MINUTE ITEM

The attached Calendar Item 16 was submitted for information only, no Commission action thereon being necessary.

Attachment: Calendar Item 16 (8 pages)



INFORMATIVE CALENDAR ITEM

16.

STATUS OF MAJOR LITIGATION

As of June 30, 1972, there were 218 litigation projects involving the Commission, an increase of 7 from last month. There are three general categories: Condemnation (62 projects), Quiet Title Action (100) and Other (56). The status of the projects most active in the past month is contained in the following summary:

1.	Dillon v. Atchison,	Topeka and Santa Fe Railway Company	₩ 503.456
	San Diego Superior	Court Case No. 283455	

(To determine validity of <u>Tideland Survey No. 17</u>, based upon a Patent from the Governor of about 1871.)

The San Diego Unified Port District and the State of California have filed the Joint Respondents' Brief. After appellants' closing brief is filed, the case will be argued before the Appellate Court.

2. <u>Boyd v. State</u> <u>Contra Costa Superior Court Case No. 95769</u>

(Flaintiff seeks to <u>quiet title</u> to several alleged berms of approximately one acre within <u>Piper Slough</u> between Bethel Island and Frank's Tract on the basis of adverse possession.)

Trial is scheduled for the latter part of July, 1972.

3. <u>Napa Sanitation District v. State, et al.</u> <u>Napa Superior Court Case No. 22114</u>

\$3

(<u>Condemnation</u>, action by plaintiff for lands adjacent to <u>Napa River</u> several miles below the City of Napa for use as settling ponds.)

The matter was taken off the trial calendar as Plaintiff has now settled with all defendants other than the State. The Attorney General and State Lands Division staff are in the process of completing a proposed settlement between the State and the Plaintiff for the consideration of the Commission and the Board of Plaintiff District.

W 503.470

7/72

シスト

W 503.498

-1-

Miller v. City of Santa Monica, et al. Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 892295

(An action by private upland owners involving <u>title to</u> <u>tidelands</u> that have artificially accreted. Both the State Lands Commission and the Division of Braches and Parks have interests to protect.)

Plaintiffs voluntarily dismissed the case. State and City may file new action if the parties do not remove the encroachments.

Notices by City and Attorney General mailed September 24, 1971, and October 28, 1971, to the 34 property owners believed to be responsible for the encroachments involved in this matter, informing the owners that action would be taken by the State of California and the City of Senta Monica if they failed to voluntarily remove the encroachments within sixty days. A public meeting was held April 6, 1972, for general exchange of views to explore possibility of settlement. Landowners were requested to respond within thirty days to City and State proposals. The State Department of Parks and Recreation will handle the bulk of the research work as they have been vested with the tideland portion of the grant.

5. <u>County of San Matco v. Ideal Cement Company, et al.</u> W 503.539 San Mateo Superior Court Case No. 125379 (companion case to No. 144257)

(In order to obtain uniformity of decision, the State has filed an answer to the Complaint. This action is a condemnation matter brought by the County of San Mateo, concerning lands located within the aforementioned statutes (Ch. 1857/65). The State contends that said lands were granted in trust to the County, or in the alternative, that the County received an easement over said lands in trust which permits the County to use the subject property for the purposes contemplated by the condemnation action.)

Stipulation has been signed by all parties, continuing any further proceedings in the case until there is a resolution of the issues presented in <u>State of California v. County of San Mateo, et al.</u> Case No. 144257 (W 1839.28). Maps have been prepared but are not yet approved. An agreement has been reached to withhold their being filed for record.

W 503.510

6. <u>Marin Municipal Water District v. State</u> <u>Marin Superior Court Case No. 49577</u>

(Plaintiff seeks to <u>quiet title</u> to lands alleged by the State to be located within the former bed of the State-owned <u>San</u> <u>Rafael Canal</u> consisting of a tidal navigable waterway reserved by the former Board of Tide Land Commissioners.)

The case is at issue. No current action pending completion of the survey by the City (Trust Grantee) pursuant to Chapter 1742, Statutes of 1971.

7. <u>County of Orange, et al. v. Heim, State of California</u> <u>Real Party in Interest</u> <u>Orange Superior Court Case No. M-1105 (formerly Case</u> No. 4 Civil 9344)

(Petition for <u>Writ of Mandate involving the legality of the</u> <u>Upper Newport Bay Exchange</u> approved by the State Lands Commission.)

On February 18, 1971, the trial court upheld the action of the Commission in approving the valiably of the Orange County-Irvine Exchange Agreement. The appeal therefrom is still pending. Closing briefs will not be completed for about 30 days. Appellant Heim's Opening Brief was served upon the Attorney General on February 22, 1972. Intervenor's Opening Brief has been filed and the State is now preparing its Brief in this matter.

8. <u>Simpson v. State</u> <u>Sonoma Superior Court Case No. 60178</u>

> (Plaintiff seeks to <u>quiet title</u> to a portion of <u>Bodega Bay</u> as successor to a State Tideland Patent.)

> State and County (Trust Grantee) claim public ownership by reason of the tidal-navigable character of the waterway in its natural location. Settlement negotiations are in process.

W 503.541

W 4926 W 503.576

₩ 503.578

565

9. Delta Farms Reclamation District v. State San Joaquin Superior Court Case No. 97183

(Plaintiff seeks to <u>guiet title</u> to an alleged berm of about 80 acres in <u>San Joaquin (Old River)</u> west of Stockton at Bacon Island as the claimed successor to a State Swamp and Overflowed Patent.)

Have had Discovery; Pre-Trial Conference is anticipated in the fall of 1972.

10. Federated Mortgage Investors, et al. v. Charles Lick, et al. W 5 Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. 940856

W 503.586

₩ 503.585

(An action between private parties to determine ownership of the Lick Pier (Pacific Ocean Park), and to <u>determine the ordin-</u> ary high water mark at that point.)

The Federal Court has refused to take jurisdiction to determine the Mean High Tide Line, and the private parties will bring a State suit to determine the Mean High Tide Line. On May 26, 1972, the State was sued in Declaratory Relief by Matador Land Co. to determine the location of the Mean High Tide Line (L.A. Superior Court Case No. 30527).

11. Donnell v. Bisso Sonoma Superior Court Case No. 62402 ₩ 503.607

(Plaintiff seeks to quiet title to about two miles of the bed of Bihler Slough located immediately north of Tubbs Island.)

A State response will not be required until plaintiff amends his complaint. A probable defense of the State will be that lands within the Slough are State-owned tidal-navigable waters.

...4m

12. U.S. v. 1119.992 Acres (Solano) 1418 U.S. v. 1393.464 Acres (Contra Costa) 369

> (These are omnibus U.S. <u>condemnations</u> for the Port Chicago buffer zone. Numerous parcels are included with questions involving disputed boundaries of the State's ownership of the bed of the tidal-navigable waters of <u>Suisun Bay and</u> <u>adjacent waterways.</u>)

The different parcels are in various stages of litigation. Settlement negotiations are under way with respect to several parcels, with the State having recently executed a disclaimer as to Parcel 644, excluding Hastings Slough.

13. Southern Pacific Transportation v. Evers Solano Superior Court Case No. 49386

W 503.631

₩ 503.641

(Plaintiff seeks to <u>quiet title</u> to lands along the <u>Vallejo</u> <u>Waterfront</u> as successor to a Railroad Grant and a Tideland Patent.)

The boundaries and the existence and extent of any private interests are disputed by State. Settlement negotiations are in process, with the trial scheduled to recommence on July 20, 1972.

14. <u>Union Pacific Railroad Company, et al. v. City of Long</u> Beach Court of Appeals Case No. 36989, 2nd Civ.

(Suit attacking the City of Long Beach <u>business license</u> <u>tax on oil production</u>. That portion of the ordinance providing for revenues from unitized tideland operations was declared unconstitutional.)

On March 30, 1972, the California Appellate Court handed down its decision reversing the trial court. This constitutes a victory for the State and City.

The Appellate Court upheld the validity of Section 6100.99-2 of the Long Beach Municipal Code. The tidelands trust will be reimbursed for the tax money. The money judgment awarded by the trial court to L.B.O.D. was reversed, and the portion of the taxes previously paid need not be returned.

Plaintiff is expected to seek a rehearing in the California Supreme Court, as approximately \$10,000,000 of State funds are involved in this case. The Notice of Appeal has not yet been received. W 503.625 W 503.628

15. <u>Westward Properties v. State</u> <u>Butte Superior Court Case No. 50579</u>

> (Plaintiff seeks to <u>quiet title</u> to lands claimed by the State to be located within the former bed of the Stateowned <u>Feather River</u> in Butte County just north of the Jutter County line.)

> The case is at issue with no settlement negotiations in process.

16. <u>Marin Yacht Club v. State</u> <u>Marin Superior Court Case No. 58068</u>

> (Plaintiff seeks to <u>quiet title</u> to lands claimed by the State to be located within the bed of the State-owned <u>San Rafael Canal</u>, consisting of a tidal-navigable waterway reserved by the former Board of Tide Land Commissioners.)

The State's response to the complaint has not been filed and there is no current action in the case pending the survey by the City (Trust Grantee) pursuant to Chapter 1742, Statutes of 1971.

17. County of Orange v. Chandler Sherman, et al. Orange Superior Court Case No. 178401

(The County brought the action, on an implied dedication theory, to <u>quiet title</u> to certain beach property near Dana Point.)

No change; ...e., Chandler Sherman filed an Answer and Cross Complaint on July 1, 1971.

18. <u>Sebastiani v. State</u> <u>Sonoma Superior Court Case No. 66440</u>

> (Plaintiffs seek to <u>quiet title</u> to half the bed of <u>Sonoma</u> <u>Creek</u> adjacent to its right or westerly bank upstream for about one mile from the Highway 121 Bridge a short distance below the City of Sonoma.)

The State claims the creek is a tidal-navigable waterway with the issue raised of State fee title in the lower meandered portion and a public easement over the upper portion. The case is at issue with settlement negotiations in process. Trial is scheduled for July 17, 1972. W 503.677

568

W 503.669

W 503.667

W 503.642

--6--

19. People v. Robinson Humboldt Superior Court Case No. 44736

> (<u>Condemnation</u> for that portion of the State Highway Bridge in Humboldt Bay between Eureka and Samoa Peninsula which crosses <u>Woodley Island</u>.)

The State and the City of Eureka (Trust Grantee) are seeking to establish the boundary between the private lands of the Island and the State-owned tidal-navigable waters of the bay. The case is at the pleading stage, with the responsive pleadings of the State and the City only recently having been filed.

20. U.S. v. 1164.34 Acres U.S. District Court Case No. 2274

> (U.S. <u>condemnation</u> action for wildlife refuge of all the mud flats between the <u>Sears Point Highway and San Pablo</u> <u>Bay</u> bounded by Mare Island Navy Yard on the east and Sonoma Creek on the west.)

State claims public ownership of the lands as being tidelands and submerged lands not included within the upland Swamp and Overflowed Lands Patent.

21. <u>People v. William Kent Estate Company</u> Marin Superior Court Case No. 32824

> (Retrial of an action to <u>abate a public nuisance</u> (a fence erected and maintained perpendicular to the shoreline) on the Pacific Ocean side of the <u>Bolinas Lagoon Sandspit</u>. The case involved a judicial interpretation of the Statutory phrase "Ordinary High Water Mark.")

Pranscripts on Appeal have been completed. Request for corrections of the record on appeal have been filed by the Attorney General's Office. Hearing was held April 24, 1972, on State's request for corrections. Request for corrections were denied except as to 6 items. Request for transcript has been filed with Court of Appeal. Appellate Court will be requested to augment the record. Appellant's (State) Opening Brief being prepared. W 503.694

W 503.696

W 1839.24

W 6987 22. State of California v. County of San Matec. et al. W 1839.28 San Mateo Superior Court Case No. 144257

(A declaratory relief action to determine what interests were conveyed in trust to the County of San Mateo by Chapter 1857, Statutes of 1965, in certain tidelands and submerged lands in South San Francisco Bays)

First Amended Complaint for Declaratory Relief and to Quiet Title was filed on November 15, 1971. On April 21, 1972, Westbay Community Associates filed a cross complaint to add thousands of ares within the bay to the suit.

W 1839.29 23. People v. Vincilione, et al. (People v. Evans, et al.) Riverside Superior Court Case No. 15156

(An action to protect fishing rights in the Colorado River.)

Matter still under submission. Interrogatories have been filed by both sides. Title to the natural bed of the river is in question.

24. People v. Clarita Valley Salvage, Inc., et al. Ventura Superior Court Case No. 54428

(An action for relief under the Harbors and Navigation Code Section 552; injunction; trespass and for damages.)

This action is to enable the State to take possession of the ship La Jenelle, to effectively guard it and have it removed. A temporary restraining order was granted on the State's behalf March 27, 1972. A hearing on the State's request for a preliminary injunction was held May 26, 1972. A preliminary injunction was issued June 2, 1972, granting the State all relief sought in the action.

W 1839.30