out the authority.

MR. HORTIG: Yes, but the Committee's life, determination of what should be done, has been extended by resolution in both houses and a report is due now in the 1966 Legislature with respect to granted tidelands.

MR. CHAMPION: However, I understand they are prepared at this session to ask that a number of things be done immediately. They are not just extending their life into the next session to delay any further recommendations, but there will be recommendations from the Committee in this session.

Am I incorrect in that?

MR. HORTIG: We have not received any indication that there will be anything that specific; and it is for that reason that in the later legislative report on this agenda that I was recommending that the Commission continue its report to the committees as it has made previously; that until there is a standardized series of programs from the Legislature with respect to granted tide and submerged lands there be a moratorium on further tideland grands, except in specific situations that don't require this moratorium, in order that all these operations can be carried out in the future on a definite prescribed basis, without adding to the hit and miss and piecemeal programs that we have had to operate on before.

Included in the later specific program would be such authorities as the Commission should undertake.

MR. CHAMPION: Mr. Chairman, I see in the audience

Mr. Baldwin, who has acted as consultant to the Joint Legislative Tidelands Committee, and I wonder if it wouldn't be in order to ask him what their present agenda calls for, what the possibilities are.

GOV. ANDERSON: Mr. Baldwin, can you identify yourself and then answer the question?

MR. BALDWIN: I am Charles Baldwin, the consultant to the Joint Committee on Tidelands.

MR. CHAMPION: Basically, Chuck, what I think we are concerned with here -- We are looking at the staffing pattern and it has been my understanding this has been discussed with you, so the Committee would be informed as to what our plans were. We are concerned whether, in fact, this meets our -- at least my understanding -- of what was being contemplated or whether there would not be more positions necessary to do the kind of work which has been discussed by the Joint Tidelands Committee in not only surveying but listing and accounting for all the trusteeships which the State has granted, in trying to work out some of the boundary problems, and a good many questions of this sort.

It had been my impression that the Committee planned to introduce some legislation at this session of the Legislature; and if that were to be done, does this staffing pattern meet the requirements of that? It is my impression now, from what Mr. Golden said, that it would not. I know you can't speak for the Committee, but in general...?

MR. BALDWIN: The Committee will recommend legislation in this session. I believe it will, although I cannot speak for the Committee.

The recommendation in our report, which was submitted in December of last year, was that legislation be put forward as soon as possible and I believe the Committee would recommend it be put forward in this session. Those recommendations, if they follow the report, would require some additional work from the State Lands Division. Whether the State Lands Division's other workload here can accommodate that additional workload here, I don't know.

Whether they can just distribute their existing personnel to accommodate that work, or whether they are going to require new personnel to accommodate this, is a question which, of course, I am not in a position to answer.

However, the recommendations would require that the existing trustees submit audit reports to the State and I believe you do have now an organizational structure which does audit. Whether it can accommodate some new workload in that audit division, I do not know.

Also, it would require that some State agency, perhaps the State Lands Division, review applications for new tide and submerged land grants and, of course, that would require some work from the State Lands Division if that was the agency that was asked to do the work.

MR. CHAMPION: That answers my question.

24ZIC-404 7-64 85M OSP

MR. BALDWIN: I don't know whether Mr. Golden has asked for staff or if he has taken that into consideration.

MR. GOLDEN: In essence, the basic assumption we had to make was that we had to deal with what we currently had on the books. If there were to be legislation of this type, we couldn't predict what it would be and, therefore, could not predict what positions we would have to have.

I think generally, when new legislation comes along requiring additional workload in any department of the State, these costs are tied to that bill and with that bill; and I think probably it would be covered under that normal procedure.

MR. CHAMPION: Could I make a suggestion here for procedure, subject to what the rest of the Commission would feel? Move approval of this pattern, with the understanding that Mr. Golden and Mr. Hortig would continue to work with Mr. Baldwin in advising staff patterns to meet the requirements of the legislation to be introduced; but I am a little concerned that on the basis of this discussion we probably need a little more attention to this before we get new legislation; that some of the things that the Chairman has spoken of today are things which are properly now within our province and things which we should be doing and whether maybe we shouldn't also consider, in addition to the demands that may be made upon us by legislation introduced by the Joint Committee - - I don't like to see us go to the Legislature once and then again and

and then again and then again - - but I guess the question is really whether we shouldn't specifically assign one position in here with the kind of function that Governor Anderson has suggested prior to and then subject to the Tidelands Committee assigning the costs at that time for the additional staff.

MR. GOLDEN: If we could assume that these things would be in the offing, when we go to the Legislature we could speak of that as being an assistant to the Assistant Executive Officer here. One of the real problems here is getting into the situation of getting our workload review in the Division. There has not been a real review along this pattern and this is one of the things basically that bothers me all the way through. Until we can get a workload review and determine what exactly has to be done, it is very difficult.

MR. CHAMPION: In other words, you wouldn't know whether one of these auditors could pick up any of this workload Mr. Baldwin spoke of or not?

MR. GOLDEN: I would suspect they could. We are dealing here when we are talking about the new audit program -- and here we are going on the basis of the consultants' estimate also -- of how many auditors would be necessary to accomplish this function. We don't have any detailed list of the number of transactions, things of a workload nature, to tie into this thing. It is a new deal, a new operation. We are going to make certain basic assumptions.

MR. CHAMPION: As a basis for discussion, I would move we approve this with the one new administrative position to the Assistant Executive Officer.

MR. CRANSTON: Your motion was not clear to me.

MR. CHAMPION: I would move the proposal as before you, with the addition of one position; and that position would be an administrative assistant for planning and research responsible to the new Assistant Executive Officer.

MR. CRANSTON: You are referring to the portion that is other than the portion related specifically to the Long Beach Unit?

MR. CHAMPION: Yes.

MR. CRANSTON: I second the motion.

GOV. ANDERSON: Moved and seconded, carried unanimously. Does that also cover Item 14? That was Item 13. We were talking about 13 and 14 in a sense.

MR. HORTIG: Yes, sir.

GOV. ANDERSON: Is there to be an additional motion now on Item 14?

MR. CRANSTON: It is a like question. It was not divided.

MR. HORTIG: A separate motion would be desirable.

GOV. ANDERSON: The motion just passed was Item 13, with the amendment.

Item 14 was the consideration of report recommendations by consultants, DeGolyer and MacNaughton, on management

program and staffing required for effective discharge of Commission responsibilities in Long Beach tidelands pursuant to Chapter 29/1956, First Extraordinary Session, and Chapter 138/1964, First Extraordinary Session. Budget recommendations for implementation of this program will be reported by the Department of Finance.

MR. CHAMPION: I so move.

MR. CRANSTON: Mr. Chairman, I second the motion; but I'd like to say about this portion of it -- I only received the copy of the recommendation from the consultants late yesterday afternoon. I have had no opportunity to give it the detailed analysis I would like, but I recognize that the report recommended that on March first we start employing a lot of people and we didn't get the report until March 22nd. I fully concur and recognize the need for immediate action to get the field going and to see to it we get maximum revenues with least cost from the field; but I have very deep reservations at this time -- and it is only based upon lack of time to examine it fully; but presently I want to express reservations about the suggestion in the report that we keep most of this large staff throughout thelife of the field. This may be necessary, but I am not convinced this is necessary for the full thirty-five years.

MR. CHAMPION: There is something else which should be added. I agree with that, but something else should be added. This is going to be a very difficult recruitment

problem, and it is going to take a considerably longer time to recruit this staff than the target date set forth in the report. We are going to be in a highly competitive situation with the new organization down there.

We need authority and I think the Commission should take note now to have it brought up to the Legislature that the money made available for these positions shall be made available with the money for consultants during that period, and during that period with the consultants we will have an idea whether this is the ultimate or something else might be; but we do need the money -- with the understanding that the money can be spent for consulting besides these positions. This is, one, because of the recruiting problem; and, two, because we are not certain what we really need.

GOV. ANDERSON: Item 14 has been moved and seconded, carried unanimously.

Item 15 is determination of Commission policy on specific current legislation affecting tide and submerged lands. Mr. Hortig.

MR. HORTIG: Mr. Chairman, I can brief this. As the Commission will recall, on August 18, 1964 the Commission authorized the Executive Officer to report to legislative committees, for consideration of future action with respect to tide and submerged land grants, several general and specific recommendations -- the principally important one being the first general placement of a moratorium on the issuance of new grants

until such time as the various studies being conducted by the various branches of government are completed and appropriate legislative control specifications have been adopted.

These recommendations were reported to three committees during the interim, as noted, and appear to the staff to be still applicable for consideration by legislative committees on tide and submerged lands bills that have been introduced at the current session of the Legislature, with one exception.

While there have been three proposed grants, only two are political subdivisions and it is as to these that it is recommended the Commission authorize the Executive Officer to report to appropriate legislative committees the position of the Commission relative to the respective legislation in S.B. 204, Short, and S.B. 754, Schrade, proposing grants to the City of Stockton and the City of Coronado in San Diego Bay, should be reviewed in the light of previous recommendations of the Commission; that on A.B. 1024, Bagley, the Executive Officer be authorized to report no objection because this act would convey certain tide and submerged lands that are necessary to the United States in furtherance of the Point Reyes National Seashore -- which places this grant and its utilization in an entirely different category in that there is a planned utilization program for these lands with a buffer zone on which considerable national funds have been spent in acquisition of adjoining uplands.

BOARD FORM 7-84 SAM OAP

GOV. ANDERSON: Our moratorium, however, isn't in any way indicating opposition to the individual application -- it is just a delay at the present time?

MR. HORTIG: Just as a matter of principle, in order to get a standard set of programs for the future.

GOV. ANDERSON: When would this moratorium go out of effect?

MR. HORTIG: When we have an established and coordinated legislative program for handling tideland grants and something which almost certainly will be compatible with the recommendations for tidelands administration that will be carried in the State Development Plan -- which, as Mr. Champion indicated, has a submittal date of this winter.

GOV. ANDERSON: Any further comment on this recommendation?

MR. CHAMPION: No. I would move that we authorize the Executive Officer to convey the thinking of the Lands Commission to the appropriate legislative committees.

MR. CRANSTON: Second.

GOV. ANDERSON: Moved and seconded, carried unanimously.

MR. HORTIG: There follows then an analysis of A.B. 800, Stevens, which in very generalized terms would preclude the Lands Commission in the future from undertaking the analyses and studies and suggestions and recommendations to a grantee of the type that the Lands Commission engaged in

with respect to reviewing an application by the City of Los Angeles for development of Santa Monica Bay tidelands.

This could be construed as resulting in actually an effective practical rescission of the review authority of the Commission, if this act were adopted.

Under the circumstances, on page 45 it is recommended that the Commission authorize the Executive Officer to report its opposition to this bill, in view of the factors which are outlined in the agenda item.

MR. CHAMPION: In view of the fact that we are trying to move toward more stringent and careful regulations, I would move that such opposition be conveyed to the committees and to the author.

MR. CRANSTON: Second.

GOV. ANDERSON: It has been moved and seconded, and carried unanimously.

MR. HORTIG: Next, starting in the upper portion of page 45, there is a reference to A.B. 1239, Bagley, which would appropriate $1,500,000 from the general fund to the Commission for making grants to political subdivisions to cover twenty-five to fifty percent of the cost of re-acquiring, that is, into public ownership, tidelands previously sold into private ownership.

The recommendation at the top of page 47 suggests that, without any reference to the desirability or feasibility of a general fund appropriation of $1,500,000, it is recommended