but I submit for the record we had a little difficulty in keeping up with people who do things like this, and this happened:

A gentleman walked into our Sacramento office, asked to be informed about this transaction. When the office engineer started to pull the maps and the vast volume of data to give him the complete information, he took one look at it and he said, "Oh, I don't have time to look at all that now. Besides, we have people we can send in to Los Angeles, since you say the very latest editions are available in Los Angeles." They finally did contact us, and then at the public hearing made the statement that information had been unavailable to them.

We have difficulty reconciling these situations or deciding on what the factual situation is, as distinguished from a motivation.

GOV. ANDERSON: Anything further? Mr. Sieroty.

MR. SIEROTY: I make a comment about this because Mr. Hortig started out by saying it is a very simple question and I think those who attended the hearing at the end of the hearing didn't come out with the same conclusion. Just to put it in perspective here -- What has happened here is that the Attorney General's Office and the State Lands Division have started back in '47 trying to work out this problem with Leslie Salt Company, determining who has title to what and; and at that time perhaps it might have been simple to work out,

1 but today we are faced with the growing need, tendency
2 and realization, as it has been expressed here in the State
3 Lands Commission several times, for planning for the Bay
4 area as a whole. So this problem which might have been simple
5 in '49 comes into this planning picture.
6 We are dealing with Leslie Salt Company -- which
7 owns, I understand, something like fifty-three thousand acres
8 of land in the south San Francisco Bay, which is a tremendous
9 amount of land. You can imagine how much land that is and
10 the possibility of utilization of this land, which I am sure
11 they have thought about a great deal.
12 For instance, they talked about this one project
13 in San Mateo County -- forty-five hundred acres of tide and
14 submerged land. That is a billion-dollar project, and that
15 isn't even their total holdings in San Mateo County.
16 So we are involved in a big thing. Again, while
17 the San Francisco Bay Conservation Study Commission has come
18 up with a recommendation to the Legislature for a moratorium,
19 which we don't know the Legislature will approve, in addition
20 to that we have other problems which I think we ought to give
21 some thought to in the future -- and that is, our relation
22 with the other agencies.
23 Now, Resources comes and says they haven't had
24 adequate time. Even though we have been involved in this
25 since '47, they haven't had adequate time to study the effect
26 on wildlife. They say it will take about six months to study

1 that. Santa Clara County comes in and says, "We don't
2 know how this is going to affect our flood control and such
3 problems, so we have to have time to study that."
4 So, whether this could be carried on a few years
5 back, I do not know; but they want an opportunity to make
6 studies and make recommendations as to what sloughs will be
7 given to Leslie or to the State.
8 As I say, I think this is kind of interesting be-
9 cause the problem is not simple because of the time we find
10 ourselves in, in terms of the desire for over-all planning.
11 MR. HORTIG: I concur one hundred percent in the
12 analysis that Alan just made -- that this is now the public
13 concept of the problem; but while very important in their own
14 sphere and as a matter of timing, these are all extraneous
15 matters to the problem which was given the Lands Commission
16 to resolve -- and that is, the basic land title problem as to
17 these little waterways. Patently, no county is going to be
18 jeopardized in any plans they had previously with respect to
19 flood control, rights-of-way, and so on, and so forth, because
20 every one of them is going to their own county records has
21 assumed these lands have been owned by Leslie, and yet here
22 is a case where three-fourths of them as a result of this
23 title clearance are going to be back in State ownership.
24 MR. CRAWSTON: Frank, isn't one way we get involved
25 in it -- various cities and counties and other units of
26 government plunge ahead with their own plan, which might not

be the best thing for an over-all Bay plan; and while title is in doubt, it may be difficult to plunge ahead and maybe a delay or moratorium until the over-all plan is developed might slow down one stage of the development. It seems to me that is the point they were trying to make in their testimony -- the fringe benefit of delay.

MR. HORTIG: One county -- and the county to the north says "This is a good program. Let's go forward." This is why, because there is yet no action by the Commission and recommendation has to be brought to the Commission and consideration has to be given to the action -- this is certainly an election that is within the complete control of the Commission to conclude whether there is advantage in planning first and title clarification later, rather than title clarification and planning later. That element will be recommended on and can be determined by the Commission. You gentlemen have this completely under your control.

MR. CRANSTON: As you put it there, that is the exact point I want to be informed on before we make any final decision on this.

MR. HORTIG: It is a question of which one you do first.

GOV. ANDERSON: Is there anything further to be brought up before the meeting? (No response) If not, then, the next date and place of the meeting will be February 25, 1965, at ten a.m., here in Sacramento. Motion to adjourn

will be in order.

MR. CRANSTON: So move.

MR. SHEEHAN: Second.

GOV. ANDERSON: Moved and seconded. There being no further business, we are adjourned.

ADJOURNED 11:45 A.M.

****

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, LOUISE H. LILLICO, reporter for the Office of Administrative Procedure, hereby certify that the foregoing forty-nine pages contain a full, true and accurate transcript of the shorthand notes taken by me in the meeting of the STATE LANDS COMMISSION held in Sacramento, California, on January 28, 1965.

Dated: Los Angeles, California, February 2, 1965.

~~/s/ Louise H. Lillico~~

26230-404 7-64 85M GSF