43. ASSEMBLY BILL 2050 (SANTA MONICA CAUSEWAY) - W.O. 4267.

The Chairman reported that several telegrams had been received relative to the Commission's stand on A.B. 2050. He asked that these be made a matter of record, as follows:

(1) Telegram signed by Councilmen Clo Hoover and Corey, urging that the Commission ask the Governor to veto A.B. 2050.

(2) Telegram from William J. O'Connor, President, Santa Monica Property Taxpayers Association, representing 3000 members of that Association, requesting that the Commission ask the Governor to veto A.B. 2050.

(3) Telegram from Doctor Basil Gordon, stating that a large number of people are opposed to the Causeway -- including 350,000 surfers in the United States Surfing Association, 75,000 members of the Democratic Council, and a thousand members of the Audubon Society, Nature Conservancy, California; the Daily Bruin, representing 20,000 U.C.L.A. students; etc. -- and requesting that the Commission ask the Governor to veto A.B. 2050.

The Executive Officer, in response to a request from the Chairman for clarification, referred to the status report submitted on legislation, Minute Item 44, pages 11,449-11,464, which includes A.B. 2050. He stated that this bill, which had gone to the Governor for consideration for signature or veto, contained substantial amendments in conformance with the position of the State Lands Commission, but that the primary basic objection by the Lands Commission on further tideland grants was never considered or reflected in any legislative modification of A.B. 2050. Therefore, in the report pending to the Governor's Office from the Commission, it would be reported that the Commission recommended the enactment of a moratorium on the issuance of new grants until such time as the various studies being conducted by executive and legislative branches of State government are completed and appropriate legislative control specifications have been adopted.

The Legislature, in passing A.B. 2050, elected to disregard this recommendation.

Commissioner Cranston moved that the State Lands Commission recommend to the Governor that he veto A.B. 2050 for the following reasons: the bill does not allow adequate time to study the far-reaching implications of a proposed major project in Santa Monica Bay; there would not be adequate State administrative controls over the proposed project; the bill does not protect the State's interest or guarantee to the public that it would get an adequate return in exchange for tideland grants; the bill would allow unprecedented authority to a local joint-powers agency; it would grant tidelands under unprecedented trust terms. Commissioner Cranston pointed out that although he was not opposed to a causeway or fill designed for the public good, he was not certain that the contemplated project was carefully enough planned.

Commissioner Champion stated that he was not going to act upon the motion at this time, as the Department of Finance was making a complete study of the question preliminary to making a recommendation to the Governor, and he did not want to bind himself. However, he indicated that he was in agreement with many of the statements made by Commissioner Cranston.

Commissioner Anderson seconded the motion, and stated that he agreed in most part with what Commissioner Cranston had said; that although the concept of a causeway may have some merit, A.B. 2050 does not provide adequate protection for the State's interest in the Santa Monica Bay.

Mr. F. M. McLaughlin, Legislative Representative for the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, reported that the Board endorses A.B. 2050, and asked that the record clearly indicate that Assemblyman Stevens, who introduced the bill, could not be present at this meeting because of an engatement made some three months previously to speak in Los Angeles; otherwise he would be present. Mr. McLaughlin was of the opinion that the requirement for approval of the County's master plan by the State Legislature would adequately protect the State's interests, and urged action against the motion made by Commissioner Cranston.

A RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED, RECOMMENDING TO THE GOVERNOR THAT HE VETO A.B. 2050, WITH COMMISSIONERS ANDERSON AND CRANSTON VOTING AYE, AND COMMISSIONER CHAMPION NOT VOTING.