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GOV. ANDERSON: The meeting of the State Lands Commission will come to order. The secretary will make note that we have two of the members here presently. The first item will be the confirmation of minutes of which meeting?

MR. HORTON: The meeting of March 29, 1962, Mr. Chairman, previously distributed to the Commissioners.

MR. CRANSTON: I move approval.

GOV. ANDERSON: I'll second; carried unanimously.

The first item classification is permits, easements, and rights-of-way to be granted to public and other agencies at no fee, pursuant to statute. Consideration is to be the public benefit. First is the Noyo Harbor District -- 45-year life-of-structure permit for submerged water main, 0.044 acre tide and submerged lands of Noyo River, Mendocino County; applicant (b) is Recreation and Park Department of City and County of San Francisco -- life-of-structure permit, 2.62 acres submerged lands of San Francisco Bay, San Francisco County -- to extend existing breakwater; applicant (c), State of California, Division of Highways -- Termination of Easement P.R.C. 2067.9; issuance of new easement in lieu thereof for 5.314 acres tide and submerged lands of Sacramento River, Tehama County, for construction, maintenance and operation of a bridge; applicant (d), United States Department of the Interior -- permit, to expire 10/31/62, for installation of experimental acoustical current velocity meter in Yuba River, Yuba County, to check...
MR. CRANSTON: None.

MR. ANDERSON: It has been moved, seconded, carried.

Next one is Classification Number 2 — Permits, easements, leases, and rights-of-way issued pursuant to statutes and established rental policies of the Commission. First applicant is Margie and Ben Rizzi — a 15-year residential lease, Lot 15, Fish Canyon, Los Angeles County, annual rental $65.

MR. SIEROTY?

MR. SIEROTY: Yesterday in the workshop Mr. Cranston raised some issues regarding our leasing cabin sites in this area and he pointed out that chances are we are, first of all, giving some implied promise of renewing these leases perhaps; also the question of what kind of structures are being built on these leases for cabin sites; and I wondered whether he had any feelings on our going ahead with a lease of this kind.

MR. CRANSTON: Well, I think that pursuant to the study we have been making of land policies that we should explore that policy very carefully and perhaps make some changes; but I think applications we have before us which have been processed should, in all fairness, be dealt with in accordance with the policy we have had in the past.

MR. ANDERSON: This is a little different from what we have talked of, so far.

MR. MILL: To the extent, Mr. Chairman, that there is a program to eliminate fish. Grunion from the jurisdiction.
of the Land Commission and to transfer such jurisdiction to the U.S. Forest Service under terms and conditions which are applicable under the lease here recommended.

GOV. ANDERSON: If we transfer this over to the Federal Government, then the lease and everything will be transferred in toto?

MR. SORTEG: Yes, sir; and the U.S. Forest Service in a previous negotiation having indicated satisfaction with the state continuing to grant such recreational leases for which it receives applications, provided the total term of the lease does not exceed ten years -- which is the practice with the Commission has followed and the practice which the Land Division has followed preceding, since 1932, for this specific area.

MR. CHAPIN: I would favor approval.

GOV. ANDERSON: Applicant (b) is Edward J. and Donald E. Orfritza -- 2-year renewal of Lease P.L.C. 2177, 50 acre site and submerged land of Sacramento River, Yolo County, annual rental $150, for floating and fishing.

Applicants (c) is Al Parker Brown -- 10-year prehistoric mineral extraction lease, 106 acres school lands, Riverside County, within the limits of prospecting held in P.L.C. 574.4 for minerals other than all others, to secure recovery from.

Applicants (d) is Al Brown -- any of the above.
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Applicants (a) is R. J. Cypher -- one-year extension, from 7/1/62 through 7/1/63 of Prospecting Permit P.R.J. 234... the above school lands, Imperial County, for geothermal steam, all minerals other than oil and gas, and water. (To further evaluate potential of the area and to carry engineering problem).

Applicants (b) is William R. Helmsen and Verlin Helmsen -- approval of assignment from H. W. Mclaury of Lease P.R.J. 285.1, as amended; other and unreserved lands of Rare Island Strait, Solano County, for facilities for boat harbor.

Applicants (c) is Southwest Gas Corporation -- assignment from Nevada Natural Gas Pipe Line Company of兹尤特-area deposits P.R.J. 104.1, submerged lands of Colorado River, San Bernardino County, for high-pressure gas pipe line.

Mr. KERR: On the assignment, etc.
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of the agenda items; and in order to clear the records of the
surviving corporation, it is necessary to approve, in effect,
the assignment from the Nevada Natural Gas Pipe Line Company
to the surviving corporation. Nevada Natural Gas Pipe Line
Corporation and Southwest Gas Corporation were combined effective March 25, 1962 through a statutory merger under the laws of the State of California and Nevada, with the Southwest
Gas Corporation as the survivor. Under the name of Natural
Gas, they did hold this easement.

COV. ANDERSON: Applicant (b) is Phillips Petroleum
Company, Edwin W. Pauley, et al -- approval of reassignment
from Shell Oil Company of its undivided interest in portion of
State Oil and Gas Lease P.R.C. 2205.1, submerged lands Santa
Barbara County. Will you give us a brief on that, too?

MR. HOWARD: Previously, the Commission approved the
partial assignment from the original bidding lessees, Phillips
Petroleum and Edwin Pauley, principally, of a portion of
P.R.C. 2205.1 to Shell Oil Company. Shell Oil Company, pursuant to that assignment, of what was approximately the
southern half of the lease, as reflected on the map following
page 10 of your agenda, drilled a further exploratory well;
had now determined that they would prefer to surrender their
assignment back to the original lessee. Upon approval of
reassignment, the records sections of the State Lands Commis-
sion will be that the total area originally acquired under
public bidding to Phillips, et al, will be under the record
GOV. ANDERSON: Back to where we were originally.

MR. HORTIS: Back to where we were originally.

GOV. ANDERSON: Applicant (1) is Phillips Petroleum Company and Pauley Petroleum, Inc., et al -- Deferment to 2/10/63 of drilling requirements, Oil and Gas Lease P.R.C. 2205.1, tide and submerged lands Santa Barbara County, to allow for completion of pipeline, accumulation of necessary reservoir performance data, and continuation of geologic studies.

MR. CRANSTON: Move approval of those items under 2.

GOV. ANDERSON: I think we are still going. Applicant (1) is Richfield Oil Corporation -- Deferment for period 7/2/62 through 12/31/62 of drilling requirements, Oil and Gas Lease P.R.C. 1/06.1, Rincon Field, Ventura County, to continue studies to determine feasibility of drilling additional wells into the leased lands from other locations; (1) Richfield Oil Corporation -- Deferment through 12/31/62 of drilling requirements, Oil and Gas Leases P.R.C. 305.1 and P.R.C. 309.1, Coal Oil Point, Santa Barbara County, pending approval of unit agreement which is currently under review.

Applicant (1) to Signal Oil and Gas Company -- Deferment through 12/31/62 of drilling and operating requirements, Santa Oil and Gas Lease P.R.C. 307.1, Rancho Mission, pending approval of unit agreement which is currently under review.
MR. HORTEG: Yes, sir.

GOV. ANDERSON: Is there any reason for all of these at one time?

MR. HORTEG: Only because the time periods are running approximately concurrently among these various leases and there is a similarity in the development taking place; and, of course, in the case of the last one, Signal Oil and Gas Company, there is non-development, but there is no basis for recommending that the lease be terminated inasmuch as there are no other potential bidders for the lease at this time and by canceling at this time we would simply cancel out the income for 510 plus acres of tide and submerged lands, of which the State has about a million unleased. So in any area not in potential demand, it is preferable to let the lease ride until such time as further exploration and development might be justified by reason of development of additional exploration data or even development of new technology -- all of which, of course, are under constant study.

In the case of all the other deferments, the lessees have all actually proceeded diligently in advance of the required drilling schedules as required under the leases; they have exceeded the minima. They are all in the position where new geologic data, exploration data, have been made available either by reason of development on the leases or, for example, Shell Oil has assigned under the L.R.C. 29C in Item (b) and in order to evaluate and establish an attitude further development
In view of the fact that these leases are developed, in general, ahead of the scheduled requirements, it is felt that it is advisable to allow the lessee to make further studies before going ahead with the development schedule.

Additionally, in item (i) relating to P.R.C. 2205, the operator has the problem of not yet having in operation a gas line from Gaviota to Golota to carry any production from the lease, even if it were developed.

The combination of these factors, the staff feels, is sufficient to grant a six-month deferment to clarify all the problems inherent there.

Item (j): The Commissioners, with the exception of Mr. Champion, will remember visiting the Rincon Island off-shore Ventura. There are now more wells drilled and in operation from the island than are required by the lease conditions up to date. Again, the minima has been exceeded. An ocean floor completion has been made to the westerly of that island. In order to evaluate techniques for new exploration and the combination of the exploration data now available to that lessee, there should be a study period to determine an optimum further development program for the future -- whether another island should be built; whether a single ocean floor completion should be placed and, if so, where -- so when the operations are resumed, they can be resumed in a sequence in order to achieve operating efficiency; because state of prior work...
moving off a well at a time would be prohibitive.

In the case of item (k), there are two adjoining leases held by the same lessees and operated by one of the joint lessees, the Richfield Oil Corporation -- two leases with two sets of operating requirements; and it appears that probably optimum development can only result from combining the operations of the two leases under one unit agreement. The format for this is under technical review by the State Lands Division and under legal review by the Office of the Attorney General; and until we can report and recommend a satisfactory format for this to the Commission, it is felt equitable that the lessee should be granted a deferment of operating requirements during this interim study period. Concurrently, the operator is also continuing technical studies with respect to combining the operations of these two leases.

Item (l), Signal Oil and Gas Company, is the lease I referred to in the first instance, which has had exploration, no development of production, is not being threatened by drainage; and hopefully the operator, I believe, is holding this lease with the anticipation that some day there may be data become available by reason of development of adjoining leases or development of new technology which may justify further exploration. The only advantage of the continuation of the lease itself as the state is concerned to do, I believe, $45 annual rental -- that, of course, state or
cancelled out if the lease were cancelled. There are no
other prospective bidders for this area at this time.

GOV. ANDERSON: Applicant (m) is the Pacific Gas and Electric Company -- two 15-year right-of-way easements, tide and submerged lands. The first is 6.61 acres of Estero Americano, Sonoma and Marin counties, annual rental $109.40, for overhead transmission lines; second, is 2.5452 acre under Humboldt Bay at Eureka, Humboldt County, annual rental $35...

for cable crossing.

Applicant (n) is Pacific Gas and Electric Company -- five 49-year right-of-way easements, tide and submerged land: 1.86 acres of Eel River, Humboldt County, total rental of $1,725.73, for overhead wire crossing; second, 0.106 acre of Middle River, San Joaquin County, total rental $300.36, for gas pipe line; (3) is 0.04 acre of Mokelumne River, San Joaquin County, total rental $111.23, for gas-line pipe; (4) is 0.14 acre of Old River, Contra Costa County, total rental $290, for gas pipe line; (5) is 0.035 acre of Latham Slough, San Joaquin County, total rental $100.75, for gas-line pipe.

MR. CHAMPION: Exactly -- What is the difference between a gas pipe line and a gas-line pipe?

MR. HERTIG: The pronunciation is different.

MR. CHAMPION: I move approval.

MR. HERTIG: Mr. Chairman, before a vote on the
motion, may I suggest you still a notice to give notice to all
those who are aware of the other right-of-way being granted.
MR. STERTY: Could we hold that until later, Mr. Chairman? I think we might have discussion on that.

MR. HORTON: As you wish.

GOV. ANDERSON: All items under Item Classification 2 have been moved.

MR. CHAMPION: Second.

GOV. ANDERSON: Seconded, unanimously carried.

Item Classification 3 -- City of Long Beach

approvals required pursuant to Chapter 29/36, First Extra session: Project (a) Subsidence Studies, second phase --

Estimated expenditures 7/1/62 through 6/30/63 of $185,000 with $1,500 estimated as subsidence costs; project (b) Price

Approval of costs to be disbursed by City of Long Beach for

operation and maintenance of tideland beach areas and facilities in the 1962-63 fiscal year from City's share of tideland

oil revenues, in amount of $1,111,265, subject to Commission review and final audit subsequent to completion of the work;

project (c) Approval of amendment to crude oil sales contract dated July 16, 1960 between the Board of Harbor Commissioners

of the City of Long Beach, as seller, and Signal Oil and Gas Company, as buyer -- to simplify scheduling of crude oil ship-

ments and payments therefor; project (d) Authorization for

Executive Officer to certify approval of "First Amendments to
Contract for Sale of Natural Gas, dated January 29, 1961, between Board of Harbor Commissioners of City of Long Beach, and Lomita-Signal-Wilmington Associates, retroactive to September 1, 1961 -- to provide for a single gas gathering system and for delivery of dry gas to operator under unit agreement for Fault Block IV, Wilmington Oil Field.

Any comment on this?

MR. HORTIG: Yes, sir. Items (a) and (b) are the normal type which are presented to the Commission: (a) as a particular projects for alleviation of subsidence or repair of subsidence, with costs allowable subject to prior approval of the State Lands Commission under the Statutes of Chapter 29, 1956; item (b) is again the normal type of presentation by the City of Long Beach, requesting advance approval for certain maintenance type projects and studies that are conducted on an annual basis, and for which annual approval for the ensuing annum must be obtained in order that the City may properly spend these amounts from its share of tideland revenues.

Items (c) and (d) are necessitated in terms of amendments to oil sales contracts and gas sales contracts primarily because, as you gentlemen will recall, the tideland operations were being conducted originally under contracts separate from current operating contracts as to update leases. In some portions of the field new, operations have been initiated, with the approval of the State Lands department, and
In order to provide for a clarified accounting and operating procedure it has been necessary to amend the individual original operating contracts to reflect the requirements of unit operation. With respect to the areas involved in these two proposed amendments, this is the case as to crude oil sales for the portion of the field affected, and the natural gas sales.

Contract amendments, under Chapter 27 of the Statutes of 1956, even though they are with respect to contracts previously entered into by the City with other operators, also require approval by the State Lands Commission. All of these contracts have been reviewed and approved for consideration by the Commission insofar as legal requirements are concerned by specific written opinion of the Office of the Attorney General.

MR. CRANSTON: Move approval.

MR. CHAMPION: Second.

GOV. ANDERSON: Carried unanimously.

Classification 4 -- Land items: Sales, selections, etc. All land-sale items here presented have been reviewed by all State agencies having a land acquisition program, and unless otherwise indicated no interest has been reported by those agencies in any of the lands proposed for sale.

(1) In the sale of vacant state school lands:

Applicant: (1) United States Plywood Corporation. The bid is above the appraiser's value; the bid is $00,100.

(2) In selection at all sale of vacant Federal lands:
The First is Molybdenum Corporation of America. The bid and appraised value are both the same -- $13,185.30. Number (2) is the State Division of Forestry -- appraised value and bid are the same, $26,600.

(c) is the selection of vacant Federal lands on behalf of the State. Applicants do not desire to proceed with acquisition of the lands, and the first is 162.62 acres in San Bernardino County, pursuant to application of Edgar Arth Turner.

MR. CRANSTON: I move approval of those items.

MR. CHAMPION: Second.

MR. HORTIG: Mr. Chairman ... .

GOV. ANDERSON: Mr. Hortig.

MR. HORTIG: With further reference to item (c)(2), the acquisition for the State Division of Forestry, which are lands which have been acquired by the State Lands Division from the Department of the Interior at the request of the Division of Forestry and are now to be transferred to the Division of Forestry, subsequent to the conveyance to the State the Land Office of the United States Bureau of Land Management cancelled -- and notified the State of the cancellation -- of an advance construction permit issued to one Charles J. Sherburne for use of a portion of a mountain top for radio communication facilities. Mr. Sherburne has appealed the cancellation of permits to the Director of the Division of Land Management, and this procedure has not yet been
resolved in the records of the Bureau of Land Management.

Therefore, the transfer of title being approved today by the
Commission to the State Division of Forestry will be made sub-
ject to any effect that the Bureau of Land Management’s deci-

dion may have as to Mr. Shorttune’s right to those lands.

GOV. ANDERSON: On the first one, how did Mr.
Stipovich get out of this? Did he turn it over or apply for
it for the corporation?

MR. SMITH: He applied for it individually; and the
first applicant having not the highest bid, Mr. Stipovich was
eliminated.

GOV. ANDERSON: And did he turn his interest over
to the U. S. Plywood Corporation?

MR. SMITH: That I don’t know. He was applying for
it personally.

MR. HORTIG: Our records show he was doing this,
which left the United States Plywood Corporation as the first
applicant.

MR. ROBINSON: Mr. Chairman and members of the Com-
mision, Clyde Robinson, Vice President of the Ocean Fish
Protective Association; and we are concerned in this disposi-
tion of State lands. I do not know your policy on the dis-
position of such lands.....

GOV. ANDERSON: Well, then are you talking about
the land which you are talking about
in a. I think more consideration should be given to that
to recreation of the State. As I say, I do not know your policy on getting rid of these lands, disposing of them; but I think we should give a great deal of consideration to the recreational potential that these lands could afford possibly in the future.

I don't know the lands in question, where they are, what they would offer; but with the influx of people that California is having at this time, recreational facilities are getting more and more in demand and I think a great deal of consideration should be given to these items in this regard before they are disposed of by the State.

GOV. ANDERSON: The secretary will make note of the gentleman's comment. You might just briefly tell him where we fit in on this, Frank. We have a policy that I think pretty well complies with what he is talking about.

MR. HORBIG: This is correct, Mr. Chairman. Of course, the Land Commissioners did hold a workshop, public review, yesterday -- with respect to development of policies which include very definite recognition of the essential nature of recreation and what relationship proper administration of state lands might have to such a program....

GOV. ANDERSON: Three and a half hours' worth.

MR. HORBIG: ... and in this particular instance -- and I do not understand the question -- I would like to call the committee's attention to the photograph of the drain proposed to be added to the [missing text].
There follows a map and then photographs -- and if anyone has ever seen a more rugged collection of boulders in California, we haven't.

MR. CHAMPION: I don't think the gentleman is speaking to this item. I think he is speaking to the general policy. In this discussion, part of the thrust of the whole discussion was that wherever there is a potential recreational use, we want to look into that ahead of any kind of private development.

MR. CRANSTON: Also, it should be noted that every public agency interested in recreation or such public use is given a prior opportunity to express interest in this land before it is sold.

MR. HORTIC: And there have been no expressions with respect to the specific parcels here offered for sale.

GOV. ANDERSON: Any other comment? (No response)

I believe you moved?

MR. CRANSTON: Yes.

MR. CHAMPION: Second.

GOV. ANDERSON: Carried unanimously. Classification 5 is compensatory royalty agreements. The first is approval of compensatory royalty agreement with Patrick A. Doheny for...
So Standard Oil Company of California of joint agreement dated February 8, 1926 between State of California, Humble Oil & Refining Company, Jersey Mid-Continent Oil Company, and Standard Oil Company of California, for State's interest in portion of the bed of the Sacramento River, Llano Seco Gas Field, Glenn and Butte counties; and authorization for demand for payment of royalty on gas previously drained from State land.

Mr. Hartig, do you want to comment on these?

MR. HORTIG: Yes, sir. The first compensatory royalty agreement proposed to be entered into with Mr. Patrick Doheny results from the discovery and drilling of wells in the Grimes area in Colusa County flanking the Sacramento River, the bed of the Sacramento River at that point being under the jurisdiction of the State Lands Commission. Mr. Doheny is willing to enter an agreement to pay a royalty of 16-2/3\% on the allocated portion of state oil and gas drilled from his wells.

GOV. ANDERSON: How far is his well from the river?

MR. HORTIG: On either side, and close enough to drain.

GOV. ANDERSON: No way of jeopardizing the river?

MR. HORTIG: There are no impediments to navigation in the river and, in fact, authority to the commission to enter such agreements is predicated on the fact that there will not be wells situated where State lands; but a
royalty will be paid in lieu of drilling on State lands. So there can be no impediment to the State lands, either above the surface or below the surface, and still royalty will be collected by the State for such gas which might migrate from State lands into adjoining lands.

MR. CHAMPION: Are gas royalties amounting to any sizable amount of money?

MR. HORTIG: Yes, sir. In Sacramento and San Joaquin Counties, the royalties a year ago were $1,250,000 to the State from leases and compensatory royalty agreements entered into by the State Lands Commission.

MR. CHAMPION: And that's steadily increasing?

MR. HORTIG: Yes, sir.

MR. JOSEPH: May I ask -- I imagine the percentage of the State ownership to the whole of the area has been calculated here. I imagine it would be.

MR. HORTIG: The answer is a categorical "yes," and the geographical details of the relationships are reflected on the second map following page 47 of the agenda. Also, the agreement has been reviewed and approved as to legal form by the Office of the Attorney General in Los Angeles, Mr. Joseph.

GOV. ANDERSON: How about (b)?

MR. HORTIG: Now, Item (b), as you gentleman will note from page 39, in the resolution of what is almost ancient history, much of the tension arises out of a compensatory royalty agreement similar to those with the local oil companies, and...
with potential participants on both sides of the Sacramento River, Glenn and Butte counties, north of the area previously discussed, as early as 1955. The compensatory royalty agreement was entered into conditionally by some of the operators, dependent upon a showing of the actual area of claim by the State as to ownership in the area, because the Sacramento River had meandered to numerous locations over a period of years also claimed by private owners. This is reflected by the complex map which you will find following page 50 of your agenda.

In the interim period, rather than entering into litigation and having a court decision, we prevailed upon the parties to this compensatory royalty agreement, Humble Oil & Refining and Standard Oil Company of California, to accept a computation (reflected on page 50) of what the State's claims are and the amount of drainage that had actually resulted -- which, under the terms of the agreement, would have yielded the State a royalty of approximately $11,107.

All parties to the agreement are now willing to pay the State its claimed past royalties. Humble Oil and Refining, having gone off production in the area, will quitclaim its portion of the agreement. Standard Oil Company of California will continue with its portion of the agreement. This is a resolution of the problem without going into the complexities and expense of extremely difficult litigation.

MR. CHIEF JUDGE: have approval of items (a) and (b)
MR. CRANSTON: Second.

MR. HORTIG: Mr. Chairman, on page 49, in the resolution -- Item 2, the next to the last line, reads: "... production from wells drilled on outside lands in the Llano-Seco." The word "outside" should be stricken from the resolution, and the resolution read: "production from wells drilled on lands in the Llano-Seco."

MR. CRANSTON: Then the motion is so revised.

MR. CHAMPION: Yes.

GOV. ANDERSON: So ordered, and carried unanimously.

Classification Number 6 -- Approval of maps and boundary agreements. (a) is authorization for Executive Officer to approve and have recorded Sheets 1 through 3 of 3 of maps entitled "Map of the Ordinary High Water Mark Along the Shore of the Gulf of Santa Catalina, Vicinity of Ocean-side, San Diego County, California," dated January 1962.

MR. HORTIG: Mr. Chairman, in anticipation of the development upstream of the Del Mar boat basin for boat harbor facilities, it is apparent that such operations will affect artificially the ordinary high water mark of the Pacific Ocean, the dividing line of the State's jurisdiction and private uplands. Therefore, it is suggested that the surveys that have been established as to the last natural location of this line be mapped, and they were; and as platted, and they were; and recorded in approval of the lands & solution, in order to fix the location of this line and preclude title...
GOV. ANDERSON: (b) Authorization for Executive Officer to approve and have recorded Sheet 1 of 1 of map entitled "Record of Survey Map Tideland Survey No. 170, located on west shore of Tomales Bay," Marin County, California, dated April 1962.

MR. NORTIG: Mr. Chairman, this is an analogous situation relating to a proposed development in Marconi Cove on Tomales Bay, where the ordinary high water mark and the mean high tide line is now in a natural condition. If and when the development proposed is to take place, the natural condition for ebb and flow of the tides will be disturbed and the boundary line will be affected because of these unnatural conditions; and it is proposed to enter into a boundary agreement with the adjoining upland owner, which is satisfactory to the adjoining upland owner, fixing as of this time and immediately prior to any development, the location of the ordinary high water mark. If, in fact, the development does not take place and the natural conditions are not disturbed, then this agreement will terminate.

GOV. ANDERSON: (c) is the authorization for the Executive Officer to approve and have recorded Sheet 1 of 1 of map entitled "Survey Map Tideland Survey No. 170, located on west shore of Tomales Bay," Marin County, California, dated April 1962; but to execute an agreement with the adjoining upland owner fixing the location of the ordinary high water mark.
Narconi Cove between State submerged lands and private lands along Tomales Bay, Marin County.

Mr. HORTIG: This would be the survey map which indicates the location of the ordinary high water mark fixed by the boundary agreement in the preceding item.

MR. CHAMPION: Move approval of this.

MR. CRANSTON: Second.

MR. SIERRCY: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Mr. Hortig mentioned in the prior case the agreement would terminate in the event the developers did not go ahead with their development. Why is it that we cannot set the boundary of our lands which will be fixed for all time for that purpose?

Mr. Hortig: Because, Mr. Sierry, the law provides that the ordinary high water mark in nature is where you find it in nature at any time of the day or hour and as long as artificial agencies interpose. The line continues to fluctuate. Hence, even if an agreement is made immediately preceding artificial conditions, this is the line. If artificial developments are not made, then the natural line will continue to fluctuate and five or ten years from now the line will fluctuate and will be the legal boundary, irrespective of any boundary the Commission has entered into. The boundary as agreed to becomes the boundary in law only if it becomes fixed because of the interposition of artificial conditions.

MR. ALBRIGHT: Move it
GOV. ANDERSON: moved, seconded and carried unanimously. Item Classification 7 -- Approval For issuance of patents. (a) Is authorization for Executive Officer to issue patent in the name of Elijah E. Lyons for 101 acres described as NE 1/4 of Section 15, Township 6 North, Range 10 W, S.W., included within Application No. 1948, Los Angeles Land District. (b) Is authorization for the amendment of descriptions and issuance of patents in name of original applicant, Charles A. Chapman, for lands set forth in Midland Surveys 35, 40, and 41, Solano County.

MR. HORDES: Both of these items, Mr. Chairman, probably have involved more discussion than the monetary value would indicate. It is of historical interest that in the case of item 7(a), a certificate of purchase was issued in 1894. The holder, or successors in the case of the holder of the certificate, are entitled to patent to the lands upon payment of the patent fees and signatures to the last payment on the partial payment plan in effect, there was a determination that there never had been a patent issued in the interest of oil in the 1894.

The Patent Office has ruled in 1919, under a duly executed, late certificate an 'Oil to a mineral interest' thereon at the cost of the test, and to be a customary thing that this has been, if the minerals, is established.
Therefore, it is recommended, in view of the application for patent, that the Commission authorize the issuance of patent in the name of the original holder of the certificate of purchase, as provided by law.

MR. CHAMPION: Move approval of items 7(a) and (b).

MR. CRANSTON: Second.

MR. ANDERSON: Moved and seconded, carried unanimously.

Classification 3: Service agreements. (a) Authorization for Executive Officer to execute service agreement with City of Berkeley, Alameda County, providing for surveying services to be rendered to the City pursuant to Chapter 2180/61, at Commission's actual costs not to exceed $7,000.

(b) Authorization for Executive Officer to execute service agreement with Sio Nois Harbor District, Alameda County, providing for surveying services pursuant to Chapter 555/61, at Commission's actual costs not to exceed $7,500.

MR. CHAMPION: Move approval.

MR. CRANSTON: Second.

MR. ANDERSON: Secendd, carried unanimously.

Item 9: Authorization for Executive Officer to request Attorney General to initiate legal action against William F. Hallin and Garrett H. Islander, individually and the Union Steam Harbors, to recover rental delinquency in amount of $11,200 against U.S.C. § 4711.
been informed of the receipt of payment of a portion of this rental delinquency. Therefore, I request that action be deferred on consideration of this item, in order that we can re-evaluate and report to the Commission subsequently.

MR. CRANSTON: So move.

MR. CHAMPION: Second.

GOV. ANDERSON: So ordered. Item 10 -- Authorization for Executive Officer to execute agreement with Metropolitan Blueprint Company of Los Angeles at cost not to exceed $7,500 for reproduction services for the 1962-63 fiscal year.

MR. CHAMPION: Is this a bidding result?

MR. HORTIG: Yes, sir. This is the lowest unit bid from many blueprinting organizations who have given satisfactory service to State Lands Division in the past.

MR. CHAMPION: Move approval.

MR. CRANSTON: Second.

GOV. ANDERSON: Seconded and carried unanimously.

MR. HORTIG: Subject, incidentally, to approval by the Department of Finance.

GOV. ANDERSON: Item 11 -- Authorization for Executive Officer to execute supplementary agreement with Bendix Corporation - Computer Division, for rental and maintenance of a 6-15 Bendix Computer and Flexewriter, and for systems analysis services for period 7/1/62 through 6/30/63, at rental of $1,950 a month, with total not to exceed $18,500.

MR. HORTIG: Mr. Chairman, one division of State Land
For approximately six months the utilization of the computer system here discussed, the utilization of which was the result of a study with the Organization and Cost Control Division of the Department of Finance for the optimum type of equipment that could be applied to the Commission’s engineering problems. We are happy to report that even in this brief time we were able to effect a 20% reduction in 38,000 man-hours of backlog in our engineering section, despite the fact that in the year the assignments included fourteen new projects for the survey of legislative grants of tide and submerged lands.

Similarly, arrangements have been made to attack problems in the resources section, which will expedite and augment royalty income and exploration of tide and submerged lands in a manner which could not have even been tackled without this equipment.

Additionally, we have under study with the Organization and Cost Control Division the supplementing of this equipment with the normal business machine type of activities, in order to include routine accounting, record-keeping procedures.

The first six months was a trial period to determine efficacy similar as engineering problems were concerned, as there were no prototypes at that time. Business machines are well known. We are pleased to report that we have been able to
rent the equipment for an additional year.

MR. CHAMPION: So move.

MR. CRANSTON: Second.

GOV. ANDERSON: Carried unanimously.

Classification 12 is the proposed Oil and Gas Lease
Santa Barbara County -- Parcel 10.

MR. HORTIG: The next parcel which is recommended
for consideration by the Commission in the sequential lease
offer procedure adopted by the Commission would be designated
as Parcel 10 in Santa Barbara County, is described on page 65,
and is depicted graphically on the map following page 65 of
your agenda. It is recommended that authorization be granted
to the staff to publish the requisite notices of intention to
receive bids for lease for this area.

MR. CRANSTON: I so move.

MR. CHAMPION: Second.

GOV. ANDERSON: Carried unanimously.

Classification 18 is approval of new pay range
established by Department of Finance as of July 1, 1962, for
position Executive Officer, and assignment of incumbent to
maximum salary range step.

MR. HORTIG: Shall I leave now?

MR. CHAMPION: I'll give approval before you leave.

MR. CRANSTON: Second.

GOV. ANDERSON: Moved and seconded.

MR. HORTIG: I learned one thing from you, Sir.
Chairman, from the legislative end of the situation; when you are ahead, quit.

GOV. ANDERSON: Carried unanimously. Classification 14 is the confirmation of transactions consummated by the Executive Officer pursuant to authority confirmed by the Commission at its meeting on October 5, 1959.

MR. CHAMPION: Move confirmation.

MR. CRANSTON: Second.

GOV. ANDERSON: Carried unanimously. Item 15 -- informative only, no Commission action required -- Report on status of major litigation.

MR. HORTIG: As indicated, Mr. Chairman, this is informative only and, in general summary, there have been no further actions -- although all the litigations are still pending. I call your attention again to the fact that the major single piece of litigation potentially -- that of the case of the U.S. versus Anchor, revolving around the Long Beach subsidence situation, will go to trial on limited legal technical grounds early in October.

GOV. ANDERSON: 16 is the confirmation -- Let's see, you have a couple supplemental items to come in before we take our adjournment.

MR. HORTIG: Yes, page 70, item 43....

GOV. ANDERSON: Page 70 is the first supplemental calendar item -- Acceptance of bid and award of oil and gas lease, tide and submerged lands, Santa Barbara County - M. O.
MR. HORTIG: In which it is recommended that the joint bid of Shell Oil Company and the Standard Oil Company of California, offering cash bonus payment in consideration of the lease in the amount of $1,502,020, received June 7, 1962, be accepted and the lease be awarded in view of the fact that the bid was reviewed and evaluated by the staff as to technical sufficiency and economic factors and the Office of the Attorney General has reviewed the bid and determined it to be legally acceptable for the consideration of the Commission.

MR. CRANSTON: I move approval.

MR. CHAMPION: Second.

GOV. ANDERSON: Moved and seconded, carried unanimously. How far is the one we just leased here and the new one we are offering today? I was looking at the map here and trying to see. This one we have just approved now is identified here as Parcel 7?

MR. HORTIG: Yes, sir. The one you recommended, Parcel 10, is immediately offshore from Capitan; Parcel 7 is immediately offshore from Caviota.

GOV. ANDERSON: About six miles?

MR. HORTIG: About six miles to the west, as a matter of fact. I will show you on the map.

MR. CHAMPION: What is the status of parcels 6 and 7?

MR. HORTIG: 6 and 7 are under bid offer at the present time. Closing date for bids on parcel 6 will be on
the 19th of July and for March 5 the 19th of August.

GOV. ANDERSON: Now, then, when this one is given, we only have what -- one or two to go?

MR. HORTIG: Two in this area.

GOV. ANDERSON: All the way from Point Conception on down....

MR. HORTIG: ... to the Elwood Oil Field will be under lease.

GOV. ANDERSON: The second supplemental calendar item 49 -- Application for easement lease for twin tower line crossing of San Francisco Bay parallel to Dumbarton Bridge, San Mateo County; Pacific Gas and Electric Company -- W. O. 3524. Frank? *

MR. NORTH: Mr. Chairman, the Commission will recall that at a prior meeting on presentation of the application for consideration with the recommendation of the staff that this right-of-way easement by granted, Mr. Sieroty raised a series of questions based on considerations particularly because of problems which you, in your membership in the San Francisco Toll Bridge Authority, have been concerned with -- particularly in connection with their parallelism with a situation which developed as to a new San Mateo Bay Bridge crossing; and as to what effects the granting of the easement in the context here proposed might have in relation to establishing similar problems in the future leases as the proposed easement parallels the existing preemptory right one of

* Mr. Cranston left the meeting at about this point.
which there also might be further planning in connection with

Roy crossings for a replacement thereof and, therefore, conflicts either physically, esthetically or otherwise in connection with the transmission line recommended casement.

Pursuant to withholding action on this item, Pacific Gas and Electric was requested to and did furnish supplemental data -- answers to specific questions relative to the feasibility or lack of feasibility of alternative methods of placement, alternative routings for the line -- which were furnished to Mr. Sieroty and copies of which are attached to the supplemental item you have before you. The applicant, Pacific Gas and Electric, having responded or intended to respond, I am sure, to the questions which were raised by your office, the item is now again before us for consideration by the Lands Commission, in the event that in your other capacity the problem and questions that were raised previously have been resolved.

MR. ANDERSON: Mr. Sieroty.

MR. SIEROTY: Yes. Mr. Tandy of Pacific Gas and Electric is here. I know he will want to speak on this. We raised several problems and Pacific Gas has been cooperative in giving us their position.

The first question was whether there was any possibility of putting these electric lines on the bridge, on the existing support structure, and that is not feasible.

The other matter is related to putting the electric
lines under the Bay and Pacific Gas has given information
which I think is quite interesting, which indicates the manner
in which it has to be done because of heat problems and pres-
surization, and the cost of doing this runs quite high -- into
several millions of dollars. Maybe Mr. Tandy would like to
give us some information on that.

We also asked whether the lines could be run to the
south of the Bay and this would increase their cost, depending
on the route which would be picked, seven million dollars to
thirteen million dollars cost.

There is remaining some question regarding the
exact location. My personal feeling, is that asking Pacific
Gas to put these lines under the Bay or to change the route
to go to the south end of the Bay perhaps is an unreasonable
request on our part because of the excessive cost. There are
possibilities and there are questions regarding the exact
location in the area.

I think our experience with the San Mateo-Hayward
Bridge indicates that we want to do some planning now with
relation to the transmission lines, so that when we get into
planning for a new Dumbarton Bridge, which will unquestionably
come in the near future, we will not be faced with the problem
that we were faced with on the San Mateo-Hayward Bridge.

Now, specifically, I think we should determine two
technical problems, which perhaps are not difficult. One is
the present proposed location, which is adjacent to the existing
Dumbarton Bridge: How far away would the minimum distance be considering only the question of the wires, snapping of the power lines, the tower lines falling on the bridge, from a new Dumbarton Bridge; and the proposal of a new Dumbarton Bridge would probably be on the north side of the existing bridge. The P. G. & E. wants to put the tower lines on the north side as well. I say on the north side because that is where the toll stations are now being located and I discussed that with Mr. Faab of the Toll Bridge Authority staff. He indicated this would be the likely location, immediately adjacent to the bridge. So this is one technical problem.

The second technical problem, and I think an important one from your study standpoint, is raised by the fact that F. G. and E. here is proposing parallel lines. That is, there will be two lines. I think we ought to have study made of the possibility of putting both of these lines on one set of towers. I know Mr. Tandy has done some work on this. This point was raised specifically in my discussions with Mr. William Stephen Allen, who has been retained by the Toll Bridge Authority to act as consultant on the San Mateo-Hayward Bridge.

He has also raised the question of the desirability of removing the tower lines from the immediate vicinity of the bridge. He would suggest, if there are going to be tower lines, that they be unobtrusive and, secondly, that they be a distance of a quarter to a half mile from the proposed
bridge. He feels to have the tower line too close is overbearing and too imposing and would interfere with the design of the new bridge.

Now, we are spending a considerable amount of money in the new San Mateo-Hayward Bridge and particularly with a design that would enhance the Bay area, and I think we would want to do that when we get to the new Dumbarton Bridge; and I think we ought to do some planning, inasmuch as you, Mr. Anderson, as well as Mr. Champion, are members of the Toll Bridge Authority. We ought to do planning now, so later on we don't find we didn't use sufficient foresight.

GOV. ANDERSON: Mr. Tandy, would you like to comment now, and we can ask some questions.

MR. TANDY: All right, Mr. Chairman. As to the locations of the tower lines with respect to the existing bridge, they are now proposed to be 240 feet from the center of the closest tower line to the center of the Dumbarton Bridge.

GOV. ANDERSON: Where will this be in relation to the possible proposed new bridge, if this is to be on the north side also?

MR. TANDY: We contacted Mr. Raab, also asked him if it had been determined where the new bridge is going to be; and he said he did not know, however he indicated possibly it would be on the north side. He also indicated -- we asked him if there would be sufficient space between our proposed tower line and the existing Dumbarton Bridge to build a new
bridge, and he replied in the affirmative -- that it appeared there would be sufficient room to construct a new bridge there.

GOV. ANDERSON: In other words, if there would be 240 feet, we would build a new bridge between the bridge and your lines?

MR. TANDY: He indicated there was sufficient space. I don't know the width or the design of the new bridge, how close it would be to the existing bridge. Again, in talking to Mr. Ruab, it will be as close as possible to the existing bridge.

MR. CHAMPION: In terms of what Mr. Sicroty said and Mr. Allen's comments in connection with the other bridge, there really isn't any difference in terms of his judgment -- whatever you did there would be too close from his design viewpoint. Is there a major problem in going south of the present structure?

MR. TANDY: Well, in going south of the present structure, now I don't know. In talking of the design of the bridge, are we talking esthetics?

MR. CHAMPION: Yes, we are. Mr. Allen is retained exclusively as a design consultant.

MR. TANDY: In going south, we are going to have three crossings of your new highway and existing highway, whereas we now have one line crossing the highway. If we go south, we are going to have three crossings. From an esthetic standpoint, it would seem to defeat your purpose.
GOV. ANDERSON: Is there some advantage to you to have your lines so close to the bridge?

MR. TANDY: Well, ordinarily, yes — most people prefer to have a barrier such as this and a line close together, rather than spotting them up and down the Bay -- keeping your crossings as close as possible and your openings.

Going to the south, you do have a railroad bridge from the south. There again, we have the problem of clearance of your Palo Alto airport. Where we are, we can maintain adequate clearance, although we will have to light our towers.

In moving north, further from the bridge, speaking esthetically you are going to have a new barrier there. There will be more to see, rather than where the line is relatively close.

MR. CHAMPION: Are there major cost considerations if we stay in this area and use the overhead? Are there major cost differences between moving north and south or moving out from the bridge?

MR. TANDY: Yes. When we get away from our present proposed route, when we go south — it is indicated in your letter, the costs advance. If we go north the same distance, you would have just about the same cost. However, one of our major problems in going north would be our right-of-way problems. Going north, we are going to have to go diagonally over considerable land to get into our service station. As far as private lands, we would have a real right-of-way problem.
Mr. Tandy, may we ask one question? Mr. Champion asked whether if you moved south it would mean major cost. In moving the lines it is the question of getting close to the airport with high towers and, secondly, this would require crossing over the bridge, over a highway going to the bridge, three times instead of one; is that correct?

MR. TANDY: That's true, yes.

MR. SIEGERTY: What are the additional costs?

MR. TANDY: They are set forth in your letter.

As far as your additional line costs you have, that would be alternative number two as set forth in the letter.

MR. SIEGERTY: Four hundred thousand dollars?

MR. TANDY: Approximately four hundred, four hundred six thousand dollars. You have an additional mile and a half of line down into that area, in addition to being close to the airport. We don't know -- this hasn't been taken into consideration, an airport clearance on this. Initially, we had some objection to the height down in that area from the Palo Alto airport. They are concerned with the hazard to the airport.

MR. SIEGERTY: From an aesthetic standpoint, probably it would be preferable to have the tower line close to the railroad line there to the south of the existing bridge; but it's a question of whether these other two factors -- that is, the height of the towers and proximity to the airport and crossing over the bridge -- would balance that out.
MR. CHAMPION: Let me ask you: Are we in a position to really come to any final conclusions about this this morning, to have any final recommendation? I would assume that if Mr. Allen, yourself and Mr. Tandy would meet to discuss various possibilities, you might have a recommendation or a clear-cut alternative for the Commission and we could act on it; but I don't think we can negotiate it in this session.

MR. SIEROTY: I would agree and would certainly be willing to do that. I think it is important if the Commission wants to take this approach and go further into this.

GOV. ANDERSON: I personally feel we could go a bit further into it. You know, on the other board we spent several millions of dollars just in the one design. Here, we are apparently doing almost contrary to what we did in the other instance. I think it is possible if the company and the designer we have hired could get together, and Mr. Sieroty, and the rest of us who are interested, we could make something out of it.

MR. TANDY: Mr. Chairman, we have tried since the last meeting to answer all the questions that Mr. Sieroty would put to us and anyone else could put to us. We have tried to give you the answers to this. We are in a real bind on these lines. We are down to the point if we don't confer our steel orders the first of the month, we are going to be faced with eight months to a year's delay on these two lines, and it is critical to get them in.
GOV. ANDERSON: What would it cost us if in the near future we found, when we were building our bridge, it was too close to your line?

MR. TANDY: Mr. Chairman, let me put it this way. Why wasn't this studied before -- these things you are speaking of? We have tried to work with you with these alternatives, as Mr. Sieroty pointed out -- the south end of the Bay, the north end of the Bay. Now you have other proposals.

GOV. ANDERSON: Originally, at that time we were not talking about alternate routes. We had hoped that there might be some way that these things could be built without any excessive cost. Some of us felt possibly cables could be placed under the water, or some other alternative, or under the bridge. Each one of these has come back that it is too costly because of heat and these things. The next thing is: Are there any other routes that would make it more acceptable?

MR. CHAMPTON: We are trying to save you money.

MR. TANDY: We studied other routes at the same time Mr. Sieroty suggested underground, which are in your study now. Let me ask you this: Is your main conflict constructionwise with the new bridge or aesthetics?

GOV. ANDERSON: A combination. I would hate to come back on the Toll Bridge Authority in the near future and find that we had given permission in this Commission to build lines right where we want to build the bridge. Then there is the other side. There is the aesthetic angle. I
think we spent six or seven million dollars on another design, just for another bridge for the San Francisco area. Then if we discard this whole idea and let somebody upset the whole approach, I think we are getting ourselves into a problem.

MR. CHAMPION: You have got several million dollars involved in this, and so have we. It isn't something in which we want to take the information before us and take something that will cost you several more million, nor do we want to put you to that cost. I think you are perfectly safe in ordering your steel.

MR. TANDY: We can't. Each tower is specially designed. These have been designed. We have ordered our steel, but have to confirm our order by the first of the month.

What I was going to suggest -- we can do this: To be assured that there will be no conflict with the bridge, we can have an additional 200 feet and still use the same towers we have designed now, and move another 200 feet to the north. You are talking about 440 feet, thereby adequately assuring that there would be no conflict with the new bridge.

MR. CHAMPION: That is purely in looking at the construction.

MR. TANDY: As to esthetics, in looking at these bridges, where you are closer to a bridge, a driver will have to look up to see the conductors. The farther away you get from the bridge, the more the conductors are in view. There again, if you are concerned with the esthetics, if you would
have various crossings across the Bay, it would seem you
would want them closer, rather than spotting them up and down
the bay.

MR. CHAMPION: Esthetics being a matter of taste,
the Toll Authority has decided to hire a consultant with a
reputation for having good taste, rather than doing it our-
selves; and I would hate to do anything without Mr. Allen
saying that under the circumstances this is a solution we can
live with. That is fundamental; what we can do.

MR. TANDY: Mr. Allen is?

MR. CHAMPION: Mr. William Stephen Allen, a Bay
area architect.

MR. TANDY: His office is where?

MR. STEROTY: San Francisco.

MR. CHAMPION: Anshen and Allen.

MR. TANDY: I brought one of our transmission engi-
neers with me. If you would like to ask him as to any portion
of the construction, what we can do, I am sure he would be
glad to answer any questions you may have.

MR. STEROTY: There was a very important question
Mr. Allen raised. That is the possibility of trying to build
a tower that would handle all these lines, rather than having
parallel lines; and maybe your expert can reply to that.

MR. TANDY: Fine.

MR. LAMBERT: My name is Lambert, F. G. and E. I
might explain what our present design is like. It's a double
circuit. There are two circuits on the towers, double circuit lines; and the design is a little bit special. It is the first time we have done this, knowing rights are going to be harder and harder to get and we don't want to cross the Bay any more. So we are designing this line so it will have twice the capacity of any 220-volt line we have had in the past. We do this by having two conductors, (we call them bundles) -- two conductors eighteen inches apart instead of one; and by doing this we will have twice the capacity of any line we have had before.

Now, of course, the load is just double over what we have had. Now, to try to put two more circuits on one tower, we would have a tremendously expensive and massive tower. I don't know how it would be. It would have to be two towers with some kind of a bridge on the top. In doing this, you are installing four circuits on a structure and doing this in any possible way would complicate the operation and maintenance of the line considerably. At the present time, we are able to take one circuit and work on it, with the other circuit remaining hot. Now, with three circuits or four circuits, that couldn't be done.

GOV. ANDERSON: You will have parallel towers -- is that the idea?

MR. LAMBERT: Under the present design?

GOV. ANDERSON: Under the present design.

Mr. Lambert: Well, there are two lines involved.
GOV. ANDERSON: Two lines, each with their own towers?

MR. LAMBERT: Yes.

GOV. ANDERSON: How far will those towers be apart?

MR. LAMBERT: 115 feet apart, and each tower line will have two circuits, each circuit being this bundle conductor. Each circuit has three phases, each phase having two conductors.

GOV. ANDERSON: And it would be cheaper for you to build two separate towers than one single structure to handle the entire load?

MR. LAMBERT: By far.

GOV. ANDERSON: What do you mean by "by far"?

MR. LAMBERT: I would think it would be at least double.

GOV. ANDERSON: What is the cost? What are we talking about?

MR. LAMBERT: One hundred thousand -- two hundred thousand dollars a mile.

GOV. ANDERSON: What is the total length?

MR. LAMBERT: That's the average for the whole line. It will be well in the vicinity of three hundred or four hundred thousand dollars on the crossing itself. It's about twenty-one miles total. The two highest towers, they are over 300 feet high. They are in the vicinity of $350,000 each including the special foundations.

MR. CHAMPION: Your present over-all cost is about...
seven million dollars?

MR. LAMERT: For the line itself.

MR. CHAMPION: If you were just to go ahead and build it, and build it the way you would like to build it, it would be about seven million dollars?

MR. TANDY: Even if we move this a couple hundred feet to the north, our engineers feel we could still use the same towers; but to go further, we will have to completely re-design.

MR. SIEROTY: What is the cost for going underground or under the Bay? You have that, I think.

MR. HORTIG: Twenty times as expensive.

MR. LAMBERT: Well, yes, in general it's fifteen to twenty times. It's going to be higher across the Bay. There are so many unknowns about putting lines under the water.

MR. SIEROTY: I was pleased to note that one of the assembling grants today -- it's only a 12-KV -- you are going under water.

MR. LAMBERT: Yes. The problems with lower voltage aren't great. There are no underwater 220-volt lines in the country and there is only very few, a very small mileage, of the underground -- not underwater; and these are very short lines.

GOV. ALDRICH: Could we get someone from the I.G. and C. with Mr. Allen and Mr. Sieroty to work this out, so we can have a little more at the next meeting?
MR. SHERTY: I will be very happy to meet and to know the P.G. and E. to try to make it go along with this.

GOV. ANDERSON: Is Mr. Allen's time pretty available?

MR. SHERTY: He has been very cooperative in discussions with me and I know he is interested in this and think he will make himself available.

MR. CHAMPION: I would be willing -- and I don't know whether the other members can arrange this -- but if some conclusion could be worked out relatively, a special meeting could be held or even telephonic communication would solve the problem, so we wouldn't have to defer your plans for a month.

MR. TANDY: Ue would certainly appreciate that. We are getting really worried about getting additional service in the area.

MR. CHAMPION: I will move that.

MR. TANDY: Will somebody set up the meeting? Will you, Mr. SHERTY?

GOV. ANDERSON: Our office will set up the meeting and, Alan, that will be your job. You move that we set up a meeting with the P.G. and E. and Mr. Allen, and I think Mr. Khan should be involved ....

MR. CHAMPION: Yes.

GOV. ANDERSON: ... and anyone else from our division or Commission who is interested, and name it like that. If they can come to some solution or recommendation, we can either take it to Rotary or go to the other council.
MR. CHAPMAN: I think certainly Mr. Horst or some member of the staff should be involved. We might get into some technical problems.

MR. SEEBROOK: I think we can set up a meeting within the next ten days.

GOV. ANDERSON: Does this conflict with any of your problems?

MR. HORST: No, sir.

GOV. ANDERSON: No objection, as ordered. Thank you very much.

The last item is confirmation of date, time and place of the next meeting — Thursday, July 25, 1962, at ten a.m. in Los Angeles.

MR. CHAPMAN: All right with me.

GOV. ANDERSON: No objection, as ordered. If there is nothing more, the meeting is adjourned.

ADJOURNED 12:37 A.M.
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