MINUTE ITEM

9/25/67

60. STATUS OF MAJOR LITTIGATION - W.O.S 2716, 1839.16, 503.461, 2875.15, 503.481, 503.513, 503.521, 503.510, 4721, AND 503.527.

The attached Calendar Item 52 was presented to the Commission for information only, no Commission action being required.

Attachment Calendar Item 52 (3 pages)

INFORMATIVE CALENDAR ITEM

52.

STATUS OF MAJOR LITIGATION - W.O.S 2716, 1839.16, 503.461, 2875.15, 503.481, 503.513, 503.521, 503.510, 4721, AND 503.527.

The following information is current as of September 11, 1967:

1. Case No. 747562 (now consolidated with Case No. 649466) W.O. 2716 People vs. City of Long Beach, et al. Los Angeles County Superior Court (Long Beach Boundary Determination, Chapter 2000/57)

The City is being contacted by the Attorney General's Office to urge them to obtain the necessary information so that this matter may be moved along more quickly than in the past.

2. Case No. 55800 People vs. Monterey Sand Co., et al. Monterey County Superi(r Court

> (Action for declaratory relief, damages for trespass, quiet title, accounting, and injunction. It is alleged that the Monterey Sand Company is trespansing upon tide and submerged lands owned by the State, and is removing valuable sand deposits from said lands without paying any royalty to the State.)

Inspection and copying of documents accomplished.

3. Case No. 30417

City of Morro Bay vs. County of San Luis Obispo and State of California San Luis Obispo County Superior Court

(By Chapter 1076, Stats. of 1947, certain tide and submerged lands in the vicinity of Morro Bay were granted to the County of San Luis Obispo. On July 17, 1964, the City of Morro Bay was incorporated so as to include the area of the granted tidelands. The purpose of the present action is to determine whether or not the City of Morro Bay acquired title to these tide and submerged lands as successor to the County and whether the City must take immediate title to such lands or may postpone taking title to some future date.)

A revised property description has been received from the City of Morre Bay that does not conform to the maps which the City furnished previously. A new map has been requested from the Consulting Engineer for the City.

-1-

v.n. 1839.16

W.O. 503.461

1079

INFORMATIVE CALENDAR ITEM 52. (CONTD.)

W.O. 2875.15

W.O. 503.481

W.O. 503.513

4. Case No. 107490 People vs. Pacific Fluorite San Bernardino County Superior Court

Stipulations for Entry of Judgment have been filed with the Court.

5. Case No. 21087

Thomas P. Raley vs. State of California Yolo County Superior Court

(Suit to quiet title to land adjacent to the Sacramento River.)

Appraisal has been made for purpose of settlement, and settlement conference is to be held.

6. Case No. 892790 City of Los Angeles vs. City of Long Beach, et al. Los Angeles County Superior Court

> (An action by the City of Los Angeles against the cities of Long Beach and Oakland, alleging that the said cities have violated the provisions of the State's grants of lands, in trust, within their harbor districts by entering into alleged discriminatory agreements.)

Demurrers of all Defendants were crally argued on August 29, 1967, and were taken under submission by the Court. A ruling is expected within the next few weeks.

7. Case No. 903714

W.O. 503.521

Standard Gil Company v. City of Carpinteria, et al. Los Angeles County Superior Court

(Challenge by Standard of the appraised value set by the State Lands Commission on the State's interest in tide and submerged lands proposed to be annexed by the City of Carpinteria.)

No change; i.e., Demurrers overruled. Respondents given leave to enswer.

INFORMATIVE CALENDAR ITEM 52. (CCNTD.)

8. Case No. 892295

W.O. 503.510

W.O. 4721

Miller vs. City of Santa Monica, et al. Los Angeles County Superior Court

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

No change; i.e., The City and the State have not filed any Demurrer or Answer as yet. However, the City and the State have entered into a Stipulation with the Plaintiffs in lieu of a preliminary injunction. The Stipulation restrains the Plaintiffs from building in the disputed area, and restrains the City and the State from removing any improvements thereon.

). Case No. 5 Original in the United States Supreme Court United States vs. State of C. lifornia

(Relating to the location of the offshore boundaries between lands under the paramount jurisdiction of the United States and lands owned by the State, for such purposes as minerals. A Supplemental Decree was entered in this case, settling the principal controversies between the State and the United States, but reserving jurisdiction in the United States Supreme Court to settle any remaining controversies.)

No change; i.e., As previously reported, correspondence between the Office of the Attorney General and the Solicitor General of the United States indicates the possibility that further proceedings may be necessary to resolve legal questions relating to the ownership of submerged lands in the vicinity of Santa Barbara and Anacapa Islands and other submerged lands off-lying Carpinteria, California. The Solicitor for the Department of the Interior has been contacted in an effort to evolve an interim working agreement relating to controverted areas off Carpinteria pending a Court adjudication.

W.O. 503.527

10. Case No. 57239 White vs. State of California Sonoma County Superior Court

> (Quiet title action against the State to determine a property boundary along the Petaluma River, Sonoma County.)

No change; i.e., State's answer filed. Meeting for settlement pending.