

1 rest of the people I represent -- I would recommend --  
2 we do not say that we should never have a bridge, but we do  
3 feel there is no just cause and when there is, we would be glad  
4 to have it. We would like if your honorable body does grant  
5 the tideland funds that your last sentence in the last para-  
6 graph be deleted because I think it is tying a liability on  
7 to the City. This is in regard to the traffic survey. I don't  
8 feel this is realistic, but that would be up to you gentlemen.

9 GOV. ANDERSON: What is that?

10 MR. ZWEIBACK: Page 15.

11 GOV. ANDERSON: You said the last sentence?

12 MR. BUEHLER: The last sentence in regards to the  
13 traffic survey in no less than three years to decide the amount  
14 of traffic which is going over the bridge and attributable to  
15 the Marina.

16 GOV. ANDERSON: In other words, you are suggesting  
17 that if we were to approve it, we should delete about six  
18 lines from where it says "It is further recommended ..."?

19 MR. BUEHLER: That's right, yes sir. However, that's  
20 up to you gentlemen, but we again wish to express our deepest  
21 appreciation for allowing us to be heard and respectfully re-  
22 quest that this item be held over until there is a full review  
23 of facts and not on assumptions.

24 MR. HORTIG: The provisions of Chapter 29 provide  
25 that if there is to be an approved expenditure of funds this  
26 has to be an advance expenditure. However, measuring the size

1 of an advance approval of an expenditure for a project for  
2 which we can have no reasonable yardstick at this time is,  
3 of course, a difficult problem for the Commission and this  
4 is inherent in the majority of the projects conducted by the  
5 City of Long Beach. So the procedure ever since the effective  
6 date of Chapter 29 has been, in effect, that these advance  
7 approvals will be on an estimated basis -- subject, however,  
8 to final determination based on audit and engineering review  
9 after the project is completed, which is the first time that  
10 we really have some precise data to work with. Hence, dele-  
11 tion of the last sentence of the recommendation, as recommended  
12 by Mr. Buehler, would eliminate any yardstick which the staff  
13 could use to come back and give the Commission a factual  
14 measure of the actual implications of this project. The  
15 \$190,600 is simply an estimated figure at this time, which  
16 would be adjusted upward or downward depending upon the pro-  
17 portion of authorized use, after the project is actually in use.

18 MR. ZWEIBACK: I wonder if we could ask Mr. Buehler  
19 what his purpose would be in suggesting that that sentence be  
20 deleted.

21 MR. BUEHLER: Well, it seems to me that the three-  
22 year time period is possibly a little short to really get a  
23 true picture of the general area. I agree if a bridge should  
24 be there, fine; I still am not in favor of it, but I feel pos-  
25 sibly this three-year period would be too soon. I want to go  
26 along with the City as much as we can, but I don't feel it is



7  
1 necessary at this time -- but if it necessary that you do it.

2 GOV. ANDERSON: You understand why we have to have  
3 the traffic count, don't you -- to determine actually how  
4 much is tidelands and how much isn't. It would be impossible  
5 to determine otherwise which cars went one way or another  
6 without a traffic count.

7 MR. BUEHLER: It is my understanding there is pos-  
8 sibly 5,000 people waiting to get their boats in the slips.  
9 It seems to me it might be possible to take a thousand of  
10 these people and see where they live. It wouldn't be too  
11 difficult to see how many of these people would be tying their  
12 boats up in the Marina. This shouldn't be a difficult way.

13 MR. GRANSTON: Mr. Chairman, I think it should be  
14 pointed out -- I don't think everyone is aware -- the traffic  
15 count is suggested to be no less than three years after this  
16 is completed. This traffic count is not something before the  
17 bridge would be built. It's something that would be done  
18 after using the bridge.

19 MR. KENDIG: I'd like to hold it down, but I'd like  
20 to put in my two bits' worth.

21 GOV. ANDERSON: Would you state your name?

22 MR. KENDIG: Tom Kendig, citizen of Long Beach. I  
23 live near the area where the bridge would be placed and feel  
24 vitally interested. Five years ago I went down to the Engineer's  
25 office because I heard of the proposed plan. I was told by  
26 the Engineer's office that this plan was only in the Planning

1 Commission's minds -- the City Engineers were not interested  
2 in it, the bridge had no application, would not accomplish  
3 anything were it to be built. Therefore, I think the Lands  
4 Commission should strongly consider the advisability of author-  
5 izing money for a bridge which the engineers felt five years  
6 ago would serve no purpose. More recently, the traffic was  
7 brought around Marina area to Belmont Shore. Now, four-  
8 fifths of the docks to be in the new Marina will be outside  
9 of the Naples area. Only 240 will actually be on the island  
10 of Naples. All the rest of these docks will be outside Naples.  
11 There will be no occasion for them to be using this bridge,  
12 no occasion for them to use the Belmont Shore bridge, the  
13 Davies bridge. So this bridge -- I see no purpose for which  
14 this should be authorized.

15 Furthermore, obviously the location of this bridge  
16 is going to destroy property values about there, the thing we  
17 are all concerned in maintaining, and I suppose that isn't  
18 under consideration; but if it is realized that actually the  
19 bridge will not serve the purpose which is proposed, that is,  
20 of relieving any congestion in traffic, then the use of tide-  
21 land funds for this purpose would be inadvisable.

22 GOV. ANDERSON: Mr. Hortig, the statement has been  
23 made that this bridge would serve no purpose several times now.  
24 I assume you have checked into this.

25 MR. HORTIG: Mr. Chairman, this is exactly the pur-  
26 pose of the last sentence of the recommendation. If this

1 eventually -- despite reports to the contrary by the City  
2 engineers, City Manager, and the other City officials of Long  
3 Beach -- were to be the case, then the City of Long Beach  
4 would be permitted to defray no portion of the cost from tide-  
5 land funds if this becomes a fact. This is the advantage of  
6 the yardstick proposed by the Commission as a condition of the  
7 approval.

8 If, on the other hand, there is substantial tideland  
9 interest use of the structure in fact after it is completed,  
10 then a proper proportion can be determined, based on actual  
11 use rather than an estimate, and the appropriate amounts which  
12 can be authorized by the Commission will have the required  
13 advance approval as provided for by statute.

14 MR. CARR: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask this ques-  
15 tion. I sympathize with the people who are objecting to the  
16 building of the bridge. If I went to buy a place there and had  
17 a boat of my own, I wouldn't be enthusiastic about a bridge;  
18 but I don't think that's our problem at all. I think we  
19 should find out if it has finally been approved and if the City  
20 makes such recommendations to us, don't we have to adopt or  
21 refuse to adopt the resolution? I think we are being asked to  
22 settle a local fight and without regard to the merits of that  
23 fight, I think we have to stay out of that. I don't think  
24 it's any of our business whatever, except if it is proper to  
25 use State funds for the purpose of this bridge. Am I right  
26 or wrong?

1 MR. HORTIG: Mr. Commissioner, I think it is a  
2 succinct explanation of the entire problem and we have a  
3 request from the City of Long Beach asking for approval to  
4 the extent the Commission can give it for the expenditure of  
5 tideland funds, which has been finally proposed by the City  
6 of Long Beach, for construction.

7 MR. CARR: May I ask another question: Even if we  
8 were to give approval of this project this morning, does that  
9 prevent these objectors here from going back to their own  
10 city government, where their objection should have been made  
11 mainly?

12 MR. HORTIG: I can't foresee any circumstances  
13 how the citizens would be precluded from so doing. The objec-  
14 tions presented here this morning -- the allegations are  
15 that their objections haven't been heard.

16 MR. CARR: I think they are putting us on the spot.  
17 I think that we should act on this thing without reference to  
18 the objections of the people. I sympathize with them as far  
19 as it concerns their property, but also it has been considered  
20 by the City of Long Beach and other people who would be using  
21 this road, and it seems to me the two sides are very, very  
22 important to those concerned but I don't think we should be  
23 asked to enter into any part of local dispute as to where a  
24 bridge should be put.

25 MR. HORTIG: This, of course, was the purpose of the  
26 instruction by the Commission at the time of the grant of



1 deferment of consideration at the last meeting -- that the  
2 problem be taken back to the local level, with the hope that  
3 it be resolved at local level before this application was  
4 again presented to the Commission, feeling that the Commission's  
5 authority extended only to consideration of the application  
6 insofar as it involves the possible expenditure of tideland  
7 oil funds and not as to the merits or demerits of the project  
8 as such, as presented here by local residents this morning.

9 MR. ZWEIBACK: I think it might be helpful to the  
10 opponents to know that the Commission is in this position:  
11 Where a project of this sort has been approved by the  
12 Attorney General as being eligible and the staff has indicated  
13 it is feasible for the use of tideland funds, if the Commission  
14 decided to reject the project the City would have recourse to  
15 the courts for permission to spend these funds.

16 MR. GARR: Mr. Chairman, I object to hearing any  
17 more of the objectors because I think it is redundant and not  
18 part of our job. If the City of Long Beach has determined it  
19 is in order, I'd like to know if it is, and if it is from the  
20 legal standpoint, I think we should act on it. I don't like  
21 to be disagreeable and don't want to be, but I don't think we  
22 should be put on this spot.

23 MR. TRASK: May I direct a question? If  $13\frac{1}{2}\%$  of  
24 the Marina would be served by this bridge compared to the other  
25  $87\frac{1}{2}\%$ , we have not been able to meet with the City Council, what  
26 is our recourse? What can we do?

1 MR. CARR: The City Council isn't this body. We  
2 have the Attorney General's report here. Why don't we hear  
3 from him?

4 MR. GOLDIN: Gentlemen, as a general rule, the  
5 Commission undoubtedly should confine itself to the legality  
6 of proposed expenditure as distinguished from its wisdom. By  
7 that I mean that the Commission ordinarily will not purport to  
8 substitute its discretion for that of the local governing body  
9 as to the desirability of a proposed project. I am not for  
10 a moment stating that there may not be such unusual circumstances  
11 where the wisdom demonstrated by the local body might actually  
12 constitute an abuse of discretion; but from the facts as pre-  
13 sented to this honorable body this morning, that does not  
14 appear to be the case -- at least in my personal opinion.

15 I would like finally to make two observations. With  
16 respect to Mr. Shallenberger's concern relative to through  
17 traffic, I wish to emphasize that the Attorney General's opinion  
18 and the Commission's action is predicated on the assumption  
19 that through traffic cannot be financed by the use of City  
20 tideland funds.

21 The last observation I'd like to make is along the  
22 lines that Mr. Carr has been pursuing and that is, should the  
23 City have determined to use general funds for the construction  
24 of this particular project, there would be absolutely nothing  
25 that this Commission could then do.

26 MR. GAY: I'd like to raise one point here about



1 tideland funds. If the City did not have the money for this,  
2 they would probably be forced to go through a bond issue and  
3 this would go to election, where the people would have a chance  
4 to vote on this, therefore you would get the actual opinion as  
5 to the bridge. As it is now, the City has presented its decision  
6 here and it's up to you to say yes or no, but we will have no  
7 alternative in the matter.

8 GOV. ANDERSON: (To gentleman indicating wish to  
9 address Commission) Can you make your point very brief?

10 MR. GREGORY: J. N. Gregory, 5651 Cerritos Drive,  
11 Long Beach. As custodian of the so-called funds, the tidelands  
12 funds, shouldn't the State Lands Commission investigate the  
13 desirability as well as the legality of expending money on a  
14 facility that may not be necessary?

15 GOV. ANDERSON: This is what our staff does. This  
16 is what Mr. Hortig's job is.

17 MR. GREGORY: We feel it is a waste of public money  
18 to install a bridge where there is no need for it; regardless  
19 of whether it is public money, there is no need to throw it  
20 away, when there is no present need, whether it will benefit  
21 the Marina or not.

22 MR. CRANSTON: If this traffic count three years  
23 after this bridge is built reveals that, it would be refused?

24 MR. HORTIG: That is right.

25 MR. CRANSTON: Mr. Chairman, I am very reluctant to  
26 make a motion on this. I'd like to say to those of you who

1 have come from Long Beach, I think you have presented some  
2 very good points and I wish I was on the Long Beach City  
3 Council so I could aid you; but it's like certain cases --  
4 a judge, when certain evidence is put in, has to strike certain  
5 evidence from the case. We are only entitled to listen as to  
6 the legality of the expenditure of the funds and whether the  
7 tidelands funds would be damaged by allocation to any project  
8 and we have precedent as to what we can do, that will deter-  
9 mine whether any some portion of the money will be used;  
10 but we are unable to look to the desirability. We are only  
11 permitted to look to the legality and that is in the instruc-  
12 tion as to how we are supposed to conduct ourselves in the  
13 Lands Commission.

14 Pursuant to your wishes to be heard, we did move  
15 the meeting down here from Sacramento and also pursuant to  
16 your desires we let it be known to the City Council to permit  
17 you to have a meeting so that you might appear there and dis-  
18 cuss the points brought up; and we received a letter from Mr.  
19 Vickers, the City Manager, saying "We question the purpose to  
20 be served" and it was not held. This is your City; it is your  
21 City Council. It has the legal power to make a decision, which  
22 we don't have, much as we might like to in our own hearts.

23 Therefore, stating that, with real reluctance because  
24 I know your feelings, I make the motion we accept the recommen-  
25 dation of the staff.

26 MR. CARR: I second it for the same reason.

1 GOV. ANDERSON: Moved and seconded. If there is  
2 no objection, it will be so ordered unanimously.

3 Item 6 -- sales of vacant State school land.

4 First applicant is item (a) - Maxwell Greenberg, etcetera.

5 Any comment on these? We will go on then. Item (a) -

6 Maxwell Greenberg, etcetera; (b) Maxwell Greenberg, etcetera;

7 (c) Andrew F. Kay; (d) Ben Mednick et al; (e) Michael

8 Slatinsky and T. S. Goodman; (f) Michael Slatinsky and T. S.

9 Goodman. Any comments?

10 MR. HORTIG: All bids received, Mr. Chairman, were  
11 equal to or in excess of appraised value. It is recommended  
12 that the lands be sold with the required statutory reservations.

13 MR. CRANSTON: So move.

14 MR. CARR: Second.

15 GOV. ANDERSON: It has been moved and seconded these  
16 be approved.

17 Item 7 -- Approval of selection of vacant Federal  
18 lands and the sale thereof, and the first applicant is George  
19 McCarthy (Item (a)) San Bernardino County, and the second one  
20 is item (b) - Ernest M. McKee in Lake County.

21 MR. HORTIG: These items relate to applications  
22 filed originally by the applicants you enumerated, Mr.  
23 Anderson. Mr. McCarthy withdrew and Mr. McKee was unsuccessful  
24 in litigation. However, the State Lands Commission is still  
25 in a position to complete the selection of these Federal lands,  
26 to obtain them from the Federal government, and thereafter



1 place them on the vacant State school land list pursuant to  
2 established procedures; and it is recommended that authoriza-  
3 tion be given for us to acquire the lands for the benefit of  
4 the State.

5 MR. CARR: Move.

6 MR. CRANSTON: Second.

7 GOV. ANDERSON: Item 8 - Lease offer for extraction  
8 of sand and gravel at minimum royalty 12¢ per cubic yard,  
9 Sacramento County .....

10 MR. CRANSTON: Mr. Chairman, I move that may be put  
11 over to our next meeting in Sacramento.

12 MR. CARR: Second.

13 GOV. ANDERSON: On the motion, this isn't the next  
14 meeting of the Commission, but the next in Sacramento?

15 MR. CRANSTON: Yes.

16 GOV. ANDERSON: Next, Item 9 -- proposed budget  
17 1960. Mr. Hortig?

18 MR. HORTIG: The budget data which is furnished to  
19 the Commission for review and approval at this time was  
20 furnished and the approval is desired in order that this pro-  
21 posed budget for operation of the Lands Division for the next  
22 fiscal year may be presented to the Department of Finance for  
23 the usual critical review in said Department, at which time  
24 Administrator Carr will be sitting with his other hat as the  
25 Department of Finance.

26 MR. CRANSTON: I move that the Director of Finance

make the motion.

MR. ZWEIBACK: I, of course, am not in a position to comment on all of these. However, there is one item I would like to hear some comment on by Mr. Hortig, and perhaps some comment by the Chairman, and that is the necessity for house counsel and our house counsel is Mr. Murphy at the left, and I think it adds to the efficiency of the Commission to have house counsel; it obviates the necessity of running up and downstairs. I think it saves many thousands of dollars a year. If we are going to have house counsel, I think we should have good house counsel, since the matters in which we need house counsel are in connection with private industry, who have top men. I was a little shocked to see the salary paid -- something like \$6200 a year, or a little over \$500 a month. I think you might recognize that with this kind of professional training, we would have difficulty retaining good house counsel, as the people with whom he will be dealing recognize such talents, and if we are going to have the kind of counsel we want, we are going to have to earn such; and I would suggest the Commission review the salary range, with a suggestion that a restudy be made by the Personnel Department or proper body, with the purpose in view of raising the salary.

MR. HORTIG: I am very happy that Mr. Zweiback brought up this question, for this opportunity to discuss it with the Commission. Getting briefly to the crux of the problem, actually the proposed salary ranges included in the budget

1 for the position occupied by Mr. Murphy and for the added  
2 position of another aiding house counsel, which is proposed  
3 for consideration by the Department of Finance, is not the  
4 salary range proposed in this budget; but rather, we have  
5 recently undergone a study by the Personnel Board, who decided  
6 the appropriate classification for the position Mr. Murphy  
7 occupies at the moment is in the range of Assistant Counsel  
8 for which funds would be provided in this budget.

9 It was proposed that this determination be accepted  
10 with reluctance, in order that we would have something in hand,  
11 and immediately thereafter request (and we have so indicated  
12 to the Personnel Board that we are requesting) a restudy.

13 It would be of assistance definitely to the staff if  
14 we could have a directive from the Commission considering that  
15 the prior determinations appear to be inadequate and a restudy  
16 with a view to upgrading beyond the most recent reluctant up-  
17 grading by the Personnel Board would be in order.

18 MR. CARR: Mr. Hoftig is undoubtedly aware of the  
19 prerogatives of the Personnel Board. You probably have en-  
20 countered those before. It isn't proper for me at this time  
21 to make any comments on the progress of the budget-making as  
22 it is going on, but in the question of classification of  
23 equal responsibilities, that is a personnel question. I think  
24 any financial assistance to Mr. Murphy would have to come that  
25 way because he would have to be reclassified regardless, in  
26 order to get more money. I have very high respect for Mr.



34  
1 Murphy and I am sure he wouldn't work a bit harder or more  
2 intelligently in a higher classification. I question whether  
3 not the Board at this time should go at Mr. Murphy's problem  
4 or anyone else's in this direction.

5 In telling tales out of school, I might say the  
6 Attorney General's office has also recommended very strongly  
7 that it isn't necessary for anyone to have house counsel,  
8 that they might take care of all the problems that might arise  
9 in the State of California. So when we get through with the  
10 budget, I think we should record our need for counsel as in  
11 the light of the whole budgetary process and then what we do  
12 have (I am speaking for this Board) should be handled on a  
13 personnel classification basis because that's statewide; and  
14 I think any attempt to upset that would be futile and redundant  
15 and might even rebound a little bit.

16 GOV. ANDERSON: Would it be out of order to ask them  
17 to take another look at this?

18 MR. CARR: No, you can ask them to take another look  
19 if you want and when it gets into the analysts' hands, they'll  
20 take several.

21 GOV. ANDERSON: This was your idea -- that this  
22 would be sufficient?

23 MR. HORTIG: This would be of aid because along with  
24 Mr. Carr's telling tales out of school and prior action of the  
25 Commission, we have found that even/such another look be taken,  
26 another real look is taken much more expeditiously than if the  
suggesting

1 staff recommend it on its own.

2 MR. CRANSTON: I'll so move.

3 MR. CARR: Second.

4 GOV. ANDERSON: Moved and seconded, so ordered.

5 Mr. Cranston says he has to leave on a plane at 1:05, so I  
6 have told him we would excuse him. If there is anything con-  
7 troversial, we will hold it for the next meeting.

8 MR. CRANSTON: I'd like to ask that we place on the  
9 agenda the recreational and leasing policies -- does that  
10 require notice for a public meeting?

11 MR. HORTIG: No sir.

12 MR. CRANSTON: I so request then.

13 GOV. ANDERSON: The Chair will ask for the approval  
14 of Item 9. (No second heard by reporter)

15 Item 10 .....

16 MR. HORTIG: Mr. Chairman, before you proceed,  
17 you did move with respect to assisting the staff in request to  
18 the Personnel Board for a reclassification study for Mr.  
19 Murphy's position, but we did not have a motion on the matter  
20 of the approval of the budget.

21 GOV. ANDERSON: I interpreted the motion to include  
22 not only that but the budget.

23 MR. CARR: I understood that it included approval  
24 of the budget.

25 GOV. ANDERSON: Item 10 is approval of plat of survey  
26 for H. F. Lauritzen, Big Break, Contra Costa County. Mr. Hortig

1 MR. HORTIG: The requested approval is pursuant to  
2 statutory procedures, whereunder on State lands which have  
3 been previously conveyed or found to have been conveyed in a  
4 survey that is in error, the present owner can file a plat  
5 which would correctly describe his lands, and which has been  
6 approved by the technical staff of the Lands Commission,  
7 and be approved in accordance with the Public Resources Code  
8 unless the Commission feel that this in any manner conveys  
9 any title to which anyone might be entitled. This approval  
10 would merely be a license to Mr. Lauritzen to go to court  
11 and have his title confirmed in quiet title action.

12 MR. CARR: Move.

13 GOV. ANDERSON: Moved and seconded, No objection,  
14 item 10 will be approved.

15 Item 11 --- adoption of policy for conduct of salvage  
16 operations on tide and submerged lands, including establish-  
17 ment of applicable fees. Mr. Hortig?

18 MR. HORTIG: Pursuant to an opinion of the office  
19 of the Attorney General, such things as vessels which have  
20 sunk and been abandoned and are resting on the ocean floor  
21 are State property and originally not under the jurisdiction  
22 of the State Lands Commission, but under the jurisdiction of  
23 the Director of Finance, as they are State property. For one  
24 year the office of the Director of Finance has been administer-  
25 ing permits for conduct of any salvage operations which citizens  
26 might want to undertake on such State property and the Department



1 of Finance decided as part of its legislative program at the  
 2 last session to introduce legislation which wished this prob-  
 3 lem off on the State Lands Commission; and since September the  
 4 18th the Director has been out from under and the Lands Com-  
 5 mission has been under. So in order to administer this problem,  
 6 we are recommending that the Commission authorize the adoption  
 7 of interim procedures pending the time that rules and regula-  
 8 tions can be established, those procedures outlined on pages  
 9 30 and 31 of the calendar, which are actually a continuation  
 10 of the procedures that the Department of Finance's administra-  
 11 tion division has used for the preceding year in administering  
 12 this same type of operation.

13 MR. CARR: This is simply a restatement of the same  
 14 procedures, which might be reconsidered and amended by this  
 15 Commission when they see fit and in the meantime gives us  
 16 something to operate on?

17 MR. HORTIG: That's right.

18 MR. CARR: I so move.

19 GOV. ANDERSON: Moved and seconded, so ordered.

20 Item 12 -- establishment of policy relating to  
 21 closing dates for calendars for Commission meetings. Mr. Hortig?

22 MR. HORTIG: The Commissioners will recall I was  
 23 directed at the October 5 meeting to prepare a policy recommen-  
 24 dation for establishing closing dates on future calendars, to  
 25 allow for staff processing time which would result in suffi-  
 26 cient time for the Commission to review and study the items in

1 the calendar prior to a scheduled meeting date. Pursuant to  
2 that directive, it is recommended that the Commission direct  
3 the Executive Officer to establish closing dates for all  
4 future calendars for Commission meetings as follows:

5 One, that material for inclusion on calendars be  
6 in the hands of the Commission staff for review and process-  
7 ing sufficiently in advance of the meeting date to permit  
8 commencement of reproduction by the clerical staff ten working  
9 days prior to the date of the next Commission meeting; that  
10 only emergency matters be added as supplemental items there-  
11 after; and emergency items to be defined differently than as  
12 in the published calendar before you, but preferably as those  
13 which are highly critical and where a delay in action will  
14 result in the impairment of the public health, safety, or  
15 welfare; and the Executive Officer to be directed to have  
16 copies of the calendar delivered to each of the Commissioners  
17 of the Lands Commission six working days before the Commission  
18 meeting.

19 MR. CARR: Is that your recommendation?

20 MR. HORTIG: Yes sir.

21 MR. CARR: So move.

22 GOV. ANDERSON: It has been moved and I'll second it.

23 MR. CARR: That gives you plenty of time, the staff  
24 plenty of time to do their job?

25 MR. HORTIG: Except for the emergencies.

26 GOV. ANDERSON: No objection -- so ordered.

1 GOV. ANDERSON: Item 13 is the status of major  
2 litigation. Mr. Hortig.

3 MR. HORTIG: No Commission action is required.  
4 This is the tabulation furnished to the Commissioners monthly  
5 so that they are aware of the status. Our next most pending  
6 litigation which is actually going to go to trial is going  
7 to be a quiet title action in the month of November, on which  
8 Mr. Goldin is our counsel, to determine the oil and gas owner-  
9 ship in Alamitos Beach State Park at the east end of Long  
10 Beach.

11 GOV. ANDERSON: Which one is that here?

12 MR. HORTIG: Item 2 on Page 33. You see, the case  
13 is set for trial for November 24, 1959.

14 MR. CAMR: That's the one where we find out whether  
15 the title for the oil passed to the State?

16 MR. HORTIG: That is correct. For Governor Anderson's  
17 benefit, the easternmost 2200 feet of the tidelands originally  
18 granted to the City of Long Beach by the State were returned  
19 to the State by Long Beach in a quitclaim primarily for park  
20 purposes, but we feel not limited thereto. This quitclaim  
21 was issued in 1932 before anyone thought about oil in the  
22 tidelands area. Since the development of oil under this area,  
23 the city of Long Beach has contended that they did not reconvey  
24 the oil, but only the surface for park purposes; and this is  
25 an oversimplification of the issues to be tried in the quiet  
26 title action.



1 GOV. ANDERSON: That takes no action. The last  
2 item on the calendar -- unless Mr. Hortig has anything else  
3 Is there anything further to come before us?

4 MR. HORTIG: Beyond confirmation of the date of the  
5 next Commission meeting November 18th, it would be helpful to  
6 have a determination approximately, if we can, on the December  
7 meeting date and the location thereof. It is suggested that  
8 with the fourth Thursday falling on Christmas Eve and the  
9 last Thursday falling on New Year's Eve, that in lieu thereof  
10 the Commission consider Thursday, December 17, which would be  
11 approximately one month after the November meeting date.

12 GOV. ANDERSON: We don't have to adopt that today.  
13 I'd want to check our calendar, but I'll take that back and  
14 see if it's all right. Will you do that too, Mr. Carr?

15 MR. HORTIG: We will recheck with your respective  
16 secretaries.

17 GOV. ANDERSON: You are thinking of December 17th  
18 at nine o'clock -- would that be in Sacramento?

19 MR. HORTIG: The Commission might consider Sacramento  
20 because we have deferred one matter to Sacramento. Confirma-  
21 tion of the next meeting is for November 18, 2 p.m. Los Angeles.

22 MR. CARR: So move.

23 GOV. ANDERSON: Moved and seconded. Next meeting of  
24 the Commission in Los Angeles two o'clock November 18th.  
25 If a motion to adjourn is in order, I'll make it.

26 ADJOURNED 12:22 P.M.

\*\*\*\*\*

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, LOUISE H. LILLICO, reporter for the Division of Administrative Procedure, hereby certify that the foregoing ninety pages contain a full, true and correct transcript of the shorthand notes taken by me at the meeting of the STATE LANDS COMMISSION of the State of California held in Los Angeles, California on October 29, 1959.

Dated: Sacramento, California, November 1, 1959.

Louise H. Lillico