANT): Consider termination of Lease Number 8241, a

eneral Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use; and an application for a General Lease - Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Main Channel of Huntington Harbour, adjacent to 16681 Carousel Lane, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for an existing boat dock, access ramp, cantilevered deck, and bulkhead protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8241; A4208; RA# 2023097) (A 72; S 36) (Staff: M. Pelka)

- TINH NGUYEN AND LAM-QUYNH NGUYEN (APPLICANT):
 Consider application for a General Lease Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of
 sovereign land located in the Main Channel of
 Huntington Harbour, adjacent to 16651
 Carousel Lane, Huntington Beach, Orange
 County; for an existing boat dock, access
 ramp, cantilevered deck, and bulkhead
 protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical
 exemption. (Lease 8259; A4451; RA# 2023177)
 (A 72; S 36) (Staff: M. Sapunor)
- ARNOLD AND SHIRLEY OSTROW, TRUSTEES OF THE OSTROW FAMILY TRUST (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Main Channel of Huntington Harbour, adjacent to 16831 Bolero Lane, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for an existing boat dock, access ramp, and cantilevered deck. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 7693; A4406; RA# 2023139) (A 72; S 36) (Staff: M. Sapunor)
- PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY (LESSEE):
 Consider amendment of Lease 9347, a General
 Lease Industrial Use, of sovereign land
 located in and adjacent to the Pacific Ocean,
 near Avila Beach, San Luis Obispo County; for
 dredging and the deposition of material
 associated with the Diablo Canyon Power
 Plant. CEQA Consideration: California Coastal
 Commission Coastal Development Permit No.
 9-23-0599. (Lease 9347; RA# 2023021) (A 30; S
 17) (Staff: D. Simpkin)

- 42 ERNIE W. QUIJADA, JR. AND DIANE G. QUIJADA (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease Recreational and Protective Structure Use, of sovereign land located in the Main Channel of Huntington Harbour, adjacent to 16671 Carousel Lane, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for an existing boat dock, access ramp, cantilevered deck, and bulkhead protection. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 5625; A4468; RA# 2023183) (A 72; S 36) (Staff: M. Harless)
- SAN PEDRO BAY PIPELINE COMPANY (LESSEE):
 Consider a revision of rent and surety bond
 to Lease Number PRC 5636, a General Lease Right-of-Way Use, of State sovereign land
 located in the Pacific Ocean, in San Pedro
 Bay, offshore Seal Beach and Huntington
 Beach, Orange County; for an existing oil
 pipeline, CEQA Consideration: not a project.
 (PRC 5636) (A 72; S 36) (Staff: V. Caldwell)
- 44 ROBERT SEBRING, JR. AND GAIL SEBRING, AS TRUSTEES OF THE SEBRING FAMILY TRUST DATED JANUARY 10, 2002 (LESSEE); STEPHEN TEMMING AND DIANE TEMMING (APPLICANT): Consider rescission of prior Commission authorization of assignment of a General Lease -Recreational Use; termination of Lease Number 8881, a General Lease - Recreational Use; and application for a General Lease -Recreational Use, of sovereign land located in Huntington Harbour, adjacent to 16402 Grimaud Lane, Huntington Beach, Orange County; for an existing cantilevered deck. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8881; A4418; RA# 2023174) (A 72; S 36) (Staff: M. McGough)
- THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ON BEHALF OF THE SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS (UCSB) (APPLICANT): Consider application for a General Lease Public Agency Use, of sovereign land located in and adjacent to the Pacific Ocean near Goleta Point, Santa Barbara County; for four existing seawater

INDEX CONTINUED

PAGE

ntake pipelines and rock revetments. CEQA Consideration: categorical exemption. (Lease 8011; A3842; RA# 2022113) (A 37; S 19) (Staff: J. Plovnick)

School Lands

46 KARUK TRIBE (APPLICANT): Consider rescission of previous Lease Authorization and issuance of a General Lease - Right-of-Way Use, on State-owned indemnity school lands, in a portion of Section 28, T9N, R3E, HM along Bald Hills Road, located between Weitchpec and Orick, Humboldt County; for installation, operation, and maintenance of two fiber optic cables. CEQA Consideration: Mitigated Negative Declaration, adopted by the California Public Utilities Commission, State Clearinghouse No. 2022060515, and adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring Program. (A3459; RA# 2021212) (A 2; S 2) (Staff: D. Simpkin)

Mineral Resources Management

- 47 CITY OF GRIDLEY (APPLICANT): Consider application for a Non-Exclusive Geological Survey Permit to conduct geological surveys on sovereign land, adjacent to Assessor's Parcel Numbers 024-220-025, 024-220-032, 024-220-999 located within the City of Gridley, Feather River, Section 4, Township 17 North, Range 3 East, Mount Diablo Baseline & Meridian, Butte County. CEQA Consideration: Mitigated Negative Declaration, adopted by the City of Gridley, State Clearinghouse No. 2022090465, and adoption of a Mitigation Monitoring Program. (Lease 5183; A4166; RA# 2023141) (A 3; S: 1) (Staff: C. Fox)
- 48 GILDRED SOLAR, LLC (PARTY); OCOTILLO SOLAR, LLC (APPLICANT): Consider termination of a Modification of Right of Surface Entry Agreement; and an application for a 40-year modification of the State's right of surface entry on 280 acres of State 100 percent reserved mineral interest school lands, Assessor's Parcel Number 253-390-57, located

bout 5 miles south of the community of Ocotillo Wells, Section 36, Township 12 South, Range 8 East, San Bernardino Baseline & Meridian, San Diego County. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (A4359; Agreement 9363; RA# 2023130) (A 75; S 32) (Staff: R. Lee)

Marine Environmental Protection

- No items for this section.

Administration

- No items for this section.

Legal

CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION (PARTY):
Consider approval of Section 3 General
Lease Provisions for General Lease Recreational Use, General Lease - Dredging,
and for other General Leases. CEQA
Consideration: not a project. (A & S:
Statewide) (Staff: W. Crunk, G. Kato)

External Affairs

Granted Lands

- No items for this section.
- VI Informational Calendar 50-51
- NOTICE OF CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR: ?Instructions to staff negotiators in Closed Session, pursuant to Government Code section 11126(c)(7), regarding applications for assignment of four leases governing the use of existing offshore oil and gas pipelines traversing state waters associated with the Santa Ynez Unit in federal waters, the Ellwood Pier, and two mooring buoys, offshore Santa Barbara County.

INDEX CONTINUED

PAGE

60

Negotiating Parties: State Lands Commission, ExxonMobil, and Sable Offshore Corp. Under negotiation: price and terms. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (Lease Nos. PRC 4977, PRC 7163, PRC 5515, and PRC 4589) (A 37; S 19)

- 51 NOTICE OF CONFERENCE WITH REAL PROPERTY NEGOTIATOR: ?Instructions to staff negotiators in Closed Session, pursuant to Government Code section 11126(c)(7), regarding an application for assignment of two existing oil and gas production leases, commonly referred to as the West Montalvo leases, where the wellheads are located on private upland properties but the wells produce from reservoirs in state waters, offshore Ventura County. Negotiating Parties: State Lands Commission, California Resources Corporation, and Cal NRG LLC. Under negotiation: price, terms, and statutory compliance. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (Lease No. PRC 3314 and Lease No. PRC 735) (A 38; S 19)
- VII Regular Calendar 52-53
- 52 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) (Staff: S. Pemberton) 50
- CITY OF LONG BEACH (GRANTEE): Consider acceptance of the Long Beach Unit Annual Plan (July 1, 2024 through June 30, 2025), Long Beach Unit, Wilmington Oil Field, Los Angeles County. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (W17166) (A 70; S 33, 34) (Staff: J. Abedi)

VIII Public Comment 81

- IX Commissioners' Comments 88
- X Closed Session 89

At any time during the meeting the Commission may meet in a session closed to the public to

consider the matters listed below pursuant to Government Code section 11126, part of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.

A. Litigation

The Commission may consider pending and possible litigation pursuant to the confidentiality of attorney-client communications and privileges provided under Government Code section 11126, subdivision (e).

- 1. The Commission may consider pending and possible matters that fall under Government Code section 11126, subdivision (e)(2)(A), concerning adjudicatory proceedings before a court, an administrative body exercising its adjudicatory authority, a hearing officer, or an arbitrator, to which the Commission is a party. Such matters currently include the following:
 - California State Lands Commission v. Signal Hill Service, Inc.; Pacific Operators, Inc., dba Pacific Operators Offshore, Inc.; DOES 1-100
 - California State Lands Commission, et al. v. Martins Beach 1 LLC, et al.
 - Campbell v. City of Sacramento, State of California, et al.
 - Candlestick Heights Community
 Alliance v. City and County of San
 Francisco, et al.
 - Casa Blanca Beach Estates Owners Association v. California State Lands Commission, et al.

- Center for Biological Diversity v. City of Long Beach and California State Lands Commission
- Dezirae Cadena, et al. v. City of Parker Dam, et al.
- Eugene Davis v. State of California and California State Lands Commission
- In re: Temblor Petroleum Company, LLC, Bankruptcy Chapter 11
- In re: Venoco, LLC, Bankruptcy Chapter 11
- Johns v. Orange County, et al.
- Martins Beach 1, LLC and Martins Beach 2, LLC v. Effie Turnbull-Sanders, et al.
- Morrow Bay Commercial Fisherman's Association, et al. v. California State Lands Commission, et al.
- North Waterfront Cove and City of Alameda v. State of California, by and through the State Lands Commission
- Oakland Bulk and Oversized Terminal, LLC v. City of Oakland
- Owens Valley Committee v. City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, et al.
- State Lands Commission v. Casa Blanca Beach Estates Owners' Association, et al.
- State Lands Commission v. Plains Pipeline, L.P., et al.

- United States v. Walker River Irrigation District, et al.
- William Buck Johns and Elizabeth Colleen Johns, as Co-Trustees of the Johns Living Trust, dated August 13, 2007, et al. v. County of Orange, et al.
- 2. The Commission may consider matters that fall under Government Code section 11126, subdivision (e)(2)(b), under which;
 - a. A point has been reached where, in the opinion of the Commission, on the advice of its legal counsel, based on existing facts and circumstances, there is a significant exposure to litigation against the Commission, or
 - b. Based on existing facts and circumstances, the Commission is meeting only to decide whether a closed session is authorized because of a significant exposure to litigation against the Commission.
- 3. The Commission may consider matters that fall under Government Code section 11126, subdivision (e)(2)(C), where, based on existing facts and circumstances, the state body has decided to initiate or is deciding whether to initiate litigation.
- B. Conference with real property negotiators

The Commission may consider matters that fall under Government Code section 11126, subdivision (c)(7), under which, prior to the purchase sale, exchange, or lease of real property by or for the Commission, the directions may be given to its negotiators

regarding price and terms of payment for the purchase, sale, exchange, or lease.

- Instructions to staff negotiators in Closed Session, pursuant to Government Code section $111\overline{2}6(c)(7)$, regarding applications for assignment of four leases governing the use of existing offshore oil and gas pipelines traversing state waters associated with the Santa Ynez Unit in federal waters, the Ellwood Pier, and two mooring buoys, offshore Santa Barbara County. Negotiating Parties: State Lands Commission, ExxonMobil, and Sable Offshore Corp. Under negotiation: price and terms. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (Lease Nos. PRC 4977, PRC 7163, PRC 5515, and PRC 4589) (A 37; S 19)
- Instructions to staff negotiators in Closed Session, pursuant to Government Code section 11126(c)(7), regarding an application for assignment of two existing oil and gas production leases, commonly referred to as the West Montalvo leases, where the wellheads are located on private upland properties but the wells produce from reservoirs in state waters, offshore Ventura County. Negotiating Parties: State Lands Commission, California Resources Corporation, and Cal NRG LLC. Under negotiation: price, terms, and statutory compliance. CEQA Consideration: not a project. (Lease No. PRC 3314 and Lease No. PRC 735) (A 38; S 19)
- C. Other matters

The Commission may also consider personnel actions to appoint, employ, or dismiss a public employee as provided for in Government Code section 11126(A)(1).

INDEX CONTINUED PAGE Adjournment 91 Reporter's Certificate 92

PROCEEDINGS

2.2

ACTING CHAIR KUNKEL: I call this meeting to order. All the representatives of the Commission are present. I am Deputy State Controller Kristina Kunkel and I'll be joined by Controller Cohen momentarily. I'm joined today by Chief of Staff Dr. Matt Dumlao, Commissioner alternate for Lieutenant Governor Kounalakis and Michele Perrault representing the Department of Finance.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Madam Chair, we have a quorum present. In addition, I would like to identify the members of the staff of the Commission participating virtually for this hybrid meeting.

First, we have Mike Farinha, Sean Ballou and Cathy Chan as our Zoom co-hosts, and our Meeting Liaison Kim Lunetta.

ACTING CHAIR KUNKEL: Thank you. So for the benefit of those in the audience, the State Lands
Commission manages State property interests in over five million acres of land, including mineral interests. The Commission also has responsibility for the prevention of oil spills at marine term — oil terminals and offshore oil platforms and islands, 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.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

I want to take a moment to acknowledge and express gratitude to the Tongva people who have inhabited these lands on which we sit and who have fished these coastal waters for countless generations. I also want 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 many 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 the Commission's activities and for their essential role in maintaining and adding to our State's rich cultural legacy.

So, our next item of business will be public comment. Before I open 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 this meeting.

I want to turn it over to Ms. Lucchesi to share some instructions on how we can best participate in this

meeting so it runs as smoothly as possible.

2.2

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Thank you,

Commissioner -- or Chair Kunkel. 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 form available on our website. We will call on you in the order in which you submitted the electronic Request To Speak form.

For those participating virtually, please make sure you have your microphones or phones muted to avoid 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 hand in Zoom. You can click on the hand icon at the bottom of your screen to do that. When you click on that hand, it will raise your hand. Second, if are you 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 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 raised their hands in the order that they are raised using the name they registered with or the last three digits of their identifying phone number. After you are called on, you will be unmuted so you can share your comments. Please also remember to unmute your computer or phone and identify yourself. Remember, you have a limit of three minutes to speak on an item. Please keep your comments respectful and focused. We will mute anyone who fails to follow these guidelines or at worst dismiss them from the meeting.

2.2

The Commission has also established an email address to compile public comments for our meetings. Its address is cslc.commissionmeetings@slc.ca.gov. We've received various emails and letters from parties that have been shared with all the commissioners prior to the meeting.

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

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

2.2

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you. 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. Next, we will move on to those joining us virtually. Kathy, can you please call on the first person who would like to make a public comment.

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Thank you. Our first public speaker is Counselmember Marcus Bush.

Please come up to the podium and begin your comment.

MARCUS BUSH: Okay. Can you hear me now?
Okay. Great. Good morning, commissioners,
staff, and members of the public. My name is Marcus Bush.
I'm a City Councilmember for the City of National City, as
well as member of -- immediate Chair of the Air Pollution
Control District of San Diego County. I'm here to ask the
Commission that you work with our San Diego LAFCo, who's
here with the City of National City and the Port on
resolving conflicts related to transparency,

accountability, public trust, and overall environmental justice. And I would say just justice overall, particularly for my community in National City.

2.2

And I understand completely that in the port how it's made up. It's a multi-jurisdictional agency, five cities. And ultimately, it's State land, and so we -- in National City though, we are members of the state of California. We are citizens of the state of California. And I feel for decades that we haven't had our fair share, whether it's access to the bayfront, overburdened by environmental justice issues, pollution. A lot of folks don't know, and you all may not know or be familiar with our -- my community. It is my hometown. I grew up in National City. It's the second oldest city in San Diego County.

And before that, I really appreciate the land acknowledgement, Chair. It was the Kumeyaay who were there for -- since time immemorial for thousands of years. So I want to acknowledge them, because they haven't had a voice at the table. They haven't had a lot of say. And they've had their access cutoff as well, so I want to recognize that.

So our access from our bayfront really -- we had -- I talked to the elders in our community. We -- they had access to the waterfront. They would fish. They

would play in the -- in Paradise Creek, the estuary there. We actually had a beach. It was a couple weeks ago I actually saw our beach. Our police and fire took us there, but it's all completely essentially walled off.

It's all used to park cars onto. And we are -- of all the five cities and actually any city in the county, we're also the most diverse. We're 90 percent people of color. We have the lowest household median income and yet our waterfront we don't have access to our bayfront, the vast majority. You can look on a satellite view. We have a tiny sliver Pepper Park, which actually isn't on the Bay. It's on the Sweetwater River Channel. But the rest of it is all used by -- the northern half of the city bayfront is by the Navy, 32nd Naval Street Station and the rest of it is used for the port industry.

2.2

We generate more revenue per capita on National City tidelands, State tidelands than any other city in the county. And yet, we get sacked with all the pollution, all the traffic. We have some of the highest rates of asthma and cancer of any city in the county. And yet, we don't get our fair share of even the public safety dollars. And to give you an example of what I think is just the inherent injustice when it comes to public safety reimbursements that the Port allocates to the member cities via the municipal service agreements, National City

gets around 1.2 million, and that's according to FY 21 numbers and the latest figures I had available. So we get 1.2 million. The City of Imperial Beach, which is less than half of our size, which generates substantially less revenue and also has less port assets, waterfront State assets on their port tidelands, they get 5 million. They get more than four times our share of public safety revenues.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

That methodology, we've been asking for years to clarify. We've sent official letters from the City to the Port. It hasn't been clarified. And I think that at this point, I would like LAFCo as also a State agency to intervene and to be an independent look at the methodology that goes into our municipal services. So that's just to I think there's a lot more with transparency and accountability. I'll say that I would really appreciate for staff and the Commission to investigate how our Commissioner, our representative, Sandy Naranjo, has been treated. She's been retaliated against for simply asking questions and accountability from the Port General Counsel -- the Port of San Diego General Counsel. name is Tom Russell. I have a lot of concerns with ethics related to Tom Russell and Nick Tonsich in contracts related to that.

And I ask you guys to look into that, because

from what I hear is Tom Russell came from the Port of LA and there were issues here. I don't know what those issues are. I'd like to find out more and I would like to work with you all to find out more. I'm not trying to point the finger. I'm not trying to start issues or a war. But what I'm looking at and what I'm seeing when I have the Port constantly threatening me and my city legally and threatening, and in my opinion, bullying other agencies into silence, I have to speak out. And I'm very aware.

2.2

Like, look I'm a politician too. I'm up for reelection this year. I'm very aware that I will be retaliated against too. I'm very aware the port -- you know, the tenants and the resources, there's going to be movement against me and I'm just from the bottom of my heart, to the commissioners, to the staff, this is something worth -- for me that's worth losing a reelection for to stand up for what's right and speak out for our community, because for decades we've been screwed over, and I'm tired of it. It's lives at stake at the end of the day, when you look at asthma and people who have died from the effects of this.

So there's a lot more to say. I want to also send to the Commission -- I know I'm over time. I'd like to send the Commission just an article that came out

yesterday. And a news source that shows that the Port has spent almost a million dollars in public funds and legal fees, legal consultant fees to go after -- to investigate the Port CEO Joe Stuyvesant. That was never disclosed to the public why Joe Stuyvesant was -- had to resign. And then against our own Port Commissioners, 155,000 at least in legal fees against our port commissioners.

2.2

So there are very, very serious issues here and I really ask that you all allow the LAFCo to start overseeing the port. And please look at the grand jury report and a whole myriad of other issues going on. Thank you and I look forward to working and communicating more with you.

ACTING CHAIR KUNKEL: Thank you, Councilmember Bush and thank you for making the drive up here. Can I request from AGP, we don't see a clock on our screen. That would be great. Thank you. Appreciate you.

Cathy, can we please have our next public speaker in the room?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes. Our next public speaker is Chris Benzen. Chris, please come up to the podium and begin your comment.

CHRIS BENZEN: Hello, everybody. I believe I have a slide show I'd like to put up there before the timer goes.

I can set a timer on my phone.

Okay. Thank you.

1.3

2.2

ACTING CHAIR KUNKEL: Well, we prefer the presentation, I guess. We'll do the presentation.

CHRIS BENZEN: Thank you very much. Thank you everybody for having me. I don't have very much time and I have a long slide show to go through. I still don't see it. Do you see it?

(Thereupon a slide presentation).

Marbor of Newport Beach. I represent over 120 mooring holders. And we've been organizing and raising funds for potential litigation against the City of Newport Beach. What's going on in the City of Newport Beach is horrific discrimination of tidelands use. You know, so in the City of Newport Beach, we have moorings and we private dock owners, private docks, and commercial docks. So there's residential docks, commercial docks, and moorings, shore moorings and offshore moorings.

The Harbor Commission is, one, not representative of any moorings. Most of these guys are, you know, ex-yacht club -- or they're ex-yacht club commodores, et cetera and we don't have any mooring representation.

But I'm wasting too much time on that. Let's go to the next slide.

[SLIDE CHANGE]

CHRIS BENZEN: This is the chart that shows the rates that the Harbor Commission is recommending based on an appraisal from an appraiser that they used that has a clear conflict of interest. The appraisal -- the appraiser, Jim Netzer, is a board member of the Newport Aquatic Center. And he also gave them a \$10,000 loan in 2015 with interest that they claim that he donated back to the NAC. The NAC is a nonprofit organization on the water. They have a free tideland grant. Their land is a 50-year lease that they just got.

He negotiated that lease with Lauren Wooding Whitlinger who's a real property administrator in Newport Beach, who he prepared the appraisal to, you know, base these rates on. He prepared the appraisal with the woman that he negotiated the 50-year grant lease with. He did not disclose any of these conflicts of interest in his appraisal report, nor in his Form 700 filings, and that's very important.

So if we can go to --

1.3

2.2

[SLIDE CHANGE]

CHRIS BENZEN: This is the slide right here. So the red bars, this is the rates that they're trying to go to. Green is what we're currently paying and mooring lengths are on the bottom. You can see this is an absolutely enormous rate increase. It's completely

unjustified. It's a 400 to 500 percent rate increase.

Most boaters are going to have to give up their moorings and sell their boats. I'm a fisherman. I have a young child that was just born last week, two weeks ago, and I want my son to be able to go fishing with me

Anyways, let's go to the next slide.

[SLIDE CHANGE]

CHRIS BENZEN: This is the, you know, California State Lands Act. And it basically says -- you all know this, that they can't, you know, discriminate in rates, tolls, or charges for any use.

Next slide.

2.2

[SLIDE CHANGE]

CHRIS BENZEN: So what we're talking about here is the dock owners. The dock owners currently have a sweetheart deal. A dock and a mooring -- the dock is on your left and a mooring is on your right. A mooring takes up less tidelands. I don't have enough time to go through this, but as you can see the difference. And the moorings are an inferior product. You know, you have to swim out to your moorings, or get a ride to it, or a boat.

Let's go to the next slide.

[SLIDE CHANGE]

CHRIS BENZEN: Okay. So on the left, you have a dock. You have two boats. There's about -- two 25-foot

boats on the left. This guy is paying \$12 a month. Okay. The guy on the right on the mooring, he's got a 34-foot sail boat, he's paying \$138 a month, and they want that to go to \$480 a month, while keeping the docks at \$12.

Next slide.

2.2

[SLIDE CHANGE]

CHRIS BENZEN: Okay. And this chart demonstrates exactly this -- you know, the discrimination. The docks on the left, 12 moorings, you know, 138 and they want to go to 481.

Next slide, please.

[SLIDE CHANGE]

CHRIS BENZEN: Over a year period, look at the difference, \$144 for a private dock with two boats and look what they want us to pay, \$5,000. Okay. So the main point here, if I could just get a couple seconds, is we are asking that the city grant us the exact same methodology on the usage calculation for the State's tidelands that we have the same calculation applied to moorings. So if they're paying \$12 on month, we also should be paying \$12 a month. They should remedy the discrimination first and then discuss whether or not those rates need to go up.

Thank you for your time.

ACTING CHAIR KUNKEL: Thank you, Mr. Benzen.

Cathy, the next speaker, please.

2.2

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Our next public speaker is Adam Leverenz.

Adam, please come up to the podium and begin your comments.

ADAM LEVERENZ: Good afternoon. If I understand correctly, the City of Newport Beach in their efforts to justitfy raising those offshore mooring rents by 300 to over 500 percent has been seeking the blessing of the State Lands Commission. The City has chosen to use an appraisal from a singular source that, as you've just heard, appears to have some conflicts, and among many has raised concerns of impropriety, the appearance of impropriety, and quid pro quo.

The California State Lands Commission calculates annual rental rates for the lease of tide and submerged lands approximately every five years. The current benchmark rate for Orange County is 45.1 cents per square foot per year. Newport Beach data was used in calculating that rate. State documentation uses the words "fair", "equitable", "reasonable", "consistent", and "appropriate" to describe it.

The current City of Newport Beach fee schedule indicates that residential piers incur annual rental fees of \$0.56 per square foot. Various city resolutions

setting rent for tide and submerged land users in Newport describes their rates as fair market value rent. A recent appraisal by a second firm, CBRE, determined that the fair rates are closely in line with those State and Newport Beach rates.

2.2

If you divide the amount of Newport Beach's most common mooring, a 40-footer, by the amount they're paying annually, that works out to a range of \$1.21 to \$1.33 per square foot. And that's considering the whole footprint a boat may drift over. So a 40-foot offshore mooring permittee in Newport Beach for use of the same State resources other users is currently paying about 216 to 237 percent more than city pier permit fees and 268 to 294 percent more than State benchmark fees for Orange County.

The Newport Beach Harbor Commission, which I understand consists of Ira Beer, Scott Cunningham, and Steve Cully -- Scully think that that's not fair. Their alternative though to make it more fair is that offshore mooring holders should pay 435 to 480 percent higher rates.

On the consent agenda today, there's over half a dozen applications for piers in Huntington Harbor. It looks like staff went through all these and set rates for each based on formulas. And I'm assuming that State staff is coming up with fair calculations. Each of these is far

below what the City of Newport Beach is trying to foist upon the offshore mooring holders.

I ask that the State Lands Commission, rather than allowing the City to use one singular source, uses all the sources. And if the City gets what they want, you're going to usurp State authority to set benchmarks.

Thank you.

2.2

ACTING CHAIR KUNKEL: Thank you, Mr. Leverenz.

Can we have our next public speaker in the room.

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes.

Our next public speaker is Adam Wilson. Adam, please come

ADAM WILSON: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and Honorable Commissioners. My name is Adam Wilson representing the San Diego Local Agency Formation or better known as LAFCo, a political subdivision to the State of California. I'm here today to introduce San Diego LAFCo to the State Lands Commission in hopes to forge a more cooperative working relationship and to provide an update on a local topic that has generated interest and involvement by your senior staff.

up to the podium and begin your comments.

The topic of involves San Diego LAFCo's unanimous decision on March 4th to formally add the Port of San Diego to the local registry of special districts that are subject to LAFCo's oversight, and in doing so correct an

administrative misstep that has gone unchecked for far too long.

2.2

This correction means all of LAFCo's regulatory and planning tasks, as set by the Legislature, now apply to the Port going forward. Simply put, the local citizenry and the Port's five city membership will now be assured that LAFCo will include the Port of San Diego in our municipal service review program, which is the backbone to LAFCo's core mission on providing independent evaluations to promote governmental efficiencies.

The reason I'm sharing the March 4th decision today is because it ties to preceding objections raised by your senior staff and their stated position that LAFCo has no authority to assert any oversight on the Port. While we respect senior staff's knowledge and expertise on the State Lands Commission matters, we find it noteworthy that a strong position would be communicated to San Diego LAFCo on what it can and cannot permissibly do under LAFCo statute. Moreover, the opining made by senior staff simply does square up as cited by the LAFCo commissioners.

First, LAFCo and State Lands Commission are cast with different oversight responsibilities. LAFCo oversees city and special district boundaries and governance structure, while the State Lands Commission oversees Public Trust Lands. I want to emphasize LAFCo's role and

responsibility does not meddle in any land use authority whatsoever.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

Second, there are at least six port and harbor districts in California that are overseen by both the State Lands Commission and the respective local LAFCo.

These relationships should be no different in San Diego.

Relatedly, it has come to our attention as late as yesterday evening that the Port of San Diego has requested a reconsideration to our March 4th decision. While San Diego LAFCo respects the Port's ability to exercise this administrative action, it unfortunately highlights the Port's continued messaging that fails to match their actions. Port representative has characterized LAFCo as operating in a rogue manner and that we haven't provided a timely opportunity for stakeholder input. This is patently false. Throughout the entire review process, we have proactively reached out to the Port representatives and their member cities to introduce them to LAFCo and share what we hope to accomplish moving forward. There have been preceding meetings, multiple written communications, direct conversations between your Executive Officer and mine, and most importantly not one, but two public hearings.

In conclusion, I respectfully presume that all of you see the great value in open and transparent

government, which is essentially LAFCo's overall goal here. LAFCo remains committed to coordinate our port activities with the State Lands Commission with a simple ask that it be reciprocated. Thank you for the opportunity to speak and I appreciate your time and attention today.

2.2

ACTING CHAIR KUNKEL: Thank you so much, Mr. Wilson.

Cathy, do we have anyone else in the room for public comment?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes. Our next public speaker is Peter Kaz. Peter, please come up to the podium and begin your comment.

PETER KAZ: Hi. My name is Peter and I'm here in regards to the mooring rate hikes from the City of Newport Beach. We have a lot of angry people over there right now to be honest. And I don't know what's going on in the city, how they're running the city. We're going to get three times for four times rate hike. Our Social Security -- or people with Social Security, people with a salary, we don't get that much increase in our salary or Social Security. So my friends they already talk about the legality or the -- more of the technical aspect of what's going on. But I just want to let you know, our city is looking for your blessing. It's looking for

somebody like a -- like a friend in a crime. So I just want you guys to don't fall in a trap.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

The City of Newport Beach looks like they have a meeting with Land Commission yesterday, which was behind closed door. And I just want to address that and I just want to make sure and let you guys know that we provided them the second evaluation for the rate hikes. what they were asking and they just -- they're looking for evaluation with someone that is kind of connected with them, has connection with the city. And it's a conflict of interest. And I just want to let you know that we have a lot of angry people and people are forcing probably to sell their boat, move out of the harbor. And we are going through the attorney an Class A lawsuit action against the City of Newport Beach to be honest. And I just want to let you guys -- don't fall for the trap and don't be part of it, and try to look into what's going on, why the city is going to hike our rates three times. That's huge.

Like, two days ago, I got an envelope too for my association fee go up. It was like 10 percent, five percent. It doesn't make sense. It just -- it doesn't go to the mind of people. So just the discrimination is happening between the mooring owner and the people also that have docks. So we pay much -- way more than them. It's -- and they say because they own the house, so they

don't have to pay that much for their boat. But it's like are the people who -- like we pay for registration, are the homeowners paying almost zero for the car registration compared to people renting in the city, like in a condominium? No. Everybody pays the same for the registration for the cars.

It's just almost like the -- we -- like almost for the boat harbor, so we don't want to see that rate hikes. And then we -- I just want to let you guys don't be part of it.

Thank you.

2.2

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you very much. Good afternoon, everyone. I just wanted to introduce myself to you. My name is Malia Cohen, California State Controller, and Chair of this body. Thank you, Kristina Kunkel, for stepping in in my stead. As I got here, I flew in here fresh from San Francisco. I'm afraid that I brought the rain. It's coming. I just got ahead of it. But nonetheless, we will continue with public comment.

Good morning, Jennifer.

Are there any other members of the public that would like to speak on this item?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Our next public speaker is Jacqueline Moore. Jacqueline, please come up to the podium and begin your comment.

JACQUELINE MOORE: Good afternoon, Chair Cohen, commissioners, Executive Officer. My name is Jacqueline Moore. I'm Vice President of PMSA, Pacific Merchant Shipping Association, here in our Long Beach office.

1.3

2.2

I'd like to thank you all for coming to our neck of the woods. I know you have many beautiful places around the State to choose from and glad that you chose our ports in spite of the rain. PMSA, we've enjoyed a long, collaborative, and effective, I think, relationship, and we are very much appreciative of that.

I would be remiss if I did not take this short opportunity to raise a topic again, and that is offshore wind. We have -- the maritime industry has a vested interest in this. We support it in practice. Of course, we simply want to make sure it's done in the safest manner possible. I'd like to thank staff at State Lands, excuse me, as well as more recently those from Lieutenant Governor's office in working with us in seeking a seat at that table along with all other stakeholders.

Again, thank you for coming down here -- down here to the San Pedro Bay ports. And that concludes my comments. Thank you.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

Ms. Chan, is there another speaker?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes.

Our next speaker is Eileen Boken calling in with phone number ending in 936. You may unmute yourself and being your comment.

1.3

2.2

EILEEN BOKEN: Eileen Boken. For this agenda item, speaking on behalf of Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee in San Francisco.

The Public Trust Doctrine is under the jurisdiction of the State Lands Commission. The Public Trust Doctrine governs both the bayside and oceanside in San Francisco. San Francisco Zoo is just adjacent to the coast. The San Francisco Mayor has sent two letters to China's President Xi advocating for the loan of pandas to San Francisco Zoo. San Francisco's Mayor will also travel -- be traveling to China on April 13th to the 21st to advocate for this.

Speaking as -- urging the Commission Chair to advocate with the Mayor to keep all segments of the Upper Great Highway open to accommodate an expected surge in visitors to the zoo to the pandas arrive. SPEAK is joined Taraval merchants to advocate for all segments of the Great Highway to re -- Upper Great Highway, to remain open to the vehicular traffic 24/7.

These statements reflect comments made at San Francisco's Capital Planning Committee on March 18th.

SPEAK looks forward to connecting with the Commission

Chair on June 7th, when the Commission is scheduled to meet in San Francisco. SPEAK would urge the SLC to meet on June 7th at the Bernard Osher Great Hall at San Francisco zoo, if it's available.

2.2

This is where the Greater Farallones National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council met on February 29th.

Although, the State Controller wasn't able to attend the meeting, the State Treasurer Fiona Ma was able to join us.

Thank you.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Ms. Boken. We appreciate the -- your public comment.

Ms. Chan, is there any other public comment?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes.

Our next speaker is Jessie Fleming joining us virtually through zoom. Jessie you may begin your comments after I unmute you.

CHAIR COHEN: Jessie, are you there?

JESSIE FLEMING: Yes, I'm here. Can you hear me?

CHAIR COHEN: We can hear you now. Please

proceed.

JESSIE FLEMING: Yes. Great. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Jessie Fleming and I live aboard my boat mooring in the tideland waters off of Newport Beach. As you have just heard, Newport Beach City plans to raise the rate of tideland water-only

permits for offshore moorings. As a mooring holder, we pay for space in the water towards the tideland water-only permits. In Newport Beach, we already pay more than any or tideland permit in the entire state.

2.2

Now, Newport Beach proposes to give us a rate increase of over 400 percent. We have all purchased our own ground tackle and maintain it regularly. We have no city amenities and we have no access parking or facilities, and very limited space at a public dock in order to go ashore. Our tideland water-only permit is not only more expensive than any other permit in the state, but it is much, much more expensive than any other tideland permit in Newport Beach. We pay more than the yacht club mooring permits, the commercial dock permits, and the privately owned dock permits.

All permits in Newport Beach are not equal. And when we why is this so and how can this be, the City said, and I quote, "The City may change different rates for different uses when it is supported by an appraisal that makes distinctions in value."

Well, if this is so, you can ask anyone that an offshore mooring is far less valuable than any commercial or privately owned dock. Basically, the City told us that we are charging you more because we can and we know that we can get these rates in Newport Beach. I felt like a

child being told, "Because I said so." The point is we live on tideland State waters not in Newport Beach and many of us live aboard with set incomes through Social Security or disability check. We have purchased our own ground tackle. We have applied and paid and followed all the rules for liveaboard permits. Now, we are told that our tideland water-only permit rate will increase over 400 percent. And this rate will not be in many of our budgets.

2.2

What this means is that the lower to middle class income families can no longer enjoy the State Land tideland waters that we hear -- are all here for to and enjoy, and we will all be forced out of Newport Beach. I ask you to please consider our request to hold Newport Beach City accountable to manage these water permits to be equal and fair rates for all permittees and not discriminatory. Please consider our request and thank you for hearing me.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you very much, Ms. Fleming, for your comments.

Ms. Chan, are there other speakers?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes.

Our next speaker is Brady Bradshaw joining us virtually through Zoom. You may begin your comment.

BRADY BRADSHAW: Hello. Can you hear me?

CHAIR COHEN: Yes, we can. Please begin.

2.2

BRADY BRADSHAW: Okay. Hi. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. My name is Brady Bradshaw representing the Center for Biological Diversity. I'm here to speak about a couple of items that are related to oil and gas infrastructure subsea pipelines in State waters off of the coast of California, those being the San Pedro pipeline and the Santa Ynez Unit pipeline leases.

It's clearer than ever that all offshore oil and gas infrastructure poses an imminent threat of the next major oil spill, exacerbates climate change, and constitutes a public nuisance. It's fully within the State Lands Commission's legal authority today to terminate offshore oil and gases leases.

The Commission has acknowledged that continued leasing fuels climate change and that this comprises an existential threat to California. It's not clear that the -- that there is -- it's not clear to me that there is sufficient language in the lease amendments in the rent revisions and bond requirements that would cover in the worst case oil spill scenario. The operations are mostly decaying oil and gas infrastructure far beyond the expected lifespan of these pipelines and it's reasonable to expect that they will spill again. And so we need to make sure that taxpayers are protected and the State is

protected from a worst case oil spill scenario in all of these negotiations, and rent revisions, and bond requirements.

2.2

Specifically, regarding the San Pedro Bay pipeline, there was the most revision dramatically cut rent on the basis of a reduced buffer area for pipeline movement from a five-foot buffer to a one-foot buffer. But given that the company itself failed to even detect a 105-foot displacement of their pipeline, and appropriately respond to the last major oil spill, this rent amount should be based on a much more substantial area and increased by orders of magnitude.

In the case of the Santa Ynez Unit, it's not clear to me what kinds of -- what kinds of inspection if in-line inspection -- we would hope to see a biannual in-line inspection of that pipeline, smart pigging as well as external inspections -- inspections, because again it's far beyond its expended -- expected life span and clearly requires the most stringent monitoring requirements possible, if these pipelines are allowed to continue receiving lease privileges at all, which they certainly should not be, given the history of spills and the very clear damage that they are causing to both the coastline from routine oil spills and from persistent climate change impacts.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you. That's your time.

BRADY BRADSHAW: Thank you very much.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

2.2

Ms. Chan, is there another speaker?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes.

Our next speaker is Laura Wilkinson Sinton.

Laura, you my unmute yourself and begin your comment.

LAURA WILKINSON SINTON: Thank you very much.

And thank you, commissioners. My name is Laura Wilkinson Sinton. I live in the beautiful Coronado Cays on the tidelands here in San Diego. And I want to speak to you about the Port of San Diego.

In recent months, the Port has had their Chief Financial Officer abruptly depart without explanation, suspended their CEO under secretive circumstances paying a huge settlement to require his resignation and keep terms secret, and censured National City's Port Commissioner. And this censure was after an expensive secretive investigation, cited no legal wrongdoing, causing the investigative journalist at La Prensa to call it a political hit job.

In addition, the Port violated the Brown Act by failing to notify this special meeting properly and an uproar by failing to inform the port member city, National

City, of the censure against its duly appointed commissioner.

2.2

Port public funds were also used to inquire if the Port Chairman could legally burrow in as the new CEO, circumventing the merit-based experience and interview process that public entities follow in the state of California. Furthermore, the Port was served a new federal lawsuit for attempting in another recent investigation to investigate a lawyer for what he said at the dais in public comments and another civil lawsuit from a news organization claiming violations of the Public Records Act.

All of this is on the heels of the recent grand jury report findings and suggested transparency reforms, which the Port staff rejected completely out of hand. And what it did was reveal to the public here in San Diego an unelected commission running a \$350 million enterprise using our public tidelands without proper oversight or accountability. The Port hasn't publicly released an external financial audit of its enterprise in decades, if ever. And this behavior is unacceptable for a public agency. The conduct of the Port of San Diego has now drawn the attention, of course, the San Diego LAFCo, Local Area Formation Commission, and State lawmakers.

The Port yet, again and again, takes an

oppositional stance against any attempt at cooperation with these agencies and accountability to the public. Port controversy has been front-page news here in San Diego for months and even the subject of op-eds.

2.2

The Port's interim CEO told the LAFCo Commission to stay in its lane publicly. The Port Commission's Chairman told the Coronado City Council last week that the LAFCo vote was rogue and that the Port opposed the newly introduced Assembly Bill 2783, the Port Reform and Accountability Act. It's an odd assertion considering that San Diego Port Commission hasn't even agendized this bill -- discussion about this bill nor voted publicly to oppose this much needed and publicly demanded bill.

So the question is who's making these decisions? Is it staff? Is it the Commission in secret? You know, this is the transparency issue. And in short, my plea to you is the SLC oversight is not enough. If this entity is fighting transparency and oversight in Sacramento, San Diego, and against duly authorized grand juries, they're the very entity that needs all of these eyes watching it. And LAFCo's review will assure the transparency that will help earn back the public's trust that is so lacking in our port here.

Thank you very much for your time.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you very much for your

comment.

2.2

Ms. Chan, is there another speak.

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes Our next speaker is Cory Briggs. Cory, you may unmute yourself and begin your comment.

CORY BRIGGS: Good morning, members of the Commission. My name is Cory Briggs. I'm an attorney in San Diego. I'm the attorney that Ms. Wilkinson just referenced. I do environmental law and open government law and I've worked with the Port for nearly 20 years. In fact, I think it's over 20 years now.

Anyways, it is one of the worst agencies in the State when it comes to transparency and accountability. And it is so bad that after I read a third-party's letter during a public meeting, I was investigated. As a member of the public, as an attorney reading somebody else's letter, I was investigated because of the comments that I made during that public meeting.

Furthermore, I was investigated because of comments I made about that public meeting to a member of the press who asked me about the comments I had made.

I was rewarded by being investigated. I filed a civil right lawsuit -- civil rights lawsuit, because it is purely retaliation. The message that was delivered during that meeting is that the Port Board is engaging in illegal

serial meetings, violations of the Brown Act, which is the equivalent to your Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Law. And the letter that I read would give a reasonable person reason to believe that one of the Port's top lawyers was drinking heavily and sharing secrets with members of the public. That wasn't my observation. That was the contents of the letter that I read.

2.2

On top of that, I represent the news organization La Prensa that requested a copy of the investigation into the former CEO. That request was denied. As you've heard, nearly a million dollars was spent to investigate the CEO. And the public would like to know why he was let go and given money. When my client asked for that, the Port said we can't have it. So basically, the public can't know why the Port is spending a million dollars of public money for this sort of thing.

I tell you all of this, because understand that LAFCo is trying to implement some reforms to help the public have a better understanding of what's going on at the port and to improve transparency and accountability. I fully support those efforts, whether they're going to go far enough, time will tell. But what would be really bad is for staff at the State Lands Commission, or anyone on this body, to be doing anything that interferes with the public trying to improve the functioning, and efficiency,

and transparency of the Port of San Diego.

So I hope that you will direct your staff to stay out of it and I hope that you too will stay out of it.

Thank you very much.

2.2

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

Ms. Chan, is there another speaker?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes Our next speaker is Jonathan Ullman. Jonathan, you may

unmute yourself and begin your comments.

JONATHAN ULLMAN: Okay. Chair Cohen, members of the Commission, I want to -- I hope you have a nice afternoon, despite the threat of rain. My name is Jonathan Ullman. I'm the Director of the Santa Barbara-Ventura Chapter of the Sierra Club.

I'll make this brief, because I know you want to move on. About nine years ago in 2015, the Refugio Beach oil disaster sent about 450,000 gallons of oil onto the coastline and into Santa Barbara Channel, resulting in at least 202 dead birds and 99 dead mammals, including at least 46 sea lions and 12 dolphins. Beaches and sea life were covered in crude costing hundreds of million of dollars to clean up.

Sable Energy is a pop -- company that just popped up on the New York Stock Exchange last month and it has apparently purchased all the Exxon's offshore oil and

onshore facilities related to those. Sable is seeking to restart the Plains Pipeline, the pipeline that both earthed and caused that disaster. And it is also seeking to be the -- it's also seeking to use State Lands so that it can transport that oil to the pipeline and on. This pipeline is very old.

I'm glad you're going to be reviewing it, as well as all the others. I'm glad it's a month-to-month lease that you have -- or lease extension. I don't even know if it's called a lease. It's an extension. But I will tell you this, this is a dangerous thing. And this thing has been shut down for almost a decade. Please do not turn it back on.

CHAIR COHEN: Does that conclude your remarks, Mr. Ullman?

JONATHAN ULLMAN: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. Thank you very much.

Ms. Chan, are there others in the queue?

19 ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes.

Our next speaker is Wade Womack. Wade, you may unmute yourself and begin your comment.

CHAIR COHEN: Mr. Womack, are you ready?

WADE WOMACK: Yes. Hi. I have a single slide,

if we can post that.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

(Thereupon a slide presentation).

CHAIR COHEN: It's posted. We can see it. You may begin.

1.3

2.2

WADE WOMACK: Great. Good afternoon commissioners. My name is Wade Womack. Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

I'm an avid boater in Newport Beach. Help us stop the discrimination -- number one, please help us stop the price discrimination against boaters using moorings in Newport.

Number two, the City is considering increasing mooring rates up to 500 percent. This will price out the average mooring user. This is the last affordable boating in Newport. These boaters will have nowhere else to go.

Number three, mooring users will be paying 20 times the rate of waterfront homeowners for their docks — that they pay for their docks for the exact same use, for the exact same tidelands, for the exact same boating. This is price discrimination and should not be allowed. The granting statute for these tidelands includes a provision prohibiting price discrimination. The SLC has a duty to enforce the granting statute and this related provision — prohibition and to stop the price discrimination in the tidelands of Newport Harbor.

Number five, we are grateful the SLC staff is performing a preliminary review of this issue. Please

encourage SLC staff to perform a deep dive into this matter. We really need your help.

Thank you for your time.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you for your comment.

Ms. Chan.

2.2

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes Our next speaker is Mike Fleming. Mike, you may unmute yourself and begin your comment.

CHAIR COHEN: Mr. Fleming, are you there?
Mr. Fleming. Mike Fleming.

Okay. Let's move on, next speaker.

Ms. Chan, let's move on to the next speaker.

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes.

We have -- we have no hands raised for comment at this time

CHAIR COHEN: Okay. Thank you very much. I want to acknowledge the importance of public comment. The -for Californians to be able to come, voice their
displeasure or even in some cases their pleasure to their
elected officials or appointed officials is an incredibly
important, cherished, and protected part of our democratic
process. And I appreciate every speaker that made the
time to either come in person, submit something in
writing, or to join us online. We will receive each and
every one of your comments equally. And I first want to

pivot to see if my colleagues or fellow commissioners have anything that they want to say?

Anything?

2.2

No. Okay. Thank you. I'll turn it back over to you, Ms. Lucchesi.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Thank you, Chair

Cowen and welcome. I do, if it's okay with you, welcome

Port of LA Deputy Director David Libatique -- Libatique -
excuse me -- to make some welcoming remarks.

CHAIR COHEN: Of course. Thank you.

Welcome. This is the Deputy Executive Director, right?

DAVID LIBATIQUE: Yes, Controller Cohen.

CHAIR COHEN: Good to see you.

DAVID LIBATIQUE: Chair Cohen, Honorable members of the State Lands Commission, I'm David Libatique, Deputy Executive Director for Stakeholder Engagement here at the Port of Los Angeles. And on behalf of Mayor Karen Bass, our Board of Harbor commissioners, Executive Director Gene Seroka, and all of the women and men who work at the harbor department for the City of Los Angeles, it's my distinct honor to welcome you. We are honored that -- and so very glad you've decided to hold your meeting here. We want to thank State Lands staff and Executive Officer Lucchesi for bringing the meeting here.

We are at the Port of Los Angeles known as America's Port. I think during the pandemic, we were in front-page news as impactful on the supply chain disruptions nationally. So it's well known at this point that the cargo that traverses the wharves of our marine terminals reach and touch every corner of the country. We are also well known as City Department, but what is less well known is we are a trustee of State Lands and we are a creation of the State of California. And it's our partnership and relationship with State Lands that we value and that as the reason why we are so glad that you're bringing your meeting here today. We wish you a productive meeting and look forward to continued partnership with State Lands, the Commission and the Thank you for being here. staff.

CHAIR COHEN: Deputy Director, thank you very much for welcoming us. You didn't have to do that. It's very kind of you. We are all public servants and enjoy serving Californians, so consider us a sister agency.

DAVID LIBATIQUE: Thank you very much.

CHAIR COHEN: My pleasure. Thank you.

All right. Let's keep moving on the agenda.

I don't know where we are.

(Laughter).

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIR COHEN: I'm not even going to pretend.

```
Where are we? What are we doing?
1
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: We are on page five.
2
             CHAIR COHEN: Thank you. Okay.
 3
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI:
                                          The -- we are ready
 4
    to move on to adoption of the minutes from our last
5
   meeting, if you're ready to do that.
6
             CHAIR COHEN: All right. So may I have a motion
7
8
    to approve the minutes?
             ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: So moved.
9
             CHAIR COHEN: All right. Thank you very much.
10
   Motion made.
11
             Is there a second?
12
             ACTING COMMISSIONER PERRAULT: Second.
13
             CHAIR COHEN: Okay. Thank you. We -- if there's
14
15
    any objection.
16
             Seeing that there is none, do we need to take
   public comment on these, no?
17
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: We don't have any
18
19
   public comment for this.
20
             CHAIR COHEN: All right. If there is no
    objection, let's take this motion unanimously. It will
21
    pass. Please conduct the roll.
2.2
23
             Call the roll, Ms. Lucchesi.
             EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Okay. Commissioner
24
```

25

Dumlao?

1 ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Aye.

2 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner

3 Perrault?

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

ACTING COMMISSIONER PERRAULT: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Cohen?

CHAIR COHEN: The motion passes unanimously.

All right. Thank you very much. The next order of business is the Executive Officer's report.

Ms. Lucchesi, you are up.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes.

CHAIR COHEN: Are you ready to go?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: I am ready to go.

13 Thank you.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. We're ready to receive

15 you.

16 (Laughter).

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: I just have a couple things I want to update the Commission and members of the public on all relating to our work in the oil and gas area. First, on March 15th, the Santa Barbara County Superior Court found in the State Lands Commission favor and against Signal Hill Oil and Gas Company operating offshore pipelines awarding the Commission nearly \$300,000 in damages plus additional costs that will be determined

at a future date. The court awarded the Commission

damages for its claims of breach of contract and trespass against Signal Hill.

2.2

As background, the Commission sued Signal Hill in 2019 after terminating its pipeline lease. The lease had authorized four pipelines from -- that connected Platform Hogan, which in federal water to shore. The Commission approved the lease termination in June 19 -- June 2019 after Signal Hill failed to pay rent for several years and maintain the required bond under its lease. After termination, Signal Hill continued to occupy State land and use the pipelines giving rise to the trespass claim.

And I just want to acknowledge and thank both Chief Counsel Seth Blackmon and his legal team and the Attorney General's office for their great representation in this really significant victory on behalf of the State Lands Commission.

Second, I did want to give the Commission an update on our two oil and gas decommissioning projects, one with Platform Holly. Our team has started cutting the 30 well conductors that link the platform wellheads to the seabed and will reme -- will be remediating the shallow portions of the nine wells, which together are the final steps to permanently plug and abandon the platforms' wells. We expect to complete this work by the end of this year. And once that's done, there will be no physical,

technical possibility of producing oil from that platform or reactivating the platform again.

2.2

So that moves us into preparing for the CEQA process for the decommissioning of the platform and related infrastructure. Currently, technical studies supporting the coming Environmental Impact Report are underway. We anticipate releasing a Notice of Preparation this fall, which will initiate the CEQA process. And that will be followed by a Draft Environmental Impact Report for public review and comment, which is expected in 2025.

ExxonMobil will decommission Platform Holly at its expense after the Commission certifies the EIR. And more information is available on our web including the executed phase two agreement that the Commission authorized last year that governs the relationship between the State Lands Commission, and Exxon, and their responsibilities for the decommissioning of that platform.

Second, relating to Rincon Island, on March 15th, Commission staff released the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Rincon phase two decommissioning project with a 60-day public review and comment period that will end on May 15th. This decommissioning project is looking at both the island, the causeway that connects the island to shore, and the onshore facility. This is a major step in this significant decommissioning project and a

milestone that we have been working towards since the fire operator filed for bankruptcy back in 2017. We will host two public meeting sessions on May 2nd to receive public comments on the draft and then work on the Final Environmental Impact Report to be considered by the Commission at a public meeting. And we are anticipating the Commission hearing that -- considering that EIR at its August meeting later this year.

And with that, that concludes my Executive Officer's Report. There's a lot more in our written report posted on the website, so I encourage the public to go take a look at that, but that concludes my verbal report.

Thank you, Chair.

2.2

CHAIR COHEN: All right. Thank you very much. We receive that report.

Commissioner Dumlao, do you have any ideas, any thoughts. I saw you taking notes over there. Anything you want to -- no. No feedback.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Well, okay, sure.

CHAIR COHEN: Okay. I knew it.

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: A couple of -couple of thoughts. Just great work on the Signal Hill
decision. You know, congrats to everyone involved there.
You know that -- I remember the issue coming before us the

first time around. And certainly that operator failed in a number of respects and so it's great to hold them accountable.

And then second, it's just always great to hear the progress that we're making on Holly and Rincon. You know, having been out to Holly, and seeing the infrastructure, and just imagining what that landscape is going to look like with that gone is really exciting. So great work.

CHAIR COHEN: Yes. I would have to agree with your comments. It's an exciting time. Thank you for sharing us the updates and we look forward to future -- or the future updates of it finally being gone.

All right. We're going to continue moving forward. We're going to go with the next item.

Cathy, do we have any public comment?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes.

Our next speaker is Patricia Coomans calling in with phone number ending in 000. You may unmute yourself and begin your comment.

CHAIR COHEN: Patricia, are you there?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: So we -- if I could intervene just for a second. We do have a couple of more people that have signed up for public comment, but we will take them at our second public comment period towards the

end of the meeting.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIR COHEN: Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: So I think we can move on to the consent agenda.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. Thank you very much.

Ms. Chan, you heard the boss. We're going to close down this public comment session and we're going to keep moving forward. We're going to move to the next item, which -- and the next order of business will be the adoption of the consent calendar. Commissioner Perrault, are there any items that you'd like to remove from the consent calendar?

ACTING COMMISSIONER PERRAULT: No, not on this one.

15 CHAIR COHEN: Okay. What about you,

16 | Commissioner?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: None.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. Thank you. So then next I'd like to call on Ms. Lucchesi to indicate which items, if any, have been removed from the consent calendar.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Certainly. Consent items 10 and 20 are removed from the agenda and will be considered at a later time and that concludes our changes to the agenda.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. Thank you very much.

Let's keep moving.

Is there any -- is there anyone joining us who wishes to speak on any of the items remaining on the consent calendar? Anyone would like to speak on any of the items remaining on the consent calendar?

2.2

If so, please come to the podium, or raise your hand on Zoom, or dial star nine if you're joining by phone. Please do this now.

Ms. Chan, do you see any action on your end?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes.

We have a public speaker that -- Barbara Griffith Barbara.

Barbara, you may -- you may begin your comments.

CHAIR COHEN: Welcome, Ms. Griffith. The floor is yours.

Okay. Ms. Chan, it doesn't look like Ms. Griffith is available. Are there any others?

CHAIR COHEN: Oh, okay. Great.

BARBARA GRIFFITH:

BARBARA GRIFFITH: I apologize. This technology nowadays, but first I want to just let all of you know how impressed I am. I'm not really involved too much in attending these types of meetings, but I am here to speak about the mooring issue in Newport Beach. We have a problem. And I know that you've received a lot of letters

I am -- I am here.

about the mooring --

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

CHAIR COHEN: Ms. Griffith, could you please hold that thought for one moment.

BARBARA GRIFFITH: I can.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you. We have a message for you.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yeah. So we are currently on the consent agenda. So we'll -- we are happy to take comments in terms of anybody who wants to comment on a consent agenda item. But for those general comments like what it sounds Barbara wants to talk about, we'll hold that until our second public comment period towards the end of the meeting.

CHAIR COHEN: Okay.

BARBARA GRIFFITH: Okay. Apologize. I wasn't -- I didn't understand how to use the system. Okay. I will wait and listen to the rest of the meeting.

CHAIR COHEN: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you for joining us.

Okay. Let's see if there's any other members of the public that would like to comment on the remaining balance of the consent calendar?

Ms. Chan, do you have anyone?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Nope.

25 | No, we have no hands raised.

The

50 Thank you. 1 CHAIR COHEN: All right. Hearing none, we will 2 now with proceed with the vote. May I have a motion to 3 adopt the consent agenda. ACTING COMMISSIONER PERRAULT: So moved. 5 CHAIR COHEN: Thank you very much. 6 Is there a second? 7 8 ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Second. CHAIR COHEN: All right. Great. We have a 9 motion that's been made and seconded. 10 Any objection to a unanimous vote? 11 Fabulous. All right. Let's call the roll. 12 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner Dumlao? 1.3 ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: 14 Aye. EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner 15 16 Perrault? ACTING COMMISSIONER PERRAULT: Aye. 17 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Cohen? 18 19 CHAIR COHEN: Aye. 20 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: The motion passes unanimously. 21 CHAIR COHEN: All right. Thank you very much. 2.2 23 The next order of business will be the regular calendar. Ms. Lucchesi, would you like to respond? 24

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Sure. Okay.

25

next order of business is the regular calendar, and item 52. And our staff member -- our Chief of our External Affairs Division, Sheri Pemberton will be giving staff's presentation.

2.2

CHAIR COHEN: That's great. Ms. Pemberton, it's good to see you. Let's make sure that her mic is on in the chamber, so we can hear her.

It's not on. Do you -- do you see a button on there?

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Oh. Thank you, Jennifer. Thank you. It was right before my eyes.

CHAIR COHEN: No problem. We want to make sure we can hear every word. The floor is yours. Thank you.

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION CHIEF PEMBERTON: Thank you, Madam Chair and commissioners. This is an informational update item. There's no action requested at this time in terms of State legislation.

And just generally speaking, the dust has settled. The spot bill deadline has passed and legislators have returned from their spring recess, so we generally know what members are going to be doing with their bills this year.

Legislators are working kind of toward an end-of-April deadline for passing out bills that are keyed

fiscal from their policy committees and it will just get busier from there out through the August 31st deadline.

2.2

One caveat is that it's still kind of on the early side, so even though most of spot bills have been amended with substantive language, we don't kind of yet have the Committee analysis and know who's going to line up in support and opposition for particular bills. We also anticipate in May at the Appropriations Committee hearings that there will be kind of a reduction in the bills based on the fiscal implications and given the \$38 billion deficits that the State is wrestling with. So we'll be monitoring all of that.

Just in terms of what we're working on staff-wise, a report back on two resolutions the Commission adopted a support position on in February, SJR 12 that would encourage the federal government to change bankruptcy laws to make it harder for an oil and gas company to file for bankruptcy to discharge their debts, and in so doing, avoid their decommissioning obligations. That bill is going to be heard in the Senate Natural Resources and Water Committee on April 15th. Staff has been providing us technical guidance to Committee staff and anticipates supporting the resolution in Committee if it's not on consent.

And then AJR 12 will be heard in the Assembly

Environmental Safety and Toxics Committee later this month. And that's the bill that would -- a resolution that would urge the federal government to approve President Biden's \$310 million dollar funding request to make repairs at the Tijuana River.

2.2

Policy-wise more broadly speaking, we're tracking bills on offshore wind energy, aquaculture, reducing idle and orphan oil and gas wells, reducing plastic pollution, and the Tijuana River. Senator Gonzalez introduced legislation to increase the State's contribution to the oil trust fund to build up the State's liability for the abandonment obligations for the Long Beach oil and gas operations when they end. So we're tracking that bill. There's also a bill by Assembly Member Dixon that would amend its statutory trust grant for a portion of Newport Beach to allow for a longer lease term for those granted lands, and we're tracking that as well.

We're also monitoring three bills that would amend the Coastal Act for purposes of addressing the housing crisis. And we're just taking a close look at those, especially since the Commission sits on the Coastal Commission, and those bills would provide exemptions to the Coastal Act, which is something that we think is -- you know, warrants attention and we're tracking as a staff.

So where does that leave us is that we'll continue to monitor these bills and report back in January -- I mean, in June at the June 7th Commission meeting and imagine recommending that the Commission take positions on particular bills at that time.

And that concludes my report.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you very much. I appreciate that report. Let me check in with my colleagues to see if there's any questions, any clarity on anything?

Thank you.

2.2

All right. Let's take some public comment on this item. This is on Item 52. Ms. Chan.

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Our first public speaker for this item is Councilmember Marcus Bush.

Marcus, please come up to the podium and begin your comments.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

MARCUS BUSH: Hello again, staff, Commission, and Chair Cohen. Again, Marcus Bush, National City Council as well as Air Pollution Control District. I ran out of time in the last comments, so I already kind of alluded to a lot of the issues with transparency and lack of accountability. But I think where I stopped it leads right into one of the bills I want to call out here is AB

2783. That was proposed by our Assemblymember David Alvarez who grew up in the area in Barrio Logan, also has had a history of a lot of environmental justice issues similar to National City. A couple things that I ask for you all.

2.2

I don't know if it's, you know, legally appropriate if you guys do do support -- offer letters of support on State bills. I would ask you all to support AB 2783, because it's essentially an ethics reform bill. We need ethics reform at the port. You all heard, you know, three other members of the public. There's many, many, many more who have issues with the port. They're fighting oversight and they fight oversight every chance they get. And any -- to me, any public agency that fights oversight is probably a public agency that needs oversight. And that's what AB 2783 is. So I ask support if you guys can.

But I also ask for you all, since you oversee the port, as State Lands Commission as ultimately responsible for the port, I think it's very, very inappropriate that they have been organizing and speaking out against AB 2783 when there has been no public discussion on their end of AB 2783. And Mr. Briggs alluded to this earlier in the call that how do they make the decision? They -- there has been no public discussion. It reeks of what appears is that there are serial meetings and violations of the

Brown Act that are going on.

2.2

And I want to read you a quote from the current Chair of the Port, Frank Urtasun, he calls LAFCo's power grab wouldn't provide any benefit to local residents, and hence protection of San Diego Bay, or improve the regional economy, but it would create new layers of bureaucracy delaying critical projects and services. That's often what Mr. Urtasun does and what a lot of the Port staff I've seen do. They attack these bills. They attack oversight and reform, in this case it is LAFCo, but they've also been very critical of AB 2783. I heard Mr. Urtasun say to the City of Coronado that it would be bad for the residents, never gave an explanation of why ethics reform would be bad for the residents.

And so I ask you all to ask the Port to -- before they -- they need to stop with their criticism of the bill without having a public discussion. I have never heard any of their commissioners. I know my commissioner. I've talked to my commissioner and I said at what point names -- her name is Commissioner Naranjo, at what point, Sandy, did you guys discuss this? And she told me internally they have never discussed it. So it's just either staff I think overextending what they're allowed to do or there are serial meetings going on.

So I please ask you guys to ask the Port to have

a public debate on AB 2783 and for your support of 2783. Thank you.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you very much.

2.2

Ms. Lucchesi, is it customary for this body to offer support letters for pieces of legislation?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yes, it is something that the commission is authorized to do. And that's what Sheri was alluding to in her presentation we're continuing to monitor the bills that have been introduced and going through their initial policy committees. And it is likely that we will come at your meeting in June with some recommendations for positions on certain bills.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. Thank you very much. So it sounds like a little bit early in the process, but we'll take your requests under consideration in June. All right. Thank you.

Are there any other members of the public that would like to speak on this topic on item -- yes, Ms. Chan.

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes. Yes. Yes, there is. Our next speaker is Luz Molina. Luz, you may unmute yourself and begin your comment.

CHAIR COHEN: Luz Molina, are you there?

LUZ MOLINA: Hello. Can you hear me?

CHAIR COHEN: Yes, we can.

LUZ MOLINA: Thank you. Hi. I am Luz Molina, a National City Councilmember in a district that represents all of our city's port lands. I'm asking for your support of Assembly Bill 2783 by Assembly Member Alvarez, which is currently listed as a tracked bill in -- under your category, the granted lands category. Of special interest to me is the provision that would establish an independent ethics committee to monitor the work of this very important and very powerful agency.

2.2

As one of five cities that make up the port of San Diego, the City of National City is committed to working with the Port on our shared interests. However, the Port's non-response to multiple issues is concerning and it is lacking in transparency and accountability. The decisions that are made at the port are important and have a direct impact in our city's economy, recreational access, and environmental impact.

Recent actions taken by the Port of San Diego against our city are highly concerning and ethically questionable. An independent ethics committee would allow the public its right to know what is going on. I believe this bill, AB 2783, is a step in the right direction to establish a mechanism to give the communities most impacted by the Port's operations a stronger voice without impeding the Port's operation and the very important role

that it has. This bill would establish reform of the Port that would promote fair policies and procedures, that maximize the likelihood of achieving balanced outcomes for the City of National City and the region as a whole.

2.2

Thank you for listing AB 2783 within your radar. I respectfully request that you go a step further and support this bill to implement policies that will lead to a more transparent and accountable Port of San Diego. Thank you.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you very much. Appreciate you. I'm not sure if you heard the -- Ms. Molina, if you heard the previous speaker, but we will be taking up a support or -- we'll be taking a position, but we will making that -- we will be making that consideration in June. Thank you.

Ms. Chan, are there any other members of the public that would like to speak?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes. Our next speaker is Eileen Boken calling in with phone number ending in 936. You may unmute yourself and begin your comments.

EILEEN BOKEN: Eileen Boken. For this agenda item, speaking on behalf of the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods. Both Sunset-Parkside Education and Action Committee and the Coalition for San Francisco

Neighborhoods have taken positions to strongly oppose SB 951, Wiener, and AB 2560, Alvarez. By a super majority, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors took a position on SB 951, Wiener, to oppose unless amended, including the District 10 Supervisor in the super majority. Despite this — this is despite the fact that the San Francisco Mayor is the official sponsor of SB 951.

The Coastal Act is one of the crown jewels of State legislation. It has a proven track record of preserving and enhancing coastal resources. The Coastal Commission has taken a position unanimously to oppose SB 951 unless amended. At some point in the future, the Coalition for San Francisco Neighborhoods strongly urges the State Lands Commission to oppose both SB 951, Wiener, and AB 2560, Alvarez, as these bills are both being tracked by the State Lands Commission.

Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you, Ms. Boken. Ms. Chan, are there any other members of the public?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: No. We have no hands raised for comment at this time.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. Thank you very much.

 $\label{eq:All right.} \mbox{ I think what we could do is we have a } \\ \mbox{motion open --}$

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: This is just and

informational report. There's no recommended action.

CHAIR COHEN: Okay. Thank you very much.

Well, let's go to the next item, that's item 53.

Item 53 is to consider the acceptance of the Long Beach

Unit -- Long Beach Unit annual plan. May we have the staff report at this time.

(Thereupon a slide presentation).

PETROLEUM RESOURCES ENGINEER ABEDI: Good afternoon, Madam Chair and Commissioners. My name is Jalal Abedi. And I am working with the Mineral Resources Management Division of State Lands Commission.

I'm presenting item 53, acceptance of the Long Beach Unit annual plan. May I ask to please go to the slides, if possible.

Thank you.

2.2

Next, please.

[SLIDE CHANGE]

PETROLEUM RESOURCES ENGINEER ABEDI: The
Wilmington Oil Field was discovered in 1932. It is one of
the largest fields in North America. The field is divided
into two parts. West Wilmington Field is often referred
to as the tidelands. And East Wilmington Field is most
commonly referred to as the Long Beach Unit. As directed
by Chapter 138, statutes of 1964, Long Beach Unit
development began in 1965. The City of Long Beach is the

unit operator and California Resources Corporation is the City of Long Beach field contractor.

Next slide, please.

1.3

2.2

[SLIDE CHANGE]

PETROLEUM RESOURCES ENGINEER ABEDI: This picture depicts the Long Beach Unit operation. The majority of the oil production here occurs from four man-made islands, Grissom, White, Chaffee, and Freeman.

Next slide, please.

[SLIDE CHANGE]

PETROLEUM RESOURCES ENGINEER ABEDI: Declining oil production from the unit led to further legislation in 1991, where the State enacted Chapter 941 authorizing the City, State, and field contractor, which was ARCO at the time, to enter into an Optimized Waterflood Program Agreement, or OWPA. This agreement was a profit-sharing arrangement that provided the city and the contractor a larger portion of the unit profits on the condition that the contractor would invest and engage in enhanced field development.

This agreement implemented in 1992 provided significant incentive for the contractor to benefit from enhanced field development and also resulted in greater benefits to the State. The State maintained a financial interest and exercised limited oversight authority,

including reviewing the annual plan and also the program plan. On their OWPA, the profits were divided as follows: contractor got 49 percent, State got 42.5 percent, and the City of Long Beach got 8.5 percent.

Next slide, please.

2.2

[SLIDE CHANGE]

PETROLEUM RESOURCES ENGINEER ABEDI: The program plan spanning a five-year period outlines the strategies for managing the unit reservoir under the OWPA. It details activity plans, production and injection rate projections, and adds to this key challenges facing the unit. Moreover, the plan also included discussion of key issues facing the unit plan for the major projects and initiatives to be implemented during the plan period and anticipated revenues and profits.

On the other hand, the annual plan focuses on the current physical year and is based on the parameter outline in the program plan. It provides current and updated estimate of volume activity levels and expenditure for the ongoing year, ensuring alignment with the broader objectives outlined in the program plan.

Next slide, please.

[SLIDE CHANGE]

PETROLEUM RESOURCES ENGINEER ABEDI: Each year as required by Chapter 138, the Commission considers

acceptance of the unit expenditures proposed by the City of Long Beach. The proposed expenditure consists of a five year program plan, which is prepared every two years, and an annual plan, which is prepared every year. For the program plan, prior to recommending this plan to Commission acceptance, Commission staff review the plan to ensure consistency with good oil field practice, consistency with the unit and unit operating arrangement -- agreements, consistency with the OWPA, and no significant environmental and safety concerns.

For the annual plan, prior to recommending this plan, the Commission acceptance -- for the Commission acceptance, Commission staff reviews the plan to ensure only consistency with the program plan regarding the expenditures. Every year, alongside receiving the annual plan, the Commission approves costs related to subsidence studies and receive an annual closing statement report detailing the actual expenditure and also the revenue figures. And every six months, the Commission receive updates on subsidence surveys.

Next slide, please.

[SLIDE CHANGE]

PETROLEUM RESOURCES ENGINEER ABEDI: Commission staff also participated in variety of other Long Beach Unit activities, which is shown here:

Participate in monthly engineering committee meeting, which really discuss the things like well net rebore for cleaning up the wellbore and the facility maintenance or replacement; also conduct oil spill prevention exercises; provide on-site inspection presence in the field; conduct safety and oil spill prevention inspections and audits; monitor and prevent subsidence; and monitor production and financial information; also conduct financial audits.

Next slide, please.

2.2

[SLIDE CHANGE]

PETROLEUM RESOURCES ENGINEER ABEDI: Last year, after the submission of the latest program plan by the City of Long Beach, the Commission ordered that the City of Long Beach include the following analysis in all future program plans. These recommend -- these recommendations were addressed in various correspondence between the city and also the Commission: SB 1137, which will prohibit new oil and gas wells within 3,200 feet of sensitive receptors, such as homes, schools, hospitals, and also requires existing wells to meet specified health, safety, and environmental requirements; also, CalGEM injection gradient requirements; power plant operation; commodity price volatility; sea level rise; environmental justice; well abandonment plan; make-up water sources; also social

impact -- impacts cost and impact of oil extraction;
public health impacts of oil production on local
communities, including minority communities; anticipated
abandonment and decommissioning costs for the Long Beach
Unit and the balance of the Oil Liability Trust Fund.

Next slide, please.

[SLIDE CHANGE]

mentioned earlier, the City of Long Beach, as the operator of the Long Beach Unit, is required by statute to submit an annual plan to the Commission each year for its consideration. The annual plan currently under review covers the period of fiscal year 2024-25 to ensure consistency with the program plan regarding expenditures. The annual plan proposes spending around \$304 million in the fiscal year 2024-25, and project a unit net income of nearly \$40 million. Oil price -- oil prices during the plan year are estimated at \$65 per barrel and estimated oil production averaging just above 14,000 barrels per day for the plan year.

Next slide, please.

[SLIDE CHANGE]

PETROLEUM RESOURCES ENGINEER ABEDI: So this table shows the differences between the program plan and annual plan for key factors, such as, for instance, the

average oil rate it was estimated in the program plan to be around 14,700 barrels per day. And then in the annual plan, it is estimated to be 4,200 barrel per day. So it's just about maybe three or four percent lower.

Also, for the expenditure, in the program plan, it was estimated to be \$360 million, whereas in the annual plan, this number is 304, just about that, million dollar. For the revenue, in the program plan, it was estimated to be \$356 million. Whereas, in annual plan, it was estimated to be \$344 million. So net profit is almost the same, \$41 million in the program plan compared to \$40.3 million in the annual plan. And the oil price in the program plan was \$65 per barrel and in the annual plan is -- remains the same.

Next slide, please.

[SLIDE CHANGE]

PETROLEUM RESOURCES ENGINEER ABEDI: So

Commission staff has reviewed annual plan and finds the plan is consistent with the program plan. Staff therefore recommends the Commission accept the Long Beach Unit annual plan as submitted by the City of Long Beach.

And this complete my presentation of staff report for item 53. And I will be happy to answer any question you may have. Thank you.

CHAIR COHEN: Mr. Abedi, thank you very much for

your presentation. Let me check with my colleagues to see if there's any questions.

Mr. Dumlao, none?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: No questions. Thank you.

CHAIR COHEN: Okay. Appreciate that.

Ms. Perrault?

2.2

ACTING COMMISSIONER PERRAULT: No.

CHAIR COHEN: Okay. You were so thorough that we have no questions. So congratulations to you.

(Laughter).

CHAIR COHEN: Okay. Seeing that there are no questions, let me check in with Ms. Chan to see if there's any public comment?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes.

Our next speaker is Brady Bradshaw. Brady, you may unmute yourself and begin your comments.

BRADY BRADSHAW: Hi. Am I up? I couldn't hear myself bing called on.

CHAIR COHEN: Yes, you're up, Brady. Good to see you again. You have three minutes.

BRADY BRADSHAW: Okay. Thank you again for the opportunity to speak. Brady Bradshaw here with the Center for Biological Diversity. Today, the City of Long Beach requests approval of an annual plan under a five-year

program plan that illegally ramps up production in the Wilmington Oil Field without environmental analysis under CEQA. Drilling on the THUMS Islands needs to be phased out as soon as possible. Instead, the City of Long Beach is vaguely mentioning enhanced oil recovery in their plans and pushing through last-minute drilling to try to preempt SB 1137. It's actually disgraceful.

2.2

The program plan projects 23 wells drilled in the Range Reservoir. But the annual plan actually projects 24 wells to be drilled in the Ranger Reservoir, if folks would examine the contents closely of the annual plan compared to the program plan. This increase above the proposed number of wells in the reservoir is inconsistent with the program plan, and therefore does not meet the Commission's requirements to improve -- approve an annual plan.

The Commission should also require an extensive analysis of the additional costs of decommissioning added by the new drilling or redrilling of each well in the plan. The information is not currently factored into the financial analysis in the program plan or the annual plan. And under the current scheme these unexplained costs may end up falling back on Californians who don't support continued offshore oil drilling and continued spilling.

The program plan clearly lists activities, such

as redrilling, possible new drilling, possible reintroduction of enhanced oil recovery, and other activities that could be capable of producing environmental impacts on air quality, water quality, noise, species, and other CEQA values. The annual plan presented today even mentions possible future construction of a new natural gas pipeline to support operations.

2.2

The City of Long Beach continues to mock the State Lands Commission's directives from the required revisions that they required to the outrageous an extraction-heavy program plan. For example, while the social cost of carbon was clearly intended to be factored into the overall financial calculations, the City continues to justify this external impact through paragraphs or sentences of recognizing that there is a social impact.

But the State, and the City, and the operators should actually take responsibility for these impacts by diverting profits in the amount equal to the social cost of carbon directly into some climate or environmental justice fund, instead of simply justifying that those impacts are okay.

We don't -- we request that the Commission sends this plan back for revisions or outright denies the annual plan, because it's not consistent with the program plan,

and further -- and further the impacts. Thank you.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

2.2

Brady, let me ask you, what organization are you with that you represent?

BRADY BRADSHAW: With the Center for Biological Diversity.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you very much.

Any -- no questions.

Okay. Ms. Chan, are there any other members in the queue?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Yes. Yes. We have one more speaker is Ann Cantrell. Ann, you may unmute yourself and begin your comment.

CHAIR COHEN: Ms. Ann Cantrell, are you ready?

ANN CANTRELL: Hello. Can you hear me?

CHAIR COHEN: Yes.

ANN CANTRELL: Yes. Good afternoon. Ann

Cantrell. I'm co-chair of the Los Cerritos Wetlands

Taskforce of the Sierra Club in Long Beach. We support

the comments and concerns brought forth by the Center for

Biological Diversity and ask for denial of this plan.

We're especially concerned about the risk of offshore spills. The staff report states there have been safety and oil spill prevention audits since 2002. Quote, "Since the first audit, the total number -- total number

of action items has decreased from 3,197 to 601 actions through the last audit in 2019. All of the previously identified action items have been resolved, which demonstrates the value of performing these staff-conducted safety audits," unquote.

The next audit is expected to begin in 2025. We urge you to conduct these safety and oil spill prevention audits every year instead of every five years. There have been too many oil spills off our coast and Long Beach would be greatly affected by an oil spill along with the marine wildlife. So eliminating these spills is a key step that we can take today to help the marine ecosystems recover amidst the many threats they face.

Again, we ask for denial of this plan or at least send it back for more to make it conform with the program plan.

Thank you.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you very much, Ms. Cantrell.

Appreciate your comments. Are there any other members of the public that would like to comment on this item.

Ms. Chan, is there anyone on your end?

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: No.

No, we have no more hands raised for comment at this time.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. I think I see someone coming up in the chamber.

ADAM LEVERENZ: Adam Leverenz. I just want to make a possible uninformed observation. The staff report cited a price per barrel of oil at \$65. On the trading market yesterday, it was \$85 a barrel. I don't know if this is a lower grade perhaps, but if it's not, the revenues could be 30 percent higher than the report indicated. Thank you.

1.3

2.2

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you for bringing that into the record to adequately reflect. Does staff want to speak on this?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Yeah, I'm happy to speak on a couple of different things relating to this item, if it --

CHAIR COHEN: Please do. Yes, absolutely.

of things I wanted to clarify. First is that, as described in the presentation, but just to add a little bit more emphasis, because of the legislation that was passed in 1991, Chapter 941, that was referenced in the presentation, the Commission's role in these operations at the Long Beach Unit was significantly curtailed intentionally. And so, the Commission does not have full discretionary review and approval role over these operations. And it's -- the statutes and the resulting agreements are very clear about the role the State Lands

Commission plays in reviewing these program plans and annual plans. And the Commission is not in a role to approve or disapprove the annual plan. It's essentially to review the annual plan for consistency with the program plan and then accept it essentially for filing. So the role the Commission plays is significantly different than some of the other roles that the Commission has in terms of leasing offshore tide and submerged lands.

2.2

Second, we are a named defendant in a CEQA lawsuit brought by the Center of -- for Biological Diversity alleging noncompliance with CEQA. So it's important that we don't speak to that, because we are in active litigation over that.

And then finally -- or a couple more things. With regards to oil the price, yes, in fact, I was just looking at the oil prices this morning in terms of the different indicators that we use and it's anywhere between \$81 and \$85 per barrel. The annual plan -- the way I like to think about the program plan and the annual plan is the program plan is essentially the city's strategic plan over five years -- looking five years into the future of how they're going to operate the Long Beach Unit Field. The annual plan is the annual budget that they look at consistent with the program plan in terms of operations, revenues, and expenditures. So the \$65 per barrel is

essentially just an estimate for budgetary purposes.

1.3

2.2

Sometimes we've been in years where the average price of oil is down to \$35 a barrel. And then at the height, it's been over \$100 per barrel. So this is really for budgeting and estimation purposes. And we acknowledge that on a day-to-day basis, at least in the last year or more, it's been significantly more than \$65 a barrel.

And then finally, last year, as referenced in the staff report, the Commission ordered significant changes to the program plan that was outlined both in the staff report and the presentation. We sent those ordered revisions to the City. The City responded by including those categories in the revised program plan, but we share some of the concerns and comments that have already been made about the adequacy of the substance of the inclusion of those categories. And we responded to the city's inclusion in February of this year in a letter. And all those are exhibits to our staff report.

Our goal is to continue to work with the city to ensure that their next program plan, which will come before the Commission next year, does comprehensively include a detailed discussion of all the categories the Commission ordered revisions to.

And with that, I'll turn it back over to the Chair.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you very much. I appreciate your additional commentary. It actually helped explain some questions that were not as clear. I do have some ideas that I want to share and just get on the record. I understand that today our vote to accept the annual plan actually falls under the Commission's standard of review to agree that the budget is aligned with the program plan submitted last year. And quite honestly, after reviewing the staff report and the annual plan, I agree that it is in line.

2.2

However, I do want to take a moment to -- and take this opportunity to briefly discuss some of my continued -- my continued concerns regarding the program plan. So overall, I believe it appears that the city addressed each of the revisions we recommended at our last meeting -- at our last meeting last year, although, I was disappointed in the effort and the extent of the environmental justice analysis in particular. I see you nodding. You might be in agreement with me.

And I just want to also state what we know. We know from countless scientific studies and reports, including the City of Long Beach's own community profile study, that the opportunity to be healthy, to be safe, and thriving it's not equal, and that health outcomes are inequitable, and primarily based on raise, based on place,

and economic status. So I was surprised that the City didn't address these known disparities and didn't sufficiently dig into the environmental justice concerns.

2.2

I -- and with that -- and with the clear community interest expressed at our meeting and at the city council meetings, I frankly was just very disappointed that the City didn't provide an additional opportunity for public com - for public engagement following the revisions to their program plan.

So I understand that time was limited and we are limited in our ability to enforce specific revisions, but how can we ensure that the public, and the Long Beach City Council, and the State Lands Commission are all given suitable time for engagement and revisions, so that next time, the program plan -- for the next time when the program plan is updated.

So I'm looking to, I guess, make some more of a process change to ensure that we are listening and not placating people, but that we are seriously being good defenders, as well as good partners for all of the people that we're representing, not just those that are wealthy enough to have a lawyer or a lobbyist to represent their interests, but everyone. So I'll leave that there. I don't -- Commissioner Dumlao, it looked like you have some -- okay. I'm not picking on him, but he's --

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: I agree with everything you said.

CHAIR COHEN: He's so animated over here. He keeps constantly catching my eye. And I'm like is there anything you want to say, besides I agree?

(Laughter).

2.2

CHAIR COHEN: Okay. Seeing none. Well said.

Thank you very much Commissioner Perrault. I appreciate that. Ms. Lucchesi, did you want to add anything to my comments?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: I just want to express my agreement --

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: -- in terms of the process changes -- the substance definitely and also the process changes. And that's something that we are actively working with the City on to ensure that we can work with them earlier on the development of the program plan, so that it is more comprehensive and more accessible in terms of engagement and outreach to the communities that these operations impact.

CHAIR COHEN: Yeah. I mean, the one thing that I hear consistently no matter where we are in the state of California, when you're talking about communities of color, working class people, when you're talking about

tease types of issues, people say the same thing that they don't feel seen, they don't feel heard, their issues are not taken under serious consideration. We are hearing it with the offshore wind issue when we're dealing with the tribes.

2.2

So this, for me, is still something that's very alarming. And, you know, also I want to speak to something that may not often get spoken to, but the level of bias and even racism that exists in the environmental community. Yes, we have environmental justice efforts, but we need to be moving together on the same page and providing the same equal platform for everyone.

So I am very -- hold these issues very close to my heart. I represented the southeastern neighborhoods of Bayview Hunters Point for eight years on the San Francisco Board of Supervisors, and spent a lot of time now as a statewide elected for the last five years connecting with communities of color, communities that are dealing with real life-changing, life-threatening environmental injustices, whether we're talking about particulate matter in the air, whether we're talking about pollution, clean water. You think we -- we talked a little bit early about the Tijuana River, just another example of just how people of color and poor people have just gotten the short end of the stick.

And I hope by the nods that I see in this room that you guys are with me that I'm just tired of it and want to be -- and want to be a little bit more proactive and aggressive in our -- in our approach to just eliminate this, so we don't have to deal with these types of issues. We've got other issues, environmental issues that we have to -- that we have to take on. And this is just a challenge that I believe that we can overcome.

Thank you for listening.

All right. I feel like we need a break.

(Laughter).

2.2

CHAIR COHEN: I feel like we need a moment to gather ourselves before we can continue with the -- with the agenda. Let's see. Okay. So I need to take a motion on this item. We've taken public comment on this. Is there a motion?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: So moved.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. A motion made by

Commissioner Dumlao. Is there a second?

ACTING COMMISSIONER PERRAULT: Second.

CHAIR COHEN: Second by Commissioner Perrault.

Let's go ahead and -- the motion, by the way, is to adopt staff's recommendation just to be clear on the record. I see my attorneys are like getting nervous.

Calm down. I got it.

(Laughter).

CHAIR COHEN: So we've got a motion to adopt staff's recommendation. The motion -- I think this is going to be a unanimous vote. Could you please call the role?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Certainly.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner Dumlao?

ACTING COMMISSIONER DUMLAO: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Commissioner

11 | Perrault?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

13

14

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

12 ACTING COMMISSIONER PERRAULT: Aye.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Chair Cohen?

CHAIR COHEN: Aye.

15 EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: The motion passes 16 unanimously.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. Thank you very much. I appreciate that. Ms. Lucchesi, what's next in the order of business.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Our next order of business is our second public comment period and I do believe we have a handful of commenters that do want to speak during public comment.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. Great. Public comment is my favorite time on the agenda. So, Ms. Chan, if

anyone wants to address the Commission on any matter that's not on today's agenda please come on up to the podium or you may raise your hand on Zoom. And if you are on -- calling in on the phone line, please hit star nine and we will recognize you. Everyone will have an equal amount of time to speak. I'm going to call on those that are here in the chamber first. We're going to first take up members of the public that are here. Then we will move to those joining us virtually.

Ms. Chan, please call the first person that would like to make public comment. Actually, I see him here in the chamber.

ADAM LEVERENZ: Okay.

2.2

CHAIR COHEN: That's okay. We'll still give you three minutes.

ADAM LEVERENZ: Adam Leverenz again. From the gratitude Mayor Bass's representative expressed for you being here, I got the impression that maybe this is unusual for you folks to be holding an in-person meeting in this area.

CHAIR COHEN: We rotate locations across the state of California.

ADAM LEVERENZ: Okay. I also very much appreciate the opportunity to be before someone. Flip phone guy here, so all the stuff doesn't work for me. And

then I have a question for you, Chair Cohen. With your travel here delaying your arrival, will you have opportunity to review the public comment that occurred before your arrival?

CHAIR COHEN: Yes.

2.2

ADAM LEVERENZ: Okay.

CHAIR COHEN: As a matter of fact the women that was chairing is my Deputy on my --

ADAM LEVERENZ: Okay. Great.

CHAIR COHEN: -- executive senior staff members and she took copious notes.

ADAM LEVERENZ: Okay. Awesome.

CHAIR COHEN: So I will have it.

ADAM LEVERENZ: And then as far as the Newport Beach issue. As has been mentioned extreme rent increases being proposed. This is going to contribute to homelessness, which I think everybody knows that there's a problem with homelessness statewide. And I don't think anything should be done to compound that.

And then State Lands Commission documentation says that, "Benchmarks are used to establish uniform rental rates in specific geographic regions with large concentrations of similar facilities, and that the use of benchmarks improves the consistency, transparency, and efficiency of how the Commission establishes rent for

large numbers of similar leases saving time, resources, and money for both applicants and the State."

And I would again opine that we're in Newport
Beach to succeed. Most of those goals are thrown out the
window. And all the efforts to be consistent and
transparent would kind of go by the wayside. And it's
already resulting in wasted time and money.

Thank you.

2.2

CHAIR COHEN: Um-hmm. Thank you for your comments.

All right. Seeing that there are no other -- you would like to speak. Come on.

MARCUS BUSH: Sorry. Last comments. I really think -- it was my first State Lands Commissioner meeting, so really appreciate staff and the commissioners for your leadership on this.

And Chairwoman, I've just go to say, I really, from the bottom of my heart, appreciate you speaking about environmental justice, environmental racism, disparities, people of color. We just need to have sometimes just really uncomfortable conversations. Sometimes we get into conflicts and speaking truth to power is always difficult, but I do this with love. I feel like you do this with love and I hope all of us are doing this with love. And you know, it gets tough, but we just have to be real with

each other and power through.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

20

21

24

And I would love -- I see that you all are rotating your meetings. I see you have it in October 17th in San Diego. I don't know you already had a venue picked out. I would love you guys to come to National City. I would invite you to use our chamber halls. My Mayor is going to be so mad. I haven't even asked him. So I'm going to text him right now. I'll double check, but I would love for you all -- to host you all in the City of National City in our council chambers. You know, and I can work out the logistics, and any of your requirements and whatever you guys need. But we would love to host you all and just continue these deeper conversations.

Thank you.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you. That's an excellent suggestion. Thank you, Councilman.

All right. Ms. Chan, let's go to your --

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: We

19 have no hands raised for comments.

CHAIR COHEN: What? None?

Not one?

22 ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Oh,

23 there's one.

CHAIR COHEN: Okay.

25 ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: Okay.

Our next speaker is Barbara Griffith. You may unmute yourself and start your comment.

3 CHAIR COHEN: Ms. Griffith, thank you very 4 much --

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN:

Barbara.

2.2

CHAIR COHEN: -- for waiting. The floor is yours.

Ms. Griffith, go ahead.

BARBARA GRIFFITH: Okay. Can you hear me?

CHAIR COHEN: Yes.

BARBARA GRIFFITH: Awesome. All right. So I'm calling in. First all, I want to thank you guys. You're so professional. You're so nice. I really love it. What a labor of love to sit on this committee -- this commissioner[sic]. I mean, thank God for you guys. You seem like you have, you know, it really well together and look for the public interest.

So I am with the Newport Beach and imposing the rate hike. And I'm sure that you're aware of it. You've received a lot of information and you had a meeting yesterday with the Commissioners. I just want to express that there is something seriously wrong with our city. I hate to say that, because I love Newport Beach. But as I get more and more involved in this issue with the raising

of the mooring fees, I can see true discrimination. Even if you take a look at -- there's 750 private docks meeting people with big houses that have big boats in front of their homes.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

They contribute -- 750 of them contribute \$300,000 a year. Okay. That's how much they pay. There is 800 and let's say 50 moorings in Newport Harbor. moorings are made up of school teachers, retirees, police officers, people who own boats that have them in a mooring and want to have family enjoyment in the Newport Harbor taxpayers. There's approximately 800 of them, probably a little bit more. They pay 1.3 million a year. They do not use -- we all use the same tidelands, okay? We all -it's the same body of water. So I really, really pray that you pay attention to what -- it's -- to us, meaning the people that are trying to tell you there's something wrong with our city. We know that there are powerful people. We know that the City Council, and the Harbor Commission, and all these private yacht clubs, and the people that you met with yesterday -- I think two of them that you met with yesterday have homes on the water, right?

So that -- but our city is controlled by the wealthy. And that is our problem, we don't have a voice. We've had to fund raise for \$47,000 so far to hire legal

representation, yet they can have their attorney at their disposal. So I hope that you hear us. They are -- by the way, last thing, they are getting these 50-year leased land from this -- from -- anyway. I'm out of time, but thank you again for your service.

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you very much for sticking with us to this point on the agenda.

Ms. Chan, are there any other members on the public --

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: No.

CHAIR COHEN: -- of the public --

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: No.

CHAIR COHEN: -- that would like to speak?

All right.

2.2

ASSOCIATE GOVERNMENT PROGAM ANALYST CHAN: No. 16 We're good. Thank you.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. Thank you. Okay, we'll move along then. All right, if anyone -- I get so excited I get confused in my -- lost in my script. I tell you I love public comment. All right. Seeing that there are no questions, Ms. Lucchesi, what's the next order of business?

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Our next order of business is closed session, but I do need to do a couple of report out -- report outs before we head into closed

session.

2.2

CHAIR COHEN: Okay.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: First, regarding items 50 and 51 on the informational calendar, Government Code section 11126 subdivision (c)(7) allows a State body to discuss real property negotiations in closed session provided that before the closed session the State body in open session identifies the real property concerned and the person or persons with whom the negotiator may negotiate with.

In accordance with this requirement, I announce that the Commission will conference in closed session with its real property negotiators regarding the following items:

Item 50 addresses four applications for assignment of leases governing the use of existing offshore oil and gas pipelines traversing State waters associated with the Santa Ynez Unit in federal waters including the Ellwood Pier and two mooring buoys offshore Santa Barbara County. The negotiating parties are the State Lands Commission, ExxonMobil, and Sable Offshore Corporation. Under negotiation are price and terms.

Also item 51 regarding an application for assignment of two existing oil and gas production leases commonly referred to as the West Montalvo leases where the

wellheads are located on the upland, but produce from reservoirs in State waters, offshore Ventura County. The negotiating parties are the State Lands Commission, California Resources Corporation, and Cal NRG LLC. Under negotiation are price and terms and statutory compliance.

That concludes my report.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. Thank you very much. So now, we will adjourn into closed session. Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

(Off record: 2:00 p.m.)

(Thereupon the meeting recessed into

closed session.)

2.2

(Thereupon the meeting reconvened open session.)

(on record: 2:48 p.m.)

CHAIR COHEN: Thank you. Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Let the time reflect it's 2:48. We're coming back into open session.

I'd like to acknowledge Jennifer Lucchesi at this moment.

EXECUTIVE OFFICER LUCCHESI: Certainly. So consistent with Government Code section 11126 subdivision (c)(7), the Commission met in closed session with its real property negotiators regarding two assignment applications. The first addressing the proposed assignment from ExxonMobil to Sable Offshore Corporation

of four leases that support the Santa Ynez Unit offshore
Santa Barbara County, and the second addressing a proposed
assignment from California Resources Corporation to
California NRG of two oil production leases offshore
Ventura County. That concludes my report out.

CHAIR COHEN: All right. Thank you very much.

So there are no other action items. There are no other agenda items on this agenda, so it is with a sad heart that I have to say our work is done for the day. But don't worry, we will come back and reconvene soon and we will have another agenda full.

Thank you, everyone. We are adjourned for the day.

(Thereupon the California State Lands
Commission meeting adjourned at 2:49 p.m.)

2.2

J&K COURT REPORTING, LLC

JPETERS@JKREPORTING.COM

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing California State Lands Commission meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, and was thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by computer-assisted transcription;

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 14th day of April, 2024.

James 4

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR Certified Shorthand Reporter License No. 10063