

1 TRANSCRIPT OF
2 MEETING
3 of
4 STATE LANDS COMMISSION

5 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
6 December 21, 1961

7 PARTICIPANTS:

8 THE COMMISSION

9 Hon. Alan Cranston, Controller, Acting Chairman
10 Hon. Hale Champion, Director of Finance

11 Mr. Frank Hortig, Executive Officer
12 Mr. Alan Sieroty, Administrative Assistant
13 to Lieutenant Governor Anderson

14 OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

15 Mr. Paul M. Joseph, Deputy Attorney General

16 APPEARANCES:

17 Mr. John H. Dawson, City Attorney for the
18 City of San Juan Capistrano
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

I N D E X

(In accordance with calendar summary)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

<u>ITEM CLASSIFICATION</u>	<u>ITEM ON</u>	<u>PAGE OF</u>	<u>PAGE OF</u>
	<u>CALENDAR</u>	<u>CALENDAR</u>	<u>TRANSCRIPT</u>
1 Confirmation of minutes meeting of Sept. 14, 1961			4
2 PERMITS, EASEMENTS, AND RIGHTS-OF-WAY, WITHOUT FEE			
(a) Division of Highways	10	1	4
3 PERMITS, EASEMENTS, LEASES, RIGHTS-OF-WAY, FEE			
(a) Calnev Pipe Line Co.	5	2	}
(b) John A. Fitzgerald	11	3	
(c) Michael McInnis et al	9	4	
(d) Don McMillan	14	5	
(e) Pacific Gas & Electric	8	6	
(f) " " "	15	7	
(g) " " "	16	8	
(h) " " "	18	9	
(i) Phillips Petroleum	6	10	
(j) Richfield Oil Corp.	4	11	
(k) " " "	19	12	}
(l) Signal Oil & Gas Co.	20	13	
(m) " " " "	28	14	}
(n) U.S. Borax & Chem. Corp.	23	15	
(o) Jay J. Vachon	3	17	
(p) Welles & Margaret Whitmore	17	18	7
4 CITY OF LONG BEACH			
(a) Town Lot. Addition #3 to estimate	13	20	7

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

I N D E X
(In accordance with calendar summary)

<u>ITEM CLASSIFICATION</u>	<u>ITEM ON</u>	<u>PAGE OF</u>	<u>PAGE OF</u>
	<u>CALENDAR</u>	<u>CALENDAR</u>	<u>TRANSCRIPT</u>
5	LAND ITEMS, SALES SELECTIONS, ETC.		
	(a) Sales Vacant State School Lands		
	(1) Imperial Irrig. Dist.	25	23 8
	(2) " " "	26	25 8
	(3) Wm. D. & Chas. Jessup	2	27 16
	MOTION ON (3) ONLY		18
	(b) Selection-Sale Vacant Fed. Lands		
	(1) Andrew D. Lum	1	28 8
	(c) Selection Vacant Federal Lands on behalf of State		
	(1) 120 ac. San Diego Co. (applic. Edward E. Keeler)	24	29 8
	(2) 40 ac. San Bernardino (applic. Jean E. Day)	7	30 8
	MOTION ON CLASSIF. 5 EXCEPT (a)(3)		8
6	Advance Rental Policy - Grantees T & S Lands	22	31 8
	MOTION ON CLASSIF. 6		11 and 13
7	Suppl. Agreement Remington Rand for indexing lands	21	33 13
8	Confirmation of transactions of Executive Officer: Donald & Lilas Sawyer	12	35 13
9	INFORMATIVE ONLY		
	(a) Parcel 5 Oil & Gas Lease	29	36 14
	(b) Status of Litigation	27	37 14
10	NEXT COMMISSION MEETING		18

I N D E X

SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR

ITEM ON PAGE OF PAGE OF
CALENDAR CALENDAR TRANSCRIPT

Proposed annexation - City of San Clemente 30 1-Sup 1

UNCALENDARED

Parcel 6 - Santa Barbara County 14

INDEX IN ACCORDANCE WITH ITEM NUMBERS

CAL. ITEM	PAGE OF CAL.	PG. TRANS.	CAL ITEM	PAGE OF CAL.	PG. TRANS.
1	28	8	19	12	6
2	27	16	20	13	6
3	17	6	21	33	13
4	11	6	22	31	8
5	2	5	23	15	6
6	10	6	24	29	8
7	30	8	25	23	8
8	6	5	26	25	8
9	4	5	27	37	14
10	1	4	28	14	6
11	3	5	29	16	14
12	35	13	30	1-Supp.	1
13	20	7			
14	5	5	PARCEL 6		14
15	7	5	CONF. MINUTES		4
16	8	5			
17	18	7	NEXT MEETING		18
18	9	5			

1 MR. CRANSTON: The meeting will come to order.
2 Lieutenant Governor Glenn Anderson is hung up in the fog in
3 Los Angeles and so are various other people who wish to be
4 here representing San Clemente and adjacent communities in
5 regard to an item involving an annexation in the San Clemente
6 area. In view of the inability of these people to be here
7 this morning, or perhaps all day, it is thought it might be
8 wise to postpone action on that matter until our January meet-
9 ing in Los Angeles, at which time we will be closer to those
10 interested and there will be an opportunity for all those who
11 wish to be here. It is our understanding that there are no
12 time or calendar problems involving this annexation that would
13 cause any hardship by this delay. I would like to know if
14 there is anyone here that objects to this proposal.

15 MR. DAWSON: Mr. Chairman, I came up here represent-
16 ing the opponents and I believe all of them

17 MR. CRANSTON: The opponents?

18 MR. DAWSON: The opponents, yes, with the exception
19 of Ken Sampson, who is the Harbor Commissioner down there.

20 MR. CRANSTON: What is your name?

21 MR. DAWSON: John H. Dawson, City Attorney for the
22 City of San Juan Capistrano.

23 MR. CRANSTON: Would you object to our putting the
24 matter over until January? Then we can advise people at the
25 airport that they don't need to be desperate and don't need
26 to come up.

1 MR. DAWSON: Only the consideration of the time - -
2 I am afraid you have not less than forty or more than sixty,
3 is that correct, Mr. Joseph?

4 MR. JOSEPH: Right.

5 MR. CHAMPION: We have been informed there is no
6 legal time problem in this action.

7 MR. JOSEPH: Once the meeting is set up, it may be
8 postponed.

9 MR. DAWSON: It may be postponed; but, frankly, there
10 is no obligation on the part of the City of San Clemente to
11 postpone the meeting. They are, I understand, postponing the
12 meeting to await your decision.

13 MR. HORTIG: May I interrupt. "At a regular meeting
14 of the City Council of the City of San Clemente held Wednes-
15 day, December 6, 1961, it was moved by Councilman Wrightman,
16 seconded by Councilman O'Hearn and unanimously carried that
17 the public hearing of December 20, 1961 shall be further con-
18 tinued until such time as a report from the State Lands Com-
19 mission is received."

20 MR. DAWSON: Well, under those circumstances, gentle-
21 men, in spite of the fact that I wandered up here on the Grey-
22 hound bus in the fog, I can see no formal objection to your
23 postponement. However, I am in a position to express to you
24 the position of the Board of Supervisors, the Harbor Commis-
25 sioner and Capistrano Beach. In fact, I think I can give
26 you the position of San Clemente, but I don't think that

1 would be quite ethical.

2 MR. CRANSTON: They have hanging in the air a request
3 that they not act until we act, so wouldn't they be considered
4 to be under constraint?

5 MR. HORTIG: They do not have a formal request as
6 such, but in view of the Commission's announcement at the last
7 meeting here in Sacramento, cognizance was taken of this in
8 the City Council resolution I just read to you and they are
9 obligated to continue until such time the Lands Commission
10 can hear and report on the matter.

11 MR. CHAMPION: This wire that I received from the
12 City of San Clemente indicates their City Council is meeting
13 this morning and is hoping to have some word on our action,
14 so they should be advised.

15 MR. CRANSTON: Our deferral is so the City of San
16 Clemente can present their side, as well as the opponents, so
17 obviously in fairness they will not act until they have heard
18 from us.

19 MR. DAWSON: I agree and I don't ever like to distrust
20 my opponents; but I would make one further suggestion, if the
21 Commission would see fit, and that is to send a written com-
22 munication by way of resolution or otherwise that unless the
23 hearing is postponed until further word from the Commission,
24 that if they go ahead, this would be considered as a protest.
25 This would protect our people and I can see no objection to
26 it. I represent two city councils and I think you know how

1 the wind blows.

2 MR. CHAMPION: I think that colors our future action.
3 I think just advising them is sufficient, will cover it.

4 MR. DAWSON: I think you are right. We have resort
5 to the courts later in any event, so I make no further objection

6 MR. CRANSTON: It would appear that no formal action
7 is necessary and I think a clear record has been made of this
8 matter this morning. We will recess for a moment and advise
9 the City Council of San Clemente and the people in the airport
10 as best we can.

11 (Very brief recess)

12 The meeting will now reconvene and we will take up
13 the regular calendar.

14 Item 1 is confirmation of minutes of meeting of
15 September 14, 1961.

16 MR. CHAMPION: Move approval.

17 MR. CRANSTON: Moved, seconded and adopted unani-
18 mously. Item 2 -- Permits, easements, and rights-of-way to
19 be granted to public and other agencies at no fee, pursuant
20 to statute. Consideration is the public benefit. Applicant
21 (a) State of California, Division of Highways -- modification
22 of right-of-way entry permit P.R.C. 2525.1 to extend effective
23 date of authorized occupancy until new State Lands Commission
24 management policy for school lands has been determined.

25 MR. CHAMPION: Move approval.

26 MR. CRANSTON: Moved, seconded and adopted unanimously

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

MR. CRANSTON (continuing) Item 3 -- Permits, ease-
ments, leases, and rights-of-way issued pursuant to statutes
and established rental policies of the Commission: (a) Calne
Pipe Line Company -- amendment of legal description in Lease
P.R.C. 2702.1, San Bernardino County, to conform to the as-
built location of the pipeline; (b) John A. Fitzgerald --
two-year renewal of Lease P.R.C. 595.1, tide and submerged lands
of Middle River, San Joaquin County, total rental \$300; (c)
Michael L. McInnis, et al -- amendment of legal description of
Lease P.R.C. 2256.1 covering a small craft marina on Suisun
Slough, City of Suisun, Solano County, to provide more exact
delineation of the leased area, to assist in lessee's financ-
ing and protection of his investment; (d) Don McMillan --
cancellation of Lease P.R.C. 1974.1, tide and submerged lands
of Klamath River, Humboldt County, effective 12/29/61, rental
delinquent; (e) P. G. & E. -- 49-year right-of-way easement
for overhead wire crossing, 0.25 acre submerged lands, Fay
Slough, Humboldt County, total rental \$580.16; (f) Pacific Gas
and Electric Company -- 49-year right-of-way easement, 0.06
acre submerged lands of Battle Creek, Tehama County, for gas
transmission line, total rental \$100; (g) Pacific Gas and
Electric Company -- 49-year right-of-way easement, 0.09 acre
submerged lands of Sacramento River, Shasta and Tehama Counties
for gas transmission line, total rental \$125.44; (h) Pacific
Gas and Electric Company -- 49-year right-of-way easement, 0.13
acre submerged lands of Sacramento River, Shasta County, total

1 rental \$482.65; (i) Phillips Petroleum Company -- Deferment
2 of drilling requirements, Oil and Gas Lease P.R.C. 2205.1 to
3 8/10/62, to allow time to evaluate geological and geophysical
4 information to determine if further development work is feas-
5 ible; (j) Richfield Oil Corporation -- deferment of drilling
6 requirements Oil and Gas Lease P.R.C. 1466.1 to 7/1/62, to
7 allow time to determine whether additional development drill-
8 ing is justified; (k) Richfield Oil Corporation -- deferment
9 of drilling requirements, Oil and Gas Leases P.R.C. 308.1 and
10 P.R.C. 309.1, through 6/30/62, pending lease modifications re-
11 quired to provide for pooling for drilling and production pur-
12 poses now under review by the staff.

13 MR. HORTIG: Mr. Chairman, on the next item, lease
14 of Signal Oil and Gas Company, the P.R.C. number should be
15 1551.1 instead of 155.1 as shown.

16 MR. CRANSTON: Item (l) Signal Oil and Gas Company --
17 Deferment of drilling and operating requirements, Oil and Gas
18 Lease P.R.C. 1551.1, through 6/30/62 to permit additional
19 studies to determine whether further exploration operations
20 are justified; (m) Signal Oil and Gas Company -- geological
21 survey permit for period 1/1/62 through 6/30/62, tide and sub-
22 merged lands in San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Los
23 Angeles, Orange, and San Diego counties; (n) United States
24 Borax and Chemical Corporation -- two-year prospecting permit
25 160 acres school lands, Inyo County; (o) Jay J. Vachon --
26 ten-year arksite lease, tide and submerged lands of Petaluma

1 River at Black Point, Marin County, annual rental \$65; (p)
 2 Welles Whitmore, III, and Margaret Whitmore -- 15-year lease
 3 6.67 acres tide and submerged lands Vallejo, Solano County, for
 4 operation of pier and boat shop, annual rental \$738.

5 Motion is in order.

6 MR. CHAMPION: I'll move approval as this is presented
 7 by the staff.

8 MR. CRANSTON: It has been moved and seconded to
 9 approve all items of Item Classification 3 and so ordered
 10 unanimously.

11 Item 4 -- City of Long Beach approvals required pur-
 12 suant to Chapter 29/56, 1st E.S. (a) Town Lot. Increase in
 13 cost covering property to be purchased from Mobil Oil Company
 14 (2nd Phase). Addition No. 3 to estimate. Proposed authoriza-
 15 tion: estimated subproject expenditures from 12/21/61 to
 16 termination of \$41,210, with \$25,962 (63%) estimated as sub-
 17 sidence costs.

18 MR. CHAMPION: Move approval.

19 MR. CRANSTON: Approval moved, seconded, and so
 20 ordered unanimously.

21 Item 5 -- Land Items -- sales, selections, etcetera.
 22 All land sale items here presented have been reviewed by all
 23 State agencies having a land acquisition program and no inter-
 24 est has been reported by those agencies in any of the lands
 25 proposed for sale. (a)

26 MR. HORTIG: Mr. Chairman, as to item (3) in this

1 tabulation, if you would pass it at this time there is a
2 supplemental report to make. This is the proposed land sale
3 to William D. Jessup and Charles S. Jessup.

4 MR. CRANSTON: Number (1) Imperial Irrigation District--
5 appraised value \$400, bid \$400; (2) Imperial Irrigation Dis-
6 trict -- appraised value \$14,400, bid \$14,400.

7 Section (b) -- Selection and sale of vacant Federal
8 lands -- (1) Andrew D. Lum, appraisal \$8,000, bid \$8,000.

9 (c) Selection of vacant Federal lands on behalf of
10 the State. (Applicants do not desire to proceed with acquisi-
11 tion of the lands) (1) 120 acres in San Diego County, pursuant
12 to application of Edward E. Keeler; (2) 40 acres in San Bernar-
13 dino County, pursuant to application of Jean Elizabeth Day.
14 And that concludes this item.

15 MR. CHAMPION: Move approval of those items in
16 Item 5 with the exception of (a) (3).

17 MR. CRANSTON: Moved, seconded, and so ordered.
18 Approval is made unanimously.

19 Item Classification 6 -- advance rentals policy --
20 grantees of tide and submerged lands. Frank?

21 MR. HORTIG: As the Commission has before it on
22 pages 31 and 32 of the agenda, the mechanical problem has
23 arisen of varying import during any specific years as to the
24 effect of legislation granting tide and submerged land areas
25 by the legislature, which areas in some instances have in
26 effect prior existing State Lands Commission leases and these

1 leases are not always necessarily recognized specifically in
 2 the statutes and, therefore, the question always arises as to
 3 whether the grantee is to receive future returns from such
 4 existing leases, is also entitled to past amounts that have
 5 been collected by the State of California; or the converse --
 6 whether the grantee is not, in fact, entitled to any payments
 7 of these amounts.

8 It has been found that there is sound legal authority
 9 for the State Lands Commission either to retain any prepaid
 10 rentals in connection with these grants or to pay them over
 11 to the political subdivision.

12 The staff suggestion in this respect is that such
 13 prepaid rentals should be retained by the State as a matter
 14 of uniform policy. Though it may be argued that such rentals
 15 should be payable to the grantee since they cover a period
 16 when title will be vested in the grantee, it is also true that
 17 the advance payments were received by the State according to
 18 contract and should be retained; the revenue from the property
 19 was developed prior to the time the grantee had an interest
 20 in the lands; and grants by the Legislature, especially in
 21 recent years, provide for a broader spectrum of localized
 22 purposes, uses and benefits as of the effective date of the
 23 grant. In the absence of specific provisions in the granting
 24 statute, it does not appear that it should be considered that
 25 it was the intent to make a gift of rentals previously estab-
 26 lished and collected by the State for statewide general funding.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

Therefore, it is recommended that the Commission adopt the following policy: In all instances where an area of tide and submerged lands granted to a political subdivision of the State contains leases let by the State prior to the effective date of the grant, any rentals applying to future lease periods which have been paid or which are past due to the State by the lessee prior to the effective date of the grant shall be retained by the State unless there are specific provisions in the granting statute regarding the leases being transferred and the disposition or proration of such prepaid rentals are defined therein.

MR. CHAMPION: I concur in this. The impact of this would be only where the rentals are prepaid. If there were still rentals to come on the leases, we would not receive them -- they would go to them?

MR. HORTIG: After the date of the grant, yes sir.

MR. CHAMPION: Is it my further understanding that in the usual kind of grant involved here we get no consideration at all in return for this grant, so in effect we would be giving up something, a potential source of revenue? We can properly consider this a sort of quitclaim deed. We are giving up a source of revenue to the local people.

MR. HORTIG: This has been the case without exception heretofore.

MR. CHAMPION: Without any compensation?

MR. HORTIG: Without any compensation to the State.

1 MR. CHAMPION: I move approval of the recommendation.

2 MR. CRANSTON: I second the motion.

3 MR. SIEROTY: I am in sympathy with the objectives
4 we are trying to reach but I am not sure this is the proper
5 way of doing it. I would think that in the ordinary situation
6 a prepaid rental ought to go to the owner of the property and
7 if title passes prepaid rental ought to be paid in an escrow
8 or in some form to the new lessor because there is going to
9 be a lessee whose rights will still be on that property and
10 the owner of the property would be entitled to a rental fee.
11 I think that what we feel here is that a political subdivision
12 is getting some kind of special break and the State is en-
13 titled to this money, but I think it ought to be done in a
14 different way. I think if we have a prepaid rental, it should
15 be in terms of a consideration; or provided in the statute
16 where the grant is made that the prepaid rental should remain
17 with the State. In other words, I would consider the ordinary
18 legal implications that prepaid rental ought to be paid over
19 to the grantee.

20 MR. HORTIG: I would concur with staff member Sieroty
21 completely as to the applicability of the statutes to the con-
22 ditions which he described, which is where there is a fee
23 transferred with the land. These are lands conveyed in trust
24 by the Legislature -- not only in trust, there is a reversion-
25 ary title retained in the State in all of these grants, in
26 that the grantee does not become the owner of the land in fee

1 simple, absolute. They are loaned by the State in trust for
2 specifically announced trust purposes. Additionally, in later
3 years, the Legislature has invariably required an evaluation
4 and report by the State Lands Commission ten years after the
5 grant to determine that the grantee has applied and developed
6 the lands to the trust purposes. Absent a favorable report by
7 the Lands Commission, the trust grant terminates and the lands
8 revert to the State. So it isn't a clearcut simple case of a
9 transfer in fee, under which circumstances I would concur that
10 the matter of prepaid rentals would be handled exactly as out-
11 lined by Mr. Sieroty.

12 MR. CHAMPION: Beyond that, with some exceptions I
13 think I would oppose the legislative grant to deprive the
14 State of income without some form of compensation. The grants
15 are being made for the wider use you specify, but the State is
16 giving up something in order to permit the locality to do that
17 and I don't see any reason for us to give up a source of in-
18 come, particularly that which we have already received. That
19 may come from my peculiar relationship with the State of Cali-
20 fornia.

21 MR. JOSEPH: Mr. Chairman, there is a further diffi-
22 culty here in that I understand from this calendar item that
23 this money goes into the general fund. There has been no
24 appropriation of the money for payment. There may be diffi-
25 culty in that regard.

26 MR. CRANSTON: Are there any further comments? (No

1 response) If not, approval of the staff recommendation has
2 been moved and seconded and is adopted.

3 Item 7 -- Authorization for supplementary agreement
4 between Remington Rand and State Lands Commission, in the
5 sum of \$25,000, for completing project of indexing lands under
6 the jurisdiction of the United States, pursuant to Section
7 127, Government Code.

8 Frank, do you have any comments? I guess there is
9 nothing to say except we need the money to complete the
10 project.

11 MR. HORTIG: And we have the money -- but the staff
12 needs the authorization of the Lands Commission to enter into
13 the contract in this amount, the Executive Officer's authori-
14 zation for contracting independently being limited to \$2,000.

15 MR. CRANSTON: Will you, with your peculiar relation-
16 ship, make a motion on this?

17 MR. CHAMPION: I will move approval.

18 MR. CRANSTON: Approval is moved, seconded and
19 approved unanimously.

20 Item 8 -- Confirmation of transactions consummated
21 by the Executive Officer.

22 MR. HORTIG: As shown on page 35, these consist of
23 prior approvals of two assignments of grazing leases completed
24 in accordance with the statutes and, therefore, confirmation
25 of the approvals of the assignments is recommended.

26 MR. CHAMPION: Move approval.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

MR. CRANSTON: Moved, seconded and adopted.

Item 9 -- Informative only, no Commission action required.

(a) Report on proposed Parcel 5 oil and gas lease -- no bids received.

Do you have any comments, Frank?

MR. HORTIG: Not beyond the report on page 36, which is completely negative.

MR. CRANSTON: Item (b) -- report on status of major litigation. Anything to report there?

MR. HORTIG: Again, not in addition to the outline of the status of the various cases as they are listed on pages 37 and 38 of the agenda.

MR. CRANSTON: Then we will proceed to the supplemental calendar. Item 30 has been disposed of. There is one other item not indicated that Mr. Hortig will present.

MR. HORTIG: As the Commission will recall, there was a previous authorization for publication of notice of intention to receive bids for an oil and gas lease on a parcel designated as Parcel 6, Santa Barbara County. The bid invitations are open; the bid closing date currently specified is February 7, 1962.

The particular parcel, as well as other unleased areas in western Santa Barbara County, require for their proper development and operation adequate pipeline capacity to transport the natural gas which is produced either directly

1 in condensed zones or in conjunction with oil that is being
2 developed on existing leases in the same area.

3 An application is presently under consideration by
4 the Public Utilities Commission of California as to certifica-
5 tion of additional pipeline facilities in this area.

6 Pending certification and construction of a pipeline,
7 development in the area has been virtually stopped because
8 there already has been developed production capacity in excess
9 of present pipeline facilities. Therefore, it is difficult to
10 justify economically additional development -- which, however,
11 as a matter of contract is required under existing State leases.

12 Therefore, until there is a resolution of the problem
13 of establishment of the additional pipeline capacity, it would
14 appear that any Commission lease offers in the area, where
15 successful development of the lease requires such additional
16 pipeline capacity, might not receive adequate bid evaluation
17 or a prospective lessee would be required to consider writing
18 his own insurance as to operating and production difficulties
19 because of lack of pipeline capacity.

20 For these reasons it is suggested that the Commission
21 authorize indefinite deferment of the date for receipt of bids
22 for oil and gas parcel 6, now set for February 7, 1962.

23 MR. CHAMPION: I so move.

24 MR. CRANSTON: The motion has been made to defer,
25 postpone action on the parcel stated by Mr. Horig, for the
26 reasons stated by him. I second the motion and it is so
ordered unanimously.

1 MR. CRANSTON (continuing) Frank, did we have to take
2 up that item 5, (a)(3) -- Jessup?

3 MR. HORTIG: Yes sir. Subsequent to preparation of
4 the agenda recommendation to the Commission for consideration
5 of private sale of the specified lands to William D. Jessup
6 and Charles S. Jessup, the Department of Fish and Game re-
7 ported to the State Lands Division a potential Fish and Game
8 interest in the parcel, which interest is amplified by letter
9 of December 13th from Deputy Director Harry Anderson of the
10 Department of Fish and Game, which I will read:

11 " This is to amplify on my letter of
12 December 6, 1961 regarding your file number
13 Work Order 3590.3, sale of State public lands,
14 transmitting property bulletin Number Sacra-
15 mento Work Order 7578, in accordance with a
16 recent phone conversation between Fred Jones
17 and Ken Smith.

18 Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall has
19 established the Lower Colorado River Land Use
20 Office at Yuma, Arizona to develop land use
21 plans for Federal lands along the Colorado
22 River. Secretary Udall has also created the
23 Lower Colorado Land Use Committee, composed
24 of representatives of California, Arizona
25 and Nevada, to study and coordinate land use
26 plans of individual municipalities, counties,
states, and Federal agencies for ultimate
development of a coordinated and integrated
plan of use of Federal lands.

Scattered throughout the Federal lands,
of course, are various parcels of State lands.
Sacramento Work Order 7578 (and this is the
file number for the Jessup application here)
refers to one of these. This particular parcel
lies within one of several blocks of public
domain lands along the river that we feel have
high wildlife and recreational values. The

1 "ultimate planning for the Federal lands imme-
2 diately surrounding this piece of State land
3 will, however, depend upon the recommendations
4 of the Land Use Committee.

5 It would appear that management would be
6 enhanced by incorporation of this parcel of
7 State land. For that reason, we suggest the
8 State Lands Commission consider withholding
9 action of sale of this piece until the Colorado
10 River Land Use Plan is completed.

11 (signed) Harry Anderson, Deputy Director"

12 MR. HORTIG (continuing) Additionally, if the Com-
13 mission desires any further information or details as to the
14 basis for the request for withholding by the Lands Commission,
15 Mr. Jones of the Department of Fish and Game is here this
16 morning with a report.

17 In view of the request from the Department of Fish
18 and Game -- and in view of the anticipated determination of a
19 uniform policy by the State Lands Commission for handling such
20 matters and the precedents already established by the Commis-
21 sion in acceding to requests of this type under the facts as
22 recited until the establishment of such uniform policy -- it
23 is the staff recommendation that the request of the Department
24 of Fish and Game be approved; that the land parcel in this in-
25 stance be withheld from sale and that the staff be authorized
26 to inform the applicant of the nature and reason for the with-
holding; and the applicant be given the option of withdrawing
from the application, receive a refund of his deposits -- or,
if he desires, alternatively to leave his deposits on deposit
in the event of determination by Fish and Game that this land

1 is not necessary for public use as herein contemplated. The
2 land would at that time be sold to the applicant if the appli-
3 cant so options.

4 MR. CHAMPION: I move - - a rather complicated motion.
5 I would move that we deal with this matter in the way set forth
6 by Mr. Hortig.

7 MR. CRANSTON: Second the motion. It is so ordered.
8 Is there anything else before we come to time and date and
9 place of next meeting?

10 MR. HORTIG: No sir.

11 MR. CRANSTON: I would like to defer fixing that date
12 until we can discuss it with Glenn, because I have a conflict
13 on that date. The next meeting is shown on the 25th and I have
14 a County Treasurer's meeting.

15 MR. CHAMPION: I have the same conflict.

16 MR. HORTIG: The staff will undertake to determine a
17 mutually satisfactory date for all Commissioners.

18 MR. CRANSTON: Is the normal time the last Thursday
19 in the month?

20 MR. HORTIG: That's right.

21 MR. CRANSTON: We have a similar problem in February.

22 MR. HORTIG: We have a suggestion there -- that
23 Thursday, March 1st in Sacramento, would be a satisfactory
24 date because the regular meeting date would be the 22nd of
25 February, which is a holiday, and also there are five Thursdays
26 in March, which would still space the meetings.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

MR. CRANSTON: I have a conflict with the Board of Equalization meetings. Is the normal schedule not the last Thursday but the fourth Thursday?

MR. HORTIG: The fourth Thursday, yes sir.

MR. CRANSTON: If there is no further business the meeting will stand adjourned. Thank you all very much.

ADJOURNED 10:47 A.M.

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

I, LOUISE H. LILLICO, reporter for the Office of Administrative Procedure, hereby certify that the foregoing nineteen pages contain a full, true and correct transcript of the shorthand notes taken by me in the meeting of the STATE LANDS COMMISSION held in Sacramento, California on December 21, 1961.

Dated: December 22, 1961.

Louise H. Lillico
