

**Assistance to Counties for Public Defenders—Continued**

The program was first budgeted in the 1965-66 Governor's Budget and the Department of Finance estimated \$500,000 would be needed. The actual subvention for that year was \$432,485 which was \$67,515 or 13.5 percent under the estimated expenditure. For 1966-67, the Department of Finance estimated \$600,000 would be needed and \$630,140 was expended. The additional \$30,140 was obtained from the \$67,515 carried over from 1965-66. The remaining \$37,375 is shown in the 1968-69 Governor's Budget as an unexpended balance, representing estimated savings for 1966-67. The amount estimated for expenditure in 1967-68 of \$600,000 represents 7.3 percent of the counties' anticipated expenditure of \$8,250,000. The 1967-68 estimated expenditures were held at the 1966-67 budgeted level to effect budgetary savings. As more experience is gained with this subvention item, the estimates of expenditures by counties should become more in line with actual experience.

*We recommend approval of the item as budgeted.*

**SENIOR CITIZENS PROPERTY TAX ASSISTANCE**

ITEM 309 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1248

**FOR SUPPORT OF SENIOR CITIZENS PROPERTY TAX ASSISTANCE FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested	\$22,000,000
Estimated to be expended in 1967-68 fiscal year	None

<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b>	None
------------------------------------	------

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Reimbursements under this program will be made to owners of single family houses who are over 65 years of age, when the combined income of all residents of the home falls at or below \$3,350 annually. A detailed explanation of the administrative expenses of this program will be found in the analysis of Item 121, the Franchise Tax Board budget.

*We recommend approval as budgeted.*

**CAPITAL OUTLAY****Summary**

Immediately after World II, the state had large sums of sequestered funds available for capital outlay. Later the electorate approved a series of bond issues which largely financed the plant expansion program without competing for General Fund dollars.

Now, for the first time, neither General Fund surpluses nor bond funds are available for continued plant expansion. Instead, the expansion is now in direct and hard competition with support needs.

After giving effect to the Governor's line item vetoes, the Budget Act of 1967 appropriated a total of over \$172,833,000 for all capital outlay purposes and from all sources, excluding the highway construction program and the water development program which do not appear

## **Capital Outlay**

### **Summary—Continued**

in the Budget Act. Over 90 percent, or more than \$155,976,000 of that total, represented bond funds for higher education, park and recreational facilities both state and local, with a relatively small portion for other state agencies such as the Department of Corrections and the Youth Authority. The greater part, by far, of the bond funds was for higher education including the junior college system, and appropriations for that purpose exhausted the bond funds other than those specially earmarked for parks and recreation. In the latter case there still remains about \$28 million available for appropriation of this, at least half is for minimum development purposes and cannot be used for acquisition. Most of the balance is for local grants.

General Fund appropriations and appropriations from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education totalled \$12,335,000 in 1967 with the former representing about two-thirds of the total. Special fund appropriations exceeded \$4,520,000, representing the Motor Vehicle Fund and the Fish and Game Preservation Fund. By contrast, something over \$288,698,000 was appropriated for outlays in the Budget Act of 1966.

The Budget Bill now before the Legislature includes a total of almost \$152,618,000 from the General Fund, the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education and assorted bond and special funds. In addition, there is included over \$19,293,000 on a contingent basis from bond funds for junior colleges which must be voted on by the electorate in June 1968. The reduction in expenditures from 1967-68 to 1968-69 as proposed is significant and reflects a continuation of the downward trend in plant expansion investment for state facilities since 1966.

*The reduction is compounded by a shifting of almost \$22 million of General Fund proposals from their heretofore normal inclusion in the local assistance portion of the bill to the capital outlay section, thus reducing construction as regularly budgeted to a grand total of only \$150 million including the junior college contingency appropriation proposal.*

*These shifts from local assistance to capital outlay consist of \$1,449,000 for county juvenile correctional facility construction aid; \$15 million for local flood control construction aid; \$3,908,155 for reclamation easements and rights-of-way acquisition aid; \$1,091,900 for participation in beach erosion control; and \$500,000 for transfer to the Water Resources Development Bond Fund for maintenance of recreational benefits of the State Water Project. Strictly defined these may qualify as capital outlay, but have not before been so treated. However, because the 1967 tax measure required that at least \$90 million of the General Fund be utilized as capital outlay on a "pay-as-you-go" basis, the total money directed to this purpose in 1968-69, with the aid of these shifts in classification has been made to aggregate \$90,919,719.*

## **Capital Outlay**

### **Higher Education**

The competition for both support and plant expansion funds has brought higher education to a crucial phase characterized by readjustment and reassessment. Because they rely more fully on state sources for their financial support, this affects the University of California and the state colleges more directly and vitally than it does the community colleges.

#### **University**

Enrollment in the University of California increased from an actual total of 55,033 FTE in the fall of 1962 to an estimated total of 81,655 in the fall of 1967 in all areas with the exception of the health sciences, an increase of approximately 10 percent per year. However, the increase of over 26,600 FTE enrollments in the five-year period tells only part of the story. The element of great importance is that growth in upper division and graduate enrollments has been appreciably more rapid so that the increase of over 26,600 enrollments contains a significantly larger proportion of upper division and graduate students. It is generally accepted among academic planners that upper division and graduate students require greater and more costly space than is required for lower division students. In the fall of 1967, lower-division students approximated 34½ percent of the total enrollment. Projected forward to the fall of 1975, this drops to slightly over 26 percent.

For the same period upper-division students drop slightly from about 37½ percent to a little over 36 percent. The two levels of graduate study on the other hand increase sharply from about 28 percent of the total in 1967 to over 37½ percent in 1975. This shift in emphasis, places a marked strain on both support and capital plant expansion funds even recognizing that graduate students may receive some benefit from federal aid both in research grants and in nonreimbursable federal grants for research space construction.

Steady and substantial increases in construction costs during the period of 1962 to date have reduced the dollar values to where a \$70 million program in 1967-68 is worth only \$55 million in 1962 construction dollars. Tracing the funds made available for construction during the same period, but excluding University funds allocated for special purposes, we find that the 1962-63 fiscal year appropriations were over \$52,307,000. In the 1963-64 fiscal year, this rose to over \$69,021,000. In the 1964-65 fiscal year, there was a drop to over \$61,737,000. In the 1965-66 fiscal year, it again exceeded \$68,508,000 of which over \$10,720,000 was anticipated to be funded from federal sources. In 1966-67 it rose to over \$78,817,000 with more than \$12,450,000 anticipated to be covered by federal grants.

In the current fiscal year of 1967-68, this dropped to almost \$70,092,000 with more than \$14,270,000 expected to be covered by federal grants. For the proposed budget year, the drop is quite sharp to \$48,200,000, of which only \$3,444,000 is expected to be covered by reimbursable federal grants. Because the projected enrollment growth for

## **Capital Outlay**

### **University—Continued**

the eight-year period from 1967 to 1975 for both undergraduates and graduates is over 32,750, or 40 percent, and because the mix is shifting in favor of graduate students, it would appear that reductions in plant expansion must have one of the following results: (1) more intensive use of the facilities already available or to be built, (2) reduction of projected enrollments, or (3) reduction of the quality of the educational process. It is of interest at this point to compare the University Regents' proposals for funds to be provided by the state with those which were ultimately provided by three budget acts. In 1965, the University's proposal exceeded \$75,659,000, and the appropriation was slightly over \$57,388,000. For 1966 the proposal was over \$87,503,000 while the appropriation was \$65,867,000. For the current fiscal year, the proposal was over \$111,596,000 while the appropriation was over \$55,821,000. These included health sciences projects. It may be seen from these figures that the gap between the University proposals and actual appropriations is growing and may accelerate since projects which are not financed as proposed in any given year usually move into the following year and become top priority for that year. The Regents' proposal for the budget year totalled over \$75,634,000 but was open ended in the sense that a number of projects therein were predicated upon the receipt of federal assistance and, in the event such assistance was not forthcoming, the amount for the state request would have risen accordingly. The Budget Bill on the other hand provides only \$44,756,000 of state funds.

It is interesting to compare enrollment projections made in preparation for the 1967-68 fiscal year, before it was known what the total construction appropriation might be, with the current projections which were made after the sharp reductions which occurred in the 1967 Budget Act and in the face of the knowledge that fund availability for plant expansion would probably not significantly improve in the near future. In the earlier tabulation, the total projection exclusive of the medical and health sciences for the 1968-69 year was 86,068 students. The current projection for the same year is 85,294 students, a relatively small overall reduction, although within the total there are five campuses which show increases over the prior tabulation. For the 1969-70 year, the projection is 90,686 in the earlier tabulation and 88,791 in the current one. In this case, the reduction is relatively significant. For the 1970-71 year and thereafter to 1975-76 there is a downward reduction in each year in the current tabulation as compared with the earlier one but generally averaging about 1,000 FTE which cannot really be considered of very great significance. It cannot be assumed from these relatively minor changes that the University has found some method of accommodating the increasing enrollments in a plant having a decreasing rate of expansion. The projections are predicated largely on assumptions that a plant adequate in the University's judgment, will be available and they are also generally based on the admission standards and practices previously adopted by the University. At some point in time if the physical plant fails to expand at the proposed rate some

## **Capital Outlay**

### **University—Continued**

effects in enrollment will probably be felt as well as possible effects on the overall quality of the institution. For the short term we believe that the University can accommodate, but over the long pull various adjustments or alternatives may have to be considered.

The five-year plan for the period 1968-73 for capital improvement published by the University under date of June 22, 1967, contemplated a total program, for those kinds of facilities which might normally be considered the state's responsibility, of \$462,831,000 in state funds and \$124,369,000 in federal grants or \$587,200,000, an average of over \$115,-000,000 for each of the five years. The five-year program for the same period published in the Governor's printed budget does not break down the projected federal funds in quite the same way as was done in the University's own document. It does, however, show that for the four-year period of 1969-70 through 1972-73 there is a projected total of so-called "unfunded projects" of nearly \$392,250,000, presumably implying state funds. To this would be added some portion of the projects shown in the same tabulation as "federal funds" totaling over \$164,-560,000. This figure probably includes what are known as additive federal grants for space wholly supported by the federal government for research purposes and the reimbursable or matching grants for space otherwise legitimately the responsibility of the state. In any case, it is clearly indicative that both tabulations contemplate an average of over \$100,000,000 annually. It should be noted that in the Governor's printed budget, however, there is a footnote to the effect that the last four years of the five-year building program is the University's estimate of need and does not represent an approved program.

### **State Colleges**

The state college system is faced with expansion pressures which are probably equally as great as those in the University but of a somewhat different composition. The graduate element in current and projected enrollments is not nearly as significant as in the University. However, there is a steady shift in the relationship between upper and lower division with a goal of achieving a ratio of 60 percent upper and 40 percent lower division by 1975. This will require more and costlier area than if the relationships were reversed since upper division requirements are significantly greater in the more expensive facilities than lower division. It may be of interest to note that of the 18 active college campuses, 11 were established since the close of World War II with Los Angeles and Sacramento being the first in 1947. These account for very nearly half of the total enrollment in the system. (Actually 19 colleges are established but Kern County has not yet admitted any students and none are included in the tabulation for the budget year.) The total actual enrollment for the fall of 1962 in the entire system was 76,000 FTE students in the period from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., the standard time span for measurement purposes. Unfortunately we have no breakdown of the percentages of upper, lower division and graduate numbers. In the fall of 1967, the total has been estimated at 119,770, an increase of over 43,200 representing more than 56 percent

## **Capital Outlay**

### **State Colleges—Continued**

of the 1962 enrollment. This is an average of about 11 percent per year for the five-year period. Graduate enrollment for the fall of 1967 is estimated at 5,500 or just slightly over 4½ percent of the total enrollment, a very much less significant figure than the one indicated for the University. In the fall of 1974, total enrollment is projected to 184,690, a seven-year increase of nearly 65,000 representing 54 percent of the estimated enrollment for the fall of 1967 and averaging somewhat less than 8 percent per year, a significant rate reduction when compared with the prior five years. Graduate enrollment is projected at a total of 9,300 or very little more than 5 percent of the total enrollment, only slightly over the percentage in the fall of 1967, indicating a fairly steady and perhaps controlled growth. Comparisons made between the projections in the Governor's printed budget for 1967 for the years 1967 through 1973 and the tabulation for the same years contained in the new budget are remarkably close with relatively insignificant variations, except that starting with 1970 the projections are slightly higher in the current tabulation than in the earlier one with an increase of 2,000 in 1973. We infer from this that the system anticipates that its plant will expand more or less as it has planned, to accommodate the increased enrollment. If the expansion does not take place as expected, it would be reasonable to assume that there would be either an intensification of the utilization of space beyond the current standards or that enrollments will not be realized, or a combination of the two.

The proposed capital outlay programs for the state college system as well as the actual appropriations have shown some curious fluctuations in the past as well as in the projected future. The five-year plan published in July 1965 and amended as late as December 1965 proposed a total of \$66,670,000 for the 1966 Budget Bill. For the five-year period including 1966–67, the total was planned at approximately \$307,500,000. The Budget Act of 1966 appropriated over \$79,292,000 of which over \$14,698,000 was contingent upon receipt of a like amount of federal funds. The net amount of state funds was almost \$64,600,000 of which \$12 million was for the purchase of four new campus sites which had not been included in the five-year program as published by the trustees.

In the five-year plan, published in June 1966 and revised as late as November of that year, the total proposal for the 1967–68 fiscal year was over \$87,344,000. The total for the five-year period through 1971–72 was over \$367,500,000. This was more than \$50 million greater than for the five-year period ending in 1970–71. The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated over \$77,222,000 of which over \$17,122,000 was contingent upon the receipt of federal reimbursements. The net state appropriation totaled \$60,099,000.

The five-year plan published in June 1967 and amended in October proposed a total of over \$109,480,000 for the budget year. The five-year total through 1972–73 was \$379 million. The Budget Bill for 1968 includes a total of \$46,729,900 plus \$17,019,400 anticipated from federal grants. The latter, if realized would make a grand total of \$63,700,000, substantially less than the trustees' published proposal. The five-year

## Capital Outlay

### State Colleges—Continued

plan as printed in the Governor's Budget indicates an "unfunded" amount for the four-year period, 1969-70 through 1972-73 of nearly \$320,900,000 or an annual average of \$80 million. Here too, it is pointed out that the amount represents the trustees' estimates and is not an approved plan.

The various projects for the University and the state colleges are so widely dispersed in our analysis that it is perhaps difficult to make ready comparisons among them of cost per square foot and efficiency ratios. Therefore, we have prepared the following table consolidating these figures so that easy comparisons can be made. Among University projects the titles sometimes give no clue as to the nature of the facility since a proper name is sometimes used rather than a functionally descriptive title. For this reason we have indicated in the tabulation the nature of such facilities.

### University of California

Project	Project cost	Construction		Efficiency ratio
		per square foot	per square foot	
Berkeley				
Working drawings—Etcheverry Hall, Step 2 (engineering) --	--	\$37.00	\$31.00	57%
Davis				
Construct—chemistry addition --	\$5,217,000	41.20	34.20	60
Irvine				
Construct—social science unit 1	5,021,600	33.30	27.70	60
Irvine Medical				
Construct—surge facilities --	3,208,000	30.00	23.40	66
Working drawings—medical science I -----	--	49.10	40.45	60
Los Angeles				
Construct—library unit 2, north campus -----	3,469,900	32.50	26.36	77
Working drawings—life science III -----	--	44.00	36.85	54
Riverside				
Working drawings—Webber Hall addition (agricultural science) --	--	40.90	32.60	53.5
San Diego				
Construct—building 2D, John Muir (humanities) -----	2,687,700	31.61	25.68	61
Working drawings—fine arts building -----	--	40.10	31.40	63
Working drawings—marine biology S.I.O. -----	--	47.70	39.75	59
San Diego Medical				
Working drawings—clinical science building -----	--	50.15	41.75	62
San Francisco				
Construct—school of nursing building -----	3,291,700	41.00	32.20	58
Working drawings—school of dentistry building -----	--	54.50	47.00	60

## Capital Outlay

### University of California—Continued

Project	Project cost	Construction			Efficiency ratio
		Project per square foot	per square foot		
<b>Santa Barbara</b>					
Construct—south hall addition (social science) -----	4,383,000	31.68	25.94	56	
Working drawings—engineering II -----	--	41.30	34.85	63	
Working drawings—college of creative studies -----	--	39.19	31.40	65	
<b>Santa Cruz</b>					
Construct—performing arts building -----	2,440,000	41.60	32.00	64	
Construct—classroom unit 1 -----	557,000	35.30	28.00	64	
Construct—college 5 -----	762,000	36.22	28.87	64	
Working drawings—social sci- ence I -----	--	37.55	29.85	59	
Working drawings—college 6 -----	--	35.26	28.61	64	

### State Colleges

Project	Project cost	Construction			Efficiency ratio
		Project per square foot	per square foot		
<b>Chico</b>					
Construct—classroom office building -----	\$2,862,000	\$35.31	\$27.00	63%	
Construct—applied arts unit 2 -----	2,337,150	37.45	27.07	67	
Working drawings—art building -----	--	38.60	26.00	65	
<b>Fresno</b>					
Construct—engineering addition -----	1,836,050	50.00	27.64	65	
Working drawings—industrial art addition -----	--	35.15	24.55	65	
Working drawings—science building addition -----	--	42.70	27.76	60	
<b>Fullerton</b>					
Construct—administration- classroom building -----	4,332,000	31.29	25.70	61.5	
Construct—engineering building -----	3,146,000	42.61	27.58	68	
Working drawings—education classroom building -----	--	33.45	24.14	60.5	
<b>Hayward</b>					
Construct—administration building -----	3,462,050	30.50	25.80	60	
Construct—library -----	7,855,900	31.15	23.88	70	
<b>Humboldt</b>					
Construct—natural resources building (science) -----	1,492,000	41.30	31.32	61.5	
Working drawings—library ad- dition -----	--	33.00	23.81	69	
<b>Kern</b>					
Construct—initial buildings -----	2,056,694	25.75	18.60	80	

## Capital Outlay

### State Colleges—Continued

Project	Project cost	Construction		Efficiency ratio
		Project per square foot	per square foot	
Long Beach				
Construct—lecture classroom building	\$337,000	\$40.20	\$28.96	75
Construct—home economic addition	825,500	33.14	23.02	66.5
Construct—drama building	1,968,800	39.75	27.25	65
Working drawings—classroom faculty office building	—	29.85	23.38	65
Sacramento				
Construct—psychology building	2,073,340	30.30	25.05	60
San Fernando				
Working drawings—education building	—	32.85	25.71	65
San Francisco				
Construct—physical science building	6,750,800	42.50	28.70	59
Working drawings—humanities building	—	33.30	24.50	65
San Jose				
Working drawings—classroom building No. 3 (general classroom)	—	30.47	23.38	65
Sonoma				
Working drawings—art building	—	37.20	26.02	65
Stanislaus				
Working drawings—science building	—	44.00	27.75	60
Cal-Poly KV				
Construct—agriculture classroom building	1,703,000	31.70	24.18	63
Cal-Poly SLO				
Working drawings—library	—	30.83	23.89	70
Working drawings—engineering south	—	41.15	26.25	65

### Junior Colleges

State financial aid for junior college construction has totalled \$80 million since its inception and the last of the available bond moneys was appropriated by the 1967 Budget Act. Additional aid is contingent upon the passage of a bond issue to be placed before the electorate coincidentally with the primary in June of 1968. If passed this would provide \$65 million of which nearly \$19,300,000 would be appropriated by the current bill leaving a remainder of about \$45 million. The projections shown on page 172 of the capital outlay budget indicate a requirement for state funds averaging \$23 million annually for the four years 1969-70 through 1972-73. The balance would therefore finance two of these years, assuming that the projections were reasonably accurate. However, it should be pointed out that in a similar projection in the 1967 budget document the budget year was shown as requiring only \$10,500,000 of state aid and the like amount for each of the suc-

## **Capital Outlay**

### **Junior Colleges—Continued**

ceeding years. This means that there has been a substantial upgrading in the estimates of total need and raises some questions as to the accuracy of the projections in either case. It might be noted that the total program for each of these succeeding three years is \$50 million which means that the junior college districts collectively, at least those that seek state aid, must supply \$23 million of their own funds each year. This is a substantial increase over past performance.

Current procedures in the Department of Finance include a fairly careful review of each project proposed by the junior college district before inclusion in the budget. This parallels the procedure with respect to state colleges and the University. It is thus possible to assure that state funds will be wisely and economically expended and that some uniformity of approach will be developed by all of the districts.

In discussing the state colleges, we called attention to the fact that the enrollment goals were based on a reduction of lower division to 40 percent with upper division representing 60 percent. Such a goal can be accomplished only by the diversion of lower division students into the community colleges.

### **Other Agencies**

Other agencies in the budget proposal, both General Fund and special funds, represent a relatively minor percentage of the total. In fact, lower than has been the case for many years. The most significant proposals, in dollar volume, irrespective of source, are almost \$6,090,000 from the Motor Vehicle Fund for the Department of Motor Vehicles for site acquisitions, working drawings and building construction. This is a significantly greater figure when compared with the five years, 1963-64 through 1967-68 where the annual appropriations average well below \$2 million.

The parks and recreation acquisition and development program is represented by proposals totaling over \$8,215,000 from three fund sources, General Fund, Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund and the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historic Facilities Fund. However, the bulk at nearly \$6 million is from the General Fund. The principal thrust of this program is in the development of additional areas in existing parks or newly acquired ones. While there is no clearly developed five-year plan or total long-range master plan, it is reasonable to assume that development demands as well as possible additional acquisitions in future years will probably require an average of \$10 million annually, irrespective of source. For example, the development of the huge new Point Mugu acquisition will require millions of dollars over a period of years. Other relatively large recent acquisitions will also require extensive development. It may also be anticipated that the steady and relatively steep increase in water-oriented recreation will require millions of dollars to satisfy even on a comparatively modest basis.

The proposals in other agencies such as the Department of Conservation, Fish and Game, Corrections, Youth Authority and Mental Hygiene represent fairly low ebbs and probably cannot be considered as characteristic of future demands.

## **Capital Outlay**

### **Minor Construction**

The total for all minor construction, from all fund sources, is considerably reduced below that which was appropriated for the current fiscal year and represents a very substantial reduction below the 1966-67 fiscal year. To a large extent the reduction is due to the elimination from the minor project category those proposals which were essentially ongoing maintenance in character. These have been transferred into the various related support budgets. This is in keeping with recommendations which we have made over a period of years that ongoing maintenance is a proper support cost and should be reflected in regular support budgets. In some instances, particularly in the smallest agencies, these shifts have not yet been fully accomplished. Our position has been that minor projects should represent only new construction, alterations, modifications or clearly designated upgrading of existing facilities and systems. As in previous years, most of the proposals contained in the budget have been reviewed by us fairly extensively in the field and on site. In situations encompassing numerous small projects, our review has been on the basis of spot checking for characteristic types and purposes. With few exceptions we are in accord with the proposals.

During the 1967 legislative committee hearings, we recommended that in the case of the state colleges, lump sum amounts be appropriated to each college directly, not subject to trustee control or transfer between colleges. Our premise was that the staffs at the colleges had expended substantial man-hours at fairly high executive levels to determine their needs and that subsequently too much time was being spent both by the trustees, and the Department of Finance as well as our office in relation to the dollar value. Our premise was to give the colleges an opportunity to demonstrate their responsibility and ability to spend these funds wisely. Further, we proposed to review the projects actually committed in the field on a post-audit basis. Since the funds did not become available until July 1, 1967, our field inspections during the period from July to October were insufficient to indicate what disposal had been made of the appropriations. Consequently, it is too early to make any judgments. However, it is our intention to make a review before the close of the current fiscal year and in the event our findings are such as to indicate an unreliability on the part of the colleges we will report at the 1969 session with appropriate recommendations. In the meantime, for the 1968-69 budget we continue to recommend the same approach.

### **1967 Budget Bill Revisions**

The Budget Bill as originally introduced under date of January 31, 1967, contained a large number of proposed reversions in Sections 11, 11.1, 11.2, 11.3 and 11.4. The Legislature in its final passage of the bill rejected 22 of these proposals, almost all of them wholly but several of them in part. In a communication dated December 4, 1967, we had been informed by the Department of Finance that nine of these had been authorized to proceed for the full amount available. Four had been authorized on a partial basis and the balance remain in abeyance. Of

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 310**

### **1967 Budget Bill Revisions—Continued**

the latter, the most significant are Item 367(k) of the Budget Act of 1966, which provided \$143,000 for an additional elevator in the San Diego office building; Item 367(m) of the Budget Act of 1966, which provided \$200,000 for working drawings for a state office building in San Jose; Item 398(l) of the Budget Act of 1966, which provided \$302,350 for continuing development of Dry Lagoon State Park in Humboldt County; Item 398(o) of the Budget Act of 1966, which provided \$890,000 for the construction of access roads into the Grizzly Valley Reservoir recreation area and Item 367.1 of the Budget Act of 1966, which provided \$750,000 for the acquisition of a site for a state office building in Long Beach. We make no comment about these items other than to observe that the Legislature's rejection of the proposed reversions indicated that it desired that these projects move ahead.

### **DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES**

**ITEM 310 of the Budget Bill**

**Capital Outlay Budget page 3**

### **FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$898,375
Recommended for approval	250,000
Recommended for special review	648,375

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ----- None

#### **ANALYSIS**

This item proposes the schedule of three projects for alterations to various state buildings as follows:

(a) Alterations—Sacramento buildings necessitated by completion of O.B. 8 and 9 ----- \$250,000

The completion of O.B. 8 and 9 is currently estimated on a limited occupancy basis for about January 1969 and an unlimited basis by March 1969. The transfer of agencies into these buildings from leased space and other state-owned space will inevitably lead to some remodeling requirements as these other buildings are reoccupied. It is apparently not possible to provide actual alteration programs at this time and we have no basis for evaluating the amount of the proposal. However, it is fairly obvious that the movement into two such large buildings will be a massive endeavor and the amount of vacated space to be used by other state agencies will undoubtedly be large. Consequently, we feel that the amount is reasonable. Furthermore, before any actual expenditures can be made, proposals for alterations will have to be reviewed by the Public Works Board, at which time it will be possible to determine whether the funds are being reasonably and economically expended. *We recommend approval.*

(b) Alterations—archives and franchise tax building ----- \$248,375

It is our understanding that the alterations proposed in this building are principally for purposes of fire and life safety based on recommendations by the State Fire Marshal. However, we have received no

**Item 311****Capital Outlay****Department of General Services—Continued**

details and consequently we have no basis for evaluating the project as of this writing. We anticipate that the information will be made available before the proposal is heard by the several legislative committees. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(c) Alterations—resources building ----- \$400,000

The Department of General Services, in 1967, established new space standards which, if applied to the Resources Building, would enable the recovery of a significant amount of assignable square footage. It is anticipated that the increased utilization of the building and the resultant savings in lease payments by agencies now occupying leased quarters would repay the alteration investment in about two years. We have seen no data to support this premise nor have we received any detailed plan for the work. While we recognize that an increased utilization of the Resources Building will undoubtedly lead to savings, dependent upon a number of factors including the lease value of space to be vacated, we do not feel that we can make an evaluation without adequate plans and data. We anticipate that the necessary information will be available before the proposal is reviewed by the several legislative committees. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES****ITEM 311 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 3****FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL  
SERVICES FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$396,346

Recommended for approval ----- 296,346

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION ----- \$100,000**

**ANALYSIS**

This item covers two proposals as follows:

(a) Equip—Office Buildings 8 and 9—Sacramento ----- \$96,346

The impending completion of the two 17-story office buildings in Sacramento necessitates the purchase of various kinds of maintenance and operation equipment including janitorial service devices, tools and special gear required for the mechanical systems of the building, a minor amount of office equipment for the building manager and others not associated with the normal occupants of the building, etc. The furnishing of the regular office space in the building will be the responsibility of the individual agency occupants and is not included in this proposal. *The amount appears to be entirely reasonable for the purpose and we recommend approval.*

(b) Alterations and improvements—various locations ----- \$300,000

It has become a fairly standard practice and operating procedure to provide an amount in each year's capital outlay budget to cover un-

**Department of General Services—Continued**

specified and undetailed alterations which may be required in the course of the budget year by changes in the number of people within a given agency or changed space uses. We have heretofore supported this approach and we would continue to do so. However, we point out that for the current fiscal year \$200,000 was provided for this purpose which we believe has proved to be ample. *Consequently, we recommend the amount be reduced by \$100,000.*

**DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES**

ITEM 312 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 3

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND  
MAINTENANCE, DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES,  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	-----	\$150,000
Recommended for approval	-----	71,500
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b>	-----	<b>\$78,500</b>

**ANALYSIS**

This item proposes eight minor improvement projects for a total cost of \$150,000, which is the same as that allocated in the current year. The projects to be funded by this request are as follows:

1. *Lighting replacement* ----- \$14,177

It is proposed to initiate replacement of the present outdoor lights with mercury vapor fixtures in Capitol Park, and the area adjacent to the Library and Courts Building and Office Building No. 1. Replacement parts are no longer available for the present fixtures and this is the first phase of a project to install new fixtures on the existing standards. They will operate on the present wiring and transformers and will provide 16 percent more light and consume 58 percent less power than the existing installation.

2. *Alterations to elevator zoning system* ----- \$50,000

The Resources Building was completed and occupied in 1964 and initially there was some difficulty with the dispatching and programming functions of the elevators. These have been largely corrected and in our opinion the elevator service in the Resources Building is as good as or better than all of the other state buildings in Sacramento. It may be that the occupants of the building are simply not accustomed to a high-rise structure wherein it cannot be expected that elevators will respond instantaneously so that absolutely no waiting occurs. This kind of service is beyond practical cost. The manufacturer of the elevators has, apparently at his own cost, made improvements and we do not believe there is any justification for expending additional funds on them. Furthermore, we should point out that we do not believe that it will be possible to make significant improvements in the present service for the proposed sum. It would take considerably more to add the much more sophisticated and selective programming electronic

**Item 313****Capital Outlay****Department of General Services—Continued**

equipment that could make a measurable improvement. In any case, we do not believe it is justified. *We recommend that the project be rejected at a savings of at least \$50,000.*

*3. Install safety hand rails* ----- \$2,915

To comply with recommendations made by the Division of Industrial Safety, \$2,915 is requested to provide and install safety hand rails in the Los Angeles State Building.

*4. Stairway repairs* ----- \$4,500

Because of a design oversight, the plaster wall finish in stairway No. 2 in the Stockton State Office Building has undergone considerable spalling due to excess expansion and contraction. It is estimated that \$4,500 will be required to repair, patch and refinish these plaster surfaces.

*5. Paint Education Building* ----- \$34,308

*6. Paint Personnel Building* ----- \$15,600

These projects constitute facilities maintenance and more properly belong in the department's support budget. The amounts requested provide for sand blasting, caulking and two coats of paint on all exposed surfaces.

*7. Repair wall tile* ----- \$10,000

Some of the glass tile panels installed on the walls of the restrooms in the Capitol Annex are cracked and it is felt they should be replaced. It is estimated that \$10,000 will be required to replace 27 panels. *We have examined the problem and do not feel it is sufficient to justify the expenditure of scarce funds.*

*8. Replace granite floor tile* ----- \$18,500

A few of the granite tiles installed on the floor of the Capitol Rotunda are cracked. Since replacement tiles are thicker and would project above the surrounding surface, it is proposed to replace the entire floor. We do not feel the present condition of this floor constitutes a safety hazard or is noticeably unsightly. *Therefore, we do not feel replacement is justified at this time.*

*We recommend this item be reduced by \$78,500 for the projects cited in Nos. 2, 7 and 8 above. We recommend approval of \$71,500 for the remaining projects.*

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE****ITEM 313 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 9****FOR MAJOR IMPROVEMENTS, DEPARTMENT OF  
AGRICULTURE, FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$64,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ----- \$64,000

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 314**

### **Department of Agriculture—Continued**

#### **ANALYSIS**

To meet freeway type needs at its Winterhaven inbound plant quarantine inspection facility located on Interstate Route 8 in Imperial County, the Department of Agriculture is requesting \$64,000 to construct lighted approach and acceleration lanes, additional vehicle inspection stations and a small office.

In testimony given before the Assembly Agriculture Committee on October 24, 1967, the department indicated that a full scope study on the effectiveness of the plant quarantine inspection program was in progress. However, at this writing we have received no information indicating that such a study has been completed. *Consequently, we recommend the project be deferred pending completion of the study and a subsequent review of its findings.*

### **DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS**

**ITEM 314 of the Budget Bill**

**Capital Outlay Budget page 13**

#### **FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$880,000
Recommended for approval	80,000
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b>	<b>\$800,000</b>

#### **ANALYSIS**

(a) *Project planning and working drawings, Medical Correctional Institution, San Diego* \$800,000

The Budget Act of 1966, appropriated funds for new facilities for the Department of Corrections. Item 401(e), provided \$880,000 to purchase the Otay Mesa site south of San Diego where three institutions may eventually be constructed. Item 401(h), appropriated \$650,000 for working drawings for a maximum security facility to be constructed near the Medical Facility at Vacaville. The department has delayed the Vacaville project and instead is requesting \$800,000 for project planning and working drawings to construct its next institution in southern California on the San Diego site. We assume the Vacaville appropriation will be reverted. This decision to construct the next institution in the south is based on the conclusion that it is advisable to place inmates in institutions as close to their home communities as practical. Currently, most of the Department of Corrections prison capacity is in central and northern California. Therefore, we support construction of the next institution in San Diego as proposed. However, we recommend deletion of the \$800,000 requested until the Department of Corrections is able to solve two important problems. First, we believe the department must adopt a firm policy position with respect to its basic program, particularly with respect to cell capacity and prison internal subdivision. Second, the department must develop a meaningful state-wide plan of prison development based on its program decisions.

**Department of Corrections—Continued**

The need to resolve policy inconsistencies with respect to the two elements cited above is crucial. All new facilities constructed or programmed by the department have been designed on a one-man-to-a-cell-or-dormitory basis. This approach is deemed necessary to discourage homosexual activity.

The department does not always stand behind the conviction that housing two inmates to a cell should be avoided. Whereas in the past it rated prison capacity based on one inmate to a cell, the 1968-69 Budget reflects adoption of a vaguely defined upper and lower limit concept. In addition, the department has been attempting the remodeling of San Quentin State Prison on a piecemeal basis without taking a position on the one-man-to-a-cell issue, implying a willingness to accept, in the long range, the double bunking situation that now exists.

The department, in developing new prisons, has required that the design limit the number of inmates that can gather in any one place. This is to diminish the possibility of mob violence such as erupted at San Quentin in January 1967, and at the California Rehabilitation Center in January 1968. Again, the department in remodeling San Quentin on a piecemeal basis has apparently not considered the subdivision concept.

The Department of Corrections is attempting to formulate development of a statewide plan. The appropriate cell occupancy must be established as a minimum in order to formulate that plan. In addition, the long-range disposition of San Quentin and Folsom must be anticipated.

Construction of a new institution must be justified either because the number of inmates exceeds capacity, or to replace an obsolete facility. But the capacity cannot be determined unless it is defined and the Department of Corrections defines capacity one way for one purpose and another way for a second purpose. That is, when it requests a new institution, capacity is calculated on the basis of one man to a cell. But with San Quentin and Folsom that concept is dropped and a capacity, which is vaguely referred to as upper and lower limits is found acceptable. The upper limit at San Quentin is 3,900 inmates and there are 2,818 cells. The adoption of the upper limit as capacity implies that 2,164 men should share cells.

The consequence of this vacillation is that it undermines the ability to judge whether a new institution is necessary. If the double cell represents an acceptable practice, then the expenditure for constructing new facilities can be deferred. If provision can be made for the double cell in a new institution, additional savings may be made. Conversely, if the double cell is unacceptable, which is our view, any proposal to remodel San Quentin or Folsom must be made on the premise of eliminating the use of the double cell. Thus, the department must be consistent with regard to these problems irrespective of whether it is planning the construction of a new \$20 to \$30 million institution or whether it intends to modernize San Quentin at a cost that may range between \$20 and \$30 million.

**Department of Corrections—Continued**

But if the one-man-to-a-cell alternative is adopted, that decision must be supported financially. There is no point in building a new institution unless the intent is to fill it and finance the necessary support costs. There is evidence that the administration is not willing to do this. For example, a new Youth Authority institution at Stockton will be completed in March 1968. But because of a lack of wards and in order to economize, it will not be opened until 15 months later. Yet that facility was planned on the basis of a shift from housing 66 percent of Youth Authority criminal court commitments in Department of Corrections facilities to housing 33 percent. This goal is gradually being approached and the Youth Authority now has only 42 percent of its criminal court commitments in Department of Corrections facilities. As the goal is approached, the shift becomes more difficult. But if the state were willing to support financially the staffing of the Stockton facility, progress towards that goal would be made. Continuation of this shift could reduce the existing need to double-bunk both San Quentin and Folsom, where 3,066 inmates were double-bunked as of December 27, 1967. Thus, when faced with the decision to economize by double-bunking versus financially supporting reduced double-bunking, the former has been chosen.

In addition to these policy inconsistencies, the department also has a planning problem. Item 342 of the Budget Act of 1965 appropriated \$10,000 for a study to determine the economic feasibility of replacing the state prison at San Quentin in a new location. But the study eventually prepared was incomplete. Item 401 of the Budget Act of 1966 appropriated \$650,000 for working drawings for a new maximum security facility to be constructed at Vacaville. But a decision was made in November of 1967 to defer this project for at least 10 years, after spending \$100,000 for preliminary design. The false start, and pointless investment in the Vacaville design should have had one beneficial effect. It should have demonstrated the need to carefully evaluate the development problem before rushing into a proposed solution. But instead, the department wishes to commit \$800,000 to the San Diego facility without having developed basic policy positions which have perpetually plagued them.

*In summary, we recommend deletion of this request because:*

- (1) *The department has not adopted a firm policy position with respect to its basic program, and*
- (2) *The department has not developed a meaningful statewide plan for prison development.*

*(b) Construct Hydraulic dredge—California Men's Colony,  
East Facility Los Padres \$80,000*

Chorro Reservoir, located on the grounds of the California Men's Colony, provides water storage for the east and west facilities and various state and local agency operations at Camp San Luis Obispo. The reservoir was built by the Army in 1941 with a storage capacity of 200 acre-feet. Since then silt and debris, washed down from up-

**Item 315****Capital Outlay****Department of Corrections—Continued**

stream, has reduced that capacity to 100 acre-feet. The \$80,000 requested will allow the institution to construct its own dredge from plans and prefabricated parts available on the market and to operate the desilting process with inmate labor. Once the dredge is constructed, it will take three years to remove approximately 165,000 cubic yards of silt in order to return the reservoir to its original capacity. Thereafter, the dredge will be used for continuous maintenance to avoid this problem.

*We recommend approval.*

**DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS****ITEM 315 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 13****FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$208,429
Recommended for approval -----	208,429

<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b> -----	None
--	------

**ANALYSIS**

The amount requested to finance 36 minor capital improvement projects at 11 of the state's 14 correctional institutions is \$266,762 below the amount allocated in the current year. This can be attributed to the fact that major maintenance or equipment projects, which in the past have been funded as minor capital outlay projects, are now funded in the department's support budget. A summary of the project justifications, by institution, is shown below.

Institution	Number of projects	Justification				Improve plant operations	Amount
		Safety	Improve security	Improve program			
California Conservation Center -----	1	0	0	0		1	\$1,250
California Correctional Institution -----	3	2	0	0		1	69,460
Correctional Training Facility -----	5	1	1	1		2	20,068
Deuel Vocational Institute -----	3	1	0	2		0	24,008
Folsom State Prison -----	1	1	0	0		0	8,000
Institution for Men -----	3	1	0	0		2	13,213
Medical Facility -----	1	0	1	0		0	8,670
Men's Colony—East -----	2	0	1	1		0	10,825
Men's Colony—West -----	2	1	0	0		1	8,745
San Quentin State Prison -----	3	0	0	1		2	14,128
Institution for Women -----	12	3	1	1		7	30,062
Total -----	36	10	4	6		16	\$208,429

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 316**

### **Department of Corrections—Continued**

Two items in the above summary are worthy of special note. The first is at the California Correctional Institution near Tehachapi where there is a project to relocate the firehouse at an estimated cost of \$53,982. The present building, constructed in 1932, is too small to accommodate the necessary men and equipment required to provide adequate fire protection. A new medium security complex with a rated capacity of 842 inmates and a minimum security dormitory housing 412 inmates were completed in 1967, which more than doubled the capacity of the existing facility. The location of the firehouse is such that firemen would be extremely handicapped in trying to provide adequate protection to the entire institution complex. It is proposed to construct a new firehouse at a location that assures an equal amount of coverage to both the new and existing facilities. This relocation would require the installation of a vehicle gate in the northeast corner of the new medium facility fence to provide convenient and quick access to the compound.

The second is at Deuel Vocational Institution where there is a \$23,739 project for completion of the dairy expansion program. Funds totaling \$264,000 were appropriated in the Budget Act of 1965 for expansion of the dairy. Subsequently, certain items in the program which were not deemed immediately necessary were deleted in order to keep the project cost within the amount appropriated. This project is to provide additional dairy corrals and related construction to accommodate the increase in the size of the dairy herd and is timed to coincide with the impending need at the completion of the herd buildup.

We have had an opportunity to examine closely a significant number of the proposed projects on site, and we consider them justified and the costs reasonable.

*We recommend approval of the total amount requested.*

### **DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY**

**ITEM 316 of the Budget Bill**

**Capital Outlay Budget page 33**

### **FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	-----	\$765,000
Recommended for approval	-----	910,240

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED INCREASE** ----- \$145,240

#### **ANALYSIS**

(a) *Fred C. Nelles School for Boys, perimeter security improvements* ----- \$150,000

This institution is located in the middle of a metropolitan area and its existing perimeter security fence, which varies in construction and height, is inadequate. The heights run from 13 feet 6 inches to a little over 14 feet in some places, with  $5\frac{1}{2}$  feet of hardware cloth at the top. This facility has consistently had the highest escape rate in the

**Department of The Youth Authority—Continued**

system. For example, from the period July 1966 through June 30, 1967, 166 boys went over the fence. Although many of these are listed as attempted escapes, a significant portion were successful in avoiding apprehension. Because of the facility's location and lack of outside perimeter road, apprehension is difficult and costly, and in many instances these escapees have committed offenses in the community before being recaptured. It is proposed to raise the security fence to the present department standard of 16 feet and to increase the width of hardware cloth at the top to nine feet. This amounts to raising and strengthening approximately 5,950 lineal feet of fence and completely replacing approximately 1,400 feet on the east boundary, adjacent to a residential area.

The decision to budget this project did not prompt an immediate authorization to prepare preliminary plans and a formal estimate. Consequently, the amount requested is \$145,240 less than the amount required. To consider phasing this type of project would defeat its purpose. We feel the estimate is justifiable and concur with the need to correct this deficiency. *We therefore recommend that this item be increased by \$145,240.*

(b) *Preston School of Industry, steam distribution rehabilitation* \_\_\_\_\_ \$250,000

Several of the main steamlines serving this facility are of prefabricated conduit buried directly in the ground, whereas present procedure is to install underground steamlines in a concrete trench. Some of the steamlines serving the facility were installed in concrete conduit and are in good condition but those portions that were not are in various stages of disintegration. Ground water has penetrated the jacket in numerous places causing considerable heat loss and major failures. The ground water intrusion has also caused electrolysis and it is economically unfeasible to continue repairing the lines without correcting the method of installation. It is estimated that it will ultimately cost \$645,700 to correct this deficiency. This project represents the first of three phases and concentrates on replacing the most deteriorated and hazardous sections first. The proposal is in line with priorities and recommendations made by the Office of Architecture and Construction following an intensive utility survey and facility study made in 1967.

*We recommend approval.*

(c) *Southern California Youth Center, sewage treatment and disposal facilities* \_\_\_\_\_ \$185,000

The sewage disposal facilities that serve the Youth Training School near Chino are maintained by the Department of Corrections and are presently operating at capacity. Additional capacity will be required to handle the first phase of the Southern California Youth Center when it is completed there. This includes construction of a 375-bed older boys reception center, scheduled for occupancy in 1970 and construction of a 480-bed medical psychiatric institution, scheduled for occupancy in 1971. The on-site sewage system for the two initial insti-

**Capital Outlay****Item 317****Department of The Youth Authority—Continued**

tutions and the youth training school was funded in the Budget Act of 1966 and plans are to connect to the City of Chino sewer system at the southerly boundary of the institution. The city is proposing to expand its plant to meet its own needs and has offered to provide the expansion necessary to accommodate the institution needs. This proposal will provide the first increment required to purchase the additional capacity in the city's trunkline which will convey sewage to the treatment plant. It is estimated that an additional \$260,000 will be required to reserve capacity in the city's sewage treatment facilities.

*We recommend approval of the amount requested.*

**(d) Los Guilicos School for Girls, adjustment unit modi-**

*fications* ----- \$180,000

The number of girls referred to parole directly from the reception centers has been increasing. Consequently, the proportion of highly disturbed girls in this institutions population is increasing. These girls, who display acute behavior problems and are severely emotionally disturbed, are housed in the adjustment unit. This unit was not designed like a normal housing unit and cannot accommodate a separate treatment program for this type of girl. It is estimated that \$180,000 will be required to provide for the additions, alterations and equipment necessary to initiate an intensive treatment program for the more disturbed girls in the population. This program will provide long-term residential treatment for 22 severely emotionally disturbed girls and short-term treatment for 10 girls with acute behavior problems. The work to be accomplished by this proposal includes enlargement of the present dayrooms to provide a dining area, conversion of three security rooms and a heater room to regular rooms, conversion of the laundry and clothing room to a personal care room and provisions for a new group counseling and activities room. Also included is construction of two adjoining classrooms and two counseling offices. These alterations will provide space for large and small group counseling, individual casework, special interest activities such as arts and crafts and a scheduled education program.

*We recommend approval.*

**DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY****ITEM 317 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 33****FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, DEPART-  
MENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY, FROM THE GENERAL  
FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$158,500
Recommended for approval -----	158,500

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

None

**Department of The Youth Authority—Continued****ANALYSIS**

The amount proposed is for nine projects and is considerably below the \$471,215 included in the 1967-68 Budget for the minor capital outlay improvement program. This is because ten projects, accomplishing major maintenance improvements and similar to projects previously funded in the minor capital outlay budget, have been included in the department's support budget where they more properly belong. Following is a brief summary of the projects proposed.

The site occupied by the Paso Robles School for Boys has had inadequate drainage since the institution was constructed. Due to lawn irrigation and rainfall, many areas remain in a muddy and unusable condition all year round and portions of the asphalt roadways are breaking up due to failure of the pavement base. A road and drainage improvement study conducted by the Office of Architecture and Construction in 1965 recommended a project be undertaken in six phases with a total estimated project cost of \$283,600. The Budget Act of 1966 appropriated \$31,600 for the first phase of this project and \$59,700 is requested in this item to continue the project.

The security fence surrounding the Northern California Reception Center requires strengthening and bracing. Several exposed sections have been weakening under the pressure produced by severe winds and pose a threat to institution security. Prior storm damage has already necessitated the straightening and strengthening of several sections of the fence and \$30,600 is requested to strengthen the remainder. Also proposed for this institution is a \$4,800 project to provide a protective roof canopy over the entrance to the boys' dining room.

A safety project to provide a fire sprinkler system in the existing commissary warehouse, as well as firewalls around telephone and transformer equipment which are located in this area, is proposed for the Los Guilucos School for Girls at a cost of \$20,500.

The third and final phase of a project to provide outdoor recreation areas adjacent to each 50-girl living unit at the Ventura School for Girls is proposed at a cost of \$16,600. Three 36-foot by 66-foot concrete play area slabs will be constructed in this final phase.

The remaining four projects range in cost from \$4,300 to \$9,600. Included is a project at the Preston School for Boys to complete the industrial water distribution supply line loop, a project to pave the paint shop area at the Fred C. Nelles School for Boys and two projects to improve the outdoor environment for the wards at the Youth Training School.

*We recommend approval of the total amount requested.*

**Capital Outlay****Items 318-319****DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY**

ITEM 318 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 33

**FOR EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF THE  
YOUTH AUTHORITY  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	-----	\$132,000
Recommended for approval.	-----	132,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

None

**ANALYSIS**

(a) <i>Equip—Pine Grove Camp</i>	-----	\$66,000
(b) <i>Equip—Ben Lomond Camp</i>	-----	\$66,000

Funds were provided in the Budget Acts of 1964 and 1966 to replace the existing Ben Lomond and Pine Grove Youth Conservation Camps. Both camps are currently under construction and are scheduled for completion in August of 1968. This request will provide funds to purchase the additional equipment necessary for those portions of the camps that are to be occupied by the Department of the Youth Authority. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Education****SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF, BERKELEY**

ITEM 319 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 52

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENTS, SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF, BERKELEY, FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	-----	\$17,400
Recommended for approval	-----	17,400

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

None

**ANALYSIS**

This item proposes five projects, the most significant of which is a request for \$10,000 to construct certain elements required before the Pacific Gas and Electric Company can proceed with installation of a new electric service to the school. A required stepdown transformer will be furnished and installed by the Pacific Gas and Electric Company.

The remaining four projects totaling \$7,400 constitute special repair and maintenance projects that should have been included in the school's support budget. Included under this category is the replacement of the roof and gutters on two dormitory buildings, the replacement of broken roof tile at various locations, the reroofing of a portion of the vocational training building adjacent to the newly constructed upholstery shop, and the replacement of deteriorated flooring in the advanced school and boys' dormitory.

*We recommend approval.*

**Items 320-321****Capital Outlay****Department of Education  
SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF, RIVERSIDE****ITEM 320 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 53****FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, SCHOOL  
FOR THE DEAF, RIVERSIDE, FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$20,100
Recommended for approval	20,100

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** \_\_\_\_\_ None**ANALYSIS**

The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$12,500 to air-condition the academic portion of this institution's high school facilities. This was part of a total proposal estimated to cost \$256,800 to provide air conditioning in eight buildings used during the summer session. The \$20,100 proposed by this item includes \$18,850 to air-condition the infirmary building. It was part of the original proposal and constitutes the second of several increments. The five-year budget plan fails to indicate if or when the remaining increments will be proposed. Funds in excess of \$225,000 would be required to complete the project.

The remaining \$1,250 proposed in this item is for application of an asphalt emulsion type sealer to 31,250 square feet of roadway to protect the original surface and is a preventive maintenance project. We recommend approval.

**HIGHER EDUCATION****ITEM 321 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 55****FOR AUGMENTATION OF THE CAPITAL OUTLAY FUND FOR  
PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$53,000,000
Recommended for approval	undetermined

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** \_\_\_\_\_ undetermined**ANALYSIS**

The total capital outlay program of \$91,494,900 for both major and minor projects, at the University of California and the state colleges is proposed in a series of items which are payable from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education.

The Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education receives oil royalties from state tidelands and Long Beach tidelands. As of July 1, 1968, it is anticipated that there will be an accumulated surplus of \$20,264,454 in the fund. During the budget year there will be anticipated revenues accruing totaling \$22,288,158, making a grand total in

## Capital Outlay

Item 322

### Higher Education—Continued

the fund as of June 30, 1969, of \$42,552,612. Because this total would not be adequate to cover the proposed appropriations, the plan is to transfer \$53 million from the General Fund into the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education which would leave a surplus on June 30, 1969, of \$4,057,712 in the special fund. A lump sum transfer would simplify the accounting and avoid the necessity of having some projects funded from the special fund and some from the General Fund. The basic approach appears to be reasonable. However, we can make no positive recommendation at this time as to the total amount that needs to be transferred from the General Fund since we have made recommendations for reductions in the appropriations for the two higher education segments. At the same time it should be recognized that there is no assurance that the anticipated revenues will materialize in the amounts indicated.

From a cash-flow basis, it should be pointed out that a substantial part of the total appropriations for higher education projects will not be obligated during the budget year. These appropriations are made for a three-year period so that obligation need not necessarily take place until the third year. *In view of the foregoing, we recommend that the actual amount of the transfer be left open to final determination after the Legislature has acted upon the project appropriations.*

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ITEM 322 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 56

### FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, FROM THE CAPITAL OUTLAY FUND FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	-----	\$1,256,000
Recommended for approval	-----	1,256,000

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION ----- None

#### ANALYSIS

The amount requested in this item will finance 39 projects required for the improvement of nine campuses and two agricultural field stations. The total is \$249,250 below that requested and approved in the 1967-68 Budget. The 39 projects can be subdivided into four distinct kinds of improvement as delineated by campus in the following table:

Campus	Number of projects	1	2	3	4	Amount
		Develop existing or new space	Convert or remodel space	Provide and utilities	Mainte- nance and safety	
Berkeley	6	3	1	1	1	\$228,000
Davis	4	2	1	0	1	165,000
Irvine	2	0	0	2	0	25,000
Los Angeles	7	1	1	5	0	238,000
Riverside	8	1	2	4	1	137,000
San Diego	2	1	1	0	0	79,000
San Francisco	3	0	3	0	0	90,000

**Item 322****Capital Outlay****University of California—Continued**

Campus	Number of projects	1		3		4 Mainte- nance and safety	Amount
		Develop existing or new space	Convert or remodel space	Provide service and utilities	13		
Santa Barbara	2	0	2	0	0	0	40,000
Santa Cruz	3	2	1	0	0	0	180,000
Lindcove Field Station	1	1	0	0	0	0	38,000
Sierra Foothill Range Field Station	1	0	0	1	0	0	36,000
Total	39	11	12	13	3		\$1,256,000

A brief description of the projects proposed for the Berkeley campus follows, to illustrate the kinds of improvements included in each of the categories specified above.

1. Develop existing or new space.

The old Fish and Game Building, which was erected as a temporary structure in 1931 and containing 733 square feet of space, will be replaced with a 1,400 square foot office and laboratory building plus a 70-foot by 30-foot greenhouse and associated facilities. This project is estimated to cost \$45,000 and will correct the present space deficiency and provide needed greenhouse space to accommodate graduate student research.

2. Convert or remodel space.

Four rooms in Mulford Hall will be remodeled for \$10,000 to provide additional storage space for teaching materials, adequate lighting and separate staff offices for forestry.

3. Provide service and utilities.

Supply fans and smog filters will be installed for \$27,000 on two insectary greenhouses at the Oxford Tract. This project will accommodate the needs of 11 graduate students and 8 faculty members by providing better environmental controls to aid both teaching and research.

4. Maintenance and safety.

In the opinion of the campus administration outdoor lighting on the general campus is considered inadequate with many dark and hazardous areas. A project, estimated to cost \$65,000, proposes to install new electroliers and relocate and/or replace existing ones in various areas of the campus.

Although we have not had an opportunity to investigate, in detail, a significant number of the proposals on site, we have discussed some of them at length and are sufficiently familiar with the campuses to feel this total request has been carefully developed and is justified. *We recommend approval of the total amount proposed.*

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ITEM 323 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 65

## FOR ADVANCE PLANNING FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, FROM THE CAPITAL OUTLAY FUND FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$1,600,000
Recommended for approval	1,300,000

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	\$300,000
-----------------------------	-----------

## ANALYSIS

This item proposes a schedule of three types of planning expenditures which generally continue previously established and legislatively accepted policies.

## Universitywide

(a) Preliminary planning	\$1,300,000
--------------------------	-------------

Preliminary planning for University projects is proposed to be continued on the conventional basis with well-developed preliminary plans being presented as supporting material for construction or working drawing funds. These preliminary plans generally cost  $1\frac{1}{2}$  percent of the potential construction value of the project. The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$1 million for this purpose which should have covered about \$66 million in construction projects. In the proposed budget actual construction projects approximate only \$33 million. The 1967 appropriation, therefore, resulted in expenditures on behalf of projects which are not proposed for state financing. If they are proposed in a future budget, further expenditures may be required to update them.

The present proposal, calculated on the  $1\frac{1}{2}$ -percent basis, should be adequate to provide for projects with a construction value of over \$86 million. As a practical matter, when compared with the proposals in the current budget this seems to be entirely unrealistic, because the budget offers no basis for assuming that there would be that much available for appropriation in 1969. *We recommend that this amount be reduced to the \$1 million level provided in the 1967 Budget Act. This would be a reduction of \$300,000.*

(b) General planning studies	\$100,000
------------------------------	-----------

The Budget Act of 1964 with an appropriation of \$115,000 established a broad legislative policy to provide funds for planning and studies which would not necessarily lead to specific individual projects. Included in such activities would be community problem studies, traffic studies, utility studies, etc. For the orderly, long-range development of the campuses and their relationships with surrounding communities, we believe that it is imperative that such studies and planning be accomplished on a continuing basis since each increment of growth or significant change on each campus produces new problems and difficulties. *We recommend a continuation of this policy.*

**Item 324****Capital Outlay****University of California—Continued**

(c) *Advance planning studies* \_\_\_\_\_ \$200,000

The Budget Act of 1967, for the first time, provided an appropriation of \$300,000 for long-range master planning for such developments as the medical school at Davis, the transfer of the California College of Medicine in Los Angeles to Irvine and the medical school at San Diego. These are extremely complex and sophisticated facilities in which relatively small errors in long-range goals, directions and emphases could be translated into substantial amounts of wasted or unnecessary capital investment. Adequate long-range master planning is virtually the only method by which such errors may be avoided. We continue to believe that investment in this type of planning is prudent and economical. *We recommend approval.*

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**ITEM 324 of the Budget Bill** \_\_\_\_\_ Capital Outlay Budget page 56

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS,  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, FROM THE CAPITAL  
OUTLAY FUND FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$29,983,000
Recommended for approval	26,684,000
Recommended for special review	\$3,299,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** \_\_\_\_\_ None

**ANALYSIS**

In the summary statement at the beginning of the capital outlay section of this analysis, we dealt at some length with the problems incident to the expansion of the physical plant of the university to meet its constantly growing needs. Suffice it to note again, that there is anticipated to be a series of federal participating grants in a number of the construction projects which hopefully will total \$3,444,000. This will release a like amount of state funds which can then be applied to the schedule of projects in the line item following hereafter. From a participating grant standpoint, this is a significantly lower total of federal funds than the university has enjoyed for a number of years.

The schedule provides something for each of the regular campuses of the university including Hastings College of Law but makes no provisions for field stations or other facilities not directly associated with one of the major campuses. It will be noted that the schedule includes no equipment items since these have been segregated into a separate schedule for which the proposed appropriation would have a one-year life as compared with the three-year life of working drawings or construction appropriations.

There is another important change in the major capital outlay item for the university. It is affected by a change in Section 8, one of the so-called control sections in the Budget Bill which heretofore excepted

**University of California—Continued**

the Regents of the University California from the control exercised by the State Public Works Board. The language granting this exception has been removed and the effect is that before each project can be committed to working drawings it must first be approved by the Public Works Board. Subsequently, construction funds must also be approved by the Public Works Board. It has been the practice of the University to bring its projects to the Public Works Board on a voluntary basis but with the understanding that even if the Public Works Board were to disapprove, the university could still proceed since it was not legally bound to follow the dictates of the board. We believe this new approach is desirable to assure that university projects will be as economical as possible both as to scope and cost. *We are in full agreement with this new approach.*

**Berkeley****(a) Construct—utilities and site development \$300,000**

The Oxford Tract which lies to the northwest of the main campus is a long rectangle bounded on the east by Oxford Street, on the west by Walnut Street, on the north by Virginia Street and on the south by Hearst Avenue. It contains research facilities in entomology, genetics, plant growth, etc. This project proposes to maximize the utilization of that site by increasing its electric power supplies and its steam supply and return facilities. Included would also be improvements to the internal electric wiring of the Oxford research unit to increase the total capacity of the system. We have examined the program and its justification and believe them to be reasonable. The costs are in line for the purpose. *We recommend approval.*

**(b) Construct—alterations to room 11, Wheeler Hall \$332,000**

Wheeler Hall is about 50 years old and Room 11 is a 342-seat lecture hall with a sloping floor having gross dimensions of about 89 feet by 37 feet with a maximum internal height of about 25 feet. It is no longer required as a lecture hall. This project proposes to create within this space three levels, the lowest of which would be about half of the long dimension and the second and third the full length of the long dimension. The first and second levels will provide a total of nine single offices and 10 double offices and the third or top level will provide 50 study carrels for graduate students. In addition, a hydraulic elevator will be added to the building which has a total of about 59,000 assignable square feet. At present it has only a small elevator which is totally inadequate to serve even the faculty. The remodeling will contain all of the necessary lighting, ventilation and other utility supplies. The program appears to be justifiable on the basis of the greatly increased utilization of space that will result and the cost is in line with the amount of work to be done. *We recommend approval.*

**(c) Working drawings—Etcheverry Hall, step 2 \$156,000**

Etcheverry Hall of the college of engineering was completed in 1964 and this project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for two additional wings with a gross area of 140,000 square feet

**University of California—Continued**

and a net assignable area of 79,360 square feet, providing an efficiency ratio of 57 percent which is on the low side but which will hopefully be increased as the project proceeds into design refinements. The two wings will provide spaces for electrical, industrial, mechanical and nuclear engineering departments.

At current construction cost index, the estimate is almost \$31 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$37 at total project level which are reasonable figures for this type of building in this location. The working drawings will ultimately generate a requirement of over \$5,100,000 for construction which will include some alterations to the existing building in order to accommodate the two wings and permit some reshuffling of space allocations. *We recommend approval of the working drawings.*

**Davis**

(d) *Construct—campus sewage plant expansion* \$1,534,000

The present campus sewage treatment plant was completed in 1950 and the existing average daily load is such that at certain periods the plant is overloaded. A significant number of buildings are now under construction and will be literally inoperable unless the treatment plant is expanded or raw sewage is permitted to reach the outfall. We have examined the project in considerable detail and believe it to be essential and that its estimated cost is in line. *We recommend approval.*

(e) *Construct—utilities and site development* \$1,145,000

This project proposes the construction of a complex series of utility and road developments, all of which are occasioned by the expansion of the campus and are timed to coincide with the completion of buildings now under construction. Included would be domestic and utility water lines, steam main, gas line, sanitary sewer, power, telephone and fire alarm system, chilled water for air conditioning and a distilled water system all for the new veterinary medicine unit 1. There are many other individual items in this total such as a new domestic water deep well and pump, the replacement of parts of the 4-KV overhead power distribution system with a 12-KV services, access and service roads to the veterinary medicine facility and so forth. As an indication of the extent to which this project has been carefully reviewed, it might be pointed out that the original proposal totalled well over \$2 million. The reduction consists mostly of portions that can be deferred on a timing basis or have been otherwise reduced in cost. The project is essential as a whole. *We recommend approval.*

(f) *Construct—chemistry addition* \$3,894,000

The Budget Act of 1956, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$234,000 for the preparation of preliminary plans, design and working drawings for an addition to the chemistry building which would add over 126,500 square feet of gross area with a net assignable area of over 75,800 square feet, giving an

**University of California—Continued**

efficiency ratio of about 60 percent. This is average for science buildings. The addition would provide a capacity of approximately 660 FTE students in the chemical sciences.

At current construction cost index, the estimate for this six-story structure is over \$34.20 for the basic building alone and over \$41.20 per gross square foot at total project level. The total cost is approximately \$5,217,000 of which it is anticipated that \$1,089,000 will be forthcoming as a federal grant, representing roughly 20 percent of the cost. *We recommend approval.*

**Davis Medical****(g) Additional construction cost—medical surge unit \$130,000**

The Budget Act of 1967, together with a prior allocation for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$1,179,000 for the construction of a so-called medical surge unit having a gross area of 42,500 square feet with a net assignable area of 29,960 square feet. This gives an efficiency ratio of 70 percent which is quite high for facilities of this type and is probably explainable by the fact that the structure is a single story with a minimum of "tare" space. Subsequently, when the project was about to go to bid it was discovered that it was inadequately financed to the extent of the \$130,000 mentioned above.

The additional amount would raise the total cost for construction of the building alone to \$815,000, or slightly over \$19.17 per gross square foot. At total project cost, it would be \$1,095,000 or \$25.76 per gross square foot. Both these figures are quite modest when compared with full scale facilities which would be at least 80 percent costlier. *We recommend approval.*

**Irvine****(h) Construct—utilities and site development \$1,022,000**

This project proposes construction of a series of utility and site development elements needed to supply buildings under construction or to be constructed in the near future. Included are such things as storm drains, sewers, water lines, heating and chilled water distribution lines, electrical distribution lines and main 12-KV feeder lines. There will also be some extension of the campus roadway system needed to make the new buildings accessible. As an indication of the extent to which the project was reviewed, we would point out that it was originally proposed at over \$2,300,000. Portions were deferred as a matter of timing or were otherwise reduced in cost. We believe the proposal as it now stands is justifiable and the cost is in line. *We recommend approval.*

**(i) Construct—social sciences unit 1 \$3,949,000**

The Budget Act of 1967, together with previously allocated preliminary plan funds, provided a total of \$188,000 for the preparation of preliminary plans, design and working drawings of a twin, six-story tower building connected with a two-story base, the total having 150,650 square feet of gross area and a net assignable area of over 90,260 square

**University of California—Continued**

feet. This provides an efficiency ratio of 60 percent which we consider somewhat low in view of the fact that the building is essentially a lecture classroom facility although some of the spaces are referred to as class laboratories. These are not laboratories in the sense of the physical or biological sciences. The current cost estimate is \$27.70 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$33.33 per square foot at total project level. The latter includes \$60,000 for group I fixed equipment which represents about 40 cents per gross square foot and is clearly indicative of the fact that the building is essentially a lecture classroom type of structure. The total project cost is estimated at \$5,021,600 towards which the federal government has provided a grant of \$999,000 representing close to 20 percent of the total cost. The building will have a capacity of 1,350 FTE students in the social sciences division, the graduate school of administration and the school of education. *We recommend approval.*

**Los Angeles**

(j) *Construct—north campus, library unit 2* ----- \$3,313,000

The Budget Act of 1965, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$156,900 for preliminary plans, design and preparation of working drawings for an addition to the north campus research library which is designed ultimately to receive one more addition. This first addition would have a gross area of almost 107,000 square feet and a net assignable area of 82,000 square feet, giving an unusually high efficiency ratio of 77 percent attributable principally to the fact that as an addition some of the unassignable space consumed in elevator shafts, stair shafts, etc., is already contained in the initial library.

The current cost estimate is \$26.36 per gross square foot for the basic building and almost \$32.50 per square foot at total project level. In view of the high efficiency ratio, the costs appear to be reasonable. It is anticipated that a federal grant of \$1,325,000 will be forthcoming towards this building which will release that amount of state funds to be used in the secondary list scheduled in Budget Bill item number 327. The addition will provide over 700 reader stations and stack capacity for 664,000 volumes plus related nonbook material. *We recommend approval.*

**Riverside**

(k) *Construct—utilities* ----- \$210,000

This project proposes the construction of three utility elements needed to meet increased demand or to provide a minimum of safety. It includes additional fire waterlines and hydrants to bring the campus up to minimum standards and to meet the Riverside Fire Department requirements. The City of Riverside provides the firefighting service for the campus.

Power supplies to the Webber Hall area and to the entomology area are inadequate to meet current demands, and the project proposes to construct two new substations which will increase capacity not only for current demand but for some future expansion.

**University of California—Continued**

The third element is to raise the power factor ratio on the campus primary and secondary electrical power systems from the present low of 75 percent to 95 percent. This would make a significant reduction in the overall annual power costs and will in fact increase the capacity of existing transformer and electrical systems. The savings should pay for the improvement in a few years.

We have examined these three elements carefully and we believe they are justified. The costs are in line. *We recommend approval.*

(l) *Working drawings—Webber Hall addition* ----- \$175,000

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings of a two element addition to existing Webber Hall, one of which would be three stories and the other four stories together providing almost 159,700 gross square feet of area and almost 85,500 square feet of net assignable area giving a very poor efficiency ratio of 53½ percent as against an average of 60 percent for most science buildings. The two wings would house the nematology and plant pathology departments plus agronomy and biochemistry. The areas will be largely devoted to graduate students, academic faculty and some nonacademic personnel although there will be accommodations for some undergraduate students.

The current cost estimate is over \$32.60 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$40.90 per square foot at total project level. Ultimately the construction requirements at project level will be about \$6,500,000 towards which it is anticipated there will be a federal grant of over \$1,230,000. The efficiency ratio of the building is so poor that we do not feel that we could make a positive recommendation until we have had further opportunity to discuss the project with the University. *Consequently, we recommend that the proposal be placed in the category of special review.*

(m) *Construct—physical sciences building alterations for engineering* ----- \$74,000

This proposal covers relatively minor changes in the existing building to provide temporary quarters for the new college of engineering. There would be a minimum amount of partition alterations, some new plumbing lines and new electrical supplies. The altered space when ultimately vacated by engineering, upon the completion of an engineering building, would continue to be usable by the physical sciences with no further changes. *The cost appears to be in line and we recommend approval.*

**San Diego**

(n) *Acquire and connect—city utility lines* ----- \$160,000

The contract consummated in 1963 between the Regents and the City of San Diego concerning the purchase of certain land contained a section wherein the University was given the right to purchase certain waterlines contained within that land upon their abandonment by the city, with the option exercisable during a 25-year period. The provision also stipulated that any use by the University of these lines after the

**University of California—Continued**

city abandoned them for its purposes constituted a consummation of that provision and made the cost immediately due and payable to the city. The continued use of these lines is the cheapest method by which the campus can obtain water. Theoretically, the campus could choose to disconnect from these lines and put in its own system and the abandoned city lines would thereby become useless to both the campus and the city. However, a campus replacement of similar capacity would cost substantially more than the purchase of the lines. Consequently, it appears to be in the state's best interest to purchase the existing lines when the city abandons them in 1968. The agreed price is \$107,000 in addition to which there would be required two meter stations, one on the 16-inch portion of the main and the other on a 10-inch portion of the main. This would bring the total cost to \$160,000. *We recommend approval of this arrangement.*

(o) *Construct—utilities and site development* ----- \$1,512,000

This project proposes the construction of a complex of utility extensions including extensions of the main tunnel system through which the major utilities are distributed. There is included work in the Revelle College area for storm drains, access road and pedestrian walks, work in the Matthews campus area on the water system, storm drains and electrical work, the general campus distribution of heating and cooling fluids through a tunnel extension system, sewer mains and finally improvements to the seawater supply system at Scripps Institute. The cost represents a reduction of about \$160,000 below what had been initially proposed. The elements of the proposal all appear to be justified and the costs are in line. *We recommend approval.*

(p) *Construct—utilities and site development Elliott Field Station* ----- \$118,000

The University has obtained the use of approximately 500 acres at old Camp Elliott as a field station for both experimental work and for a production center for experimental animals. This would reduce the scope and cost of animal housing facilities that would otherwise have to be handled in the medical sciences area and in the biological sciences area on the main campus. The major element in this proposal is to provide adequate fencing around the areas where expensive experimental equipment and experimental animals are held in an open range area. It is essential to deter both the curious and the vandal as well as stray animals which might otherwise contaminate the experimental animals. In addition, there is some essential access roadwork and the installation of a sanitary sewer and waterlines. We have examined the proposal in detail and we believe the elements are all essential and the costs are in line. *We recommend approval.*

(q) *Construct—building 2D, John Muir College* ----- \$2,528,000

The Budget Act of 1967, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$159,700 for planning, design and preparation of working drawings for what is essentially the sixth

**University of California—Continued**

permanent building in the second college which has now been named John Muir. The building is basically a lecture classroom facility of seven stories which will house the humanities as its primary function. It will have a gross area in excess of 85,000 square feet with a net assignable area of approximately 51,730 square feet providing an efficiency ratio of 61 percent which is slightly on the low side but is explainable by the fact that there is a substantial number of offices in the building. This tends to reduce the efficiency because of the added corridor space needed to serve the offices. The major facilities in the building will be 21 general assignment classrooms and a 220-seat lecture hall. The current cost estimate is \$25.68 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$31.61 per square foot at total project level which includes almost \$60,000 for fixed group I equipment, the small amount of which is indicative of the general classroom nature of the building. It is anticipated that a federal grant of approximately \$900,000 will be forthcoming towards the construction costs of the building which will release a like amount of state funds to be applied to the secondary list of projects. We believe the costs are in line with recent similar experience and the program is justifiable. *We recommend approval.*

**San Francisco Medical**

(r) *Construct—school of nursing building* \$1,474,000

The Budget Act of 1967, together with a prior allocation for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$86,000 for design and preparation of working drawings for a new building to house the School of Nursing. It should be pointed out that the working drawings project was not part of the original budget but was offered by the Governor late in the session and it first appeared in the June 6 amended version of the Assembly Budget Bill. It was brought up at that late point because unexpected assurances had been received by the University that a 50 percent grant would be forthcoming from the federal government. The project as now conceived, has a gross area of over 80,200 square feet and a net usable area of almost 46,400 square feet giving an efficiency ratio of 58 percent. The building will be located behind, that is to the south of, the old clinics building and to the west of the two H.S.I.R. towers. The location is a difficult one which requires what would otherwise be an excessive amount of circulation space on the two lower floors to accommodate it to the existing building and to the plaza that is developed among it, the old clinics building and the H.S.I.R. west tower. This accounts for the relatively low efficiency ratio. However, under the circumstances this is quite reasonable. The current cost estimate is \$32.20 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and \$41 at total project level. Since the nursing curriculum requires quite a few laboratory spaces and in consideration of the extremely difficult area for construction purposes, the cost appears to be reasonable. The total construction estimate for the project exclusive of movable equipment, is \$3,291,700 towards which there is expected to be a federal grant of \$1,669,300. This represents slightly more than 50 percent of the cost. The School of Nursing presently occupies about 12,000 as-

**University of California—Continued**

signable square feet of space in six different structures representing approximately one-fourth of the assignable area which will be available in the new building. In the fall of 1966 the enrollment was 376 students with a faculty of 92 full-time equivalent instructors. With this building it is anticipated that the class level will reach a static point of about 510 enrollments with 144 FTE faculty. *We recommend approval.*

(s) *Construct—utilities expansion—west side* \$155,000

This project proposes the construction of two elements needed to reinforce the steam and condensate service and the electrical and fire alarm service between health sciences west, the new school of nursing, the school of dentistry and the new heating plant No. 2 which is scheduled to come on the line in 1970. We have examined the program and find it completely justified. The costs are in line with the nature of the work proposed. *We recommend approval.*

**Santa Barbara**

(t) *Construct—utilities and site development* \$1,546,000

This project proposes the construction of a complex collection of utility and surface development projects, many of which are occasioned by the anticipated completion of buildings now under construction. One of the most significant surface developments is the continuation of the filling of the Storke acquisition, particularly in the northwest portion. Included are such things as gas mains, sewers, water mains, sewage pumping station, street and roadway lighting, primary power supply and communication system extension, main entrance road development, etc. The original proposal totaled over \$2,850,000 for construction. A thorough review resulted in the elimination of many elements which were related to the residential development on the Storke addition. We had suggested, during the review, that many of the services proposed to be extended from the campus at state cost, could be provided from nearby general public utility supplies. This was subsequently found to be possible in most of the elements connected with the residential development and resulted in a significant actual reduction and not merely a deferment. The cost of the remainder appears to be in line with the proposal which is otherwise completely justified. *We recommend approval.*

(u) *Construct—south hall addition* \$3,019,000

The Budget Act of 1967, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$197,000 for the design and preparation of working drawings of what has evolved as a six-story "L"-shaped building having a gross area of almost 138,350 square feet and a net usable area of 77,000 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 56 percent. We would consider this low for a building in which conventional lecture classroom spaces are heavily emphasized. The facility will provide accommodations for the social sciences, languages and literature departments, mathematics and education. This complex mixture results

**University of California—Continued**

in some fragmentation of the total space, perhaps tending to reduce overall efficiency. In connection with the proposed working drawings at the 1967 budget consideration, we objected to the relatively low efficiency and suggested that the working drawings project be placed in the category of special review. The Legislature approved the item with the understanding that in the development of the working drawings every effort would be made to improve the efficiency. In the interim we have reviewed the project at considerable length with the university, and while there will be some improvement, the basic efficiency ratio will change very little and we are not convinced that the nature of the facilities should preclude significant improvement. The current cost estimate is \$25.94 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and \$31.68 per square foot at total project level which is acceptable for this type of building, in this area. The total building project cost, exclusive of movable equipment, is \$4,383,000 towards which a federal grant of \$1,167,000 has already been assured. This represents over 26 percent of the project cost. We believe the university should explain, to the Legislature, the reasons for its failure to accomplish a more economical approach in space use.

*Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**Santa Cruz****(v) Construct—utilities and site development \$741,000**

This project proposes the construction of a complex series of utility developments and extensions and some surface developments generally connected with buildings or colleges under construction or financed. Included are such things as water, sewer and drainage facilities, electrical supply lines, heating water supply lines, gas lines and some walks and services roads. The buildings to be affected include the engineering unit 1, which is financed for construction, college No. 5, which is financed for working drawings, and the performing arts building, which is financed for working drawings. There is also some general campus drainage and erosion control around natural sciences unit 1 which is completed.

The original proposal was for more than twice the amount now requested but a careful review of timing plus elimination of certain specific elements has resulted in the reduction. We have reviewed the program in detail and the costs appear to be in line for what is proposed.

*We recommend approval.*

**(w) Construct—performing arts building \$1,500,000**

The Budget Act of 1967, together with prior allocation for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$118,200 for the design and preparation of working drawings for a performing arts complex which has now evolved as a structure having about 58,500 square feet of gross area and over 37,625 feet of net assignable area giving an efficiency ratio of about 64 percent. This is close to the average for facilities of this type, including a little theater. The little theater portion will have 500

**University of California—Continued**

seats and in addition there will be a concert-recital area together with classrooms, seminar rooms and class laboratories. The current cost estimate is \$32 per gross square foot for the basic building and about \$41.60 per square foot at total project level. The total building project cost is approximately \$2,440,000 towards which there has already been awarded a federal grant of \$820,700, representing over 33 percent of the cost of the building.

*We recommend approval.*

(x) *Construct—college 5* ----- \$762,000

The Budget Act of 1967, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$38,700 for the state's share of the design and preparation of working drawings for the college No. 5 complex which, as in the prior four units, is a combination of residence facilities, dining commons and other facilities financed from nonstate sources and classroom areas which are financed by the state. The latter areas in the plan, as it has evolved, represent a gross of 22,100 square feet and a net assignable of 14,217 giving an efficiency ratio of about 64 percent. This is close to the average. Current cost estimates indicate \$28.87 per gross square foot for the basic building of the classroom spaces and \$36.22 per square foot at total project level. The costs appear to be in line with previous experience in the other four colleges and the program is justifiable.

*We recommend approval.*

(y) *Working drawings—social science unit 1* ----- \$105,000

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings of a four-story structure having a gross area of about 67,200 feet with a net assignable area of almost 39,700 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 59 percent which we consider to be substantially on the low side for a building designated as a "social sciences" facility. However, the nature of the overall campus plan at this campus is such that most of the conventional lecture room work in the disciplines of anthropology, economics, geography, government, psychology and sociology will take place in the separate colleges, relegating to the social science building the highly specialized classrooms, laboratories, graduate student study and research areas and faculty research areas which would otherwise be integrated in a conventional building with lecture classroom areas. This results in a much more complex and subdivided building than would otherwise be the case and in turn this requires generally more nonassignable corridor and other types of areas. Consequently we believe that the efficiency ratio is acceptable in relation to the relatively unique nature of the building.

The current cost estimate is almost \$29.85 per gross square foot at basic building level and over \$37.55 at total project level. In view of the relatively low efficiency and despite the greater sophistication or concentration of the sophistication in the overall building, it is our feeling that the projected cost is significantly higher than can be justified. Until we can resolve some of the basic differences of opinion, we do not feel that we can make a favorable recommendation.

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 325**

### **University of California—Continued**

*Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**Hastings College of the Law**

**(z) Construct—alterations \$129,000**

Funds were previously appropriated by the Legislature for the construction of a substantial addition to the college building in San Francisco. At that time, it was understood that in a following budget there would be a request to make certain alterations in the existing building so that it would work more smoothly with the addition. This entails changing certain physical situations to conform with the connections of the new building, etc. This has always been part of the total project and has been thoroughly justified in order to make the new and the old wings operate as a single unit.

*The cost is in line and we recommend approval.*

### **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**ITEM 325 of the Budget Bill**

**Capital Outlay Budget page 56**

### **FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA FROM THE CAPITAL OUTLAY FUND FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$3,617,000
Recommended for approval	None
Recommended for Special Review	3,617,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** None

#### **ANALYSIS**

This item covers a schedule of three projects on two of the University medical campuses which have been segregated into this separate line item because of the lack of adequate supporting material or because of significant data or informational elements which are inadequate, ambiguous or otherwise unsatisfactory. The language in this item controls the funds so that only the Director of Finance may release them upon adequate showing, to his satisfaction, that all problems have been resolved or clarified. This is a technique that has been used for a number of years and has proved satisfactory and workable.

#### **Irvine Medical**

**(a) Construct—medical surge facilities \$2,400,000**

The history of the proposed medical facilities for the Irvine campus is rather complex. The medical portion of this campus is unusual in that instead of being entirely new as was the case in San Diego and Davis, this campus will receive by transfer an ongoing medical training program from the California College of Medicine presently located near the county hospital. Appropriations were made in two years, 1965 and 1966, to the California College of Medicine totalling \$673,500 for planning and some construction at the old site. Subsequently, the Regents made a decision to move the entire operation to the Irvine cam-

**University of California—Continued**

pus and the money is now available to be used on that campus. This includes, in addition to the appropriations mentioned above, \$134,500 which was allocated for preliminary plans making a grand total of \$808,000 available for planning purposes.

The program and design premises have been equally confusing, and at the time the prior appropriations were reappropriated and redirected in the 1967 Budget Act there was still a great deal of uncertainty about the program and general direction of the design. The so-called medical surge facilities now proposed provide a basic facility which will permit the transfer to Irvine as soon as the facility is completed. Initially, the basic sciences activities will be transferred to the surge facilities until a basic sciences permanent building is completed, at which time a second move will take place and the initial facilities will be used for other medical school purposes. As of this writing, there are still a great many features which have not been clarified or adequately justified. For this reason, we do not feel that we can make a favorable recommendation. However, it is anticipated that before the legislative committees reach the point of reviewing this project, most of the difficulties will have been resolved or otherwise clarified. In broad terms the proposal is for a structure that would have a gross area of almost 106,000 square feet with a net usable area of 70,000 square feet giving an efficiency ratio of 66 percent. This is relatively high for complex medical school facilities and to some degree reflects the attempt at simplification, and limiting the structure to two stories in height. Current cost estimates are about \$23.40 per gross square foot for the basic building and about \$30 at total project level exclusive of movable fixtures and equipment. *In view of the foregoing, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(b) *Working drawings—medical sciences unit 1 \$717,000*

The official action to transfer the California College of Medicine to the Irvine campus did not occur until April, 1967 and since that time attempts have been made to clarify the general approach to a medical enclave at this campus. As of this writing, the total approach is not clear. In any case, there is no question that a basic medical sciences building will be the foundation of any program on this campus. The present thinking is for a facility of approximately 367,000 gross square feet with a net assignable area of 220,000 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 60 percent which is good for a medical sciences facility. Current estimates are \$40.45 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$49.10 per square foot at total project level. The ultimate requirement, at current construction cost index would probably exceed \$18 million for construction, of which a substantial portion, probably as much as 50 percent, may be forthcoming from federal sources. Since the background material is still in the process of being developed, we do not feel that a positive recommendation can be made at this time. However, it is hoped that by the time the legislative committees are prepared to review the project most of these problems will have been clarified. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

## Capital Outlay

Item 326

### University of California—Continued

#### San Diego Medical

##### (c) Construct—facilities at County-University Hospital \$500,000

The Budget Act of 1967 together with appropriations in the 1965 and 1966 Budget Acts have provided well over \$1 million for alterations, additions and improvements to the San Diego County Hospital which has now been taken over by the University to be operated as a typical, good quality general community medical and surgical hospital and as a medical teaching adjunct. The proposal for additional work, which is still only part of what will ultimately be required on this site, has not yet been completely clarified as to purpose, scope and direction. In any case, it might be pointed out that the county hospital, while still relatively new, was constructed on a minimum budget resulting in a facility which, in the view of the University has no built-in expansion capabilities and, in fact, was short of power capacity even while it was still being operated by the county. In order to bring the facility up to the level of a good community and teaching hospital, there may have to be a series of projects to upgrade it. In view of the fact that many of the problems incident to the changes and alterations have not yet been resolved, we cannot make a favorable recommendation. Furthermore, we suggest that a thorough airing of the long-range program and its financial implications is essential. Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

#### ITEM 326 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 56

#### FOR MAJOR EQUIPMENT, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, FROM THE CAPITAL OUTLAY FUND FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$8,300,000
Recommended for approval	7,480,000
Recommended for special review	820,000

#### TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION None

#### ANALYSIS

The Budget Act of 1967 established, for the first time, a separate equipment item for previously financed construction projects, and limited it to one year rather than the three-year period for which construction projects are generally funded. The premise is that equipment should be funded only in amounts than can reasonably be expected to be committed within the budget year and that any additional amounts required should be budgeted in subsequent years as needed. We endorsed this approach in 1967 and we continued to support it.

This item consists of a schedule of equipment proposals for each of the University campuses including Hastings College of Law, but excluding the San Francisco Medical Center. Generally, the proposals represent minimum essential requirements which have been reviewed with considerable care and attention to detail.

## University of California—Continued

## Berkeley

(a) *Equip—engineering materials lab addition* \$500,000

The construction of the laboratory was funded by an appropriation in the 1964 Budget Act together with an anticipated federal grant. To date the state has provided \$4,149,000 and federal funds \$1,778,961, which included about \$230,000 for equipment. The approximate gross value of the project, exclusive of equipment, is therefore almost \$5,700,000. The present equipment proposal represents less than 10 percent of the project value. This is relatively low for a complex engineering facility heavily oriented to research and graduate work. *We recommend approval.*

(b) *Equip—alterations to room 11, Wheeler Hall* \$30,000

The main item for major construction projects in the University includes alterations to room 11 in Wheeler Hall at a cost of \$332,000. Because this value represents alterations rather than the gross ultimate value of the space, it becomes virtually meaningless to compare the amount of equipment to the value of the alteration project. Nevertheless, on the basis of a rough rule of thumb, the amount of space being created is probably worth twice the amount proposed and the equipment would therefore represent about 5 percent of the gross value of the space. This is about average for situations requiring merely office furniture and associated items. *We recommend approval.*

## Davis

(c) *Equip—floriculture greenhouses and headhouses* \$45,000

The Budget Act of 1966, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$480,000 for a construction project having 13,500 assignable square feet of greenhouse space, 3,500 square feet of headhouse space and 3,500 square feet of specimen preparation and storage area for instructional and research activities in a program which included the transfer of the floriculture program from the Los Angeles campus.

While "greenhouse" or "headhouse" might suggest relatively simple spaces, in the University context they are considerably more sophisticated and complex. The amount proposed for equipment represents about 10 percent of the cost of the project and includes a great deal of laboratory equipment needed for both research and instruction. *We recommend approval.*

(d) *Equip—campus sewage plant expansion* \$6,000

Elsewhere in the budget there is a proposal for over \$1,500,000 to expand the sewage plant on this campus. Movable group II and III equipment for a project of this type usually cannot be related to the value of the construction on any rational basis. The equipment consists of items required to test and control the plant processes and the amount proposed appears to be reasonable. *We recommend approval.*

**University of California—Continued**

(e) *Equip—school of law building* \$201,000

Prior state appropriations provided a total of over \$2,480,000 for planning and constructing a school of law building which is presently scheduled for completion in December 1968. The proposed equipment represents approximately 8 percent of the project cost and includes some library equipment for the specialized library area in the building. The amount appears to be in line with statistical experience on other campuses. *We recommend approval.*

(f) *Equip—classroom and office unit 3* \$206,000

Prior appropriations plus a federal grant of \$1 million provided a total of \$3,200,000 for the construction of a building having an assignable area of approximately 62,500 square feet to house the departments of mathematics, education, agricultural education and economics. The equipment proposal represents slightly over 6 percent of the building's project cost. This is comparatively low because most general lecture room and office combination facilities approximate 10 percent. We assume, therefore, that there may ultimately be an additional proposal. In any case, the amount now proposed appears reasonable. *We recommend approval.*

**Davis Medical**

(g) *Equip—medical surge unit* \$720,000

The Budget Act of 1967, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans, provided \$1,179,000 for the construction of a so-called medical surge unit as the initial step in implementing the medical training facilities on this campus. This unit was admittedly to be of less costly construction than a conventional medical school and would be only one story in height, permitting certain savings that would not be possible in a multistory structure. As a result, the actual project cost of the facilities is significantly less than the assignable square footage would normally indicate. We make this point as a preface to the fact that the proposal for equipment at \$720,000 represents over 61 percent of the cost of the project, which is substantially higher than is normally expected on a statistical basis. Even allowing for the fact that the cost of the facilities is lower than normal, we still feel that there is a significant discrepancy in the amount proposed. It is anticipated that the problem will be clarified before the project is considered by the legislative committees. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(h) *Equip—veterinary medical facilities unit 1* \$300,000

The planning and construction of a teaching and research hospital as a first unit of the veterinary medical facilities have been previously funded by the Budget Acts of 1964 and 1965. In addition, there has been a federal grant providing a grand total of almost \$5,224,000 for planning and construction. The equipment proposed represents less than 10 percent of the total cost of the project and as such is only a first increment with at least one more to come in the future. Statistically, there has not been sufficient experience with veterinary medical facil-

**Item 326****Capital Outlay****University of California—Continued**

ties to establish standard relationships between equipment and project costs. Nevertheless, assuming the usual complexities of a science building, 20 to 30 percent for equipment would not be unusual. *Consequently, we recommend approval of the proposal.*

**Irvine**

(i) *Equip—central plant unit 2* \$11,000

The expansion of the central heating and cooling plant was previously funded, particularly in the Budget Act of 1967 for a total of \$935,000. The operation of such a plant requires special tools and a certain amount of laboratory equipment to test and control various phases of water quality and chemical composition. The amount proposed for the equipment appears to be in line. *We recommend approval.*

(j) *Equip—library unit 2* \$159,000

The Budget Act of 1967, together with prior appropriations for working drawings and allocations for preliminary plans, provided a total of over \$2,026,000 for the construction of library unit 2. This total included \$856,000 from an anticipated federal grant. The addition was designed to add something over 50,000 square feet of assignable area which approximately doubled the existing library space. The equipment proposal represents less than 10 percent of the cost of the project and appears to be reasonable. *We recommend approval.*

(k) *Equip—fine arts unit 1* \$334,000

The Budget Act of 1967, together with a prior appropriation for working drawings and a prior allocation for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$4,194,000 for planning and constructing a fine arts complex having an assignable area of about 65,000 square feet for activities in art, drama, music and dance. The total amount included an anticipated federal grant of almost \$1,372,000. The proposed equipment represents slightly less than 9 percent of the facility's project value and this falls well within the statistical average for this purpose. *We recommend approval.*

(l) *Equip—physical sciences unit 1* \$500,000

The Budget Acts of 1965 and 1966, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans and a substantial federal grant, provided a total of over \$6,900,000 for the design and construction of a science facility to provide about 115,000 square feet of assignable area for instruction and research facilities in chemistry, physics and mathematics. Science facilities of this type usually require equipment representing between 20 and 30 percent of the basic cost of constructing the project. The present proposal represents less than 10 percent and is to be considered a first increment. In addition, there is \$192,000 available for equipment from federal sources. *We recommend approval.*

(m) *Equip engineering unit 1* \$584,000

The Budget Act of 1967, together with a prior appropriation for working drawings, a prior allocation for preliminary plans and nearly

**University of California—Continued**

\$3 million in federal grants, provided a total of over \$8,717,000 for the planning and construction of an engineering complex of two buildings having almost 107,000 square feet of assignable area to house the school of engineering and the mathematics department, including a computer facility. A relatively small part of the federal funds is allocated for equipment.

Engineering facilities, particularly on a university campus where research and graduate work is emphasized, generally require very substantial amounts of equipment often representing 20 percent or more of the basic structure cost. The proposal in this instance represents less than 7 percent and is to be considered a first increment. Ultimately there will be at least one more increment. *The amount appears to be reasonable and we recommend approval.*

**Irvine Medical**

(n) *Equip—medical surge facilities* ----- \$100,000

In another item in the budget bill the sum of \$2,500,000 is proposed for the construction of the medical surge facilities. The project has been set up in a special category because of the inadequacy of the background material. The provision for equipment, probably only a first increment, is equally inadequately supported. *Consequently, we recommend that the proposal be placed in the category of special review.*

**Los Angeles Medical**

(o) *Equip—hospital and clinics unit 2B, step 2* ----- \$1,000,000

The Budget Act of 1964, together with prior appropriations for working drawings and prior allocations for preliminary plans and federal grants totaling over \$5 million, provided a total of over \$16,870,000 for a massive addition to the hospital and clinics unit 2B. There were a number of delays in starting the project partly because of the question of the availability of federal funds and partly because of the difficulty in arranging for the construction of vertical elements on top of existing buildings which can readily be recognized as being highly disruptive to an on-going hospital and teaching operation. The project is now expected to be completed sometime in 1969 and this proposal represents the first increment of equipment with one or possibly two more increments to come. A relatively small part of the federal grant is set aside for equipment. A teaching hospital and clinical facility is probably one of the most expensive structures to equip. Statistically they have been running well over 30 percent of the cost of constructing the project. This proposal represents substantially less than 10 percent. *We recommend approval.*

**Riverside**

(p) *Equip—library unit 3* ----- \$292,000

The Budget Act of 1966, together with a prior appropriation for working drawings and a prior allocation for preliminary plans plus a \$1 million federal grant, provided a total of \$4,195,000 for constructing the third and presumably final increment of library facilities at this

## University of California—Continued

campus. This would provide capacity for an enrollment of 10,000 FTE. The equipment proposal represents slightly under 7 percent of the project cost of the addition and is fairly average for libraries. *We recommend approval.*

(q) *Equip—physical sciences building alterations for engineering* \$217,000

Elsewhere in the budget there is a proposal to make relatively minor alterations in the physical sciences building to permit the engineering program to get started in temporary space. The alterations would cost about \$74,000 and therefore cannot serve as a basis for comparing the cost of the equipment. However, because the list has been carefully reviewed and represents basic necessities for a beginning engineering program, we believe it is justified. Ultimately, the equipment will be moved into a permanent engineering facility. *We recommend approval.*

## San Diego

(r) *Equip—building 2A* \$500,000

The Budget Acts of 1965 and 1966, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$3,934,000 for planning and constructing a multistory building having about 71,000 square feet of assignable area and representing the first permanent building in college No. 2 now referred to as John Muir College. The building, consisting of laboratories, classrooms, offices and a computer center, is intended to house the departments of mathematics, applied electrophysics, applied mathematics and a general computer facility. Because the structure is part general lecture room facility and part specialized laboratory facility, this results in a situation which makes it difficult to compare the building with others on a statistical basis. Straight lecture room buildings will run between 7 and 10 percent for equipment and science buildings will run in excess of 20 and as high as 30 percent. The proposal in this instance represents a little under 13 percent, or about halfway between the two. We would conjecture that there will probably be a proposal for additional equipment in the future. In any case, we believe that the present amount is reasonable. *We recommend approval.*

(s) *Equip—building 2E, step 1* \$20,000

Building 2E at John Muir College is a combination structure, the major portion of which is residential facility and only a small part representing actual academic space. This is somewhat in the idiom of the Santa Cruz campus. The Budget Act of 1967, together with a prior appropriation for working drawings and allocation for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$211,000 to plan and construct those portions of the structure which would represent the state's academic interest. The equipment proposed represents roughly 10 percent of the construction cost of that space. *We recommend approval.*

**Capital Outlay****Item 326****University of California—Continued****San Diego Medical**

(t) *Equip—basic science building* \$500,000

Appropriations made in the Budget Acts of 1964 and 1965, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans and federal grants representing more than half the total project value, provided a total of over \$14,620,000 for the planning and construction of a basic sciences building as the first permanent increment of the medical enclave on this campus. The building is probably one of the largest constructed at a single time on any of the University campuses, containing over 190,000 square feet of assignable area. The completion of the building will permit freshman medical students to enroll late in 1968. The facility is designed to provide the first two years of medical training for 192 students, 128 graduate students, 60 postdoctoral trainees and approximately 60 FTE faculty. The medical training program which is already underway is basically an intern program taking place at the County-University Hospital.

The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$228,600 as a first increment for equipping the building and a significant part of the federal contribution is also designated for equipment. As we have mentioned elsewhere, the equipment for a complex and sophisticated medical sciences facility is one of the most expensive in the University budget. The present proposal plus the prior one represents little more than 10 percent of the state's share of the total investment in the structure. As such this is significantly less than the statistical average and we may expect a further increment proposal. *We recommend approval.*

**Santa Barbara**

(u) *Equip—classroom and office unit 4* \$227,000

The Budget Acts of 1965 and 1966, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans and a federal grant of about \$1 million, provided a total of about \$4 million for the design and construction of a general classroom and office unit, No. 4, having about 77,000 square feet of assignable area to house the social science departments such as geography, history, philosophy, political science, etc. The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$20,000 as a first increment for equipping the building which together with the present proposal represents about 6 percent of the construction value of the total project. This is on the low side of the statistical average for buildings of this type and may indicate that another increment will be proposed in the future. *We recommend approval.*

(v) *Equip—physics unit 1* \$597,000

The Budget Acts of 1965 and 1966, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans and a federal grant of \$1 million, provided a total of over \$4,500,000 for the construction of a specialized physics building having over 62,000 square feet of assignable area. Statistically this type of structure would require at least 20 percent of its construc-

**University of California—Continued**

tion project value in movable furnishings and equipment. The present proposal is slightly over 13 percent and probably indicates that there will be at least one more increment proposed in the future. *We recommend approval.*

(w) *Equip—music unit 2* ----- \$80,000

The Budget Acts of 1965 and 1966, together with a prior allocation for preliminary plans and a federal grant of almost \$766,000, provided a total of \$2,166,300 for the design and construction of a music building to augment the existing music facilities on the campus. The building contains about 37,300 square feet of assignable area. The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$147,000 as a first increment for equipping the building. This, together with the present proposal, makes a total of \$227,000 and represents slightly more than 10 percent of the construction project cost. Generally, equipment for music buildings will run significantly over 10 percent of total building costs. In the case of an addition, it is difficult to establish a yardstick. Nevertheless, since the equipment list has been carefully reviewed, the amount appears to be in line. *We recommend approval.*

**Santa Cruz**

(x) *Equip—college 4* ----- \$62,000

The Budget Acts of 1965 and 1966, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$551,000 for the design and construction of a facility in which the nonstate funded residential and commons portions represent by far the largest share of the total area. The state's contribution was to cover academic space for which the state assumed responsibility and this came to 10,800 square feet of assignable area. The equipment proposal therefore represents slightly over 11 percent of the project construction value of the state academic area. This falls within the statistical range for equipping such general classroom space. *We recommend approval.*

(y) *Equip—natural sciences unit 2* ----- \$500,000

The Budget Acts of 1965 and 1966, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans and a federal grant of \$1 million, provided a total of \$3,420,000 for the design and construction of a natural sciences building having an assignable area of almost 58,800 square feet which would house the departments of chemistry, physics, astronomy, earth sciences and, on an interim basis, engineering. Science buildings of this type usually require 20 percent or more in equipment value in relation to the project construction cost. In this case, the proposal is less than 15 percent and in all likelihood indicates that a second increment will be proposed sometime in the future. *We recommend approval.*

(z) *Equip—engineering unit 1* ----- \$460,000

The Budget Acts of 1966 and 1967, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans and a federal grant of about \$1,200,000, provided a total of \$4,121,000 for the design and construction of an engineering facility which would provide almost 76,000 square feet of assignable

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 327**

### **University of California—Continued**

area. The proposal constitutes a first increment of equipment and as such represents slightly more than 11 percent of the project construction cost. This compares with an average of 20 percent or more based on recent projects of a similar type. Consequently, there will probably be at least one more increment proposed some time in the future. *We recommend approval.*

#### **Hastings College of Law**

*(aa) Equip—addition* **\$131,000**

The Budget Acts of 1966 and 1967, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans and a federal allocation of almost \$676,500, provided a total of \$2,402,000 for the design and construction of an addition to the single building that had comprised the Hastings College of Law in San Francisco. This added 38,400 square feet of assignable area, nearly doubling the available size of the plant and providing for an ultimate capacity for 1,200 students instead of the normal capacity of 650 in the existing building. The equipment represents about 5½ percent of the project construction cost. This would ordinarily seem somewhat low for what is basically a classroom building with no conventional laboratories, but it must be borne in mind that the addition was more costly than similar space would have been on a nonmetropolitan type campus. In this case, the very tight construction situation in the heart of the City of San Francisco, plus the need to reproduce the prior architecture, resulted in a cost significantly higher than if a law building had been constructed, for example, at Davis. Consequently, a percentage based on the cost of this building is misleading. However, we believe that the amount proposed is adequate to do the job and *recommend approval.*

*(bb) Equip—alterations* **\$18,000**

The Budget Act of 1967 provided \$12,000 for working drawings and elsewhere in the present budget there is a proposal of \$129,000 for constructing alterations in the existing building to accommodate it to the new wing and to permit some shuffling of spaces to provide for smoother operation of the two wings together. Some of these alterations will require additional furnishings and the amount proposed appears to be reasonable. *We recommend approval.*

#### **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**ITEM 327 of the Budget Bill**

**Capital Outlay Budget page 56**

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS,  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA FROM THE CAPITAL  
OUTLAY FUND FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	<b>\$2,861,000</b>
Recommended for approval	<b>623,000</b>
Recommended for special review	<b>2,238,000</b>

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** **None**

**University of California—Continued  
ANALYSIS**

This item consists of nine projects on five campuses which are anticipated to be financed by funds released from Item 324, the main item for major projects of the University, by the application of federal grant funds to a number of the construction projects contained in that item.

The project schedule which follows is not in priority order but is in alphabetical order, by campus. To the extent that federal funds fail to materialize, the University will have to make choices from this list based on priority of need. The net effect of the item is a zero appropriation because the state funds are offset by federal funds and expenditures can be made only to the extent of the federal funds. Nevertheless, each project is in effect a state funded project and should be reviewed and considered as such.

The University is also eligible to receive outright federal grants for additional projects or portions of projects which represent types of space not normally supported by the state, e.g., those in which the federal government has a strong research interest and in which federal support for the research is subsequently provided.

**Irvine**

(a) *Construct—natural sciences unit 1, conversion* \$825,000

The physical sciences unit 1 is presently under construction and will be complete by January of 1969 at which time it will be possible to vacate almost 37,500 assignable square feet in natural sciences unit 1 now occupied by physics and chemistry laboratories. When the space is released, it will be converted to biological sciences laboratories and as such there will be a significant amount of plumbing, electrical, ventilation, fume hood work, lighting and partition alteration required. For example, the change-over requires the addition of 13 fume hoods and the necessary duct systems to support them and the addition of about 240 sinks of various types. Much of the existing laboratory benchwork is not usable for the biological sciences and will have to be removed and replaced with new fixed equipment. The gross area of the spaces to be altered is almost 39,400 square feet and the current cost estimate for the construction alone is around \$19 a square foot and at total project level will be over \$23 a gross square foot. Actually, this represents about 60 percent of the cost of new space, the only significant value in the space after it is gutted being that of the basic structure. To the extent that the fixed equipment which is removed can be reused elsewhere, the cost would be reduced. However, we have received no indication as to what is planned in this regard. Consequently, we do not feel that we can make a positive recommendation at this time. Hopefully by the time the legislative committees reach the review of this project we will have received the necessary information and will be able to resolve the problem. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**University of California—Continued****Los Angeles****(b) Construct—Old Public Health Building, alterations—\$482,000**

The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$20,000 for the preparation of working drawings for alterations to the old public health building, formerly the home economics building, to accommodate it to the needs of the language departments of the humanities division. In addition, there will be a small project carried on simultaneously with the conversion for language use to provide for a student health facility which will be constructed from nonstate fund sources. The conversion will occur in an area of nearly 24,000 square feet of assignable space which represents almost all of the building. The gross area of the building is about 36,000 or 37,000 square feet which means that the total project would represent a cost of about \$13.15 per gross square foot, substantially less than half the cost of new space. It should also be recognized that almost half of the total proposed cost is occasioned by adding air conditioning to the building. We have examined the program for the proposed alterations and the costs appear reasonable. *We recommend approval.*

**San Diego****(c) Working drawings—fine arts building—\$181,000**

This project proposes the planning and preparation of working drawings for what is actually a complex of buildings which would provide facilities for the fine arts, including drama. It is contemplated as having a total of over 113,200 square feet of gross area and over 71,430 square feet of net assignable area giving an efficiency ratio of 63 percent which is satisfactory for the purpose. It is referred to as serving a "cluster" in that it will provide the fine arts capabilities for three colleges. The first, Revelle College, has been in operation for some years. The second, John Muir College, is under construction and its student body is being staged in the Matthews campus. The third college has not yet been financed or named. This concept would mean that ultimately, since the master plan calls for 12 colleges, there would be four art centers on the whole campus.

The current estimate is over \$31.40 per gross square foot for the basic building and over \$40.10 per square foot at total project level. Both of these figures are significantly higher than we have been averaging for facilities of this type with the exception of the U.C.L.A. campus which had a highly specialized and sophisticated facility because of its emphasis on the dramatic arts. Working drawings would generate a construction cost requirement of over \$4,155,000 of which it is hoped \$1 million will be financed by federal grants. We have raised serious questions about the design and the inclusion of some of the facilities and these have not yet been resolved. The most important is the fact that the proposal includes a 900-seat auditorium for which 400 seats would be financed from nonstate sources and the balance by the state on the premise that the standard is a 500-seat little theater on all campuses. However, the design does not include a full-scale stagehouse

**University of California—Continued**

which would make the auditorium fully usable as a little theater. Consequently, it appears that the auditorium would be just that and very little more other than its capability of being used as a concert hall. *In view of the foregoing we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(d) *Working drawings—marine biology instruction and research building, S.I.O.* \$113,000

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a large, complex and sophisticated science building for the Scripps Institute of Oceanography which would provide a gross area of about 132,000 square feet and a net assignable area of 78,000 square feet giving an efficiency rating of about 59 percent which is fairly close to the average for buildings of this type. It would replace some of the oldest buildings now on the site which have become both expensive to maintain and completely inadequate for both instructional and research purposes. We have reviewed the program and are generally in accord with it.

The current cost estimate is over \$39.75 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and over \$47.40 at total project level. These figures, to some degree, attest to the complexity and sophistication of the building which among other things would have an expensive and difficult to maintain salt water supply system for creating and maintaining characteristic marine environments. The sophistication of the building is further demonstrated by the fact that it will be fully air conditioned because of the necessity to control the ambient environment. Moreover, its ventilation system will provide 100 percent fresh air, that is to say there will be no recirculation of interior air as is commonplace with most air conditioned buildings. The building will provide facilities for microbiology, physiology, biophysiology and biochemistry in both instruction and research and in addition will include three special groups, photobiology, marine neuroscience and development biology which are required to operate in close collaboration with the others mentioned above. It should further be pointed out that the site is a relatively difficult one and this adds to the cost of the building. Hopefully, during the design development and preparation of working drawings some economies may evolve. *On this basis we recommend approval of the working drawings.*

Santa Barbara

(e) *Working drawings—engineering unit 2* \$147,000

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a second engineering building to house chemical and nuclear engineering and mechanical and aeronautical engineering. The first unit is largely devoted to electrical engineering and associated electronic disciplines. The proposal contemplates a gross area of over 113,800 square feet and a net usable area of nearly 71,500 square feet giving an efficiency ratio of 63 percent which is relatively high for a complex, multistory building of this type.

**University of California—Continued**

The current estimated cost of the building, which is to be fully air conditioned, is over \$34.85 per gross square foot for the basic structure and over \$41.30 per square foot at total project level. We consider this excessive despite its complexity and sophistication. For example, the estimate indicates almost \$6 per square foot for heating, ventilating and air conditioning which is at least \$1 more than we have generally experienced even for the most sophisticated buildings. The plumbing portion is estimated at over \$3, also high despite the fact that there would be a significant number of wet laboratories for chemistry and nuclear engineering. Paradoxically, the estimate includes less than \$2 per gross square foot for fixed group I equipment which is remarkably low for any kind of engineering building. This would indicate either that the total estimate is unreliable or that there has been a serious oversight in the calculation of the amount of fixed equipment required in the building. In any case, the working drawings would generate a requirement for a total of over \$4,700,000 in construction funds towards which there is an anticipated federal grant of about \$1 million. This would also include an allocation for moveable furnishings and equipment. The uncertainties attached to this project are such that we do not feel that we can make a favorable recommendation at this time. However, it is hoped that by the time the legislative committees reach consideration of the item these will have been resolved. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**(f) Working drawings—college of creative studies----- \$69,000**

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a semi-autonomous college unit somewhat along the lines of the college units at Santa Cruz in that it will be a combination of residence, dining, instructional and administrative space which would be funded by a combination of state and nonstate funds, generally loans. The gross area of the initial project is contemplated at over 111,000 square feet with nearly 48,600 gross square feet being supported by the state which would result in a net usable state area of almost 31,600 square feet giving an efficiency ratio of approximately 65 percent. This would be average for general classroom facilities.

The facility would be a special coeducational college for students who demonstrate a special talent for original work in the fields of art, science, literature, drama and music. It would provide housing for 233 students but the total student capacity, academically, would be about 450 plus 35 faculty members some of whom would be in residence. The concept would be a distinct departure insofar as the Santa Barbara campus is concerned which was basically master-planned as a conventional campus as differentiated from the concept at Santa Cruz and the modified concept at San Diego. The estimate for the project at current construction cost index is over \$26.38 per gross square foot for the total project but over \$31.40 per gross square foot for the state portion

**University of California—Continued**

alone. At total project level these become \$34.68 and \$39.19 respectively. We would point out that nearly \$31.50 at building construction level is a very high cost for what appears to be essentially a relatively simple classroom concept within the total complex although there would be some laboratory spaces included. Since the concept is a distinct departure without adequate justification and we believe that both the cost and the design are needlessly complex and expensive, *we recommend that the proposal be placed in the category of special review.*

**Santa Cruz**

(g) *Working drawings—college 6* ----- \$28,000

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for the sixth college in the ultimate series of 20 and it represents the cost of the drawings for just the state supported academic space within the college complex, most of which is devoted to residential and commons facilities.

The complex is conceived as a facility having a gross area of 147,600 square feet in which the state's portion represents 20,900 gross square feet. The net assignable area for the total project is 93,000 square feet in which the state's portion is 13,400 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio for that portion of 64 percent which is satisfactory for classroom purposes, particularly in such relatively small areas. The current cost estimate is \$28.61 per gross square foot for the basic building area supported by the state as compared with \$23.09 per gross square foot for most of the nonstate supported area. At total project level, this is \$35.26 per gross square foot and \$29.12 respectively. The rationale for this difference is based on the concept that the classroom space is considerably more sophisticated from a utility standpoint as well as ventilation than would be the balance of the area. In any case, it represents a statistically uniform cost for state space when compared with the prior colleges. It is interesting to note that \$28,000 as the state's share of the working drawings compares with \$26,000 provided in the 1957 Budget Act for college No. 5 and \$21,600 for a college No. 4 provided in the 1965 Budget Act. The facility will provide for 650 undergraduates of whom 425 will be in residence and the balance commuters. *We recommend approval.*

(h) *Construct—utilities and site development, college 6* ----- \$459,000

Elsewhere in the budget there is included a proposal for utilities and site development at the Santa Cruz campus generally which originally included utilities and site development for college No. 6. These were subtracted from that project on the premise that they should be tied to the problem of financing the state portion of college No. 6. Furthermore, we would point out that the amount proposed is at considerable variance with the portion in the larger site development project which has not yet been satisfactorily explained. In any case, the project consists of a series of elements to provide electrical, gas, water, service road and general access road extension facilities.

**University of California—Continued**

It is interesting to note that there is a significant anomaly in this proposal when it is compared to analogous situations on other campuses. For example, on a conventional campus utilities, roads, walks, etc., are supplied to academic buildings which normally constitute significantly higher concentrations at any given point than occur in any one of the Santa Cruz colleges. Simultaneously, any residence facilities built at conventional campuses must pay for utility extensions to their individual sites from the nearest campus feeders and for access roads, service roads, walks, etc., that are fundamentally service to the residence facility. At Santa Cruz the residence facilities which comprise the major portion of each of the colleges, therefore, benefit very considerably from the fact that all of these services and site development elements are provided to them by virtue of the fact that the residence and academic facilities are totally intertwined. It is suggested that some thought should be given to the peculiarity and financial implications of this situation. We believe that the financing of the residence portions of each college should bear a fair share of the costs of providing all the services.

In any case, because of the discrepancies in cost and the lack of adequate description of the individual portions, we do not feel that we can make a positive recommendation at this time. Hopefully, these problems will be resolved by the time the project is considered by the legislative committees. *Consequently, we recommend that the proposal be placed in the category of special review.*

(i) *Construct—classroom unit 1 \$557,000*

This project proposes the design, preparation of working drawings and construction of a relatively small lecture facility which will provide a number of large lecture rooms which are not available in the individual colleges. The program is to make available special facilities to allow lectures, scientific and technical demonstrations and audio-visual presentations before large groups of students. The project is conceived as a unit having about 15,350 gross square feet of area with over 9,800 square feet of net assignable area giving an efficiency ratio of 64 percent which we consider to be relatively low in view of the possibilities for a facility of this type in which internal corridors and other unassignable spaces can be kept to a minimum. Furthermore, since actual construction is also included in the proposal we do not feel that the materials that have been submitted are adequate for making sound judgments as to design, construction cost, etc. The current cost estimate is somewhat over \$28 per gross square foot for the basic building and over \$35.30 per square foot at total project level which, as we have already stated, are relatively difficult to evaluate without adequate preliminary plans. Hopefully, these shortcomings may be resolved by the time the legislative committees consider the project. *We recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

## **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**ITEM 328 of the Budget Bill** Capital Outlay Budget page 56

**FOR MAJOR CAPITAL OUTLAY PROJECTS, UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA FROM THE CAPITAL OUTLAY FUND FOR  
PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$583,000
Recommended for approval	None
Recommended for special review	\$583,000

## **ANALYSIS**

This item contains four projects on four campuses for which financing will be available only upon the release of state funds in Item 324 as a result of the allocation of federal funds to some of the projects contained therein. The total value of this item is zero since the federal funds are shown as a total reimbursement requiring no direct state appropriation. However, there is an indirect state appropriation by virtue of the fact that the released funds are state funds and the projects to be financed from these funds should be reviewed in the same manner as those financed by direct appropriations.

The basic reason for setting forth these four projects in a separate Budget Bill item is because of the lack of adequate background material, or unresolved differences of opinion between the University and the administration. This item, therefore, contains control language in which the Director of Finance is given authority to release the funds only when he is satisfied that all problems have been resolved and in his opinion it is appropriate to proceed. This does not necessarily imply that the administration considers the projects unnecessary or unjustifiable. Our position is in support of this concept. However, we would go beyond this in hoping that the problems can largely be resolved before the legislative committees consider the individual projects. If they are not resolved, it would mean that the Legislature would be asked to provide, to some degree, a blank check and would rely on the Director of Finance to release the funds at his discretion.

Berkeley

(a) Working drawings—botany plant growth laboratory—\$30,000

Botany plant growth laboratory facilities have either been "boot-legged" for years or have been totally unavailable so that the research needs and supply needs of the disciplines relying on this material have been unmet in a significant degree. The concept of such a laboratory has been in the long-range program of this campus for many years, but it has been repeatedly pushed into the background because of more urgent demands upon capital outlay funds.

A hilltop site has been chosen near Grizzly Peak Boulevard which will require extensive fill and other development to make it usable.

**University of California—Continued**

The site has been chosen because of favorable general environmental soil and other conditions. Development would require extensive utilities which do not now exist in the immediate vicinity. The project is generally conceived as having a gross area of 23,700 square feet and a net assignable area of 17,700 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 75 percent. This appears to be somewhat low in consideration of the fact the buildings are essentially greenhouse structures with some headhouse area. It should be noted, however, that these greenhouses are not simple conventional structures but are relatively complex laboratory-oriented facilities in which there is an underlying raised plenum to permit special forms of smog-free ventilation, the running of utilities, etc. The complexity and sophistication of the facility is attested by the estimate which at the current construction index is \$32.15 per gross square foot for the basic facilities alone and \$38.26 per gross square foot at total project level. As a further evidence of the sophistication of the project, the heating and ventilating portion which includes some cooling is estimated at almost \$9 per gross square foot and electrical portion at over \$4 per gross square foot. The ultimate requirement for construction funds will be in excess of \$900,000, \$360,000 of which it is hoped will be offset by a federal grant. As previously mentioned, this project has been in process for some time and we are familiar with it. However, we question the relatively high cost; and until this is completely justified, we cannot make a favorable recommendation. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**Los Angeles**

(b) *Working drawings—life sciences 3----- \$132,000*

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a facility which is intended to house the departments of bacteriology, biological chemistry, biophysics, botany and plant biochemistry, medical microbiology and a number of other related specialties. It is contemplated as a large structure having a gross area of nearly 167,000 square feet with a net assignable area of slightly over 90,120 square feet, giving a very poor efficiency ratio of somewhat under 54 percent. Normally, we would consider 59 or 60 percent the lower limit for a laboratory structure of this type. Because of this poor efficiency, we have raised a number of questions which have not yet been resolved. The current cost estimate is \$36.85 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and over \$44 at total project level. Both figures are significantly higher than recent experience would indicate necessary. The working drawings would generate an ultimate requirement for construction funds of over \$7,355,000 of which as much as \$4,360,000 may be forthcoming from the federal government although some of this will be earmarked for equipment. Because the efficiency is so poor and the costs so high, we do not feel that we can make a favorable recommendation at this time. We anticipate, however, that by the time the legislative committees reach consideration of this project most of the problems will have been resolved. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

## University of California—Continued

## San Diego Medical

(c) *Working drawings—clinical science building* ----- \$321,000

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a fairly massive seven-story structure having a gross area of almost 197,000 square feet and a net assignable area of over 122,500 square feet giving an efficiency ratio of 62 percent which is quite good for the purpose. The clinical science facility is essential for the third or junior year in medical training at which time students are introduced to clinical methods, techniques and philosophies. For a year or two, while the medical class size is small, the basic sciences building can serve both as basic science area and clinical area on a makeshift basis. However, if the class size is to grow, a clinical sciences building becomes imperative. It will support the activities required for a full scale 96-student class in all four years of the curriculum.

The current cost estimate is \$41.75 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and \$50.15 per square foot at total project level which we consider relatively high. For example, the heating, ventilating and air conditioning is estimated at nearly \$7 per gross square foot against a statistical average of between \$5 and \$6. The working drawings will generate a requirement for over \$9,870,000 for construction towards which there may be between \$5 million and \$6 million of federal funds available as grants, although some of this may be earmarked for movable furnishings and equipment. We do not feel that we can make a reasonable judgment based on the material now available. *Consequently, we recommend that the proposal be placed in the category of special review.*

## San Francisco Medical

(d) *Working drawings—school of dentistry building* ----- \$100,000

This project, which represents only a partial cost, proposes the design and preparation of working drawings of a very large facility having a gross area of 270,000 square feet with a net assignable area of approximately 161,400 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of about 60 percent which is average for a complex facility of this type. An additional appropriation for the balance of the cost of working drawings is anticipated in 1969. The present school of dentistry occupies a total of 55,000 assignable square feet in eight separate buildings, a condition which we are informed makes it rank as the worst of the seven major dental schools on the Pacific Coast. The present space is totally inadequate for the present class size which has been admitting 75 first-year dental students as of the fall of 1965 at which time total enrollment was 366. It is proposed to expand the enrollment so that ultimately there will be 108 first-year students admitted, 32 first-year dental hygiene students, 85 graduate students and a total enrollment of 568 plus teaching and research faculty of 155 FTE. We believe that the basic program is justifiable and that the need is quite real. Upon completion of the dentistry building the present space would be released for a number of uses, principally for expansion of the school of pharmacy. However, we would point out that the current cost estimate is almost

## Capital Outlay

Item 329

### University of California—Continued

\$47 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and almost \$54.50 per square foot at total project level which generates a building project requirement of over \$14,700,000 towards which it is hoped there will be a federal grant or grants totaling perhaps \$8 million in addition to which there would probably also be federal grants for equipment. The site is admittedly not an easy one and will result in some additional cost over normal expectations. Furthermore, we recognize the fact that a dental building has a great deal of space divided into relatively small areas and cubicles which also lead to higher costs. Nevertheless, we consider the current estimate as quite excessive. In addition, there are some paradoxes in the overall estimate. In the heating and ventilating portion, the estimate is about \$3.90 per gross square foot which, of course, does not include air conditioning but which, nevertheless, can be compared with the clinics building at San Diego where the cost was around \$7 a foot including air conditioning. Consequently, despite our recognition of the need for the building we do not feel that we can make a positive recommendation at this time. We hope that by the time the project is before the legislative committees for consideration we will have resolved any questions. *Therefore, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

### CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

ITEM 329 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 102

### FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, FROM THE CAPITAL OUTLAY FUND FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$40,112,400
Recommended for approval	26,469,800
Recommended for special review	13,642,600

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** \_\_\_\_\_ None

#### ANALYSIS

In the summary statement at the beginning of the capital outlay analysis section, we discussed at some length the academic needs of the state colleges and the fiscal implications resulting therefrom. In the item immediately preceding this one covering project planning and studies, we described a new approach that is to be used henceforth and which will become effective for the first time with regard to 1969 budget proposals and discussions.

The item now under consideration covers a schedule of 30 projects at 15 of the 19 ongoing state colleges not counting 3 colleges which are still in the process of land acquisition. It will be noted that 14 projects, almost half of the total number, are for utilities developments and that the 3 working drawings projects on the list are also for utilities development. The balance of the schedule covers actual construction projects for academic facilities which, while representing fewer than half of the total schedule in project numbers, accounts for over 80 percent of the dollar volume.

**California State Colleges—Continued**

Practically all of the actual construction projects carry with them a potential for federal participation which is calculated at over \$11,600,000. If realized, this will release an equivalent amount of state funds to be used to finance additional working drawings and construction projects contained in the schedule of a following item.

It will also be noted that the schedule under consideration does not include any equipment proposals. These have been gathered together in a separate schedule attached to a separate line item which will be made available for only one year instead of the three-year period for which construction projects are financed. This continues the precedent set for the first time in the 1967 Budget Act.

The working drawing and construction projects for the state colleges have always been subject to review and approval by the State Public Works Board. This budget proposes no change in that procedure. It might be pointed out that the board has full authority to defer a project or reject it for excess cost or other reasons. Through the four nonvoting legislative members of the board, the Legislature is kept apprised of its actions and its reasons for approval, rejection or deferment.

**Chico****(a) Construct—classroom office building \$2,729,000**

The Budget Act of 1967 provided \$100,000 for the preparation of working drawings for a combination classroom and administrative office building with a gross area in excess of 81,000 square feet. In addition, \$33,200 had been previously allocated towards the project for preliminary plans purposes. The design has now developed into a seven-story structure using steel frame, concrete fireproofing and bracing and with some brick veneer to provide continuity with the existing brick buildings. The building will have a net usable area of approximately 50,650 square feet. This will give an efficiency ratio of nearly 63 percent which would be average for a building of this type. The current estimated total cost of the project, including fixed group I equipment and all fees and contingencies, is \$2,862,000, resulting in a project cost of over \$35.31 per gross square foot. For the basic building alone, exclusive of site work, utilities, fees, etc., the cost would be nearly \$27 per gross square foot. We believe these costs to be excessive for what is a relatively simple building in which the heating and cooling mediums are supplied from an outside source and not by steam generating or chilling equipment within the building and included in its cost. We have not, as of this writing, been able to resolve the reasons for the excessive costs. Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the special review category.

**(b) Construct—applied arts—unit 2 \$2,150,800**

The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$160,000 for the design and preparation of working drawings for an applied arts facility with a gross area of approximately 62,400 square feet. In addition, there was \$26,350 previously allocated for preliminary plans. During the discussions of the working drawings proposals before the Legislature, we

**California State Colleges—Continued**

pointed out that the costs appeared to be excessive for what should be a relatively simple, semi-industrial type of building. These costs have not yet been satisfactorily resolved. The current estimate for the basic building alone is \$27.07 per gross square foot, and at total project level including fixed group I equipment and all fees it is \$37.45 per square foot. We believe that there are a number of features in the design which lead to the excessive cost, at least in part. Until these can be resolved we cannot make a favorable recommendation. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(c) *Construct—site development-utilities, 1968* ----- \$454,000

This project proposes working drawings and construction of essential utilities needed to keep the campus operating properly. There are two distinct elements involved. The first concerns the fact that the Legislature in 1967 appropriated funds for the construction of a new central heating and cooling plant on a new site, to replace the existing one because it could no longer be expanded and was already operating beyond its normal capacity. The major portion of the funds now proposed would cover the switchover from the old to the new plant entailing new main steam lines and main electrical feeders. No chilling equipment is contemplated at this time.

The second element concerns a proposal to switch from a campus-generated water supply to a tie-in with the local city water system which is made necessary by the fact that the campus supply is inadequate and it would be more costly to attempt to expand it than to tie in with the local supply.

While both these elements are essential and we recognize the need, they represent the stripped down remains of a very much larger proposal for which we had some details. For this lesser proposal, we have not, as of this writing, received complete details and have therefore not been able to evaluate the proposed costs. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(d) *Working drawings—central chiller plant* ----- \$55,000

The Chico campus experiences fairly long periods of extreme heat in the late spring, summer and fall months and air conditioning is considered essential for most of the buildings. Heretofore it has been supplied on a piecemeal basis with chilling equipment being individually included in each building. Taking into consideration the planned ultimate growth of this campus, a utility study indicates that a central chiller plant would in the long run reduce total capital investment and significantly reduce the cost of maintenance and operation. It is therefore proposed to build an addition to the boiler plant which will house the chilling equipment and from this source chilled water will then be distributed to a number of buildings now under construction and ultimately to buildings now having individual equipment. Some of the buildings now under design or construction contain individual equipment which will now be deleted. This will result in a significant savings

**California State Colleges—Continued**

which will then be applied towards the ultimate construction cost of the central chiller plant. We have on many occasions expressed the belief that central chilled water supply is very significantly cheaper from a capital investment standpoint and from a maintenance and operation standpoint. We believe that this is the appropriate technique for this campus. *We recommend approval of the working drawings.*

**Dominguez Hills**

(e) *Construct—site development—utilities, 1968* \$881,300

General development of this campus is now proceeding from funds previously appropriated by the Legislature for the construction of initial buildings, the construction of a social science building, initial physical education facilities and outdoor physical education facilities, a corporation yard and general development of roads, walks, lighting, etc.

The present proposal covers further extensions of the utilities such as heating and cooling mediums, water supply, drainage, etc.

The project as originally submitted and detailed was estimated at over \$1,200,000 and the proposal as now submitted represents a stripped down version, the details of which have not been communicated to us, as of this writing. Consequently, we have no basis for evaluating the elements of the proposal as to cost and priority of need. *We recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(f) *Construct—off-site utilities* \$192,200

This project is comprised of two elements, one the construction of about 2,500 feet of storm drain line outside the campus property lines to the county storm sewer which will require the major portion of the total proposal. The second is for the development of sewer lines outside the campus boundary and the payment of sewer assessments to the two districts which overlie the campus. Both elements are absolutely essential to the functioning of the buildings now under construction and the costs appear to be reasonable for the purpose. *We recommend approval.*

(g) *Construct—central plant—phase I* \$774,000

The master utility plan for this campus contemplates that heating and cooling will be supplied to all the buildings from a central plant rather than to have each building equipped with its own heating and cooling generating devices. Ordinarily, at this point in the development of the campus, only working drawings would be proposed for such a central plant. However, the types of heavy equipment required in the plant are becoming increasingly difficult to procure and substantial lead times in ordering equipment are needed to assure delivery at the appropriate time. Consequently, the proposal herein is for working drawings and for funds to purchase the major equipment required for the building, consisting of boilers, chillers, pumps, electrical control centers, etc. At this stage in the development the project might prop-

## Capital Outlay

Item 329

### California State Colleges—Continued

erly be thought of as the initial part of Phase I of the central plant. The building will probably have about 9,000 gross square feet of area plus an enclosure for the cooling tower and its total cost is currently estimated at about \$1,500,000. *We recommend approval.*

#### Fresno

##### (h) Construct—engineering addition \$1,733,500

The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$58,000 for the preparation of working drawings for an engineering building having a gross area of something over 33,000 square feet. Prior allocations for preliminary plans provided \$9,550. While the proposal is termed an addition it is, in fact, a separate and distinct building adjacent to the existing engineering building. At the time the work drawings were proposed, the cost implications were considerably below those that have now developed. The current estimate for the basic building alone is \$27.64 per gross square which is acceptable. However, at total project level this becomes almost \$50 per gross square foot and contains several elements which we believe to be excessive. For example, the fixed group I equipment is proposed at almost \$10 per gross square foot which is substantially greater than prior statistical experience. In addition, the project includes \$136,000 for remodeling the existing building which we do not believe can be accomplished at the same time the new building is under construction. Another distorting factor is the fact that there is included about \$150,000 for construction of utilities outside the building lines which is relatively very high. While the utilities may be necessary, as a rule when this amount of money is involved it is set up as a separate site development-utilities project. In any case, collectively these various factors need to be resolved before we can make a firm recommendation. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

#### Fullerton

##### (i) Construct—administration-business classroom building \$4,141,000

The Budget Act of 1967 together with prior allocations for preliminary plans provided a total of \$191,000 for preliminary plans, design and preparation of working drawings of a multistory building which, as now designed, will have approximately 134,500 gross square feet of area and over 82,600 square feet of assignable area giving an efficiency ratio of about 61.5 percent. The building will be the permanent location for the school of business administration and economics with a capacity of 1,328 FTE students. In addition, the building will house certain functions of the campus administration as well as 76 faculty office stations.

The cost of the basic building alone is currently estimated at \$25.70 per gross square foot and at total project level at \$31.29 per gross square foot. These costs are reasonable for a building of this type and quality. *We recommend approval.*

##### (j) Construct—engineering building \$2,900,000

The Budget Act of 1967, together with prior allocations for pre-

## California State Colleges—Continued

liminary plans provided a total of \$246,000 for preliminary planning, design and preparation of working drawings of an engineering building complex which is now designed as a three-element structure having a gross area of almost 72,000 square feet with a net usable area of almost 49,000 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 68 percent which is average for facilities of this type. The building will consist of two high bay one-story wings and a four-story office and classroom unit. The high bay areas will provide for the large engineering laboratories requiring numerous pieces of fairly large equipment. The building would have a total instructional capacity of 229 FTE students as well as 41 faculty office stations. The current cost estimate is \$27.58 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and \$42.61 per square foot at total project level. This includes a substantial sum for fixed group I equipment. These costs are about average for engineering facilities. Note that fixed group I equipment is about \$6 per square foot as compared with Fresno at \$10. It should also be pointed out that the engineering curriculum has already been started with equipment provided from prior appropriations and is being conducted in temporarily assigned spaces. *We recommend approval.*

(k) *Construct—site development-utilities, 1968* \$280,000

The construction of an art building on the west perimeter of the campus was funded in the 1967 Budget Act. It is now proposed to fund the extention of utilities to the art building site from the existing terminus at the cafeteria. This would include heating and chilled water supply pipes and signal lines to be run in a tunnel extention and electrical, gas and water supplies to be run separately outside the tunnel.

Almost half of the proposed cost is due to the construction of the tunnel itself and since this would be a terminal installation with nothing beyond the art building, we have raised the question as to the propriety of the extra cost of a tunnel in the face of current restrictions on the availability of capital investment funds. We believe that the supply lines can be provided either by direct burial or in a concrete conduit at a significantly lower cost than by the construction of the tunnel. As of this writing, this question has not yet been resolved. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(l) *Working drawings—boiler plant addition, phase III* \$50,000

The existing boiler plant which was completed in 1963 and expanded in 1966 will have all its capacity committed to existing buildings or those under construction. An administration-business classroom building and an engineering building are being proposed for construction in this budget. These additional spaces will require expansion of the boiler plant and the addition of heating and chilling equipment. *We recommend approval.*

## Hayward

(m) *Construct—administration building* \$3,291,300(n) *Construct—library* \$7,545,700

The two projects named above are so closely interrelated that we

**California State Colleges—Continued**

believe they should be discussed together as though they were a single project. Physically, they are one structure. The estimates now available for these two projects are valid only if both projects proceed together. The design interrelationship of the two buildings is such that it would be virtually impossible to build them separately without redesigning each.

The library portion is a large three-story structure having a gross area of over 252,000 square feet which straddles, at its west end, a vehicular service road and at its east end a broad pedestrian walkway. The administration portion is a nine-story tower which rises through the library so that its second and third stories, where they coincide with the second and third stories of the library, are actually integrated into and used as library space. The balance of the building which rises above the library will be an office and classroom tower which will house the administrative functions of the campus and some classroom space on an interim basis until such time in the future as the entire upper tower is required for administrative purposes alone. The administration tower has a gross area of 113,500 square feet, part of which, as noted above, will be library space. The Budget Act of 1967 together with prior allocations of preliminary plan funds, provided a total of \$170,750 for preliminary plans and working drawings for the administration building and the same Budget Act provided a total of \$310,200 for the library building. Current cost estimates for the library building alone at construction level indicates \$23.88 per gross square foot with an efficiency ratio of almost 70 percent. For the administration tower, the cost on the same basis is \$25.90 per gross square foot. In both cases, the costs are reasonable for the purpose and are, in fact, slightly below the statistical average principally because of the large size of the total project. The library would have adequate size to accommodate a total campus enrollment of about 11,000 FTE and the administration tower will have a capacity of about 1,000 FTE in classrooms although it is not possible to say at this time when the classroom space will be converted to administrative office space.

We have examined this total project with considerable care because of its size and cost and we believe that the proposed design solution is an excellent one which should produce both an architecturally handsome building and a highly functional complex. *We recommend approval.*

**Humboldt**

(o) *Construct—natural resources building* ----- \$1,416,200

The Budget Act of 1967 together with prior allocations for preliminary plans provided a total of \$75,800 for development of design and working drawings for a two-story science building which has now developed a gross area of 35,700 square feet and a net usable area of almost 22,000 feet providing a ratio of about 61½ percent efficiency which is good for a laboratory building. The capacity of the structure would be approximately 242 FTE students mostly in laboratory spaces but with some lecture facility and offices as well. The current cost esti-

**California State Colleges—Continued**

mate is \$31.32 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and over \$41.30 per gross square foot at total project level. The Eureka-Arcata area is now generally recognized as requiring a premium cost for any typical building construction. This premium is generally considered to be between \$1.50 and \$2 per square foot. When this premium is deducted from the costs mentioned above, the result is equivalent to the statistical average for buildings of this type elsewhere on state college campuses. However, we have raised certain questions concerning the design which have not yet been resolved. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**Kern****(p) Site development—utilities, 1968—initial buildings — \$454,600**

The first academic facility development contemplated for this new college site will be generally similar in character to the initial facilities provided at San Bernardino and Dominguez Hills in which a small corner of the campus was developed for early use and placement of the initial buildings. Subsequent development of the balance of the campus will occur in stages as new specialized buildings are justified and authorized. It is contemplated that this campus will commence operations in the fall of 1970 which makes it necessary that utilities, roads, parking, walks, lighting, etc., be provided on a small area of the campus. Included will be general grading and earthwork to make the initial building site usable and to provide for the roads, walks and parking. All utilities contemplated are within the boundaries of the state property. The Budget Act of 1967 and prior allocations for preliminary plans provided a total of almost \$32,000 for planning the site development and preparing working drawings. The proposed construction appears reasonable and the cost is in line with recent similar experiences. *We recommend approval.*

**(q) Site development—utilities, 1968—off-site————— \$200,000**

The agreement whereby the Kern County Land Company made a gift of the site to the state included the construction of a sanitary sewer line extension, the cost of which would be borne jointly by the Kern County Land Company, the City of Bakersfield and the state with the state's share not to exceed a maximum of \$150,000. In addition, there was a separate agreement with the Kern County Land Company alone by which it would extend drainage facilities from the campus boundary line to an existing drainage channel on the company's property with the cost to be borne by the company and the state with a state expenditure not to exceed \$30,000. A third element was to provide an emergency fire control water supply at a cost of \$20,000, also from a source outside the state property. These three elements are absolutely essential to the development of the campus and the costs appear reasonable for the purpose. *We recommend approval.*

**Long Beach****(r) Construct—lecture classroom building————— \$314,000**

The Budget Act of 1967, together with a prior allocation of prelim-

**California State Colleges—Continued**

inary plan funds, provided a total of \$23,000 for the design and preparation of working drawings for a small lecture classroom structure having a gross area of 8,380 square feet and a net usable area of 6,300 feet, giving an efficiency ratio in excess of 75 percent. The plan calls for a large single room divisible by two folding partitions into three "pie-cut" shaped units providing a total of 400 seats which would produce a rated capacity of 600 FTE students. The current cost estimate is \$28.96 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and over \$40.20 per square foot at total project level. While we recognize that the cost per square foot is usually higher for a small building than for a large building of the same general type, the cost in this case appears to be excessive in an area which generally enjoys the lowest construction cost rate in the state. We have raised a number of questions about some of the design details, particularly the air conditioning systems and the movable partitions, which have not yet been resolved. It is our belief that these are the two major elements that tend to make the cost higher than it should be. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(s) *Construct—home economics addition* \$781,000

The Budget Act of 1967, together with the previously allocated preliminary plans funds, provided a total of \$44,500 for preparation of design and working drawings for an addition to the existing home economics building which would add about 24,500 square feet of gross area and a net area of 16,280 square feet giving an efficiency ratio of about 66½ percent. The current estimate is \$23.02 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and \$33.14 at total project level. The space would have a capacity of about 50 FTE students in the general home economics field. *The cost appears to be in line and we recommend approval.*

(t) *Construct—drama building* \$1,859,200

The Budget Act of 1967 together with previously allocated preliminary plan funds provided a total of \$109,600 for the design and preparation of working drawings for a drama building having a gross area of almost 57,000 square feet, with a net usable area of 32,000 square feet which resulted in a very poor efficiency ratio for a building of this type. As the design progressed it has resulted in a gross area of slightly over 49,000 square feet while still maintaining the same amount of net area and increasing the efficiency to 65 percent which is average for a building of this type. Actually, the project represents an addition, physically attached to and part of the existing little theater building. The addition provides a scene shop which is otherwise totally inadequate in the existing building, a small laboratory theater sometimes referred to as a "theater in the round" and a number of classrooms and so-called laboratory spaces for drama purposes, dressing rooms, costume storage and fabrication spaces, etc. The addition has a rated capacity of 200 FTE plus about 16 faculty stations. The current cost estimate for the basic building alone is approximately \$27.25 per gross square foot and

**California State Colleges—Continued**

over \$39.75 per foot at total project level. This includes a substantial amount for fixed group I equipment. The increased efficiency which significantly reduced the gross area of the building also significantly reduced the gross potential cost. The present estimate appears reasonable for the purpose. *We recommend approval.*

(u) *Site development—utilities, 1968* ----- \$455,300

This project proposes increasing electrical power supplies and distribution made necessary by growth of the campus and the construction of new buildings. A recently completed utility study clearly indicates the necessity for the additional switchgear, feeder lines and duct banks. We have no reservations concerning the total power demand being designed or its cost. However, we think it appropriate to raise a question concerning the sharing of costs.

One of the major power users that make this additional service necessary is the student union which enjoys a very low power rate because the campus passes on to it the low rate which it gets as a result of metering at one point for the entire campus. However, the capacity designed in the distribution lines which includes the demands of the student union represents a significant investment and we suggest that it is appropriate for the student union to share in the cost of providing the additional power capacity on a basis proportionate to its connected load as compared with the total connected load on the lines. This is analogous to situations in which a campus or other state reservation joins in the cost of outside sewer lines or sewage disposal systems or even water supplies where the state pays a share which is commensurate with its demand as compared to the total capacity. *For this reason, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**Los Angeles**(v) *Working drawings—site development—utilities, 1968* ----- \$30,000

The Budget Act of 1967, together with prior appropriations for working drawings and allocations of nonstate funds for a parking structure, provided a total of over \$11 million for the construction of a massive physical sciences and parking structure complex. This complex imposes a very significant additional load on all the utilities required to service it. The working drawings proposed represents an ultimate project of over \$600,000 to extend water, gas, sewer and electrical utilities to serve the building, plus the installation of a hot water generator and a chiller in a small building to be attached to the physical sciences building. The timing of the physical sciences complex is such that only working drawings are needed at this time. *We recommend approval.*

**Sacramento**(w) *Construct—psychology building* ----- \$1,980,000

The Budget Act of 1967, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$93,340 for the preparation of design and working drawings for a psychology classroom building now conceived as having almost 67,000 gross square feet of area with a net

**California State Colleges—Continued**

usable area in excess of 40,000 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of slightly over 60 percent. This is relatively satisfactory for a psychology building because this type of structure is usually heavily subdivided into small areas requiring a relatively high percentage of unassignable corridor and other types of "tare" space. It is anticipated that the structure will have a capacity of over 1,230 FTE students plus about 99 faculty stations. The current cost estimate is \$25.05 per gross square foot for the basic building and over \$30.30 per square foot at total project level. These costs appear to be reasonable and, in fact, are slightly below the statistical average for psychology buildings on state college campuses. *We recommend approval.*

(x) *Construct—central chiller plant and utilities, 1968* — \$1,178,000

The Sacramento campus experiences weather conditions in the spring, summer and fall which makes air conditioning for most of the buildings a necessity. Heretofore, air conditioning has been provided on an individual building basis which meant a proliferation of single-unit compressors, cooling towers, etc. For a campus which will ultimately be very large, this is uneconomical both from the standpoint of capital investment and maintenance and operating costs. The long-range plan now contemplates going to a central chilled water supply system. Initially, the centralized supply would serve three new structures, the teacher education building, psychology building and new library. The first building is already financed, the second is proposed for construction in this budget and the third is under design and financing will probably be provided in the 1969 budget proposal. Ultimately, the chilled water distribution system will be extended to pick up existing buildings as well as all future buildings to be constructed on the campus. The central chiller plant will be constructed as an addition to the existing boiler plant. This proposal will provide the additional building space, the chilling and auxiliary equipment, the main distribution runs, electrical supplies to the chilling equipment, etc.

The total project also includes the extension of utilities to the teacher education building which is already financed. These include principally electric power supplies, but also gas, water and sewer lines. We have no reservations about the total project cost which appears to be in line for the purpose. However, it is our understanding that the 1967 Budget Act in appropriating \$353,000 for expansion of the boiler plant also included in that appropriation the amount necessary for the preparation of working drawings for the central chiller system. This amount was approximately \$53,000 and we find that the estimate for the construction of the system has not taken credit for this amount. *Consequently, until the exact amount of money required can be resolved we would recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**San Bernardino**

(y) *Construct—site development-utilities, 1968* ————— 800,000

The Budget Act of 1967, together with a prior appropriation for working drawings and an allocation of funds for preliminary plans,

**California State Colleges—Continued**

provided a total of over \$4,793,000 for the construction of a central library building for this campus. The site of the library building is in an undeveloped portion of the campus which is not yet supplied with utilities or other services. This project proposes the extension of the utility tunnel to the vicinity of the library and the construction of the service lines in the tunnel including chilled water supply and return, high temperature hot water supply and return and domestic hot water supply. In addition, there would be constructed walks, service roads, lighting, electrical power supplies to the building, etc. These are all essential to make the building operable upon completion which is anticipated for the fall of 1969. *The cost of the proposal appears to be in line for the purpose and we recommend approval.*

**San Diego****(z) Construct—site development-utilities, 1968 ----- \$441,000**

This project is principally an upgrading of the electrical and steam supplies to existing buildings or those under construction because the present utility system has been loaded to its practical maximum capacity and actually beyond that causing relatively unsafe and unreliable conditions. We have no reservations with respect to the need and justification for the work to be done. However, we find that there is a considerable discrepancy between the project as originally presented and the amount now proposed. Until we can get the necessary details relating to the differences, we believe that a firm recommendation should be held in abeyance. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**Sonoma****(aa) Construct—additional chiller equipment-boiler plant \$215,200**

The Sonoma campus is designed to distribute heating and cooling fluids from a central plant. The individual buildings have no local sources of supply of either high-temperature hot water or chilled water for cooling. This proposal represents the second phase of chilling equipment for the central plant which is needed to accommodate a number of buildings already financed or under construction. *The cost appears to be in line for the purpose and we recommend approval.*

**Cal-Poly KV****(bb) Construct—agriculture classroom building ----- \$1,609,500**

The Budget Act of 1967, together with previously allocated preliminary plan funds, provided a total of \$93,500 for a project described as an agriculture classroom addition which has now been designed as having a gross area of 50,550 square feet with a net area of over 32,150 square feet. This gives an efficiency ratio of over 63 percent which is somewhat on the low side for what is basically a straight classroom building. It should also be pointed out that the building is not an addition to an existing one but a totally separate structure and should perhaps better be called classroom building No. 2 rather than an addition. The building will provide largely so-called laboratory types of spaces although most are not the sophisticated type found in a science or

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 330**

### **California State Colleges—Continued**

engineering building. The current cost estimate is \$24.18 per gross square foot for the basic building and almost \$31.70 per square foot at total project level. While the cost appears to be reasonable, there are elements in the design which we feel will actually lead to a considerable higher cost than the estimate would indicate and which we believe are not justifiable. We have raised questions about these elements but they have not yet been answered. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**(cc) Site development—1968** \$413,000

This project consists principally of a new main road connection to accommodate the new freeway intersection that is being constructed by the State Division of Highways. It is important as the main entrance to the campus with very high peak traffic flows. The work consists largely of grading, paving, curbs and road lighting extending beyond the new connection and into some of the existing road system where heavy night traffic requires adequate lighting. The cost appears to be in line for the purpose. *We recommend approval.*

**(dd) Construct—site development—utilities, 1968** \$650,000

This proposal consists of two elements, drainage and water supply. The gradual development of the campus and construction of new buildings has resulted in some difficult drainage problems for stormwater runoff. This accounts for most of the cost in this item. The balance is to upgrade the water supply and distribution system to provide more reliable firefighting water pressure. *The cost appears to be in line for the purpose and we recommend approval.*

### **Cal-Poly SLO**

**(ee) Construct—site development—utilities** \$136,800

This project consists of two elements, the replacement of an existing sewer line which periodically overflows because of its lack of capacity and the rebuilding of one of the primary electrical feeder lines which is an overhead system presently including a number of serious safety and code violations. Both elements appear to be relatively essential and the cost appears to be in line. *We recommend approval.*

### **CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES**

**ITEM 330 of the Budget Bill**

**Capital Outlay Budget page 112**

**FOR PROJECT PLANNING AND STUDIES, TRUSTEES OF  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, FROM THE CAPITAL  
OUTLAY FUND FOR PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$766,000
Recommended for approval	616,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** \$150,000

#### **ANALYSIS**

This item proposes a schedule of three planning authorizations as follows:

**Item 330****Capital Outlay****California State Colleges—Continued**

(a) *Project planning for the 1969-70 fiscal year \$350,000*

This proposal represents a significant departure from what has been the conventional approach to preliminary planning for the past 17 or 18 years. Heretofore, preliminary planning has been predicated on the premise that fairly well developed designs would be made available as a basis for justifying and establishing the amounts proposed for each project in a given budget presentation. Such well developed plans usually represented from 1 to 1½ percent of the potential total cost of a given project.

Based upon substantial experience over a number of years the concept has gradually evolved in connection with working drawing proposals that it is possible to reach reasonable conclusions and make judgments using only well documented programs and a good statistical background of average costs for various types of buildings and facilities. Also germane to this concept is the premise that this would allow more freedom for the state colleges in arriving at design solutions which, in any event, could not be finally implemented without first receiving Public Works Board approval. The assumption is made that the procedure of Public Works Board approval would provide a significant checkpoint which would control excessive potential construction costs, functionally inefficient designs and configurations, and potentially excessive maintenance costs which could result from improper use of materials or downgrading of the quality of materials. To some degree this approach shifts the responsibility of decision from the Legislature to the Public Works Board, although the Legislature would continue to exercise control from the standpoint of project cost as reflected by appropriations.

We believe this approach has merit and is worthy of trial for several reasons. One is the fact that heretofore there have been significant expenditures on preliminary plans for projects which do not get into the budget for which they are planned because of overall capital investment limitations. Subsequently, if such projects rise in priority due to the delay, the preliminary plans are often out of date and almost as much must again be expended to redesign or otherwise renew the plans. Secondly, we believe that the trustees should be given the opportunity to demonstrate their responsibility and appreciation of the state's limited capital investment ability.

The concept includes the continued preparation of preliminary plans for utility and site development projects and for other projects so small as to be proposed for funding both the working drawings and the construction at the same time. If this is to be the overall approach, then it is appropriate to calculate that \$350,000 represents 1½ percent of the potential project cost of the kinds of projects mentioned above or a project value of about \$23,500,000 which is totally unrealistic. In the budget now under consideration, these categories total much less than \$10 million. Therefore, we recommend that the amount be reduced by \$150,000 to a total of \$200,000.

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 331**

### **California State Colleges—Continued**

*(b) Master planning for college campuses ----- \$216,000*

One of the most significant difficulties that has been experienced over the years is the lack of adequate long-range master planning, particularly where ultimate enrollment goals have been repeatedly revised and raised for various campuses. Another element which significantly affects long-range planning is the changing mix of lower division, upper division and graduate relationships and changing curriculum demands. A continuous review and redesign of master planning is essential and we believe in the long run will result in better utilization of the state's limited capital investment potential or reduction in that investment to achieve a given goal. *We recommend approval.*

*(c) General studies ----- \$200,000*

The concept of this category was initiated in the 1964 Budget Act with an appropriation of \$50,000, followed by \$100,000 in 1965 and \$200,000 in 1966 and 1967. These studies relate to problems which require special skills to solve but which do not always result in immediate specific projects from which such studies could be financed. For example, a growing campus and a growing community around it usually give rise to serious traffic problems and traffic flows. It is to the interest of the campus that such problems be carefully studied and appropriate solutions arrived at by specialists. The community usually participates in such activities. Another example concerns potential utility problems which are often neglected because they are not as obvious as buildings and roads and other visible facilities. Nevertheless, these utilities are vital to the functioning of the campus and to the preservation of the capital investment in the visible facilities. Past experience has provided some significant examples of utility failures which could have been avoided by timely study. We have heretofore supported this approach and we continue to believe it is a wise investment. *We recommend approval.*

### **CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES**

**ITEM 331 of the Budget Bill**

**Capital Outlay Budget page 102**

### **FOR MAJOR EQUIPMENT, TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$4,610,500
Recommended for approval -----	4,162,200
Recommended for special review -----	448,300

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION ----- None**

#### **ANALYSIS**

This item continues the format established for the first time in the 1967 Budget Act by which equipment projects are scheduled under a separate line item, and the amounts are made available for one year

**California State Colleges—Continued**

rather than the three-year period for which construction projects are funded. We concur in this one-year approach.

The item proposes appropriations on 17 campuses for various types of projects already funded and in most cases already under construction, running from sophisticated and expensive science and engineering buildings to simple physical education projects and corporation yards.

**Chico**

(a) *Equip—phase III, farm buildings* \$74,100

The Budget Act of 1967, together with prior preliminary plan allocations, provided a total of \$599,500 for the construction of a third phase of farm buildings consisting of a meat laboratory, a greenhouse and headhouse, beef cattle-fattening barn and fencing and site work. The gross area of the buildings themselves will be something over 17,000 square feet. It is anticipated that the buildings will be ready for use sometime in late 1968 and it is essential that the equipment needed to make them operable be financed at this time.

There is no reliable statistical information upon which to base the relationship of equipment value to building value with respect to farm structures on state college campuses. However, the meat laboratory is basically an abattoir and will require a certain amount of fairly expensive equipment in the building. The greenhouse and headhouse will also require some expensive and extensive equipment. The amount proposed appears to be reasonable for the purpose. *We recommend approval.*

**Dominguez Hills**

(b) *Equip—initial buildings* \$125,000

The Budget Act of 1964, plus preliminary plan allocations and augmentations, provided over \$1,415,000 for the design and construction of initial buildings on this campus. These were to be simple one-story structures of good quality, similar to those constructed on the San Bernardino campus, which would serve the initial enrollment at the campus. Subsequently they would become a sort of staging area for each of the new permanent large buildings to be constructed and ultimately the initial complex would become a sort of school within the college. The Budget Act of 1964 also provided \$127,200 for equipping temporary buildings which was to go into rented facilities and ultimately to be moved to the initial buildings upon completion. The Budget Acts of 1966 and 1967 added two more phases totaling \$315,500 which was intended to complete the equipping of the initial facilities. It is now proposed to add a fourth phase, and presumably the last one, which was not included in the five-year plan for the period 1968 to 1972 as published by the trustees in June of 1967. We have received no list, as of this writing, nor do we have a sound basis for making any comparisons at this point. *Consequently, we recommend that the proposal be placed in the category of special review.*

(c) *Equip—initial physical education facilities* \$27,900

The Budget Act of 1967, together with previous preliminary plan allocations, provided the total of \$413,500 for the design and construc-

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 331**

### **California State Colleges—Continued**

tion of a small initial physical education facility with a gross area of about 13,000 square feet. This would not provide large conventional gymnasium floor areas but only activity rooms, locker, shower and drying facilities and some faculty offices. The building is scheduled for completion in June of 1969 at which time it would be necessary to provide the various kinds of equipment applicable to the spaces so that the building could be used in the fall of 1969. The amount proposed appears to be in line for the size and type of spaces. *We recommend approval.*

*(d) Equip—Outdoor physical education facilities \$25,900*

The Budget Act of 1967, together with preliminary plans allocations, provided a total of \$343,400 for planning and construction of the first part of Phase I of outdoor physical education facilities. These were to consist of six tennis courts, six multipurpose courts and five acres of general turfed area together with some minor development of a larger area surrounding the facilities. This equipment proposal would provide all that would be necessary for this particular area and would consist of such things as tennis equipment, volleyball equipment, archery equipment and various other devices needed for the numerous outdoor activities which could be conducted on the turfed area as well as the multipurpose courts. The amount appears to be fairly consistent with what has been provided at other campuses for similar areas. *We recommend approval.*

*(e) Equip—corporation yard \$105,400*

The Budget Act of 1967, plus preliminary plans allocation, provided a total of \$347,400 for planning and construction of a corporation yard facility which would represent a first phase adequate to handle the campus for some years. The facility includes over 14,000 gross square feet of building space for shops, storage and offices and a large paved, fenced outdoor area for the storage of materials not subject to weather damage and for various maintenance vehicles.

The equipping of a corporation yard usually represents a disproportionate relationship of equipment value to building cost since the facilities are usually quite simple in nature and hence are relatively inexpensive while at the same time requiring fairly expensive kinds of equipment such as machine tools, woodworking tools, at least one forklift truck, maintenance vehicles, etc. The amount is in line with what has been provided initially at other campuses. *We recommend approval.*

### **Fullerton**

*(f) Equip—humanities-social sciences building \$362,000*

The Budget Acts of 1965 and 1966, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$3,841,000 for the design and construction of a classroom building having a gross area of almost 145,000 square feet which is estimated to be completed and ready for occupancy in January of 1969.

**Item 331****Capital Outlay****California State Colleges—Continued**

The present proposal for equipping the building represents nearly 9½ percent of the cost of constructing the project and might perhaps be adequate to completely equip the building. However, on a statistical basis classroom buildings of this type have usually run 10 to 11 percent and it may be that a future increment will be required. *We recommend approval.*

(g) *Equip—physical education facilities* \$73,300

The Budget Acts of 1963 and 1964, together with preliminary plans allocation and augmentations, provided over \$3,682,000 for the construction of a gymnasium facility and a complex of two swimming pools. In addition, there was a series of appropriations for outdoor physical education facilities. The Budget Act of 1965 appropriated \$164,000 for equipping these facilities, at which time it was considered that this would be adequate to make the facilities operable. It now appears that a second and hopefully final increment of equipment will be necessary to make all the physical education facilities fully operable. The two increments together represent approximately 6 percent of the total investment in physical education facilities. This is within the statistical range of past experience in the other state colleges. *We recommend approval.*

(h) *Equip—engineering building* \$343,100

The Budget Act of 1967 provided \$226,000 for the design and preparation of working drawings for a specialized engineering building which, according to the current design, would have around 72,000 gross square feet of area. It is anticipated that the total cost of the structure including plans, based on the current construction cost index, will be about \$3,150,000. The equipment now proposed is for items requiring long lead times and represents something under 11 percent of the cost of the building. This compares with a statistical average of 25 to 30 percent for equipping engineering buildings. Consequently, there will probably be at least one more equipment phase when the building is nearing completion. It is currently estimated that the buildings will be ready for occupancy in the fall of 1970. *We recommend approval.*

**Hayward**

(i) *Equip—speech-drama building* \$50,000

The Budget Acts of 1966 and 1967, together with allocations for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$2,258,000 for design and construction of a speech-drama building having a gross area of nearly 60,000 square feet. This is the building which would include a 500-seat little theater and is scheduled for completion in the spring of 1969, but probably not in time for general use during the spring semester. It is proposed to provide a first phase of initial equipment for the building representing items that may take longer than usual to procure. The amount obviously represents a very low percentage of the building cost and it will probably be followed by two more phases before the facility is fully equipped. *The amount appears to be reasonable and we recommend approval.*

## California State Colleges—Continued

(j) *Equip—science building* ----- \$152,100

The science building on this campus was one of the first to be completed in 1963 and in fact is a reproduction of the one on the San Fernando campus. Initially the building served a number of purposes other than science and it was contemplated that over a period of years these other purposes would be phased out, and, as space was freed, it would be converted to science use and would require additional equipment. There have already been four phases totaling \$1,531,900. This proposal would bring the total to \$1,684,000 with possibly three phases yet to come.

The initial cost of the building plus subsequent alterations represents an investment of \$4,433,000 with most of it having been committed in 1962. The total equipment cost including the proposed phase would therefore represent almost 38 percent of the cost of the building which nominally is very close to the upper limit that has been experienced statistically with buildings of this type. However, it should be borne in mind that the long phasing cycle has distorted the percentage relationship because of the steadily increasing cost of scientific equipment compared to the fixed value of the investment in the building which occurred in 1962. On an adjusted dollar value basis over the period of the several equipment phases, the actual comparison is somewhat closer to 30 or 31 percent. Consequently, the proposal for this fifth phase appears to be reasonable. *We recommend approval.*

(k) *Equip—classroom building no. 1* ----- \$88,100

The Budget Acts of 1964 and 1965, together with preliminary plans allocations, provided a total of \$2,616,000 for design and construction of a major classroom building having a gross area of approximately 120,000 square feet and a student capacity of approximately 1,990 FTE plus faculty offices. The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$210,000 as a first increment of equipment and the present proposal, which is intended to be the last, would bring the total to \$298,100, representing a little over 11 percent of the total project cost of the building. This is within the normal statistical range for simple lecture-type facilities. *We recommend approval.*

## Humboldt

(l) *Equip—biological science addition* ----- \$108,100

The Budget Acts of 1965 and 1966, together with preliminary plans allocations and augmentations, provided a total of \$2,454,250 for the design and construction of an addition to the existing biological sciences building which would add a gross area of about 71,000 square feet. It is now proposed to provide the first of two phases primarily to cover equipment requiring long lead times. The amount appears to be reasonable for the purpose. *We recommend approval.*

(m) *Equip—remodeling founders hall* ----- \$49,900

The Budget Act of 1967, together with preliminary plan allocations, provided a total of \$639,000 for the design and remodeling of areas in

**California State Colleges—Continued**

the existing Founders Hall. Much of the work is made necessary by the fact that the original building does not entirely conform to the Earthquake Safety Code. The balance represents alterations of spaces which will increase academic capacity by 416 FTE.

It is not possible to make percentage comparisons between equipment and cost of construction since this is a remodeling job. However, using the increased FTE capacity as a basis, the cost per FTE would be very low and indicates the reuse of a great deal of existing equipment. *We recommend approval.*

**Kern**

*(n) Initial complement—library books, phase II \$105,000*

The Budget Act of 1967 provided \$187,000 as a first phase in the purchase of library books which are projected to total 50,000 when the library opens in 1969. The present proposal represents the second phase and should complete the 50,000 volumes. This is considered the standard complement for such new libraries. *We recommend approval.*

**Long Beach**

*(o) Equip—engineering building No. 2 \$24,700*

The Budget Acts of 1965, 1966 and 1967, together with preliminary plans allocations, provided a total of \$1,508,750 for the design and construction of engineering building No. 2 on this campus. The building is to have about 84,000 gross square feet of area and is scheduled for completion sometime late in 1969. It is now proposed to provide funds for engineering equipment items which require very long lead times. *The amount is relatively modest and we recommend approval.*

*(p) Equip—industrial arts building, II \$59,000*

The Budget Act of 1964, plus preliminary plans allocations and augmentations, provided a total of \$872,700 for the design and construction of an industrial arts building having a gross area of about 24,000 square feet. The Budget Act of 1965 provided \$100,000 for initial equipment which at the time was thought to be all that would be required. It is now proposed to add a second and final phase which would bring the total to \$159,000, representing about 18 percent of the cost of the building. We have relatively inadequate statistical history on the equipment of industrial arts buildings. The university does not provide this type of facility. However, such facilities usually include some fairly expensive machine tools, woodworking tools, welding equipment, etc., and the total amount does not appear to be out of line. *We recommend approval.*

**Los Angeles**

*(q) Equip—library building \$394,600*

The Budget Acts of 1964 and 1965, together with preliminary plans allocations and augmentations, provided a total of \$7,222,764 for the design and construction of an addition to the library building. This would add over 288,000 gross square feet of area and provide for an enrollment of well over 16,000 FTE. The building is presently scheduled for completion in the fall of 1969 and the equipment proposal

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 331**

### **California State Colleges—Continued**

represents the first of probably three increments covering items requiring long lead times. Since this first increment represents little more than 5 percent of the cost of the building, it appears justified. *We recommend approval.*

#### **Sacramento**

##### *(r) Equip—science building, phase III \$360,500*

The Budget Acts of 1962, 1963 and 1965, together with allocations for preliminary plans, provided over \$5,880,000 for the design and construction of a new science building having a gross area in excess of 194,000 square feet. Subsequently, there was a savings of nearly \$300,000 so that the net investment in the building project itself is around \$5,580,000.

The Budget Acts of 1965, 1966 and 1967 provided the total of \$1,410,000 for three phases of an expected total of four to equip the building with its initial complement of movable furnishings and equipment. This represents approximately 25 percent of the cost of the project itself and is significantly below the statistical average for equipping general science buildings. Ultimately, a fourth increment will probably bring the percentage up to about 30 percent. Consequently, the present proposal appears to be justified. *We recommend approval.*

#### **San Bernardino**

##### *(s) Equip—library-classroom building \$118,900*

The Budget Acts of 1966 and 1967, together with previously allocated preliminary plan moneys, provided a total of \$4,793,000 for design and construction of a combination library and classroom building having a gross area of something over 165,000 square feet. It is intended that the gross size of the building will provide the library facilities for an enrollment of 3,800 FTE which will not be reached until 1974 or 1975. In the interim, a part of the building will be used for lecture and activity rooms as well as faculty offices. The building is not scheduled for completion until September 1969, but it is necessary to provide some funds at this time to purchase those items which require longer than usual lead times. On this basis the amount appears reasonable and represents the first of two increments. *We recommend approval.*

##### *(t) Equip—biological science building \$168,100*

The Budget Acts of 1964 and 1965, plus preliminary plans funds and augmentations, provided a total of \$1,942,000 for planning and construction of a biological sciences building having about 53,000 gross square feet of area. The Budget Acts of 1966 and 1967 provided \$257,100 for initial equipment and the present proposal makes the third phase of what now appears to be a total of four. The funded phases and the one now proposed total over \$425,000 and represent about 22 percent of the total cost of the project. This is on the low side of the statistical average for buildings of this type, indicating that a fourth phase will probably be justified. *We recommend approval.*

##### *(u) Equip—physical science building \$72,100*

The Budget Acts of 1964 and 1965 plus preliminary plans allocations

**Item 331****Capital Outlay****California State Colleges—Continued**

provided a total of \$1,815,000 for the design and construction of a physical science building having a gross area of almost 53,000 square feet. The Budget Acts of 1966 and 1967 provided \$212,400 for two phases of equipment of what will probably turn out to be a four-phase process. The total of the three phases will be \$284,500 representing less than 16 percent of the cost of the building. This is well below the statistical average for reasonably sophisticated science buildings of this type and would indicate that a fourth phase would probably be justified. *We recommend approval.*

**San Diego**

(v) *Equip—music classroom building* ----- \$239,100

The Budget Acts of 1964 and 1965, plus preliminary plans allocations, provided a total of \$2,601,000 for the design and construction of a new music classroom building with a gross area of over 76,000 square feet with a capacity of 424 FTE students. The equipment proposal is contemplated as one of two phases and represents slightly over 9 percent of the cost of the building itself. This is lower than the average for such buildings. It is not known at this time how large the second phase will be. However, the amount appears reasonable for the first phase. *We recommend approval.*

(w) *Equip—library-classroom building* ----- \$100,000

The Budget Acts of 1964 and 1966, together with prior allocations of preliminary plan moneys, provided a total of almost \$8,600,000 for the construction and design of a new library-classroom building on this campus. As of the latest financial statement, it appears that perhaps only \$8,200,000 will be required to design and construct the building which is on the verge of being started. The building will have a gross area of over 314,000 square feet and upon completion it will relieve the existing library of that function and that building will then be converted to other classroom uses. The present equipment proposal is merely a first increment of what will probably be a total of three and represents the cost of those items requiring unusually long lead times. *We recommend approval.*

**San Francisco**

(x) *Equip—music-speech building converted space* ----- \$87,200

The Budget Act of 1967 provided \$292,000 for completion of unfinished basement and loft space in the recently completed addition to the music and speech building. The space was to be converted to highly sophisticated motion picture studio facilities in support of the extensive program in this field at this college. It is difficult to make percentage comparisons since the cost of the space includes not only the appropriation made for finishing it but the basic construction financed from an earlier appropriation. However, in view of the nature of the space and the kinds of equipment which are ordinarily required for programs of this type, the amount appears to be reasonable. *We recommend approval.*

## Capital Outlay

Item 331

### California State Colleges—Continued

San Jose

(y) *Equip—corporation yard* \$65,000

The Legislature originally provided two appropriations for the construction of a new corporation yard for this campus, to be located on the south unit. Subsequently, there became available for purchase the abandoned American Can Company plant lying approximately halfway between both campus units and containing almost ideal space for corporation yard facilities with far more area than was actually required. The Legislature at its 1967 session approved the reversion of the original appropriations and appropriated \$500,000 to purchase this property and \$200,000 to make the necessary alterations and modifications. Together these two appropriations were significantly less than those for a totally new facility.

It is now proposed to equip the new, enlarged facility at the American Can Company plant to which also would be moved such equipment as now exists at the corporation yard facilities on the main campus. The amount proposed appears to be reasonable for the purpose although there are a number of items in the list about which there is some question at this time. *Nevertheless, we would recommend approval of the project on the premise that any questionable items will be resolved before the legislative committees act on the matter.*

(z) *Equip—science building 2, phase III* \$324,600

This project has a relatively complex history. The Legislature in 1961 appropriated \$500,000 for working drawings for a science building designated as No. 2 which was conceived as roughly shaped like the letter "H" and six stories in height. Subsequently, it was decided to proceed with the building in two phases so that the first phase would produce one leg and the crossbar. This is now almost complete and partially occupied. The second construction phase will complete the building. The working drawing funds were actually split so that nearly half was reserved for this second phase. Consequently, to be accurately described, the equipment proposal now in the budget is the third and final phase of equipping Phase I of science building No. 2. The second construction phase will probably commence sometime in 1968. The current final estimate for Phase I construction including planning and all fees is approximately \$5,435,000 which is significantly less than the appropriation. The present equipment proposal together with the two prior ones would provide a total of \$1,551,300 which is fairly close to the statistical average of about 30 percent for sophisticated science buildings into which category this building falls, because, among other things, it has some extensive radiological areas for nuclear physics studies. *By several other measurement techniques such as average cost per FTE and average cost of equipment per assignable square foot, the total proposal appears to be within acceptable limits. We recommend approval.*

**Item 331****Capital Outlay****California State Colleges—Continued****Sonoma**

(aa) *Equip—library* ----- \$112,600

The Budget Acts of 1965 and 1966, together with allocations for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$1,978,300 for construction of the first phase of a library building having a gross area of nearly 65,000 square feet. This is scheduled for completion in July of 1969. This equipment proposal is the first of what will probably be two phases and by itself represents something less than 6 percent of the project cost of the building. Some equipment for the library is already available from the temporary library space which will be vacated when the new building is ready for occupancy. In addition, the second phase, together with the existing equipment, will probably bring the cost to something over 10 percent of the project cost. This is within the statistical average range for library buildings. *We recommend approval.*

(bb) *Equip—physical education facility* ----- \$111,300

The Budget Acts of 1963 and 1966, together with previously allocated preliminary plans funds, provided a total of \$2,128,000 for the design and construction of a conventional physical education building containing the usual gymnasium floor areas plus locker and shower rooms, etc. The facility is expected to be completed and ready for occupancy about December of 1968 and will have approximately 67,000 square feet of gross area. This equipment proposal represents slightly over 5 percent of the cost of the building. *We recommend approval.*

**Cal-Poly Kellogg-Voorhis**

(cc) *Equip—library building* ----- \$323,300

The Budget Acts of 1965 and 1966, together with an allocation for preliminary plans, provided a total of \$3,906,000 for the planning and construction of a new library building containing over 144,000 square feet of gross area. This building was intended to take the place of the existing library which will ultimately be converted to classroom use. The new library is also designed to be expanded in the future which could not be accomplished with the old library without serious difficulties both architectural and engineering.

This equipment proposal, which is intended to be the only one, represents about 9 percent of the cost of the building itself. Past experience indicates an average of 10 percent for equipping a library. In this instance, since all of the equipment in the existing library is presumed to be usable and transferable to the new building, the total equipment would probably represent a value of 15 percent or more which we consider excessive. Therefore, without having on hand an inventory of equipment in the existing building and without having examined in detail the equipment list proposed at this time, we believe that the equipment decision should be held in abeyance until the total inventory and proposal can be resolved together. *We recommend, therefore, that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 331**

### **California State Colleges—Continued**

#### *(dd) Equip—engineering building \$286,400*

The Budget Acts of 1961 and 1962 plus preliminary plans, provided well over \$5,330,000 for the construction of a four-story engineering building having over 174,000 gross square feet of area with a calculated capacity of 1,480 FTE. The building which was completed in September, 1964 actually produced a substantial savings so that the final figure was approximately \$4,800,000 for construction and planning. Subsequently, there were four increments of initial equipment for the building in the Budget Acts of 1963, 1964, 1965 and 1966, totaling \$1,761,500. At that time it was not known how many additional increments would be required but it now appears to be two, the one now proposed plus one in the future.

With the increment now proposed the total equipment would come to over \$2,080,000. This represents approximately 43 percent of the building cost. Unfortunately, this is somewhat misleading because the construction cost of the project was determined when it went to bid in 1963 while the equipment was provided in a series of purchases over a period of time in a rising market in which equipment was affected to an unusual degree by rising costs and inflation. However, if the cost of the structure is adjusted to current construction cost index values it would be increased by 23 percent, making a current replacement value of approximately \$5,900,000. When compared to this value, the equipment percentage is reduced to 35 percent thereby falling between 30 and 40 percent which statistically has been the average for engineering buildings. Therefore the fifth phase now proposed appears to be marginally in line. However, we would seriously question the justification for a sixth phase which appears to be in the making for the 1969 Budget Bill. *We recommend approval of the current proposal.*

#### **Cal-Poly San Luis Obispo**

#### *(ee) Equip—biological sciences building \$73,200*

This project was at one time described as a biological sciences addition. In fact, it is a separate and distinct building which was funded for working drawings and construction in the 1963 and 1964 Budget Acts and for a first major increment of equipment in the 1966 Budget Act which appropriated \$396,100. The initial appropriation plus that proposed here would make a total of \$496,300. When compared with the \$1,645,275 total cost of the building, including preliminary plans, working drawings and construction, this represents slightly over 28 percent of the cost. We have been using the percentage relationship between initial equipment and the project cost of the building as one statistical yardstick for determining what is a reasonable initial complement of equipment. In this case the percentage falls within acceptable limits when compared with other recent facilities at state colleges and the University. This proposal, we have been assured, is the last for the initial complement of equipment for the building. *We recommend approval.*

**CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES****ITEM 332 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 112****FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND  
EQUIPMENT, TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE  
COLLEGES, FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$1,250,000
Recommended for approval	1,250,000

We recommend the Legislature adopt a concurrent resolution requesting the Department of Finance to review its administrative practice with respect to this program and to make positive recommendations to the Legislature by the fifth legislative day of the 1969 legislative session.

**ANALYSIS**

We recommend a reduction in the 1966-67 minor capital outlay budget for the Trustees of the California State Colleges in order to identify misdirected administrative effort being devoted to selection of the projects. We did not intend to have the total amount reduced, only to obtain a forum to express our dissatisfaction with the administrative process. We presented our case to the Assembly Ways and Means Subcommittee, which chose not to reduce the appropriation but instead instructed the state college representatives to review their procedure and amend it if advisable. The state college representatives subsequently expressed the opinion that they were limited by State Administrative Manual regulations and that the Department of Finance would have to take the corrective action. The Department of Finance did not respond so we raised the issue for the second time in our Analysis of the 1967-68 Budget. The Legislature amended the 1967-68 Budget Bill, in response to our recommendation and earmarked capital outlay funds for each individual campus without Trustee control. Subsequently, we corresponded with the Department of Finance in a letter dated November 7, 1967, expressing our understanding of the controversy and requesting that it review its position. Representatives of the department met with us but the department has failed to act.

The issue in question involves the willingness of the Department of Finance to delegate authority to a meaningful level. The State Administrative Manual controlled by the Department of Finance requires that a minor capital outlay project be substantiated as fully as a major capital outlay project. This documentation must be submitted to the Department of Finance to support an agency's budget request. Presumably, the Department of Finance exerts the effort required to make an informed judgment with respect to the need for each of the projects requested. But this is not in fact the case. The major state agencies submitted over 900 projects at an estimated cost of over \$14 million for inclusion in the 1968-69 Budget. The Department of Finance estimated that it spent approximately one-quarter of a man-year reviewing these

**California State Colleges—Continued**

projects and eventually included approximately 375 projects, estimated to cost \$5½ million, in the budget. One-quarter of a man-year in this context is sufficient only to make arbitrary judgments and more likely represents a detriment rather than a contribution to the minor capital outlay program.

We identified this administrative problem first in our analysis of the California State College capital outlay budget because of our belief that the state college administrators were diligently determining their minor capital outlay needs at the campus level. This diligence was rewarded only by having their efforts subverted both by the Department of Finance and at the California State College Trustees office level in their attempt to anticipate arbitrary cuts by the Department of Finance.

Despite our criticism, and despite the Legislature having expressed dissatisfaction, the Department of Finance has failed to respond in a positive manner. Although the Legislature first requested a review by the administration in 1966, and revised the state college capital outlay budget schedule in order to express its dissatisfaction in 1967, the Department of Finance has reviewed the minor capital outlay program on a project-by-project basis in both years, and does not propose to do otherwise. The department has not even honored the instructions that the Legislature made last year with respect to budgeting the minor capital outlay program on a campus-by-campus basis and has instead proposed a lump sum appropriation to the California State College Trustees. The effect of this change is to deny the Legislature the opportunity to take action on projects defined by budget page and line but it will not affect the ability of the Department of Finance to require project-by-project substantiation either before the budget is approved or afterwards.

*We do not wish to jeopardize any part of the California State College minor capital outlay program because we believe the amount to be justified. It is \$199,466 less than appropriated last year. We do wish to report the Department of Finance failure to respond to legislative interest. We recommend the Legislature adopt a concurrent resolution requesting the Department of Finance to review its administrative practice with respect to this program and to make positive recommendations to the Legislature by the fifth legislative day of the 1969 legislative session.*

**CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES****ITEM 333 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 102****FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND WORKING DRAWINGS, TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, FROM THE CAPITAL OUTLAY FUND FOR HIGHER EDUCATION****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$17,019,400
Recommended for approval	14,380,400
Recommend for special review	2,639,000

<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b>	None
------------------------------------	------

**California State Colleges—Continued****ANALYSIS**

In the preceding item for the regular major capital outlay for the state colleges, we pointed out the anticipated receipt of substantial federal grants for each of the 13 building construction projects included in that item. No federal grants are anticipated for utilities development projects or for working drawings projects. To the extent that the federal grants are forthcoming, the equivalent amount of state funds thus released from each project will be used to fund the projects contained, in two groups, in the schedule following. This schedule is not in any priority order but is in campus alphabetical order. The total value of the schedule equals the maximum anticipated federal grants which means that the trustees will have to make priority choices from this schedule if the federal funds are not fully realized. It will be noted that the item totals to a zero value because it does not constitute an appropriation of additional funds but merely an authority to substitute appropriated funds where federal grants make this possible. Nevertheless since, in fact, the substitute funds are state funds, we feel that the same attitude concerning review should be taken towards each of the projects in the schedule as is taken in connection with the main appropriation item. Sixteen of the 19 campuses are represented in the schedule.

**Group A****Chico****(a) Construct—building modernization \$468,000**

The Budget Act of 1967 together with prior allocations of preliminary plans funds provided a total of \$49,001 for the preparation of working drawings for the modernization of two of the oldest buildings on campus, the auditorium and the administration building. It should be pointed out that the auditorium represents a facility which is not being provided on any of the new campuses and, in fact, is found only at Chico, San Jose and Humboldt. While we recognize that the auditorium does not meet code requirements because of its age, we question the propriety of expending the extremely limited capital funds for a facility which normally does not take an FTE count. It should also be pointed out that this campus in company with all the others does have a little theater with 500 seats. This has been completed only recently. Consequently, we suggest that any expenditures in the auditorium be deferred until capital outlay financing problems can be resolved. If the building is, in fact, dangerous to occupy because of its failure to meet the code, and remedial features cannot be added economically, then its use should be discontinued.

With respect to the administration building, we note that there has been a series of modernization and alteration projects in this building which were intended to convert space to classroom use and we question why, as part of these alterations, the problem of code conformance was not included. We have no basis for evaluating the propriety of the cost since it would be difficult to do so without having completed working

**California State Colleges—Continued**

drawings of what is being proposed and the probable construction values. The drawings are not yet available. *Consequently, we recommend that this proposal be put in the category of special review.*

*(b) Working drawings—art building \$93,000*

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a specialized facility having a gross area of approximately 62,500 square feet and a net usable area of approximately 40,600 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 65 percent which is about average for art buildings. The building in addition to various fine arts studios and workrooms would contain an art gallery and 25 faculty office stations. It is calculated as having a capacity of 311 FTE students and hopefully would be ready for occupancy in the fall of 1971. At the current construction cost index, it is estimated that the basic building would cost slightly over \$26 per gross square foot. At total project level this would be over \$37.30 per square foot which would include fixed group I equipment and all fees and contingencies but would exclude landscaping. This would probably add another \$1.30 per gross square foot to the project. Since we have no schematics on which to judge this proposal, we can only make recommendation on the basis of the program and the proposed cost which appears to be equivalent to recent experience on other state colleges for art buildings. *We recommend approval.*

**Fresno**

*(c) Working drawings—science building addition \$220,000*

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a substantial addition to the existing science building. This would add a gross area of 126,000 square feet with a net assignable area of over 75,550 square feet and would provide an efficiency ratio of about 60 percent. This is average for science buildings. The addition would provide expansion space for biology, chemistry, geography, geology and a little bit for physics. It would produce a capacity of almost 670 FTE in 33 laboratories, 3 activity classrooms and 6 lecture classrooms, plus 72 faculty offices and numerous auxiliary and other non-capacity spaces. Also included is a remodeling of about 55,000 square feet in the existing building. The current cost estimate is \$27.76 per gross square foot for the basic building addition alone, exclusive of remodeling, and \$42.70 per gross square foot for the total project including the remodeling. The working drawings will generate a requirement, at current construction index levels, of almost \$5,400,000. While we do not have preliminary plans and specifications, we have examined the program and are in general agreement with it. The cost appears reasonable for sophisticated science space. *We recommend approval of the working drawings.*

*(d) Working drawings—industrial arts addition \$64,000*

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a specialized industrial arts building having a gross area of almost 43,000 square feet and a net usable area of almost 27,800 square

**California State Colleges—Continued**

feet, giving an efficiency ratio of about 65 percent which is about average for this purpose. The building would contain nine additional activity classrooms plus 16 faculty offices, department and deans offices and auxiliary spaces. The total project is estimated to serve 148 FTE students. However, it should be pointed out that part of the project includes the remodeling of the existing industrial arts building. This would result in a zero gain of FTE capacity because the remodeling will take out of service several areas which are now counted as having FTE capacity. The result of the total addition and remodeling is to upgrade the facility so that it will provide a quality level in this curriculum area without adding any actual capacity for additional students. The existing facilities are relatively substandard when compared with like facilities at other campuses. The major shortcoming is the lack of so-called briefing rooms where laboratory students can be assembled and given lecture material that cannot be given within the laboratory room itself. These briefing rooms are presently available on other campuses in like facilities.

The current estimate for the new construction for the basic building alone is approximately \$24.55 per gross square foot and over \$35.15 per foot at total project level. Since we have received no preliminary plans or schematics, we can only make a recommendation based on the fact that the proposed program and costs are well in line with recent experience for this type of construction on other campuses. *On this basis, we recommend approval of the working drawings.*

**Fullerton****(e) Working drawings—education classroom building \$129,000**

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a six-story general classroom building having a gross area of 94,000 square feet and a net assignable area of almost 56,900 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of only 60.5 percent, which we consider on the low side for a building which is essentially a lecture room facility. The program provides for 36 lecture rooms, 3 activity rooms and 13 so-called laboratories containing a total of 1,281 student stations. This would generate 1,625 FTE capacity, attesting to the fact that the building is basically a lecture facility. It is intended to serve the school of education and the English department.

The current cost estimate is \$24.14 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and \$33.45 per square foot at total project level. This would generate an ultimate requirement in excess of \$3,100,000 for construction. We have received very sketchy schematic plans and specifications but have reviewed the program in detail. Hopefully, during design development the efficiency ratio will be improved. *On this basis, we recommend approval of the working drawings.*

**Humboldt****(f) Working drawings—library addition \$68,400**

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for an addition to the existing library which would add over 50,000

## California State Colleges—Continued

gross square feet of area with a net usable area of substantially over 34,000 square feet. This gives an efficiency ratio of 69 percent, which falls within the statistical experience for buildings of this type. Usually libraries are considerably larger than this building and their efficiency ratio is 70 percent or better. As a general premise, the smaller the building the poorer the efficiency ratio. The addition would provide a total facility to serve a campus of 5,000 FTE students and would also provide space for the ultimate audio-visual complex for the campus. At current construction cost index the estimate is \$23.81 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and about \$33 at total project level. This would generate a subsequent requirement in excess of \$1,600,000 for construction. We have examined the program in detail and the cost estimate appears to be in line with recent experience. *On this basis, we recommend approval of the working drawings.*

## Kern

(g) *Construct—initial buildings* \$1,958,000

The Budget Act of 1967 together with previously allocated funds for preliminary plans provided a total of \$98,694 for the preparation of preliminary plans, design and working drawings for a complex of initial buildings essentially similar to those provided at San Bernardino and Dominguez Hills. The question might be raised as to the possibility of reusing the plans of either of the two former designs. Unfortunately this is not practical because the curriculum of each campus is not identical and in many instances can be substantially different. This leads to significant differences in building requirements and any attempt to use the prior plans would require so much redesign and at such cost as to make the approach of a completely separate design much more logical and effective. Another element in the difference between this campus and the other two is the relative slow rate of growth which would mean that these initial buildings would serve as the main complex for a longer period of time than in either of the other two. This fact also militates against the reuse of prior plans, not to mention the difference in site conditions and climatic conditions.

We have examined the program which sets up a requirement for a gross area of almost 80,000 square feet with a net assignable area in excess of 64,000 feet giving a very high efficiency ratio of over 80 percent, characteristic of buildings of this kind which are of more or less open design with few interior corridors and a great deal of multipurpose assignable space. At current construction cost index levels, the estimate for the basic buildings alone is over \$18.60 per gross square foot and over \$25.75 per square foot at total project level. This compares favorably with prior experience. While the program is justifiable and the cost appears acceptable, we would point out that we have as yet seen no results from the prior working drawings allocation and consequently have no basis for recommending construction funds. It is one thing to recommend approval of working drawings appropriations based on program and standard costs where there is an opportunity to evaluate such working drawings before the Public Works Board. It is an entirely dif-

**California State Colleges—Continued**

ferent matter to attempt to make recommendations which should be based on existing working drawings or at least very well developed preliminary plans when such plans or drawings are not available. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**Long Beach***(h) Working drawings—classroom and faculty office building*

\$103,000

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for what is basically a lecture classroom facility with faculty office spaces. The program calls for a gross area of over 88,000 square feet and a net usable area of over 57,000 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 65 percent. This is average for buildings of this type. This project would provide general purpose classrooms and space for journalism which would have a capacity for 2,500 FTE students plus office space for 189 faculty. At current construction cost index the estimate is \$23.38 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$29.85 per square foot at total project level. This will generate an ultimate requirement of over \$2,500,000 for construction. We have examined the program in detail and the cost and efficiency ratio are in line with recent experience. *We recommend approval of the working drawings.*

**Sacramento***(i) Construct—remodeling and additions to speech drama building, phase II*

\$696,000

The Budget Act of 1966 appropriated \$523,000 for the first phase of remodeling the old speech drama building which also included some additional construction. In the appropriation was an amount for the preparation of working drawings for the second phase. This has now developed as an availability of \$30,000. The Budget Act of 1967 added another \$20,000 for phase II working drawings which, together with prior allocations for preliminary plans, made a total of \$63,000 for the preparation of working drawings. The bulk of the proposed appropriation would cover a speech clinic addition and a theater workshop addition. These would add over 16,000 gross square feet of area to the existing building with a net usable space of almost 10,300 square feet. Less than 20 percent of the proposal would be expended on remodeling some existing spaces. The net result of the remodeling and additions would be to provide space for an additional 226 FTE students in five lecture classrooms, seven so-called laboratories and faculty offices for 18. At current construction cost index the new space will cost slightly over \$28 per gross square foot for basic building alone. Because this involves two separate additions it is more costly than might otherwise be the case. Nevertheless, the cost appears to be in line for the purpose although it is difficult to make direct comparisons with other recent experience. *We recommend approval.*

**California State Colleges—Continued****San Bernardino****(j) Construct—conversion of bio-science building ----- \$192,200**

The biological science classroom building for this campus which was financed for construction in the 1965 Budget Act, was based on the premise that the building would be complete in the fall of 1967 and initially contain spaces designed for ultimate use as laboratories but would be used for other purposes until enrollment growth justified conversion. The building was not completed on schedule and was not actually fully occupied until the winter term starting in January of 1968. Projected enrollment growth indicates the need for more laboratory space in the fall of 1969, and this project proposes the conversion of nine rooms to laboratory purposes, for which they were designed. Actually, most of the cost in the project is occasioned by the fixed group I equipment which will be added to these rooms and the balance will be for running the necessary utilities and making other minor adjustments in the building. This approach whereby a building is designed for a certain capacity but is used for more than one purpose and then gradually phased into its ultimate purpose has been used repeatedly and we believe it is the only practical way to approach certain kinds of buildings, particularly expensive science buildings. We have examined the program and the proposal appears to be in order. *We recommend approval.*

**(k) Working drawings—conversion of initial buildings ----- \$9,100**

The initial buildings contain, among other things, a large open area of about 10,000 square feet which was to be devoted to library uses until a permanent library was constructed. The permanent library is now under construction and it is hoped that it will be occupied by the middle of 1969. This will permit the 10,000 feet to be vacated and converted to general classroom use. Since the existing space is simple, open area with no partitions, its use for classroom purposes will require extensive partitioning, light and ventilation changes, etc. The conversion will create capacity for 180 FTE students plus offices for some of the administrative functions such as Director of Admissions and Records, Administrative Assistant to the President, etc. The additional administrative space will probably satisfy administration requirements until 1975. We have examined the program and the proposal appears to be in order and justified. *We recommend approval of the working drawings.*

**San Fernando****(l) Working drawings—education building ----- \$138,000**

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for what is basically a general lecture classroom type of building with a program gross area of almost 109,700 square feet with a net usable area of almost 71,400 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 65 percent which is average for this type of building. The structure would provide facilities for the school of education as well as for home economics and speech, creating space for approximately 1,300 FTE students in 28 lecture rooms, 6 activity rooms and 8 laboratories. In addition, there would be 169 faculty office stations.

**California State Colleges—Continued**

At current construction cost index, the estimate is \$25.71 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$32.85 at total project level. When compared with other relatively similar buildings in this budget, we feel that this estimate is at least \$1 per square foot too high. We have examined the program in detail and we have no disagreement with it. Hopefully during the design development period the estimate can be reduced to the average of other similar buildings. *On this basis we would recommend approval of the working drawings.*

**San Francisco****(m) Construct—physical science building ----- \$6,522,100**

The Budget Act of 1966 together with previous allocations for preliminary plans provided a total of \$228,700 for the design and preparation of working drawings for a new physical science building on this campus. The facility is now conceived as a nine-story structure having a gross area of almost 159,000 square feet with a net assignable area of nearly 94,000 square feet giving an efficiency ratio of about 59 percent. This is slightly on the low side but is occasioned by the fact that site conditions are such as to require the high-rise building which results, usually, in lower efficiencies. The program calls for 20 laboratories, 10 graduate project rooms, and 13 lecture rooms, providing a capacity of 800 FTE students as well as areas for 70 faculty office stations. At current construction cost index the estimate if \$28.70 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$42.50 at total project level. This includes substantial provision for fixed group I equipment which is usually one of the major costs in a physical sciences building. The cost appears to be in line with recent experience at other state colleges, taking into account the relatively high rise of the building. *We recommend approval.*

**(n) Working drawings—humanities building ----- \$214,000**

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a large multistoried structure which is essentially a lecture classroom facility although it will have some spaces other than lecture rooms. It will have a gross area of approximately 173,500 square feet with a net usable area in excess of 112,700 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 65 percent which is average for general classroom structures. The program provides for a capacity of 3,400 FTE students plus 257 faculty office spaces and as such will provide for the total ultimate program in the humanities within the maximum enrollment contemplated for this campus. At current construction cost index the estimate is \$24.50 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and \$33.30 per square foot at total project level. This will generate a requirement in excess of \$5,500,000 for construction in a subsequent budget. The cost appears to be reasonable when taking into account the necessity for the structure to be a high-rise building with the usual elevator provisions and other factors which tend to increase slightly the cost of a high-rise building when compared to a conventional three- or four-story building. We have examined the program and it appears to be justifiable. *We recommend approval of the working drawings.*

**California State Colleges—Continued****San Jose**

(o) *Working drawings—classroom building no. 3* ----- \$165,000

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a large structure programmed at over 134,000 square feet of gross area with a net usable area of over 87,000 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 65 percent which is average for general classroom buildings. The structure would provide a capacity of over 3,260 FTE students in the social sciences including anthropology, geography, history, economics, political science and sociology. In addition, there will be 220 faculty office spaces. At current construction cost index, the estimate is \$23.38 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$30.47 per square foot at total project level. These are average and reasonable costs for a building of this type, based on recent experience. We have examined the program in detail which appears justifiable. *We recommend approval of the working drawings.*

**Sonoma**

(p) *Working drawings—art building* ----- \$44,500

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a facility to provide permanent housing for the arts program. It is contemplated that it would have one general classroom, one lecture room and seven studios for instruction in various arts such as painting, photography, sculpture, ceramics, etc. In addition, there would be a gallery for exhibiting the artwork and eight faculty office stations. The present program contemplates a gross area of 29,200 square feet with a net usable area of 19,000 square feet, providing an efficiency ratio of 65 percent which for a building of this size and type would be reasonable. The project will generate a capacity for 146 FTE students.

At current construction cost index, the estimate is \$26.02 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$37.20 per foot at total project level. This is reasonable when taking into account the premium costs in the Sonoma area as well as the site problems occasioned by the adobe soil. Ultimately, the construction would require in excess of \$1,050,000 in a subsequent budget. We have examined the program which appears justifiable. *We recommend approval of the working drawings.*

**Stanislaus**

(q) *Working drawings—science building* ----- \$96,000

This campus now has only two permanent academic units, a combination classroom-administration building and a combination library and classroom building. A performing arts building was funded in the 1967 Budget Act and is currently going into design and working drawings. This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a science building which would have 16 laboratories of various types, 5 general lecture classrooms and 29 faculty stations providing a capacity of 390 FTE students. Also there will be an animal room, greenhouse and related auxiliary areas in a structure having a gross area now programmed at over 51,300 gross square feet with a net usable area of 30,800 square feet providing an efficiency ratio of about 60 percent

**California State Colleges—Continued**

which is average for science buildings. At current construction cost index, the estimate is over \$27.75 per gross square foot for the basic building and almost \$44 at total project level. We consider the latter to be excessive since it includes over \$7 per gross square foot for fixed group I equipment which is high in a building having a substantial part of its area devoted to lecture classroom space. However, we have examined the program in detail and it appears to be justified. We anticipate that during the design development the cost of the group I equipment will be reduced. *In view of the cost we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**Cal-Poly KV**

(r) *Working drawings—convert library* ----- \$117,800

A new central library is under construction on this campus. It was financed on the premise that the existing library would ultimately be converted to general classroom purposes. This project now proposes to provide for the design and preparation of working drawings of the conversion in the existing library building, which has a gross area of something over 72,100 square feet and the conversion program contemplates a net usable area of over 42,200 square feet, providing a relatively low efficiency of less than 58½ percent. Conversions of this type have not occurred with sufficient frequency to give any kind of a background history on what might be expected in the way of cost and efficiency. However, it is fairly obvious that the general module of a library building is not the best one for a general classroom building. Nevertheless, we question the scope of the project as outlined in the program and as indicated in the outline specifications. We believe these go further than is necessary to provide the simple conversion of the space to classroom use.

A new general classroom building, in the Pomona area, would probably run between \$23 and \$24 per gross square foot for the basic building alone. The estimate for the remodeling is \$15.25 per gross square foot and almost \$28 at total project level which we consider to be excessive, despite the fact that we recognize that one of the cost elements is air conditioning the building to bring it up to current standards for this area. For example, fixed group I equipment is indicated in the estimate as almost \$6.50 per square foot, which is what one usually expects for a new science building.

The converted building is programmed to provide additional capacity of about 1,120 FTE students with language laboratories, curriculum library, classrooms and faculty offices. With the exception of the language laboratories the spaces are generally straightforward lecture type facilities which makes it difficult to account for the estimate. There are other factors in the specifications which appear to be unjustifiable. Based on this estimate, the ultimate requirement of over \$2 million for construction would be proposed in a subsequent budget. While we have no reservations concerning the program of space utilization, we do not feel that we can recommend the project in its present form. *Consequently, we recommend that it be placed in the category of special review.*

## California State Colleges—Continued

## Cal-Poly SLO

(s) Working drawings—library \$135,000

The existing library on this campus is a building with approximately 120,000 gross square feet of area which was built in two phases fairly widely separated in point of time. Construction of still another addition in order to bring the total complex up to the size required for an enrollment of 12,000 FTE students has been considered. The five-year plan has contemplated such an addition but since the publication of that plan, it has been determined that it would be wiser to build an entirely new library of a size sufficient to handle the 12,000 enrollment and to subsequently convert the existing building into general classroom uses. We believe that the current concept makes better sense because, among other things, the existing library was not initially designed to be expanded. This makes any addition to it extremely difficult and architecturally unattractive.

The Budget Act of 1967, together with prior preliminary plan allocations, provided a total of \$205,000 for the preparation of working drawings for the concept of an addition to the existing library. A substantial part of the preliminary plans funds have been expended and would, of course, be lost for purposes of a totally new structure. The present proposal would add the \$135,000 to the \$120,000 appropriated in 1967 making \$255,000 plus whatever remains from the preliminary plans, the exact amount of which is not known at this time. The new building would have a gross area of 221,100 square feet and a net usable area of 154,750 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 70 percent. The net area was arrived at on a formula basis which provides 40 volumes per FTE on the basis of one-tenth of a square foot per volume plus 25 percent extra for special periodicals and reader stations based on 25 percent of the total enrollment multiplied by 25 square feet per station plus minimum areas for technical and public services as well as personnel areas. The program appears to be entirely justifiable. Based on the current construction cost index, the estimate is \$23.89 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$30.83 per square foot at total project level which would generate a requirement for over \$6,600,000 for construction in a future budget. We have not yet seen a program for the utilization of the existing library space, but it will serve the place of a new building in the long-range program. We believe this is the logical direction that the expansion of this campus should take. *Consequently, we recommend approval of the working drawings.*

(t) Working drawings—engineering, south \$193,000

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a new engineering building somewhat to the south and west of the so-called engineering-west building. There are actually three existing buildings which form an engineering complex known as engineering east, engineering west and engineering-math building which lies between the two. This proposal would add an additional structure,

**California State Colleges—Continued**

in fact, the first phase of an additional structure with a gross area of 123,000 square feet and a net area of 80,000 square feet giving an efficiency ratio of 65 percent which ordinarily is somewhat low when compared with the conventional large laboratory type engineering facility. This generally runs close to 70 percent. Hopefully as the design develops for this project, the efficiency will be increased. The project will provide laboratory capacity for 205 FTE students in facilities for aeronautical, air conditioning, mechanical and metallurgical engineering and technical arts, plus 56 faculty office stations.

At current construction cost index, the estimate is \$26.25 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$41.15 per square foot at total project level. This includes a substantial amount of fixed group I equipment. We have examined the program in detail and the costs parallel recent experience in this type of structure. *We recommend approval of the working drawings.*

**Group B****Dominguez Hills****(u) Working drawings, theater arts building \$77,000**

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a theater arts facility, including a 500-seat little theater, having a gross area of 37,900 square feet and a net usable area of 26,500 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 70 percent, which is about average for this type of unit. In addition to the little theater space, there will be classrooms with a total capacity of 65 FTE students. At the current construction cost index, the project is estimated to cost almost \$30.40 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and over \$49 per square foot at total project level. The latter includes about \$6 per square foot for fixed group I equipment, which appears to be somewhat excessive. However, it is difficult to make a direct comparison with other theater arts buildings, recently constructed, since most of them contain a great deal more of additional auxiliary classroom space than is contained in this project. This would tend to increase the gross area and decrease the cost per square foot of the group I equipment. The estimated cost at building construction level is also somewhat high and may perhaps be explained in the same way. In any case, we have examined the program, which appears to be justifiable. It should be pointed out that the ultimate requirement for construction purposes may be around \$2 million. We believe it is possible that, during the development of preliminary plans and working drawings, the cost can be scaled down. *On this basis we would recommend approval of the working drawings.*

**Long Beach****(v) Working drawings—administration III \$88,000**

This project proposes the preparation of design and working drawings for a third phase of the administration facilities with a gross area of almost 65,000 square feet and a net assignable area of somewhat over 42,000 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 65 percent, which

**California State Colleges—Continued**

is fairly average for office buildings. The project is expected to provide the total space required for administrative functions covering an enrollment of 20,000 FTE students which would probably be reached in the fall of 1975, based on current projections. At the current construction cost index, the estimate is over \$25.70 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and slightly over \$34 per square foot at total project level. The latter includes some remodeling in the existing administration building. *The costs appear to be in line and we recommend approval.*

**Los Angeles****(w) Construct—plant growth facility \$300,000**

This project proposes the design and construction of a specialized, sophisticated greenhouse-type of plant growth facility on top of the physical sciences building. It will have a gross area of over 5,500 feet with a net assignable area of nearly 3,000 square feet. This provides what appears to be a very low efficiency ratio, which is accounted for by the fact that the location of the facility is such that a large mechanical equipment room must be constructed adjacent to it and that certain alterations must be accomplished to the existing building. We have examined the plans and the space relationships appear to be reasonable. The total project cost is relatively high at over \$54 per gross square foot, but the sophistication of the spaces, the necessity to construct on top of an existing building and the alterations required in the existing building all tend to produce a cost which appears to be high when related to the conventional idea of a greenhouse. However, this unit will have complex and expensive equipment for specialized purposes both for instruction and research that is ordinarily not found in a simple conventional greenhouse. Taking all factors into consideration, we believe the cost is justifiable. *We recommend approval.*

**(x) Construct—southwest chiller plant \$114,200**

The Budget Act of 1966 appropriated \$242,900 for the construction of an air conditioning system for classroom building No. 2. Subsequent studies indicated quite clearly that the development of individual building chiller systems would be uneconomical in the long run from both capital investment and maintenance and operation standpoints. It is therefore proposed to convert the prior appropriation to the construction of a semicentral plant to be known as the southwest chiller plant which will provide the chilled water for classroom building No. 2 as well as several others. The total project cost is estimated at \$363,200 requiring the additional \$114,200 proposed in this project. We have long held the position that, if large institutional plants were to be air conditioned, or heated for that matter, the most economical way to accomplish the purpose, over the long pull, would be by means of one or more centralized plants. We believe that the proposal for this campus is appropriate and in line with that philosophy. The cost appears to be reasonable for the purpose. *We recommend approval.*

**California State Colleges—Continued**

(y) *Working drawings—site development, 1968* ----- \$12,000

This project proposes the preparation of design and working drawings for the second phase of the site development in the area referred to as Gravois. It covers about 3½ acres of recently acquired land on which ultimately will be constructed a new corporation yard. Most of the work would be grading and related earthwork with some road development. The balance is based on the requirement to relocate existing utilities to permit utilization of the area which previously had been occupied by a series of small dwellings. The ultimate total project cost will be over \$250,000. *We recommend approval.*

**San Bernardino**

(z) *Construct—cafeteria* ----- \$1,245,100

The Budget Act of 1967, appropriated \$57,000 for the development of working drawings, and prior allocations provided \$17,375 for preliminary planning for a facility contemplated as having a gross area of 31,500 square feet with a net usable area of over 22,300 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of nearly 71 percent, which is fairly average for cafeteria structures because of their large dining areas. It should be pointed out that when the project was proposed for working drawings its efficiency ratio was only 67 percent, to which we raised objection. The present proposal is a distinct improvement.

The project represents a cadre facility which is provided on all new campuses as a matter of state policy. Future additions would be funded from nonstate sources, generally student body funds or loans based on those funds. The initial facility will have a seating capacity for 615 persons. At the current construction cost index, the basic building is estimated to cost \$25.50 per gross square foot and \$41.50 at total project level. These are relatively better figures than were provided at the time working drawings were proposed. *We recommend approval.*

**San Francisco**

(aa) *Construct—administration building addition* ----- \$3,556,500

The Budget Act of 1967, appropriated \$145,000 for the design and preparation of working drawings for an addition to the existing administration building which entailed the elimination of an existing one-story wing. Site conditions are so confined as to make it virtually impossible to add to the building in any other direction and therefore the only way that the building could be expanded would be by the demolition of the existing one-story wing and its replacement by a multistory structure including a basement garage area. The latter is essential because there is no other surface parking space in the immediate vicinity of the building. When the working drawing proposal was presented, we objected to the fact that its efficiency ratio was relatively low at 61 percent. As the project has now evolved, it will have a gross area of 103,620 square feet, exclusive of the garage area, with a net usable area of almost 69,000 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of close to 67 percent, which is excellent for an office building. The total project cost is estimated at over \$4,033,000 including the garage portion which will be funded from nonstate sources leaving a

**Capital Outlay****Items 334-335****California State Colleges—Continued**

net requirement in state funds of \$3,556,500, taking into account the previous appropriation for working drawings and an allocation for preliminary plans. This results in a cost per gross square foot of the basic building alone, without the garage, of \$26.70, which is reasonable when taking into account the fact that the cost includes the demolition of the existing wing and the premium that will result from constructing on a very restricted site. *We recommend approval.*

**CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY****ITEM 334 of the Budget Bill**

Capital Outlay Budget page 171

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS,  
CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY,  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$20,000
Recommended for approval	20,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

None

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide funds for the design and preparation of working drawings for a new library. Space in the residence hall is presently being utilized for this purpose and because it contains only 1,240 square feet, it is inadequate to meet the requirements of an average enrollment of 250 midshipmen. The new library, based on state college standards, will contain approximately 4,691 square feet of assignable space, providing stack capacity for 20,000 volumes and reading stations to accommodate 60 midshipmen. The estimated total project cost is \$244,000 plus \$24,000 required for equipment.

*We recommend approval of the working drawings.*

**CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY****ITEM 335 of the Budget Bill**

Capital Outlay Budget page 171

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS,  
CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY,  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$76,525
Recommended for approval	76,525

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

None

**ANALYSIS**

This item consists of two projects to improve wharf facilities and power supplies. The present breakwater structure needs replacement, due to age and battering by the elements, and \$61,665 is requested to replace deteriorated piles and planking. As part of the replacement project, the breakwater will be realigned to enlarge the usable area of the boat basin and thus more effectively serve its designed purpose. The second project is to increase the electric power supply on the wharf at

**Item 336****Capital Outlay****California Maritime Academy—Continued**

a cost of \$14,860 to adequately meet the needs of the training ship and dock side activities.

*We recommend approval of the amount requested.*

**DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HYGIENE****ITEM 336 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 183****FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HYGIENE, FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$2,411,345
Recommended for approval	2,289,845
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b>	<b>\$121,500</b>

**ANALYSIS**

(a) <i>Neuropsychiatric Institute at Los Angeles, equip mental retardation addition</i>	\$853,000
---	-----------

The Budget Act of 1966 appropriated \$2,411,565 as the state's share of the construction cost for two additions to this facility. The total cost of the project is estimated at \$6,166,400 for a one-story lateral outpatient clinic addition and a four-story vertical addition to the existing three-story facility. The federal government contributed \$3,754,835 towards the cost of construction. At the time it was understood that the state would be responsible for funding the total cost of equipping the facility. However, the federal government is now expected to contribute towards the cost of equipping the facility.

The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$117,000 to equip the outpatient clinic portion of the project. The \$853,000 designated in this item will equip the four-story vertical addition. Of this amount only \$310,000 is the cost to the state, as a \$543,000 reimbursement grant is anticipated from the federal government. *We recommend approval of the amount requested.*

(b) <i>Metropolitan State Hospital, correct fire and life safety deficiencies</i>	\$295,525
---	-----------

In an initial report submitted in 1956, the State Fire Marshal cited deficiencies in 10 ward buildings at Metropolitan State Hospital. Seven of these wards, housing approximately 70 patients each, form a "U"-shaped complex north of the receiving and treatment building. Since that initial report, three wards in the complex were extensively remodeled at an average cost of \$3,455 per patient and the fire and life safety deficiencies cited in the State Fire Marshal's report were corrected.

The amount requested in this item is to correct the deficiencies in five more ward buildings and to provide for the installation of an institutional fire alarm system to be connected to the Los Angeles County Fire Department. The latter project was recommended by the State Fire Marshal in a separate report made in 1966. It is estimated that

**Department of Mental Hygiene—Continued**

\$202,525 will be required to provide for additional exits and stairways, alteration and replacement of window glass and sash and for various alterations to interior openings in the five ward buildings. This will also provide for the installation of a heat-actuated fire alarm system in each ward building. The cost of these alterations is approximately \$40,500 per ward or \$580 per patient.

The Budget Acts of 1965 and 1966 appropriated over \$4 million to fund a systemwide environmental improvement program. This program constituted remodeling wards with at least a 10-year life expectancy with the maximum expenditure in any one ward limited to \$800 per patient capacity. This approach was taken in lieu of major remodeling because the department had failed to develop an adequate systemwide master plan to guide determination of a priority arrangement from which to select projects for budgeting. Under that program, two ward buildings included in this budget request, were remodeled at a cost of \$133,600. The scope of that work did not include correcting fire and life safety deficiencies. As indicated above, it would have cost an additional \$580 per patient to correct these deficiencies. The decision to invest environmental improvement funds in ward buildings that constitute a safety hazard, without correcting the safety hazard, is indicative of the department's deficiency in planning ability.

The department still has not developed a systemwide master plan based upon analysis of physical facilities and related to declining population. Such an analysis may have prevented the investment cited above. But, since an investment was made, it would be unwise to defer making the necessary fire and life safety modifications in these two ward buildings. However, we do not feel that any funds should be invested in the other three buildings included in this request until such time as the department is in a position to justify the economic feasibility of retaining them. We understand that these ward buildings are scheduled for remodeling under the environmental improvement program.

An analysis of the request to install an institutional fire alarm system was excluded from the above discussion because it effects the entire facility and is not an integral part of the request to correct the fire and life safety deficiencies in the five ward buildings. We feel this portion of the request is totally justified as an institutional safety precaution.

*We recommend that this item be reduced by \$121,500 to \$174,025 to provide funds to correct fire and life safety deficiencies in two ward buildings and for the hospital fire alarm system.*

(c) *Metropolitan State Hospital, air-condition 200-bed geriatric ward* \_\_\_\_\_ \$100,325

When this ward building was constructed in 1959, provisions were made to accommodate the addition of refrigerated air conditioning to the heating and ventilating system. Natural ventilation does not provide adequate comfort during the hot summer months for the infirm geriatric patients occupying the building. This project provides for the installa-

**Department of Mental Hygiene—Continued**

tion of refrigerated air conditioning. Since provisions were initially made to accommodate this type of proposal, all that is required is the installation of a chiller, cooling tower, connecting pipe and controls.

*We recommend approval of the project.*

- (d) *Fairview State Hospital, install ventilation system in acute infirm wards* ----- \$331,795

This request is to install a mechanical ventilation system in three ward buildings housing acute infirm patients. Each building contains two ward sections housing 52 patients each, for a total of 312 patients in the three-building complex. This complex was constructed in 1955 as part of the first increment of construction at the hospital. The initial construction consisted of two ward-building complexes, which were not mechanically ventilated. All ward buildings constructed thereafter were mechanically ventilated.

The buildings included in this proposal house acute crippled and infirm bedridden patients, as well as patients receiving intensive treatment. The lack of proper ventilation and air movement is particularly crucial to the care and treatment of this type of patient.

The \$331,795 requested in this item will provide for the construction of six one-story fanroom additions, two for each ward building. It will also provide for the installation of duct work, heating and ventilating units, exhaust fans, fire dampers and related electrical work. *We recommend approval.*

- (e) *Porterville State Hospital, air-condition ward buildings* ----- \$1,373,700

This project is the first of a three-phase project to replace the existing evaporative coolers in 34 ward buildings at Porterville State Hospital. These units were installed when the facility was constructed and are approximately 16 years old. Initially, they were effective in reducing inside temperatures but the efficiency of this type of conditioner lessens as humidity increases. Within the last few years, a significant portion of the surrounding area has been developed for agricultural purposes. This has produced a considerable expansion of irrigation and impounding of water, thereby increasing humidity. In addition to being inefficient, the present evaporative coolers are becoming a maintenance problem and many of their components are obsolete. This hospital is located in an area that experiences consistent high summer temperatures. Because the hospital foresees its function as caring for the more profoundly retarded, adequate air conditioning is essential to proper care and treatment.

The amount of funds requested in this item will provide for the replacement of existing evaporative coolers in 13 ward buildings with refrigerated air-cooling units. Chilled water will be piped to these units from a central chiller plant, which will be constructed to accommodate three 600-ton absorption units and three cooling towers. Only one absorption unit and one tower will be installed in this phase of the project. A new substation and motor control center will be installed to provide power and control wiring for the central plant.

## Capital Outlay

Item 337

### Department of Mental Hygiene—Continued

The Office of Architecture and Construction conducted a study of the air conditioning needs of Porterville State Hospital and recommended the central plant approach. We concur and recommend approval of the project as budgeted.

### DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HYGIENE

ITEM 337 of the Budget Bill Capital Outlay Budget page 183

### FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS,

DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HYGIENE,

FROM THE GENERAL FUND

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted \$1,304,724  
Recommended for approval 1,259,724

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** \$45,000

### ANALYSIS

This request will finance 130 projects at 16 facilities operated by the Department of Mental Hygiene for the care and treatment of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. This includes six hospitals for the mentally ill only, four hospitals for the mentally retarded only, four hospitals for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded and two training and research institutes. The amount requested is \$192,871 lower than that appropriated by the Budget Act of 1967, which is due to a significant reduction in the number of maintenance projects included in the minor capital outlay request. These have largely been transferred to the support budget.

The type of projects vary from a \$27,775 maintenance project at Modesto to reroof various hospital buildings to \$10,000 at Camarillo to improve the patient environment by installing privacy partitions in the toilets. Also included are such proposals as \$3,000 at Mendocino to install sneeze guards in dining room serving areas and \$1,680 to remodel the receiving dock area at Langley Porter to facilitate employee efficiency. Table 1 contains a summary of the purposes of the projects by hospital.

Table 1

Hospital	Number of projects	Purpose					Amount
		Improve patient environment	Health or safety improvement	Facilitate employee efficiency	Utilities	Maintenance	
<b>Hospitals for Mentally Ill</b>							
Agnews	7	2	1	1	3	0	\$80,514
Atascadero	4	0	1	2	0	1	52,000
Camarillo	9	6	1	1	1	0	113,800
DeWitt	8	3	2	0	2	1	119,520
Mendocino	16	6	4	3	1	1	166,700
Metropolitan	4	1	0	2	0	1	90,000
Modesto	2	0	1	0	0	1	32,775
Napa	16	6	4	4	1	1	146,050
Patton	7	2	3	1	1	0	39,330
Stockton	18	7	3	5	2	1	104,200
Total	81	33	20	19	11	7	\$944,889

## Department of Mental Hygiene—Continued

Table 1—Continued

Hospital	Number of projects	Improve patient environment	Health or safety improve- ment	Facilitate employee efficiency	Purpose		Amount
					Utilities	Maintenance	
<b>Hospitals for Mentally Retarded</b>							
Fairview	11	3	5	3	0	0	\$47,000
Pacific	6	3	0	1	0	1	92,245
Porterville	6	3	1	1	1	0	38,010
Sonoma	17	7	7	2	0	1	121,200
Total	40	16	13	4	1	2	\$298,455
<b>Institutes</b>							
Langley Porter	3	0	1	2	0	0	\$8,380
UCLA	5	1	1	3	0	0	18,000
Total	8	1	2	5	0	0	\$26,380
Grand Total	129	50	35	28	12	9	\$1,269,724

This table outlines 129 projects totaling \$1,269,724, which is one project and \$35,000 less than the amount requested in this item. The remaining project is a type appearing in the budget for the first time for demolition of buildings at various hospitals. Although we feel this is a valid expenditure, we have received no information to indicate that the department has developed a systemwide master plan to guide determination of a priority arrangement from which to select buildings for demolition. Therefore, we feel this project is premature.

*We recommend this project be deferred until such time as the department prepares a definitive systemwide master plan of construction, renovation and demolition.*

Two items in the table deserve special mention. A proposed utility project at DeWitt is to convert the existing boiler equipment from oil fired to natural gas with oil standby. The project is estimated to cost \$60,020 and is designed to correct what presently is an unsafe, inefficient and costly operation. It is estimated that conversion to natural gas will produce a savings in fuel and maintenance of \$16,000 annually, indicating that the conversion would pay for itself within five years.

A patient environment improvement project at Porterville is a request for \$10,000 to conduct a study of the air conditioning system at this hospital. We understand such a study has already been made by the Office of Architecture and Construction and that this request was inadvertently included in the budget.

*We recommend that this item be reduced by \$45,000 for the demolition project and air conditioning study cited above. We recommend approval of the remaining projects totaling \$1,259,724.*

### **Capital Outlay**

**Items 338-340**

**Department of Rehabilitation  
ORIENTATION CENTER FOR THE BLIND**

**ITEM 338 of the Budget Bill**

**Capital Outlay Budget page 201**

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, ORIENTATION CENTER FOR  
THE BLIND, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted \_\_\_\_\_ \$1,150  
Recommended for approval \_\_\_\_\_ 1,150

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION:**

None

## **ANALYSIS**

Storage space for maintenance material and equipment at this facility is inadequate. To correct this deficiency it is proposed to construct a storage building at a cost of \$4,600. The federal government will finance \$3,450 of the total cost and the \$1,150 requested by this item represents the state's share. We recommend approval of the project.

## **MILITARY DEPARTMENT**

**ITEM 339 of the Budget Bill**

**Capital Outlay Budget page 201**

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, MILITARY DEPARTMENT,  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted \_\_\_\_\_ \$149,735  
Recommended for approval \_\_\_\_\_ 149,735

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION:**

- None

## ANALYSIS

The federal government provides funds for the construction of National Guard facilities that relate primarily to the care and maintenance of federal equipment issued for state use. The state is expected to fund only the cost of preparing designs and working drawings and inspection during construction, as its share of the total project cost. The \$149,735 requested by this item is estimated to be the state's share of an anticipated \$1,188,700 federal construction program to be initiated during the budget year. The Military Department, in conjunction with the Office of Architecture and Construction, has reviewed the list of federally approved projects it anticipates will be financed during the budget year to determine the amount of funds required for planning and supervision. We feel the amount requested is justifiable. We recommend approval.

## **MILITARY DEPARTMENT**

**ITEM 340 of the Budget Bill**

## **Capital Outlay Budget page 202**

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENTS, MILITARY DEPARTMENT, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$131,7000  
Recommended for approval ----- 131,7000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

None

**Item 341****Capital Outlay****Military Department—Continued****ANALYSIS**

This item proposes a number of maintenance and improvement projects for various existing armories. Two of the projects proposed are justified on the basis of facilities maintenance and are estimated to cost \$56,500. This includes a \$50,000 roof repair proposal for an unspecified number of armories, and a \$6,500 preventive maintenance project to install a double seal coat on paved areas at the Vallejo Armory. There is a \$68,900 improvement project to surface the unpaved vehicle storage compounds and parking facilities at 11 armories. The total project is estimated to cost \$92,150 but it is anticipated that the federal government will provide \$23,250 to fund a portion of the work. This is a continuing project to correct a deficiency at some of the older armories which were constructed at a time when the installation of asphaltic concrete surfacing was not authorized by the National Guard Bureau. We understand that this request will complete that program.

The remaining projects proposed total \$6,300 and include the installation of sidewalks, curbs and gutters at the Richmond Armory and \$4,000 to reimburse the Office of Architecture and Construction for services required pursuant to the acquisition of real property for armory construction.

*We recommend approval of the total amount requested.*

**DEPARTMENT OF PROFESSIONAL AND VOCATIONAL STANDARDS****ITEM 341 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 205****FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENT AND EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF PROFESSIONAL AND VOCATIONAL STANDARDS, FROM THE PROFESSIONAL AND VOCATIONAL STANDARDS FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$141,660
Recommended for approval -----	None

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION----- \$141,660**

**ANALYSIS**

(a) *Automate—three passenger elevators, business and professions building ----- \$141,660*

The capital outlay budgets for the 1964-65 and 1965-66 fiscal years included a request for funds to install automatic programming and dispatching controls on the three elevators in the Sacramento Business and Professions Building. In each instance, the Legislature rejected the request, but in the 1965 Budget Act provided funds for safety improvements which, among other things, permitted one of the elevators to be passenger operated.

Presently, two of the elevators are operator controlled and one is capable of passenger operation. The project is justified on the basis of an anticipated \$14,000 per year salary savings, but the increased maintenance cost of approximately \$2,000 per year associated with the auto-

## **Capital Outlay**

**Items 342-343**

### **Department of Professional and Vocational Standards—Continued**

matic dispatching diminishes the extent of the savings. This means a payout period approaching 15 years. The salary savings will be the result of eliminating two jobs that require very limited skill. However, we are not convinced that the nature of traffic using these elevators is such that operators should be dispensed with entirely. Because the elevators and equipment are 30 years old and must ultimately be replaced, we believe it would be advisable to defer automation until that time when the situation can be reviewed and automation provided, if justified. *Consequently, we recommend the project be rejected.*

### **DEPARTMENT OF PROFESSIONAL AND VOCATIONAL STANDARDS**

**ITEM 342 of the Budget Bill** Capital Outlay Budget page 205

### **FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS, DEPARTMENT OF PROFESSIONAL AND VOCATIONAL STANDARDS, FROM THE PROFESSIONAL AND VO- CATIONAL STANDARDS FUND**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$6,250
Recommended for approval -----	6,250

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION----- None**

#### **ANALYSIS**

This item includes a request for \$3,750 to install approximately five lineal feet of marble or granite wainscot facing on each side of the "N" Street entrance to the Business and Professions Building. The present painted concrete surface is a continual maintenance problem because of frequent abuse from people's shoes as they lean against the wall. The remaining \$2,500 requested in the item is for replacement of the manually operated overhead door that provides access to the basement of the building. The existing door is in need of replacement and in addition is operable only from inside the building, which is inconvenient for authorized vehicles entering and leaving after hours when the door must be kept closed for security reasons. The proposed replacement will be electrically operated and controlled from both inside and outside the building. *We recommend approval.*

### **Department of Conservation**

#### **DIVISION OF FORESTRY**

**ITEM 343 of the Budget Bill** Capital Outlay Budget page 206

### **FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$388,686
Recommended for approval -----	388,686

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION----- None**

**Item 343****Capital Outlay****Division of Forestry—Continued****ANALYSIS**

This item provides for a series of minor projects, classified by the Division of Forestry as follows:

1. General projects -----	\$267,901
2. Inmate labor projects -----	\$100,315
3. Radio vaults and associated facilities -----	\$20,470
Total -----	\$388,686

Projects included in the first category require the assistance of construction tradesmen and are undertaken on a day labor or contract basis. There are 25 projects ranging in cost from \$2,000 to remodel the toilet and shower room at the Fountain Springs Forest Fire Station to \$49,124 to construct a 2,253 square foot combination barracks, mess hall and two-bay equipment storage building at the Anza Forest Fire Station. Several of the projects entail enlarging or replacing existing facilities to accommodate increased numbers of men or changing equipment needs. The following table summarizes the type of projects in this category requested for each district.

District	Number of Projects	Project					
		Expansion and Reconstruction		Facilities Replacement		Equipment	Maintenance
		Utilities	Improvement	Storage	Maintenance		
		and	and	Storage	Maintenance	Amount	
I (North Coast) -----	5	1	1	3	0	\$50,949	
II (Sierra Cascade) -----	2	1	1	0	0	34,150	
III (Central Sierra) -----	5	3	0	2	0	38,972	
IV (San Joaquin) -----	4	1	0	3	0	21,000	
V (Central Coast) -----	6	1	1	1	3	36,266	
VI (Southern California) -----	3	1	1	1	0	86,564	
Total -----	25	8	4	10	3	\$267,901	

There are 24 projects in the second category which is distinguished by the fact that less costly inmate labor is used and the cost is almost totally for the purchase of necessary material. There are 12 projects totaling \$44,760 to construct truck trails and firebreaks and repair roads and compound areas. In addition, there are four projects totaling \$21,900 for utilities improvement and a \$1,000 project to replace the telephone line to the Iron Peak Lookout. The seven remaining projects entail construction or improvement of conservation camp buildings at a cost of \$32,655.

The third category covers three projects to improve the Division of Forestry communications network. This includes construction of a new generator building and modification of the existing radio vault at Laughlin Ridge for \$8,560, expansion of the radio shop facilities at the District II headquarters for \$4,450, and construction of a new radio vault at South Fork Mountain for \$7,460.

We have reviewed many of these projects in the field and consider them justifiable. We recommend approval of the total amount requested.

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 344**

### **Division of Forestry—Continued**

*Attention is directed to the language contained in this item which would empower the Director of Finance to convert these funds to support purposes on request of the Department of Conservation. We oppose this approach and direct attention to our comments in the item immediately following for the major capital outlay in the Department of Conservation in which the same language occurs.*

#### **Department of Conservation DIVISION OF FORESTRY**

**ITEM 344 of the Budget Bill**

**Capital Outlay Budget page 206**

#### **FOR SITE ACQUISITION, MAJOR CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$426,314
Recommended for approval -----	426,314

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION----- None**

#### **ANALYSIS**

This request provides funds for six site acquisition projects, two construction projects and two related equipment projects.

(a) *Land acquisition—Elk Camp Forest Fire Station----- \$8,000*

This item will enable the purchase of the four acres of leased property on which the fire station is located. Some adjoining acreage will also be acquired to provide sufficient area to accommodate possible future replacement of the facility. *We recommend approval.*

(b) *Land acquisition—Telegraph Hill Lookout ----- \$15,000*

(c) *Land acquisition—Sierra Vista Lookout ----- \$15,000*

These two acquisition projects were proposed in the 1966-67 Budget and were to be acquired out of \$50,000 appropriated for land acquisition for lookouts and forest fire stations by Item 386(a) of the Budget Act. Instead, the funds were expended for five acquisition projects considered to be of higher priority than the above. Subsequently these projects were proposed to be included in the 1967-68 Budget but because of general reductions, were not included in the 1967 Budget Act.

It is proposed to acquire one-half acre adjacent to the Telegraph Hill site and 5.72 acres adjacent to the Sierra Vista site. The former will provide title to land presently being encroached on by some of the repeater tower's guy wires and the latter will provide a buffer strip to prevent line-of-sight restrictions. *We recommend approval.*

(d) *Land acquisition—Piedra Forest Fire Station----- \$6,000*

This project suffered a setback similar to the Telegraph Hill and Sierra Vista proposals, as it was to be acquired out of \$50,500 appropriated for land acquisition by Item 386(c), Budget Act of 1965. The proposal is to purchase 2.5 acres of adjoining land to provide for pos-

**Division of Forestry—Continued**

sible expansion of the fire station, which is presently located on a triangular nine-tenths-acre parcel. *We recommend approval.*

(e) *Land acquisition—Etiwanda Forest Fire Station* ----- \$15,000

The site on which this station is presently located is too small to accommodate expansion. It is proposed to acquire a strip of land 50 feet wide by 200 feet long, immediately adjacent to the facility, to provide future flexibility. *We recommend approval.*

(f) *Construct—Klamath Forest Fire Station* ----- \$120,000

(g) *Equip—Klamath Forest Fire Station* ----- \$2,609

The present forest fire station occupies facilities leased from the federal government, which has indicated a desire to terminate. It is proposed to replace the station on a new site recently acquired from the United States Forest Service on a 20-year term special use permit. It is contemplated that this new land will be part of a future exchange with the federal government involving three other state leased parcels and a piece of land owned by the state, known as the Orleans Tract, located within the Six Rivers National Forest boundaries. The new facility will consist of a standard 10-man combination barracks and messhall and a two-bay equipment storage building. Both structures will be wooden frame with redwood plywood siding and composition shingle roofs. The estimated cost per square foot is \$20.55 at building level and \$31 at project level. *We recommend approval.*

(h) *Construct—Robinson Mills Forest Fire Station* ----- \$209,000

(i) *Equip—Robinson Mills Forest Fire Station* ----- \$5,605

The Hurleton Forest Fire Station consists of World War II surplus metal buildings with bed and dining room space for only seven men and is located at the end of a four-mile substandard access road. Because it would not be economical to remodel this facility, it is proposed to replace it on a new site. The proposed Robinson Mills Forest Fire Station will consist of a standard 12-man combination barracks and messhall, a two-bay equipment storage building with an attached office, a three-bedroom residence, a tank storage building and a pump house. All structures will be wood frame with redwood plywood siding and composition shingle roofs. The estimated cost per square foot is \$18.40 at building level and \$33.40 at project level. The latter cost is high, largely due to the cost of utility development which is estimated at \$47,000. *We recommend approval.*

(j) *Land acquisition—Mt. Bullion Youth Conservation Camp* ----- \$30,000

This proposal will provide for the purchase of the 20 acres of leased property on which this 80-boy camp is located, and includes purchase of a right-of-way to the campsite. *We recommend approval.*

Attention is directed to the language in this item immediately following the schedule. It proposes to empower the Director of Finance, only during the 1968-69 fiscal year, to convert portions of the funds in the item to support expenditures by transfer to the regular support

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 345**

### **Division of Forestry—Continued**

item in the bill for the Department of Conservation. It should also be pointed out that in the support item the language provides for the reverse effect to permit the Director of Finance to transfer support funds and convert them to capital outlay projects.

While the desire to provide this kind of flexibility is understandable, we would point out that such language in effect vitiates the whole concept of the separation of support items as distinct from capital investment. Furthermore, there already exists the necessary mechanics for making changes, at least in the direction of augmentation of the support funds. This could be accomplished by use of the Emergency Fund, access to which the Department of Conservation has always had, and requesting the Director of Finance to withhold expenditure of capital outlay funds if the two were related. The converse could not take place because there would be no mechanism for adding capital outlay projects without prior legislative approval.

*We recommend that the language be stricken from the item.*

### **DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES**

**ITEM 345 of the Budget Bill**

**Capital Outlay Budget page 213**

### **FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	-----	\$55,000
Recommended for approval	-----	55,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ----- None

#### **ANALYSIS**

This proposal has two parts. First, \$51,000 is required to replace one of nine wooden bridges providing access to the Sutter Bypass from the east levee at various locations along the bypass channel. The state has a responsibility for the maintenance of these structures as part of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project outlined in Section 8361 of the Water Code. The replacement bridge will be a concrete structure in order to withstand dry rot resulting from annual inundation.

The remaining \$4,000 is for material to construct a snow survey cabin in the vicinity of Mt. Whitney for joint state-federal use. The federal government is to provide for transporting material to the site and construct the shelter. There are a number of these facilities located throughout the Sierras, which the state occupies during the winter months to gather data relative to snow runoff conditions in the summertime. *We recommend approval.*

**DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL**

ITEM 346 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 214

**FOR LAND ACQUISITION, MAJOR CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT, CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL, FROM THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$1,520,668
Recommended for approval	887,668
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b>	<b>\$633,000</b>

**ANALYSIS**(a) *Remodel—headquarters building, Sacramento \$546,000*

The new headquarters building for the California Highway Patrol is scheduled to be completed in March, 1968. At that time a significant portion of the staff now occupying the existing headquarters building will move into it. To coincide with that move, it is contemplated that Zone II personnel, who now occupy the same building as the Sacramento area command at Arden and the freeway, will move into the existing headquarters building. This in turn will provide needed expansion space in the area office. To accommodate this shifting of personnel, it is proposed to remodel extensively the interior and exterior of the present headquarters building at an estimated cost of \$546,000.

Our objection to the program represented by this item is based upon the following considerations.

1. We feel the scope of work proposed for this particular structure constitutes a poor investment. We cannot justify such a huge investment in a 16-year-old, one-story structure, which apparently needs considerable repair and makes inefficient use of expensive property. This area will become a hub of Sacramento with completion of the nearby freeway interchange, so the value of this property should be expected to increase. As property values rise, the tendency will be to build vertically instead of laterally to conserve valuable space. Thus, a \$546,000 investment in this facility would only serve to prolong the life of a structure that has limited future economic value.

2. In the existing transportation complex master plan this building is to be replaced with a parking structure, but the plan has not been updated to correspond with recent developments. If a poor investment is made within this complex and the master plan is subsequently revised, the investment is either lost or the master plan must be prostituted to salvage the value of the investment. The recent history of project starts and stops within this complex emphasizes the need for comprehensive planning.

On the strength of the California Highway Patrol's plan to construct a nine-story annex to its new headquarters building, the Department of Motor Vehicles requested \$15,000 in working drawing funds in the 1965-66 Budget to remodel the existing headquarters building into a field office. In the 1966-67 Budget, they requested \$654,000 for con-

**Department of California Highway Patrol—Continued**

struction. This amount was subsequently reduced to \$546,000 in the Budget Act of 1966. Later it was decided that it would be more feasible to remodel the space for the department's financial responsibility section. In its 1967-68 Budget request, the department proposed to revert all but \$125,000 of the \$546,000 appropriation. Based on our statement that this proposal had not been adequately studied, the entire amount was reverted. At the same time, the California Highway Patrol canceled plans to construct the headquarters annex and reverted \$850,000 of the \$1,000,700 appropriated in the Budget Act of 1966 for working drawings and initial construction.

We believe this vacillation demonstrates the ill effects of the absence of adequate planning. Prior to making any further investment in the transportation agency complex, the long-range space needs of these agencies must be determined.

3. The department has not developed a program which clearly defines its needs. Instead, it is requesting funds equivalent to the amount appropriated, in the Budget Act of 1966, which was to remodel this facility into a field office for the Department of Motor Vehicles. A clearly defined program and the preparation of preliminary plans and a formal estimate is essential to budgetary review. The need to develop such a program is exemplified by the fact that when the Department of Motor Vehicles determined its needs, it reduced its request to \$125,000, as cited in No. 2 above.

*In summary, we recommend that this project be deleted because:*

- (1) *The proposal constitutes a poor investment.*
- (2) *The transportation complex master plan has not been updated to correspond with recent developments, and*
- (3) *The department has failed to prepare an adequate program.*

*(b) Land acquisition—Bishop ----- \$6,500*

The site for this facility was originally purchased from the City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power as surplus land. Since the facility was constructed, operating experience has developed the fact that the 160-foot-wide frontage is too narrow and makes patrol vehicle ingress and egress difficult. Recently, the Department of Water and Power declared surplus an additional 55-foot-wide parcel of land, immediately adjacent to the facility. The amount requested will allow the department to purchase that additional parcel. *We recommend approval.*

*(c) Purchase and install—radio communications equipment—statewide ----- \$918,168*

This proposal provides the California Highway Patrol fixed equipment complement required to tie into the basic state microwave system. Equipment attached to the automobiles and motorcycles is included in the support section.

The amount requested is required for the following purposes:

1. *Replace and purchase additional base station equipment including transmitters, consoles and tape recorders ----- \$91,650*

**Item 347****Capital Outlay****Department of California Highway Patrol—Continued**

2. Replace and purchase additional repeater and control station equipment	\$671,208
3. Replace and purchase additional communications vaults support equipment, including standby and auxiliary generators, radio microwave towers and their conditioning and heating equipment	\$155,310
	<b>Total \$918,168</b>

Replacement is justified by functional obsolescence, high maintenance due to age and inability to convert, economically to modern modes.

Included in the request for base station equipment is \$25,500 for the purchase of equipment for three new leased facilities—Thousand Oaks, Garden Grove and Beaumont. *In line with our recommendation in the analysis of the department's support budget, against leasing two of these facilities, we recommend this item be reduced by \$17,000.*

That request also includes \$20,000 for base stations and attendant equipment to provide radio communications in the three bores of the Caldecott Tunnel. This proposal would require the installation of antennas and coaxial cable within the tunnel. Because this installation would conflict with the Division of Highways plan to purchase automatic tunnel cleaning equipment, the department is pursuing alternate methods of solving this communications problem. *We recommend the department's request, for base station equipment in the Caldecott Tunnel, be deleted.*

(d) Construction program planning ----- \$50,000

This item provides funds for the preparation of preliminary plans, specifications and estimates for those projects to be requested in the 1969-70 Budget. The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$50,000 for this same purpose and is available for three years. We understand these funds have not been encumbered and would therefore be available for project planning for the 1969-70 Budget. *We recommend deletion of the \$50,000 requested.*

**DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL****ITEM 347 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 214****FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL,  
FROM THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$195,450
Recommended for approval -----	133,950

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION----- \$61,500**

**ANALYSIS**

This budget item proposes nine minor improvement projects as outlined below:

**Department of California Highway Patrol—Continued**

1. The central communications dispatch point, which provides radio communications for the entire Los Angeles basin, is located at the Zone V headquarters office. The 13-year-old 25-KW generator which provides emergency power for this equipment cannot adequately accommodate the power demand. The department proposes to construct a concrete block generator vault and install two new 40-KW diesel-powered emergency generators and a 2,000-gallon underground fuel storage tank at an estimated cost of \$46,900. The need for two emergency generators is to prevent power surges caused by the ventilating equipment from harming the electronic equipment.

2. The operations of the Los Angeles Zone V central dispatch system have grown to the point where it is no longer possible to properly keep track of the operating units by the more conventional means. To provide for more efficient utilization of the equipment and for proper monitoring of patrol vehicles, the department is requesting \$40,000 to install a status board. This device would provide instantaneous indication of the status of enforcement vehicles being controlled by central dispatch.

3. The proposed California Highway Patrol headquarters annex was to be located immediately north of the new headquarters building. In anticipation of that construction, the proposal to develop this lot into a parking area was eliminated from the headquarters building construction program. Instead, only funds adequate to provide paving and drainage were requested. The decision to delay construction of the headquarters annex has prompted the department to request \$45,000 to complete development of this area into a parking lot.

As we pointed out in our analysis of the department's major capital outlay requests, the master plan for the transportation complex has not been updated to accommodate recent developments. Until such a step is taken, we believe it would be unwise to invest any capital in any project that has not been reviewed in line with an updated master plan. *We recommend this project be rejected.*

4. The access driveway to the Fresno Zone IV headquarters was originally designed to channel only a small volume of public vehicles. With the advent of the passenger vehicle inspection program, there has been a significant increase in that volume of traffic. Considerable congestion is now being experienced and \$6,500 is requested to redesign the curbs and sidewalk areas of the access driveway to alleviate this problem.

5. The Pomona area office, which is a leased facility, was originally designed to accommodate approximately 50 traffic officers and support personnel. The number of officers assigned to this facility has grown to 85 and it is anticipated that this number will grow to over 100 when the Pomona Freeway is completed. To accommodate this expansion of operational personnel, the department intends to negotiate with the owner for 440 square feet of additional land. To avoid paying increased rent for the improvements, the department is requesting \$16,500 to pave and fence this area and to construct 2,000 square feet of additional carport space. Since the lease is due to expire in five years, it would be uneconomical for the state to make this kind of capital investment. We believe the basic improvements should be an obligation of the lessor,

**Department of California Highway Patrol—Continued**

even if it means increased rent. The provision for additional carport space is not critical and should be deferred.

As a separate project, two carport spaces will be enclosed to provide a new locker room and free existing space. The following chart indicates the amount of space that will be available after the proposed expansion is complete, as compared to the amount of space programmed for proposed new facilities at Auburn and Oakland.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Number of traffic officers</i>	<i>Size of facilities (square feet)</i>	
		<i>Building</i>	<i>Carpark</i>
Auburn -----	50	3,800	2,500
Oakland -----	150	5,340	9,000
Pomona			
Before remodeling -----	85	2,260	1,900
After remodeling -----	100+	2,740	3,420

It is apparent that either the proposed expansion at Pomona will be insufficient to accommodate future needs or the programs for the new facilities are extravagant. We believe the former possibility is correct and the department should consider acquiring new land and constructing a state-owned facility that would adequately accommodate its needs. *Therefore, we recommend this project be rejected.*

6. The department is requesting \$9,300 to convert two carport spaces at the Pomona area office into a locker room. The lease on this facility expires in March, 1973. To partially alleviate the existing crowded conditions, we believe it would be advisable to fund this conversion.

7. The volume of communications at the Zone III San Francisco office has grown to the point where the radio dispatchers cannot efficiently handle the radio communications operation. It is proposed to install a central dispatch complaint board to correct this deficiency, at an estimated cost of \$7,500. This installation will separate the radio dispatching from routine and emergency telephone communications into two operational areas.

8. The bakery operation at the California Highway Patrol Academy on Meadowview Road is presently being carried out in the vegetable preparation area. This area has become overcrowded and \$8,750 is requested to add a 450-square-foot concrete block structure to house the bakery operation.

9. During the 1968-69 fiscal year, it will become necessary to make alterations to both leased and state-owned facilities for the purpose of accommodating the personnel augmentations at many field locations. The department is requesting \$15,000 to provide for such contingencies.

*In summary, we recommend deletion of projects 3 and 5 for the reasons cited above. The total of our recommended reduction is \$61,500.*

**DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES**

ITEM 348 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 216

**FOR LAND ACQUISITION, MAJOR CONSTRUCTION AND  
PRELIMINARY PLANNING, DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR  
VEHICLES, FROM THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$6,089,408
Recommended for approval	6,157,618
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED INCREASE</b>	<b>\$68,210</b>

**ANALYSIS**

The use of quantitative and qualitative techniques as a means of justifying budget requests is increasing. We have sought an economic analysis of relative costs of leasing versus owning state office buildings. The Department of Motor Vehicles has produced reasonable substantiation, on a project-by-project basis, that it is in the best interest of the state to own its facilities at the locations proposed in the schedule for this item. Consequently, we support its request and recommend approval of the site acquisitions and construction projects proposed.

But this quantitative analysis is in our opinion not complete or adequate. There are other important considerations that are being neglected. We believe that a public building should be of good design and quality and offer a pleasant working environment. We do not believe the design solutions for the proposed projects are aesthetically satisfactory. Perhaps this is because excessive emphasis has been placed on economy to the detriment of aesthetics. In this case, we believe a reasonable additional amount should be provided for each construction project proposed to *insure* that each facility enhances its environment rather than contributes to community blight. The department's Cottage Way office in Sacramento, is an example of the latter.

We have discussed with the Office of Architecture and Construction the designs submitted for the Department of Motor Vehicles' new offices and they have assured us that they will reconsider their design solutions. But that is not enough. We believe the Office of Architecture and Construction has the ability to produce good design, but they must have the support of their clients. We believe there should be policy support, which takes the form of either explicit or implicit program direction requiring that a facility must be pleasing even if this means a reasonable added cost. The state initiated a "good design" program several years ago, with some results. This emphasis should be continued.

*We therefore recommend that this item be increased by \$38,000 to provide additional preliminary planning money to redesign proposed projects in support of that idea.*

In this item the department is requesting funds that will ultimately provide for 17 new state-owned facilities. This proposal includes a request totaling \$2,261,500 to purchase eight new sites and a request for \$3,797,908 to construct 10 new office buildings, nine of which will be

**Items 349-350****Capital Outlay****Department of Motor Vehicles—Continued**

*In summary, we recommend:*

1. That this item be increased by \$30,210 to account for the inaccurate budget proposals as outlined above, and
2. That in addition, this item be increased by \$38,000 to provide additional planning funds to support the idea that, part of the program for new facilities should be the requirement that the design be such as to enhance the community and provide a pleasant working environment.

**DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES****ITEM 349 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 216****FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS,  
DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES, FROM  
THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$25,000
Recommended for approval -----	25,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION-----**

None

**ANALYSIS**

The amount requested in this item will provide additional parking at the department's Van Nuys facility and includes grading, paving and landscaping of additional land that was acquired with funds appropriated in the Budget Act of 1966. We recommend approval.

**Department of Veterans Affairs  
VETERANS HOME OF CALIFORNIA****ITEM 350 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 220****FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND  
IMPROVEMENTS, VETERANS HOME OF CALIFORNIA,  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$29,600
Recommended for approval -----	29,600

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION-----**

None

**ANALYSIS**

This item consists of six projects, three of which are justified on the basis of facilities maintenance and includes roof repairs on two buildings and a proposal to rebuild the kitchen grease trap and repipe 350 feet of drainage line for a total of \$14,900, all of which more properly belong under special repairs and maintenance in the Veterans Home support budget. The remaining three projects totaling \$14,700 are improvements and are justified on the basis of safety and improved plant efficiency. Included are replacement of hot and cold mixing valves in 21 showers with the thermostatic type, the installation of 750 feet of eight-inch water pipe to provide a loop trunk water service to the Veterans Home east side for pressure reliability and the reconstruction

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 351**

### **Veterans Home of California—Continued**

of the garbage disposal counter in the pot-washing area of the main kitchen. *We recommend approval.*

**ITEM 351 of the Budget Bill**      **UNALLOCATED**      Capital Outlay Budget page 222

### **FOR PROJECT PLANNING TO BE ALLOCATED BY THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	-----	\$300,000
Recommended for approval	-----	300,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ----- None

#### **ANALYSIS**

This item is intended to continue the long established policy of the Legislature by which advanced funds are provided for the preparation of preliminary plans and outline specifications to be used as supporting data for requests for working drawings and/or construction in a succeeding budget. This applies only to those agencies which normally receive their support or capital outlay from the General Fund with the exception of the University of California and the state college system. The latter are provided for elsewhere in the bill. The most significant agencies are the Departments of Parks and Recreation, Youth Authority and Mental Hygiene, Corrections and Conservation.

The cost of the preparation of well-developed preliminary plans and outline specifications is generally considered to be approximately  $1\frac{1}{2}$  percent of the estimated project cost. On this basis, the amount proposed would indicate that the General Fund capital outlay proposals for the 1969-70 budget year will be approximately \$20 million. In contrast, we should point out that in the present Budget Bill major projects from the General Fund total less than \$7 million. Consequently, it might be assumed that \$300,000 for preliminary plans seems unrealistic. However, the five-year plan indicates very substantial proposals, actually exceeding \$20 million, in the 1969-70 fiscal year for the particular agencies mentioned. It should also be pointed out that a similar amount was appropriated for this purpose by the 1967 Budget Act which is in contrast with the less than \$7 million proposed in the present bill for actual working drawings and construction. This leads to the question as to how much of the \$300,000 has been expended. If all of it has been expended then some of it must have been expended unproductively since the prior appropriation should have produced projects to the value of approximately \$20 million. The Governor's Budget on page 222 indicates that the entire 1967 appropriation will have been expended or committed. We suggest that an explanation is in order.

With respect to the current proposal, if we assume the possibility that the administration will devote approximately \$20 million towards General Fund capital outlay projects in the 1969 Budget Bill, then the proposed sum for planning is reasonable. *On this basis we would recommend approval.*

**UNALLOCATED**

ITEM 352 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 222

**FOR AUGMENTATION OF FUNDED PROJECTS IN ACCORD-**  
**ANCE WITH SECTION 16409 GOVERNMENT CODE**  
**FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$1,000,000
Recommended for approval	600,000
Recommended for special review	400,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** \_\_\_\_\_ None

**ANALYSIS**

The Legislature established a policy, over 15 years ago, by which it recognized the steadily rising trend of construction costs and the need to provide a system of augmentation of construction project funds which would permit each authorized project to be consummated within the framework of its approved scope despite cost rises which might have occurred between the time the project was first estimated for appropriation purposes and the time when it actually was offered for bid. The procedure established was in effect a revolving fund in that savings from unexpectedly low bids could be used to augment projects which encountered higher than estimated bids. The process was started by a "bank" with an appropriation to which savings would also accrue and from which augmentations would be allocated by Public Works Board action. The policy has been to revert at the end of each fiscal year any balances remaining in this revolving fund and starting the new budget year with a fixed appropriation, in this case the \$1 million proposed.

In the past, there have been occasions when the savings exceeded augmentations by significant amounts, but for the last few years the trend has been in the other direction. In any case, the amount of augmentation should be related to General Fund projects that are in the "pipeline" and which might be expected to go to bid within the budget year. Since the construction cost index has been rising at an average rate of between 4 and 5 percent annually, and assuming that every project in the pipeline would require augmentation, the \$1 million proposal would provide for \$20 million worth of projects that might come to bid during the budget year. We have not been able to establish that this is realistic. We believe that \$600,000 which could augment projects totaling \$12 million should be adequate. Beyond this we suggest that the remaining \$400,000 be justified to the legislative committees by the administration. *Consequently, we recommend that this portion be placed in the category of special review.*

**Capital Outlay****Items 353-354****UNALLOCATED****ITEM 353 of the Budget Bill**

Capital Outlay Budget page 222

**FOR MISCELLANEOUS REPAIRS, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT TO BE ALLOCATED BY THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	-----	\$50,000
Recommended for approval	-----	50,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ----- None**ANALYSIS**

The Legislature in the Budget Act of 1967, established \$50,000 as a reasonable level to cover emergency and truly unexpected situations which could not wait to be funded in the succeeding budget. For example, the total failure of a boiler at an institution which would require extensive repairs or replacement would be the kind of project to be covered by this item.

On page 224 starting at line 30, there is a tabulation of the expenditures made from the miscellaneous item appropriated in Chapter 2 of 1966. It will be noted that the total expended was \$17,300. While there is no way to predict emergency requirements, on the basis of past experience, it would appear that \$50,000 is adequate. *We recommend approval.*

**DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME****ITEM 354 of the Budget Bill**

Capital Outlay Budget page 310

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME, FROM THE FISH AND GAME PRESERVATION FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	-----	\$480,000
Recommended for approval	-----	452,500

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ----- • \$27,500**ANALYSIS**

(a) *Replace three patrol boats and purchase additional airplane* ----- \$450,000

The *Bonito* and *Marlin* are 63-foot wooden vessels built by the federal government and acquired by the department after World War II. They have reached the point where they are extremely costly to maintain and, because they are propelled by gasoline engines, are expensive to operate. These vessels will be replaced with two smaller 40-foot vessels equipped with twin diesel engines. They will have a cruising speed of 25 knots and a minimum range of 300 miles. To offset the reduced offshore capabilities of these smaller vessels, the department proposes to purchase an additional aircraft. This proposal is discussed under the

**Department of Fish and Game—Continued**

subitem following. Each vessel is estimated to cost \$70,000 based upon specifying steel construction, but we understand the department is also examining the feasibility of using aluminum or fiberglass. These materials are much lighter than steel and would require less horsepower for propulsion, which would reduce operating costs. The department, in its five-year projection, proposed to replace two additional patrol boats with 40-foot vessels. Consequently, they are carefully examining the economic feasibility and reliability of various alternatives before proceeding. It is estimated that specifying aluminum would add an additional \$10,000 to the cost of each vessel which would necessitate augmentation of the amount requested.

The *Albacore* was built by the department in 1958 at a cost of \$278,103 to patrol the north coast. It is 90 feet long, requires a six-man crew and is slow and unwieldy and expensive to operate. In 1964, at the request of the Assembly Interim Committee on Fish and Game and the Assembly Rules Committee, we made a study of the department's patrol operations on the north coast. In our report, we recommended that the department investigate alternatives to their present operation, considering alternate uses or disposal of the *Albacore* in favor of a smaller, less expensive vessel. In response to our recommendation the department proposes to replace the *Albacore* with a 65-foot vessel estimated to cost \$250,000. Its design will be identical to the new aluminum-hulled boat *Bluefin*, completed in 1967, which requires only a four-man crew and because of its size and speed can cover one-third more area in the same amount of time and for less cost. The cost estimate is based on that experienced with the *Bluefin*, and although it was built for considerably less because of a windfall situation, estimates at the time placed its value at close to \$250,000. Consequently, we are skeptical as to the ability to accomplish what is proposed within the amount requested.

The request to purchase an additional airplane, for \$60,000, is justified on the basis of providing a more efficient patrol operation. This is to be achieved by replacing larger patrol boats with smaller vessels as they require replacement and utilizing an airplane for offshore patrol instead of the larger boats. The department has experimented with its twin-engine Beechcraft, which is normally used for planting, and is satisfied that the airplane offers distinct advantages over boats for offshore patrolling. It would save time in locating fishing fleets and violators and would result in an overall reduction in operating time for its total patrol activity. The plan is to purchase a twin-engine Sky-master airplane for this purpose. It will be equipped with a camera as well as all the necessary navigational and safety equipment.

*We recommend approval of the proposal.*

(b) *Preliminary planning and working drawings—*

*headquarters building, region II* ----- \$30,000

The Region II office is presently occupying space leased from the Division of Forestry located in a building constructed in 1952 on the Sacramento State College campus. This subitem would provide funds

**Department of Fish and Game—Continued**

for preliminary planning and working drawings for a new office to be located within the present Department of Fish and Game compound at Nimbus Hatchery. The request for working drawing money is premature inasmuch as the preliminaries have not been prepared nor have we received sufficient program information to enable us to adequately review and evaluate the proposal.

*We, therefore, recommend that the item be reduced to \$2,500 to provide funds only for preliminary planning. The total of our recommended reduction is \$27,500.*

**DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME****ITEM 355 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 310****FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME, FROM THE FISH AND GAME PRESERVATION FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$169,100
Recommended for approval	149,100

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ----- \$20,000**ANALYSIS**

This item contains a number of assorted minor projects as follows:

1. A well at the Mojave River Hatchery, drilled in 1956 in very sandy strata, pumps half the water for which it was designed. This well will be relocated elsewhere on the hatchery grounds and equipped with a new pump and stand-by equipment at an estimated cost of \$40,000.

2. To provide an adequate supply of water to hatchery ponds at the Fish Springs Hatchery, 3,600 feet of pipeline will be installed from an additional pump at an estimated cost of \$36,000. This project is needed in anticipation of the adverse effect the completion of the second barrel of the Owens Valley Aqueduct will have on the availability of spring water.

3. An additional project at Fish Springs Hatchery, estimated to cost \$20,000, provides for the replacement of the aerator tower which is 12 years old and beyond economical repair.

4. The floor and sills in Mt. Shasta Hatchery building "A" are rotting from continuous dampness and \$20,000 is requested to replace them.

5. A fish holding tank will be constructed for \$10,100 at the Newell Creek base to furnish additional holding capacity to handle the increase in catchable trout production for Region III.

6. An estimated \$15,000 is requested to construct a low-water barrier at the confluence of Old River and the San Joaquin River. The barrier will divert flow into the San Joaquin River during low-water conditions to alleviate flow reversal and pollution conditions which interfere with salmon migration upstream.

**Item 356****Capital Outlay****Department of Fish and Game—Continued**

7. Additional breeder and holding pens will be constructed at the Vacaville Game Farm by inmate labor and \$5,000 is requested for materials.

8. Two electric space heaters will be furnished and installed for \$3,000 in the garage at the Moccasin Creek Hatchery to permit maintenance and repair work on planting trucks and equipment during the winter months.

*We recommend approval of the above projects totaling \$149,100.*

9. The remaining \$20,000 requested is for a public information display in the yet to be constructed Kelly Ridge Visitor Center at Oroville Dam. Since funds for working drawings and construction of the visitor center are being requested in this budget, we feel this project is premature. *We recommend this item be rejected.*

**Department of Fish and Game  
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD**

**ITEM 356 of the Budget Bill**

**Capital Outlay Budget page 311**

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, WILDLIFE CONSERVATION  
BOARD, FROM THE FISH AND GAME  
PRESERVATION FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$1,000,000
Recommended for approval -----	1,066,500

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED INCREASE ----- \$66,500**

**ANALYSIS**

This item provides \$1 million towards the construction of a new hatchery on the Mad River, seven miles east of Arcata in Humboldt County. Item 373 of the Budget Bill provides \$1 million in bond funds for this project, making a total proposal of \$2 million. The Budget Act of 1966 appropriated \$138,000 for the design and preparation of working drawings for a hatchery that will produce one million salmon and steelhead trout yearlings and five million fingerling king salmon annually.

The facilities proposed included a spawning incubator building, a spawning and hatchery building, public restrooms, four small residences and an office building. Production will come from 60 concrete raceway rearing ponds, each 100 feet long and 11 feet wide. Service facilities include a fish food storage building and a power standby building. Except for the residences, all structures will be steel frame with metal siding and roofs. The residences will be wood frame with plywood siding and shingle roofs.

Much consideration has been given to minimizing cost, as this project was initially estimated at \$3,440,850. The latest project estimate indicates a total project cost of \$2,293,000. Deducting \$160,000 which has been transferred to the Office of Architecture and Construction to prepare preliminary plans and working drawings, leaves \$2,133,000 as the balance of funds required. We have examined the plans and feel that

**Wildlife Conservation Board—Continued**

the estimate is reasonable. Since the total amount appropriated is \$133,000 less than the amount required, we recommend that this item be increased by \$66,500 with a corresponding increase in Item 373 of the Budget Bill.

It is anticipated that federal construction funds will be available on a matching basis from the Anadromous Fish Act to reimburse the Fish and Game Preservation Fund for the amount requested in this item.

**DEPARTMENT OF HARBORS AND WATERCRAFT**

ITEM 357 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 316

**FOR SMALL CRAFT HARBOR CONSTRUCTION PLANNING, DEPARTMENT OF HARBORS AND WATERCRAFT, FROM THE HARBORS AND WATERCRAFT REVOLVING FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$285,000
Recommended for approval	285,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ----- None**Other Recommendations**

Limit expenditure of Coxo Harbor planning funds until a Corps of Engineers navigation permit has been secured.

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item finances investigation and planning for two harbor of refuge projects as follows:

Coxo Harbor, Santa Barbara County	\$240,000
Fort Bragg area, Mendocino County	45,000

This proposal marks a major policy departure for the Department of Harbors and Watercraft. Prior to this time its expenditures have been in the form of local assistance to other agencies of government for the improvement of harbors and the construction of boating facilities. With this proposal, the department will be involved in the actual construction and operation of harbors.

The purpose of a harbor of refuge is to provide a place of safety or refuge for boaters traveling along the coast. The harbor should be designed and constructed so it is safe to enter and anchor under all but the most extreme storm conditions. No single-purpose harbors of refuge have yet been constructed in California. There are about 17 existing multipurpose harbors which provide refuge in addition to their function of providing calm water for permanent berthing and other services.

The 1964 California Boating Plan indicates that "ideally, there should be a chain of harbors of refuge about 35 nautical-miles apart along the coast. This is the distance that any small craft, the crew of which keep themselves advised of weather conditions, could travel in sufficient time to take shelter from an impending storm." However, it is economically impossible to provide the number of harbors that would be required to meet these requirements within the foreseeable future. The plan indicates that about 15 additional harbors would have to be

**Department of Harbors and Watercraft—Continued**

constructed at specific locations along the coast to fill out the minimum chain of refuge harbors which would be adequate for current conditions and would suffice for the anticipated needs by 1975.

The harbor of refuge program would benefit a minority of the boaters, perhaps as few as 20 percent, because most boaters do not have craft large enough for safe coastal travel. However, the fuel tax on greater fuel consumption by large boats compared to small boats is generally considered to compensate for some of this factor. Also, inland waters are becoming crowded and the one area for future unlimited use is the ocean.

The proposal for the Coxo planning includes land surveys, geological investigations, wave analysis and model testing, investigation of littoral drift and the preparation of construction plans. The budget document indicates that the planning will include those safeguards that are necessary to insure state control of land access to the harbors. At this time the estimated construction cost of the Coxo Harbor of Refuge is \$4 million. Annual maintenance costs are estimated at \$100,000.

Before the department can begin construction of the project, a navigation permit is required from the U.S. Corps of Engineers. At one time the corps was conducting a study of the use of Coxo as a multipurpose harbor. The proposed facility is near Vandenberg Air Force Base, and at the request of the Air Force the corps terminated its study. Although the Department of Harbors and Watercraft now proposes construction of a facility at Coxo which would provide minimum harbor of refuge facilities, to date the Department of Defense has not given approval to the state's proposal. Vandenberg Air Force Base prefers to keep the coastline clear in that area for missile launching. Without a navigation permit, the project cannot be built. It remains to be determined how valid the objections of the Vandenberg Air Force Base are. Legislative approval of the appropriation for planning would strengthen the department in its negotiations for a navigation permit. However, no planning money should be spent until the permit is received.

*We recommend approval of the project planning moneys for the Coxo project provided that no funds are expended until the Department of Harbors and Watercraft obtains a navigation permit from the U.S. Corps of Engineers.*

The proposed investigation in the Fort Bragg area for a harbor of refuge results from Corps of Engineers' studies which indicate that improvements required to make Noyo into a harbor of refuge are economically infeasible. The department indicates that within the vicinity of Noyo there are a number of coves that could be made into harbors of refuge. The suggested areas are Fort Bragg Cove, Casper, Mendocino Bay, Little River and Albion Cove. The budget request is for three site studies to include hydrographic surveys, land ownership and access studies, geology investigations, wave refraction studies and the preparation of reports.

*We recommend approval of the department's request for \$45,000 to carry out the preliminary investigations in the Fort Bragg area.*

**Capital Outlay****Item 358****DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

ITEM 358 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 316

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$5,088,345
Recommended for approval	522,000
Recommended for special review	3,208,925

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** \$1,357,420**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

In the 1967 legislative session there was considerable controversy over the development budget of the Department of Parks and Recreation. In the prior year the department had received a development appropriation from the General Fund of approximately \$14 million. To this was added the major task of planning for and acquiring approximately \$80 million in acquisitions financed from the Recreation Bond Act of 1964. This program was larger than the department could execute and the accumulated carryover of authorized expenditures was larger than the General Fund could fund along with other commitments.

As a consequence the administration proposed last year to revert a number of major appropriations for General Fund park development which would otherwise have carried over from prior years. These reversions were the subject of much debate in the Legislature, and as the budget bill was enacted, some were approved, but not all of them. The administration had already stopped all work on projects being proposed for reversion with a result that these projects have been dropped, whether reverted or not, except for South Grove Parkway, Calaveras Big Trees; Plaza Hotel restoration, San Juan Bautista State Historic Park; Reconstruction, Pio Pico State Historic Monument; and onshore development at Grizzly Valley Reservoir. These projects were modified and continued.

At the same time the department was proposing the above reversions last session, it also stopped work and reverted the remaining funds for approximately \$2 million in additional General Fund development appropriations. It could do this because these balances had reached the end of their three-year period of availability. The projects are as follows:

## Budget Act of 1963:

Benbow Lake State Recreation Area—repairs to dam	\$20,000
Clear Lake State Park—shoreline development	80,300
Henry W. Coe State Park—campground	174,700
Joshua Trees State Park—campground	255,800
Natural Bridges State Beach—parking area and utilities	92,700
Anza Borrego Desert State Park—campground	213,000
Millerton Lake State Recreation Area—day use area	232,200
Sonoma Coast State Beach, Bodega Bay—campground	296,600
Total	\$1,365,300

**Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued**

Budget Act of 1964:

Grover Hot Springs State Park—hot springs pool	\$59,700
San Buenaventura State Beach—parking area and service facilities	307,300
Santa Monica State Beach—harbor dredging	300,000
Salton Sea State Recreation Area—campground	230,000
Total	\$897,000

The result of all these revisions is that of \$25,011,582 which was scheduled for General Fund capital outlay in 1966-67, \$10,391,496 is shown now as expended in that year, while \$9,675,818 which was estimated to be spent in 1967-68 will be reduced to \$1,639,762 now estimated to be expended in the current year. The remainder of the money is shown in the Governor's Budget as estimated savings. Beginning with next year, the department estimates it will have no carryover but will start with the \$5,935,735 which is being requested for General Fund development programs. It should be noted that the above figures do not include bond funds which remain available. Similarly, other non-General Fund money has been expended as originally appropriated.

The total capital outlay program for the Department of Parks and Recreation next fiscal year consists of \$5,935,735 in General Fund money, \$866,150 in Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund appropriations and estimated expenditures of \$31,290,104 mostly from prior appropriations from the Recreation Bond Act of 1964. The General Fund portion of the department's capital outlay program will return to the approximate level of several years ago. This same level is projected for the year 1969-70 and is the basis of the department's planning program, which is now being contemplated. This is also approximately the highest amount that can be expected to be available for park development in 1969-70, based on present state fiscal conditions.

This proposal covers the construction of nine major projects, two of which are also partly financed from another fund source and one project planning allocation. The projects are concerned with established and ongoing parks or beaches and represent standard, more-or-less permanent facilities. None of them concerns initial, or temporary facilities for units newly acquired from bond funds since such development is also funded from the bond source.

(a) Reservoir recreation development planning, state water facilities	\$155,000
---	-----------

This project proposes continuing preliminary and development planning for state water project recreational facilities under the Davis-Dolwig Act. Water oriented recreational facilities are increasingly in demand and it is essential that advanced planning be accomplished in order to determine the magnitude of the requirement for state development funds. We recommend approval.

(b) Custom House Plaza development, Phase I, Monterey Monuments	\$367,000
---	-----------

The Budget Act of 1967 provided \$75,000 to permit the preparation of preliminary plans and drawings for the rehabilitation and restora-

**Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued**

tion of the so-called Custom House Plaza in Monterey. The development is to be done in cooperation with the Urban Renewal Agency of Monterey so that certain streets might be closed and vehicular traffic rerouted to permit unlimited pedestrian access and use of the area.

The project does not contemplate any work on buildings as such but consists of brick street paving, garden walls, drinking fountains, lawn development, lighting, plantings, etc. The design work is being prepared by a private firm of landscape architects which made the estimate. The major elements are the main plaza area, pedestrian streets and the Custom House parking area. A final phase, to be funded sometime in the future is currently estimated at \$500,000. We have reviewed the general plan and the outline details. The cost appears to be commensurate with the scope and detail of the proposal. *We recommend approval.*

(c) *Continued development—San Diego "Old Town" ---- \$250,000*

The Budget Act of 1967 provided \$100,000 for the start of a planning, redevelopment and restoration program encompassing a fairly large area and a number of buildings. The Legislature in providing extensive acquisition funds indicated its agreement with a development approach. However, we have seen no comprehensive long-range plan nor incremental estimates of cost on which to base a recommendation. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(d) *Continuing project restoration, Pueblo De Los Angeles \$500,000*

The state has now provided over \$2,870,000 including the \$100,000 appropriation made by the Budget Act of 1967 towards the acquisition, restoration and redevelopment of this state historical monument. Most of the funds have been expended in the major block bounded by North Main Street, the Plaza, Los Angeles Street, and the Santa Ana-Hollywood Freeway. The block is bisected along its north, south axis by Sanchez Street. To date only two buildings have been completed and are in general use, the Masonic Building on North Main Street and the old firehouse at the corner of Los Angeles and the Plaza. Neither of these is revenue producing in any significant sense. The balance of the funds have been expended on structurally stabilizing most of the buildings in the block and in restoring the exterior walls and facades of some of them, notably the Pico Hotel. The present proposal is apparently one of four, each for \$500,000 which presumably would ultimately complete the project although there is no clear indication that this is the case.

The proposal in the present budget is described as work that would permit all the buildings located on the east half of the block from Sanchez Street through to Los Angeles Street to be rented and produce revenue for the commission which operates the project in behalf of the city, county and state. There is no clear indication of what kind of rentals these will be and what revenue might be expected. In any case, the work includes the working drawings and restoration of a

**Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued**

building designated as 425 which faces on both Sanchez and Los Angeles Streets, and buildings 128, 130 and 132 which face the plaza. In addition, it is proposed to complete the roof and first floor restoration of the Garnier Building which also faces both Los Angeles and Sanchez Streets. The actual description of the work would indicate that there is more intended than the simple statement of completing the roof and the first floor restoration. Beyond this it is proposed to furnish and install a central air-conditioning system in the basement of one of the buildings to service the entire block from North Main to Los Angeles Streets. This would include both cooling and heating. Utility services and connections for water, sewer, gas and electrical supplies are also included. Finally, there is a neat catch-all portion of the project described as "other repairs found to be necessary during the course of this work". In these old and badly deteriorated buildings, this category might very well use up a substantial part of the proposed appropriation.

We suggest that until there is a clear plan and at least token commitments as to the occupancies of these buildings and the potential revenues, that no further investments should be made lest the state and the local commission operating the area find themselves with finished space which would require maintenance, security and operation without tenants. We suggest furthermore that if commitments were to be obtained from bona fide tenants, the interior restoration work could be oriented to the needs of these tenants rather than to complete the space in advance and then find that future potential tenants would require changes. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval of the project.*

(e) *Continuing development—North Beach Area, Doheny State Beach ----- \$850,000*

A major appropriation in the 1966 Budget Act provided funds for initial development and redevelopment in the north day-use area to provide various facilities and picnic units with no overnight camping contemplated in that particular vicinity. The current proposal covers the major development of the actual user facilities and consists of a number of buildings including three comfort stations, a park office, life guard control tower, three lifeguard stands, 112 picnic units, a large car-parking area and all of the auxiliary utility, roads, walks, lighting, landscaping, etc., needed to make the area fully developed and usable. An estimate prepared by the Office of Architecture and Construction under date of January 15, 1968, covering the gross project which includes funds appropriated both in 1965 and 1966 indicates a total cost of \$1,781,200. It should be pointed out that the latter figure includes costs of working drawings which were completed and subsequently totally reworked because of extensive changes in scope and program. Towards the total cost, the estimate indicates an availability of \$1,088,685, leaving a balance required by additional appropriation of \$692,515. As of this writing we have received no explanation for the higher figure of \$850,000 shown as the requirement in the

**Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued**

budget. Furthermore, the project description has been altered in a number of ways which leaves us in considerable doubt as to the total program. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(f) *Continued development—Carpinteria State Beach* \$600,000

The Budget Act of 1965 appropriated \$389,900 for the development of a new campground in the upland area of Carpinteria State Beach. The development was described as having a capacity of 73 units plus 2 type "B" combination shower and restroom buildings and extensive road, walk and utility developments to serve the new area.

The present proposal appears to be an abandonment of the earlier one and instead the redevelopment of existing facilities including the remodeling of four comfort stations, one shower building, an entrance station, five portable lifeguard stands, one central lifeguard tower and a vehicle storage and laundry building. There would be certain other utility and access road additions. Also, the plan contemplates the razing of three existing residences, a garage, three comfort stations and a lifeguard building. Beyond this it is proposed to relocate two shop buildings and one paint storage building to a new service area. The most important aspect is the development of 140 new units in what is referred to as a class "A" campground complete with tables, stoves, cupboards, parking spurs and utility hookups plus area lighting. The current estimate, prepared by the Office of Architecture and Construction under date of January 22, 1968, indicates a total project cost of \$973,750 (including working drawings completed prior to extensive changes in scope and program). Of the \$397,202 in available funds, \$178,400 has been expended or is otherwise no longer available. This leaves a balance of approximately \$179,000 and requires almost \$755,000 of new appropriations to make the project solvent. The proposal is for \$600,000 with no explanation as to how this figure was derived. While we recognize that Carpinteria Beach is a fairly popular facility and the need is undoubtedly real, we do not feel that we can make a favorable recommendation until the discrepancies can be explained and justified. Hopefully, this will occur before the legislative committees are asked to review the project. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(g) *Development—Kelly Ridge, Oroville* \$857,420

The existing visitors' overlook at Oroville Dam is slightly west of, that is downstream, of the dam and on a high knoll above it so that visitors may look down upon the face of the dam and its top.

The area known as Kelly Ridge is at a slightly higher elevation than the existing overlook and is upstream of the dam so that the view is down on the lake proper and the top of the dam. When the lake is full, it will also be visible from the existing overlook.

It is proposed to develop a visitors' center and other facilities on Kelly Ridge with part of the cost being provided by the Department of Water Resources out of project funds. In addition, the Department

**Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued**

of Water Resources will provide funds for the relocation of certain historical artifacts in the vicinity of Kelly Ridge. The principal artifact is the Old Bidwell Bar Suspension Bridge which will be re-erected over a canyon and be used as a pedestrian walkway. The present proposal is for development of an access road, a parking area, utilities and presumably a 10,000-square-foot visitor center with most of the cost for the center itself being borne by the Department of Water Resources. We use the word "presumably" because the total relationship does not seem to be entirely clear nor is there a clear indication of the actual size of the facility. In any case, it should be pointed out that the proposal is based on an estimate made by the Division of Beaches and Parks under date of November 2, 1967. There is also an estimate dated December 12, 1967, prepared by the Office of Architecture and Construction which indicates that the cost of the project will be almost \$940,000. On this basis alone, we would ordinarily be inclined to recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.

However, irrespective of the accuracy of the estimate, we believe that there is an important philosophical and programming problem that should be considered. The existing overlook is adequate for ordinary sightseeing purposes and will probably continue to be adequate for many years. We suggest that the expenditure of close to \$1 million to provide a substitute overlook is an improper approach when the same amount of money would provide for extensive camping recreational facilities in the Loafer Creek area in addition to the already proposed day-use areas. As the lake approaches its normal level, there will probably be a greatly increased use of it for boating, and good camping in the immediate vicinity of the lake would be in great demand. The expenditure of scarce funds to provide what is merely a transient sightseeing facility seems to us to be unjustifiable. In addition the state water project is faced with a short term lack of financing and should be conserving its funds. Consequently, we recommend disapproval of the project as proposed and recommend that regular camping facilities at Loafer Creek be designed instead. This would require at this time only working drawings funds to the extent of perhaps \$80,000.

(h) Continued development—Loafer Creek Area, Phase II, Oroville \$837,925

Prior appropriations have provided for initial immediate public-use-type facilities in the Loafer Creek area. These consisted of an unpaved access road with dust-palliative treatment, day-use parking, unpaved but dust-treated, picnicking and boat and trailer parking areas, chemical sanitary facilities, beach development and portable dressing rooms with temporary utilities. A permanent three-lane paved boat launching ramp was also included.

The present proposal covers seven acres of lawn area including automatic irrigation, additional beach area development, upgrading of the roads and parking areas, the construction of a checking station and office, one comfort station building and one combination comfort station, shower facility, permanent utilities including connections to exist-

**Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued**

ing public utility systems and conventional picnicking appurtenances such as barbecues, etc. The amount proposed is based on an estimate made by the Division of Beaches and Parks and not by the Office of Architecture and Construction which will be required to perform the design, engineering and ultimate contract supervision. Based on previous experience, we feel that estimates made by the Division of Beaches and Parks are not reliable and are usually low when compared to ultimate estimates made by the Office of Architecture and Construction. Hopefully, more accurate and dependable figures will be available by the time the project is reviewed by the legislative committees. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(i) *Continued development—Clear Lakes State Park ----- \$321,000*

This project is based on dual financing with an additional \$90,000 to be proposed from the Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund which will be shown in another item. However, the entire project as a whole will be discussed in connection with the General Fund portion. There is contemplated the construction of a new 65-unit campground including a comfort station, two combination comfort and shower buildings, various roads, parking areas and trails. Auxiliary facilities include the construction of a vehicular and pedestrian bridge access to the boating area, a pedestrian bridge for access to the swimming beach, a four-lane boat launching ramp, a floating accommodation dock, a fish cleaning facility and a complement of utilities and other conventional adjuncts for a camping operation.

All the data that have been submitted to us, as of this writing, consist of a generalized plan prepared by the Division of Beaches and Parks and a project description with an agency estimate of \$411,000 which equals the total of General Fund and the Watercraft Fund proposals. There has not, apparently, been prepared a preliminary plan or an estimate by the Office of Architecture and Construction which would be required to perform the actual architectural and engineering service. In the absence of such an estimate and based on past experience, we do not believe that we can make a favorable recommendation of the amount proposed in the Budget Bill. If the project description is accurate, it seems most unlikely that it can be designed and constructed for the proposed amount. However, it is probable that by the time the legislative committees consider the proposal the information will have been accurately developed. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(j) *Continued development—Sonoma Coast State Beach--- \$350,000*

This project proposes the development of an 100-unit campground on the north end of Bodega Harbor and immediately to the west of the town of Bodega Bay. Included would be a new road system with an entrance from State Highway No. 1, a park office building, campsite parking spurs, sewer and septic tank systems, two combination restroom shower facilities, two comfort station buildings, connections to

**Item 359****Capital Outlay****Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued**

electric power, telephone and water and extensive windbreak and screening planting and other landscaping throughout the unit.

We have no reservations with respect to the nature and scope of the project and we recognize that the Sonoma Coast is a very popular area during the normal vacation periods. However, the estimate for the project was prepared on December 20, 1967, by the Division of Beaches and Parks and apparently no estimate by the Office of Architecture and Construction has been prepared or is available. Based on prior experience, we do not feel that the proposed amount is a reliable estimate. However, we anticipate that by the time the project is considered by the legislative committees the appropriate information will be available. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**Department of Parks and Recreation  
DIVISION OF BEACHES AND PARKS**

ITEM 359 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 316

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS,  
DIVISION OF BEACHES AND PARKS,  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$617,390
Recommended for approval -----	594,390
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b> -----	<b>\$23,000</b>

**ANALYSIS**

This item funds a series of minor improvement projects to develop or conserve the natural and man-made resources at various state beaches, parks and historic monuments. Included are projects for beach erosion control, water and sewerline improvements, fire protection and construction of sanitary facilities. The following chart outlines the types of projects requested.

Park unit	<i>Improve or develop public facilities</i>	<i>Conservation of park resources</i>	<i>Interpretive exhibits</i>	<i>Improve or develop utilities</i>	<i>Roadway maintenance</i>
Angel Island -----	\$45,000				
Bolsa Chica -----		\$38,519			
Bothe—Napa Valley--			\$37,000		
Calaveras Big Trees--					\$23,750
Humboldt Redwoods--		65,000			
La Purisima Mission *				\$50,000 <sup>1</sup>	
Leo Carrillo -----	35,000				
Millerton Lake -----			50,000		
Monterey (Custom House) -----			37,000		
Palomar Mountain -----				40,000	
Pismo -----					28,000
Point Lobos -----				30,000	
Samuel P. Taylor -----				28,000	
San Diego Coast -----				23,891	

**Capital Outlay****Item 360****Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued**

<i>Park unit</i>	<i>Improve or develop public facilities</i>	<i>Conservation of park resources</i>	<i>Interpretive exhibits</i>	<i>or develop utilities</i>	<i>Roadway maintenance</i>
Doheny -----		\$6,400			
Will Rogers -----	\$10,000	5,000			
Prairie Creek -----				\$12,700	
Mt. San Jacinto -----				18,000	
Hendy Woods -----		12,000			
San Clemente -----	8,000				
Austin Creek -----	8,000				
Fort Ross -----		2,280			
Petaluma Adobe -----		3,850			
Total -----	\$106,000	\$133,049	\$124,000	\$202,591	\$51,750

<sup>1</sup> Includes two projects for \$25,000.

\* See Text.

One of the two projects proposed at La Purisima Mission State Historic Park is to provide adequate water pressure at the service area and residences and to install an underground irrigation system in the pasture area. In its justification for the latter project, the department indicates that the necessity to install an underground irrigation system is due to the fact that "the historical scene is marred in the main mission area due to the employment of exposed irrigation pipe and sprinklers." We do not believe that the existing conventional means of irrigation poses a significant threat to the historical atmosphere of the mission in view of other existing anachronisms. *We recommend that this portion of the proposal be rejected. This would be a reduction of \$23,000.*

*We recommend approval of \$594,390 for the remaining projects.*

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****ITEM 360 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 316****FOR ACQUISITION OF LAND, DEPARTMENT OF PARKS  
AND RECREATION FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$230,000
Recommended for approval -----	None
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b> -----	<b>\$230,000</b>

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The \$230,000 contained in this item is to pay the Department of Water Resources for its interest in nonrecreation lands at Frenchman and Lake Davis Reservoirs pursuant to Water Code Section 11915.5. The land is being exchanged with the U.S. Forest Service for lands now being used by the state park system under Forest Service use permits at Plumas-Eureka State Park and at Squaw Valley State Recreation Area. The \$230,000 is not divisible in relation to the individual exchanges involving Squaw Valley and Plumas-Eureka.

In the case of Plumas-Eureka State Park, we have no explanation or justification of the need for additional land other than the desire to

**Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued**

expand the park. The land proposed to be secured in fee simple under this exchange transaction would permit the department to become more deeply involved in ski operations. Presently the department has a Forest Service use permit for certain lands being used locally and privately for ski operations. The land exchange would give the department fee title to the land and require the department to assume certain unknown responsibilities for its operations. No reason has been advanced for the department to become involved in ski operations, particularly when the U.S. Forest Service is the present owner of the land and is staffed with personnel experienced in administering vast areas of Forest Service lands where most of the ski operations in the western United States are located.

The exchange of land with the Forest Service in order to secure fee title to 1,150 acres of land in Squaw Valley is a part of the department's efforts to dispose of the state's interest in Squaw Valley. Last session the Legislature passed AB 557, now Chapter 1251, which directs the department to dispose of all state interests in Squaw Valley. The chapter requires the department to submit a report to the Legislature containing all terms and conditions of any conveyance, grant, exchange, or other disposal of any rights, title, interest, and obligation of the state in or to real or personal property for the Legislature's review and approval. Further, the Legislature is required to give final approval to each transaction. The proposed plan to dispose of the state's interest in Squaw Valley presumably will be presented to the Legislature in a quarterly progress report which will be released approximately the first of March.

There is not available at the time of preparing this analysis, any comprehensive appraisal of the value of the lands in Squaw Valley which are subject to the exchange transaction. The Property Acquisition Service has been preparing this data. Without this data the Legislature cannot be assured that it is acting properly in consummating this land exchange, that is, increasing the marketability of its assets rather than acquiring more land, which under the present encumbrances, will only make disposition of the state's assets more difficult. Presumably the land exchange for which the \$230,000 is to be appropriated cannot be executed until the Legislature gives specific approval by statute to the exchange pursuant to the requirements of Chapter 1251.

*Until more information is available and there is some clarification of the approach to the disposition of the state's interest at Squaw Valley, we cannot recommend approval of this item nor can we recommend approval of increased state involvement in ski operations at Plumas-Eureka State Park*

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

ITEM 361 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 316

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS,  
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, FROM  
THE HARBORS AND WATERCRAFT REVOLVING FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$847,950
Recommended for approval	None
Recommended for special review	847,950

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** None**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item covers a schedule of four projects, one of which represents a portion of a project the major portion being payable from the General Fund.

(a) *Water facilities, Clear Lake State Park* \$90,000

This project was discussed under the General Fund item for the Department of Parks and Recreation. It represents the Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund share of the total new development project. *Based on inadequate estimates, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(b) *Construct—water facilities, Spillway Area, Phase II, Oroville* \$391,800

This project proposes the completion of a two-stage boat launching ramp facility including a 600-car upper parking area, a 310-car lower parking area and the upper stage launching ramp, plus various appurtenant facilities. Presumably, the lower parking ramp will have been completed from prior funds.

Our information on this project is totally inadequate and we have no formal estimate to cover it. We assume that by the time the project is heard by the legislative committees we will have received adequate information and estimates. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(c) *Construct—water area facilities, Angel Island* \$265,000

This project proposes a series of improvements and developments in the Ayala Cove area which is now the only formal entry to the island park. The west side of the cove is quite shallow and at low tide is available only to relatively small boats. It is proposed to dredge this area, thereby permitting a more extensive use of the cove. In addition, it is contemplated that there will be established 40 moorings referred to as the "Avalon" type. These are essentially anchorages consisting of a dead weight on the bottom with a chain and float at the surface which permits a boat to tie to it and remain anchored at that point. It is also proposed to extend the concrete pier, provide an additional 20-foot-by-

**Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued**

80-foot metal float and construct a concrete boat ramp. The latter is intended almost exclusively for the use of the park L.C.M. (landing craft) by which vehicles, of various kinds, are carried to and from the island. One of the most essential needs for this ramp is based on the fact that the island has one fire engine but it has an agreement with the Marin County Fire Department by which its fire equipment would be ferried over in the L.C.M. and could be used on the island in case of a major fire. This firefighting equipment would need a proper landing facility in order to be able to reach the road.

While we recognize the increasing demand for boat use at this island, the amount proposed is based on an undated estimate made by the Division of Beaches and Parks. There is no estimate available either by the Office of Architecture and Construction or the Division of Highways which in the past installed the new pier facilities. Experience indicates that estimates prepared by the Division of Beaches and Parks are generally unreliable and on the low side. Hopefully, proper information and estimates will be available by the time the project is reviewed by the legislative committees. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

(d) *Construct—water facilities, Del Valle Reservoir ---- \$101,150*

This project proposes the construction of a boat launching ramp and a parking area in the "Venados" area of the reservoir. The ramp would consist of four 15-foot lanes of asphaltic concrete construction. The parking area is apparently not expected to be completely surfaced as part of this development but is to be created by embankments and the placement of riprap material with surfacing to occur at some future time.

The reservoir is scheduled for completion in 1968 and the usable water level will be reached by the middle of 1969. The Davis-Dolwig Act requires that initial recreation facilities be completed concurrently with the project completion. While we recognize that in order to attain the required completion date the project must be funded in the new budget, we point out that the only estimate we have was prepared by the Division of Beaches and Parks in December 1967. There is as yet no estimate from the Office of Architecture and Construction which would be required to do the design and contract management work. However, we assume that proper information and estimates will be available by the time the project is considered by the legislative committees. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.*

**Department of Parks and Recreation  
DIVISION OF BEACHES AND PARKS**

ITEM 362 of the Budget Bill

Capital Outlay Budget page 316

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS,  
DIVISION OF BEACHES AND PARKS, FROM THE  
HARBORS AND WATERCRAFT REVOLVING FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$18,200
Recommended for approval-----	18,200

<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b> -----	<b>None</b>
--	-------------

**ANALYSIS**

This item includes two projects to construct launching floats at Brannan Island and Folsom Lake State Recreation Areas. Three 6-foot-by-60-foot floats will be constructed at Brannan Island at an estimated cost of \$10,000. This will eliminate congestion at the launching ramps by providing facilities that are not presently available. Three 6-foot-by-24-foot floating docks will be constructed at Granite Bay on Folsom Lake at an estimated cost of \$8,200. These facilities will be adjacent to existing launching ramps and will provide for more efficient use.

*We recommend approval.*

**DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES**

ITEM 363 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1005

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$500,000
Recommended for approval-----	500,000

<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b> -----	<b>None</b>
--	-------------

Approve item with final amount subject to future legislative redetermination.

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

In past years minor expenditures have been included in the support budget of the department to pay for the portion of the operation and maintenance costs of Frenchman, Antelope and Grizzly Projects which have been allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement and which are properly a General Fund responsibility under the Davis-Dolwig Act. In the preparation of the budget for next year a similar item has been included for certain costs incurred in operation and maintenance of the California Aqueduct. This amount has been arbitrarily estimated to be \$500,000. It reimburses certain expenditures financed from project funds in past years which may be General Fund obligations and pays estimated costs in the budget year.

Under current law the obligation of the General Fund to pay the above costs is clear and the Governor's Budget should show the costs. The amount to be shown, however, is a difficult problem. The Legislature has made no final cost allocation from the Upper Feather River Projects and has not considered cost allocations for the aqueduct. In

**Item 364****Capital Outlay****Department of Water Resources—Continued**

addition, the Resources Agency is currently in the process of reviewing and deciding the extent it will propose to add recreation and fish and wildlife features to the aqueduct. Finally, the department's latest cost allocation report, Bulletin 153-68 has not yet been released. As a consequence the \$500,000 figure is an approximation of the amount due the water project from the General Fund.

It is not possible at this time to determine the amount which we would recommend be included in the Budget Bill. In addition, until the Legislature has finally determined and approved the cost allocations to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement pursuant to the Davis-Dolwig Act and Chapter 27, Statutes of 1966, any funds provided at this time should be conditioned by language which makes the amounts of the payment subject to redetermination upon final cost allocation action by the Legislature. (It should be noted that the \$500,000 is for annual operation and maintenance costs of water project features a portion of which features serve recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement. This cost will recur each year in future budgets. This cost is not for any portion of the capital costs allocated to recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement pursuant to Chapter 27, Statutes of 1966 from the \$5 million in Long Beach tidelands oil revenues.)

*It is recommended that the item be approved with the exact amount subject to legislative redetermination when more information is available.*

**Department of the Youth Authority****ASSISTANCE TO COUNTIES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF JUVENILE HOMES, RANCHES  
AND CAMPS FROM THE GENERAL FUND****ITEM 364 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 340****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$1,449,000
Recommended for approval	1,449,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

None

**GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT**

The State Welfare and Institutions Code, Section 891, authorizes state subsidies to counties for construction of juvenile correctional facilities. This participation by the state is limited to 50 percent of the cost of facilities but not to exceed \$3,000 per bed unit. Heretofore, this item of appropriation has been carried in the "Local Assistance" section of the Budget Bill. It is now proposed to include this as part of the regular capital outlay program for reasons which we have discussed in the preliminary statement to our capital outlay analysis section.

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Eight counties have proposed construction and equipment projects having a total value of \$5,374,293. These projects would generate a total of 483 beds. At the maximum subsidy of \$3,000 a bed, this would result in the total of \$1,449,000 as proposed. The amount represents

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 365**

### **Assistance to Counties for Construction of Juvenile Homes, Ranches and Camps from the General Fund—Continued**

approximately 27 percent of the total cost of the projects. This approach appears to be favorable to the state, because, lacking these local institutions, persons who will be committed therein would in all probability become direct charges of the Youth Authority at a considerably higher cost to the state both in capital investment and operations. However, we point out that we have made no review of the projects, as such, because no detailed programs, plans or specifications have been received. This is essentially the same situation that existed in prior years when the item was carried in Local Assistance. *We recommend approval of the request as submitted.*

### **DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES**

**ITEM 365 of the Budget Bill**

**Budget page 340**

### **FOR ALLOCATION TO LOCAL GOVERNMENT FOR FLOOD CONTROL AND WATERSHED PROTECTION PROJECTS FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$15,000,000
Recommended for approval	None
Unresolved	15,000,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** \_\_\_\_\_ Pending

#### **ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The state has, since 1945, assumed the costs of lands, easements and relocation of utilities which federal law requires local governments to pay on any United States Corps of Engineers flood control projects involving levee and channel work. Money requested in this item is to reimburse cities, counties and districts for the above costs on such flood control projects, except those projects administered by the State Reclamation Board. The flood control projects, both major and minor, which will receive funds under this item are shown on pages 341 to 342 of the Governor's Budget.

This item also includes funds for watershed protection projects. Sections 12850 to 12875 of the Water Code authorize the Department of Water Resources to reimburse local agencies for costs of lands, easements and relocation of utilities for watershed protection projects constructed by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service. Projects being funded by this item are shown on budget page 342.

In line with the practice of past years, the total estimated expenditures have been reduced by an expenditure timing adjustment in order more accurately to reflect the expected level of disbursement. This adjustment is appropriate because of difficulties in anticipating the rate of federal expenditure and the speed with which local agencies will request reimbursement from the department for the funds they expend on a project.

Although this program has been budgeted as a subvention in past years, it is being budgeted as a capital outlay program in 1968-69 in order to finance it from the \$90 million dollars in General Fund reve-

**Items 366-367****Capital Outlay****Department of Water Resources—Continued**

nues earmarked for capital outlay when the Legislature increased taxes last session through enactment of Chapter 963.

Since the Governor's Budget was prepared, the President has announced his budget for next fiscal year. Present indications are that the federal government will not be financing its portion of all the projects now included in the Governor's Budget. The Department of Finance may revise this item when more information is available. Therefore, no recommendation can be made on this item until the revisions have been prepared.

**RECLAMATION BOARD****ITEM 366 of the Budget Bill**

Budget page 343

**FOR THE STATE'S SHARE OF FLOOD CONTROL  
PROJECTS IN THE CENTRAL VALLEY  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$3,908,155
Recommended for approval	None
Unresolved	3,908,155

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

Pending

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The funds appropriated by this item are used by the Reclamation Board to acquire lands, easements and relocate utilities for the construction of Corps of Engineers major levee and channel flood control projects in the Central Valley. The support portion of the Reclamation Board's activities are entirely funded by a reimbursement from this item.

This item, like the one preceding it, has previously been classified as a subvention. Next year the Governor's Budget classifies it as capital outlay in order to permit financing it from the \$90 million reserved for capital outlay under Chapter 963, Statutes of 1967.

As discussed under the analysis of the Reclamation Board's support budget, the Department of Finance is expecting to revise the board's budget due to changes required by the President's Budget. No recommendation can be made on this item until that revision is received.

**DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES****ITEM 367 of the Budget Bill**

Budget page 344

**FOR THE STATE'S SHARE AND ADVANCE TO THE FEDERAL  
GOVERNMENT FOR BEACH EROSION CONTROL  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$1,091,900
Recommended for approval	600,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

\$491,900

## **Capital Outlay**

**Item 368**

### **Department of Water Resources—Continued ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The previously entitled subvention for beach erosion control is budgeted as capital outlay in the Governor's Budget for 1968-69. The item provides the state's contribution to a federal program, executed by the U.S. Corps of Engineers, to control dangerous erosion along the ocean beaches of the state. Under Sections 335 through 338 of the Water Code, the Department of Water Resources pays one-half of the project costs assigned to local interests and advances the portion of the costs assigned to the federal government for the Orange County Project. Other future projects will not be subject to the state advance since the authorization for the advance was not extended last session for other projects when the entire beach erosion legislation was reviewed and the program extended.

The Orange County Project has been subject to a number of changes in timing of construction and revisions in appropriation requirements during recent fiscal years. Present indications are that the project has been revised since the Governor's Budget was prepared and that the \$1,091,900 contained in the budget for 1968-69 can be reduced to approximately \$600,000. In addition, the Department of Water Resources has indicated that the federal government is also terminating its practice of scheduling beach erosion control projects based on local advances of the federal share. As a result it is not clear that the federal government will require the approximately \$402,000 advance which is contained in the presently estimated cost of \$600,000 for this project.

*It is recommended that the appropriation be reduced by approximately \$591,000 and that the Department of Water Resources determine whether an advance of the federal share will be accepted by the federal government.*

#### **UNALLOCATED**

**ITEM 368 of the Budget Bill**

**Capital Outlay Budget page 222**

**FOR AUGMENTATION OF FUNDED PROJECTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 16354 OF THE GOVERNMENT CODE,  
FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

#### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$3,000,000
Recommended for approval -----	3,000,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION-----**

**None**

#### **ANALYSIS**

Chapter 1756 of the Statutes of 1959, added Sections 16353 and 16354 to the Government Code for the purpose of establishing an augmentation procedure for capital outlay projects payable from the State Construction Program Fund (bonds) in recognition of the upward trend of the construction cost index and to assure that approved projects could be constructed, within approved scope, despite cost rises which may have occurred between the time a specific project was estimated for appropriation purposes and the time it was submitted for

**Item 369****Capital Outlay****Unallocated—Continued**

public bid. The augmentation procedure was to be under the control of the State Public Works Board.

Section 16353 provided authority for the Director of Finance with the approval of the State Public Works Board to transfer unexpended and unneeded balances from any construction project bond appropriation to be used for augmenting bond projects requiring financial assistance.

Section 16354 of the Government Code appropriated, without regard to fiscal years, the savings mentioned in the section above and provided for their allocation by the Director of Finance with the approval of the State Public Works Board.

For a period of years following the inception of this procedure, the savings generally exceeded the augmentations or at least equaled them so that there has always been a sufficient amount in the augmentation fund to take care of project assistance. However, a series of recent lean years in which augmentations exceeded savings has reduced the fund to a very low level, inadequate to cover ongoing projects. The total project value of projects in the "pipeline" which could conceivably require augmentation during the budget year probably exceeds \$60 million. On the assumption that each project would require augmentation and using an average of 5 percent, the \$3 million proposed would appear to be adequate and justifiable. It seems unlikely that all projects will require augmentation or that those actually needing assistance would require as much as 5 percent in every case. Nevertheless since the augmentations are under the control of the State Public Works Board and are not in fact a blank check for each project, there does not appear to be any good reason for recommending against the amount. The funds cannot be used for a purpose other than capital outlay. Furthermore, it should also be recognized that this particular proposal deals only with those projects payable from the State Construction Program Fund which were covered by bond authorizations prior to the 1966 Public Higher Education Bond Act which was limited to only higher education projects. A separate augmentation amount is proposed for the latter. *We recommend approval.*

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION****ITEM 369 of the Budget Bill**

Capital Outlay Budget page 172

**FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY ASSISTANCE TO JUNIOR COLLEGES,  
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, FROM THE  
STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$19,293,587
Recommended for approval	19,293,587

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** \_\_\_\_\_ None**ANALYSIS**

The State of California has provided a total of \$80 million since 1961 in a program of capital expansion aid to junior colleges of the state,

**Department of Education—Continued**

now referred to as "community colleges." Of this total \$70 million came from two state construction program bond fund proposals in 1962 and 1964. The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated the last of the funds available from the latter source. Distribution or allocation was based on formulas which took into account the ability of each district to provide its own funds, the availability of federal funds, and projected enrollments and needs. All of the appropriations with the exception of the one made in the 1967 Budget Act, were based entirely on a formula approach with very little review of individual projects as to design, scope, cost, etc., either by the Department of Finance or by the Legislative Analyst. However, postappropriation reviews were made prior to action by the Public Works Board.

The 1967 appropriation was based on a limited amount of pre-appropriation review but most of the review occurred after appropriation and prior to approval by the Public Works Board.

The budget proposal is based not only on the formulas contained in the enabling legislation, but also on a fairly comprehensive, detailed review by the Department of Finance. In some instances the proposals were re-referred to the districts because of excessive costs or other factors that were considered to be out of line with current practice in the state colleges. We have also made a detailed review, although the material is not quite as complete as that provided by the University and state colleges. Generally speaking, the costs of the projects proposed average no more per square foot than similar facility categories in the state colleges and in many instances less. The total program for the budget year is \$39,110,467 of which the state's share will be slightly less than half, with the balance of over \$15,816,000 coming from district funds and \$4 million anticipated from federal aid.

The funds to support the proposed appropriation are based on Chapter 1555 of 1967, known as the "Junior College Construction Program Bond Act of 1968." This provides that a bond proposition be put before the electorate on a consolidated ballot with the June 1968 primary for an authorization of \$65 million. The projections for state aid in this program for the period from 1968-69 through 1972-73, total over \$111,293,000. Therefore, if these projections are realistic, it may be accepted that the bond proposal will cover a three-year period. However, it should be pointed out that the printed Governor's Budget put before the Legislature in 1967 projected the potential state aid requirement for 1968-69 at only \$10,500,000 as against the present proposal of almost \$19,300,000. Obviously, if the same degree of inaccuracy prevails in the projections for the balance of the five-year period, the bond funds probably will not last beyond the 1969-70 fiscal year.

The budget proposal covers 35 junior college districts encompassing 102 projects of a wide variety including land acquisition, planning, site development, remodeling existing facilities, construction of new facilities for science, fine arts, libraries, drama and music, various technologies, physical education, administration, service functions, general classroom buildings and equipment of many kinds. All of the projects are subject to a postappropriation review by the State Public Works

**Items 370-371****Capital Outlay****Department of Education—Continued**

Board which will provide a final assurance that the state aid funds are properly and economically utilized. The largest total amount for one junior college district (state, local and federal funds) is over \$3,852,000. The smallest allocation to a single district is slightly over \$29,000 covering two small projects.

*We recommend approval of the program.*

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****ITEM 370 of the Budget Bill**

Budget page 1217

**FOR GRANTS TO LOCAL AGENCIES FOR RECREATION  
FROM THE STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL  
AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES FUND**

Amount requested	\$2,290,516
Estimated to be expended in 1967-68 fiscal year	9,960,538
Decrease (77 percent)	\$7,670,017

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

None

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The State Beach, Park, Recreation and Historical Facilities Bond Act of 1964 allocated \$40 million of bond proceeds for local and regional park projects to be distributed as grants to the 58 counties on the basis of their estimated population on July 1, 1975.

The Legislature, under provisions of the Bond Act, approves appropriation requests for these local project grants. To date, 110 projects have been approved by the Legislature and \$28,443,905 has been appropriated. The 1968-69 budget proposes 28 additional projects to be financed from local grant funds at a cost of \$2,290,516. A list of these projects and the grant amounts is provided in Item 370 of the Budget Bill. The Department of Parks and Recreation estimates that this will leave approximately \$8.5 million of local grant money available for future appropriation.

*We recommend approval as budgeted.*

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****ITEM 371 of the Budget Bill**

Budget page 1229

**FOR REVIEW OF STATE GRANT PROJECTS FROM THE  
STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATION AND HISTORICAL  
FACILITIES FUND**

Amount requested	\$60,546
Estimated to be expended in 1967-68 fiscal year	51,665
Increase (17 percent)	\$8,881

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

None

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item is to finance the project review of local grant projects under the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Act. The appropriation finances three positions and related ex-

## Capital Outlay

Item 372

### Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

penses in the Division of Recreation, which reviews the local grant requests.

*We recommend approval of this item as budgeted.*

### DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

ITEM 372 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1217

#### FOR RECREATION GRANTS TO LOCAL AGENCIES FROM THE STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES FUND

Amount requested	\$1,158,352
Estimated to be expended in 1967-68 fiscal year	1,706,595
Decrease (32 percent)	\$548,248

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** None

#### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Under provisions of the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, federal grants are available on a 50-50 matching basis to state and local agencies for planning, acquisition and development of outdoor recreation areas. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation establishes eligibility criteria and makes final project approval on state and local grant applications. In order to be eligible for grants under this program, states must have prepared a comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan and there must be a designated state official who has the authority and the responsibility to receive and administer funds. The Director of Parks and Recreation is the state official so designated.

Land and Water Conservation Funds are allocated 45 percent for state recreation projects and 45 percent for local agency recreation projects with 10 percent held aside as a contingency reserve under current apportionment rules established by the director. At the present time public hearings are being held pursuant to Chapter 1322, Statutes of 1967, to consider the proposed standards governing the disbursements of the Land and Water Conservation Funds administered by the director.

All projects in which local grant bond monies are used for matching purposes with the federal Land and Water Conservation Act funds are listed in Item 372 of the Budget Bill as required by the Recreation Bond Act of 1964. This item meets the technical requirements of legislative appropriation of the federal funds. There are nine such projects proposed for fiscal 1968-69 for a total cost of \$1,158,352.

*We recommend approval as budgeted.*

**Items 373-374****Capital Outlay****Department of Fish and Game  
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD****ITEM 373 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 311****FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, WILDLIFE CONSERVATION  
BOARD, FROM STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL  
AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$1,000,000
Recommended for approval	1,066,500

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED INCREASE**

\$66,500

**ANALYSIS**

Item 356 of the Budget Bill provides \$1 million to construct the Mad River Hatchery. This item appropriates an additional \$1 million in bond funds which will be transferred to the Fish and Game Preservation Fund to provide a total of \$2 million for construction. The latest estimate from the Office of Architecture and Construction indicates that \$2,133,000 will be required for construction.

We have examined the plans and feel the estimate is reasonable.

*Consistent with our recommendation under Item 356, we recommend that this item be increased by \$66,500.*

**Department of Fish and Game  
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD****ITEM 374 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 311****FOR LAND ACQUISITION, WILDLIFE CONSERVATION  
BOARD, FROM STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL  
AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$389,130
Recommended for approval	389,130

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

None

**ANALYSIS**

The amount requested in this item represents one-half of the \$778,260 required to purchase approximately 763 acres along the Mojave River near Victorville. The remaining funds required are requested in Item 376 of the Budget Bill, as an advance from the bond funds which will be reimbursed from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund. The acreage proposed for acquisition is within two hours' driving time of Los Angeles and is located at a point where the normal subsurface flow of the Mojave River surfaces. Ground water is plentiful near or at the surface and a potential fish hatchery site is available at the upper end of the property where water temperatures are considered ideal. The County of San Bernardino has agreed to develop and maintain the area in such a manner as to emphasize fishing and wildlife as the primary recreation use. The hatchery site would be retained for Department of

**Capital Outlay****Items 375-376****Wildlife Conservation Board—Continued**

Fish and Game use if required. The Wildlife Conservation Board would retain the right to review and approve the county development plans.

*We recommend approval of the project.*

**Department of Fish and Game  
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD**

**ITEM 375 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 310**

**FOR PROJECT ASSISTANCE, WILDLIFE CONSERVATION  
BOARD, FROM STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL  
AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$8,000
Recommended for approval	8,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

None

**ANALYSIS**

The amount requested provides for the support budget costs of staff time required to develop the bond project programs. This work is a legitimate and proper charge against the bond funds. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Fish and Game  
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD**

**ITEM 376 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 311**

**FOR LAND ACQUISITION, WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD,  
FROM STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL  
AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$389,130
Recommended for approval	389,130

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**

None

**ANALYSIS**

This item represents a \$389,130 advance from the bond funds which will be reimbursed from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund. The amount requested is one-half of the total acquisition cost for the Mojave River wildlife area and the remaining funds required are requested in Item 374 of the Budget Bill. A description of the acquisition proposal is included in our analysis of that item. *We recommend approval.*

**Items 377-378****Capital Outlay****DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****ITEM 377 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 316****FOR PROJECT PLANNING, DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND  
RECREATION, FROM THE STATE BEACH, PARK,  
RECREATIONAL AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$613,942
Recommended for approval	613,942

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ----- None**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*In line with our detailed submission of master planning and development planning contained in the analysis of the department's support budget, Item 219, we recommend approval of this item.*

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****ITEM 378 of the Budget Bill****Capital Outlay Budget page 316****FOR MAJOR PROJECTS, DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND  
RECREATION, FROM THE STATE BEACH, PARK,  
RECREATIONAL AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	\$415,000
Recommended for approval	None
Recommended for special review	415,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ----- None**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item proposes a schedule of two projects, one of which is a joint financing with the General Fund.

(a) *Construct and rehabilitate-buildings, old Sacramento Historic Park* ----- \$375,000

This project proposes some initial structural stabilization of some of the buildings, area clearing, safety barricades and some parking development. In addition, there would be some expenditure for development planning covering other buildings such as the Hastings Building and a general area, architectural, archaeological and historical master plan. We have received no details on the project either as to scope or long-range cost. Furthermore, the appropriation represents only part of the cost with some being carried forward from prior appropriations. Perhaps by the time the project is reviewed by the legislative committees we will have received adequate information and details. Consequently, we recommend that the project be placed in the category of special review.

(b) *Additional construction and restoration—San Diego "Old Town"* ----- \$40,000

This represents the bond funds share of a total project that has been estimated at \$290,000. This was discussed under the General Fund

**Capital Outlay****Items 379-380****Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued**

project proposals wherein we pointed out the lack of information and the inadequacy of the estimate. *Consequently, we recommend that the proposal be placed in the category of special review.*

**UNALLOCATED****ITEM 379 of the Budget Bill**

Capital Outlay Budget page 222

**FOR PROJECT PLANNING TO BE ALLOCATED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE FROM THE STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$100,000
Recommended for approval -----	100,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION----- None****ANALYSIS**

There remains between \$9 million and \$10 million dollars available in the special park bond fund for initial development of projects acquired by the use of the bond funds. This item proposes to finance the preliminary planning for projects which will probably be presented to the Legislature in 1969. On the assumption that preliminary plans require about 1½ percent of the total project cost, the proposal would finance about \$7 million worth of projects. *We recommend approval.*

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****ITEM 380 of the Budget Bill****FOR REAPPROPRIATION OF DEVELOPMENT AND ACQUISITION FUNDS, DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, FROM THE STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL AND HISTORICAL FACILITIES FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount reappropriated -----	\$225,000
Recommended for approval -----	225,000

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item reappropriates funds for two projects originally financed in the 1967 Budget Act as follows:

(1) San Diego "Old Town" Development -----	\$100,000
(2) Drum Barracks land acquisition -----	125,000
Total -----	\$225,000

These projects should have been funded for three years in the 1967 Budget Act but through an oversight were funded for just one fiscal year. The item reappropriates the funds for these two projects, located in San Diego and Wilmington, for expenditure during the 1968-69 and 1969-70 fiscal years. *We recommend approval.*

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****ITEM 381 of the Budget Bill**

**FOR REAPPROPRIATION OF LAND ACQUISITION FUNDS,  
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, FROM THE  
STATE BEACH, PARK, RECREATIONAL AND HISTORICAL  
FACILITIES FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount reappropriated	\$32,214,000
Recommended for approval	32,214,000

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item reappropriates funds for land acquisition at nine different projects originally financed in the Budget Act of 1965 from the Recreation Bond Act of 1964. The funds were appropriated for three years and the appropriation authorization expires June 30, 1968. The projects are as follows:

- (1) Point Mugu
- (2) Delta Meadows
- (3) Camp Pendleton—San Onofre
- (4) Huntington State Beach Expansion
- (5) Marin Headlands
- (6) Pfeiffer-Big Sur Expansion
- (7) Malibu Lagoon State Beach
- (8) North Coast Redwoods—Gold Bluff Beach
- (9) Topanga Canyon

Some of these projects have been acquired. The purpose of this item is to reappropriate the undisbursed balances for the remaining acquisition projects.

*We recommend approval.*

## **Control Sections**

### **CONTROL SECTIONS**

Sections 4.5 through 36 appear in both the Assembly and Senate versions of the Budget Bill and are referred to as "control sections." They have been arranged and numbered, for the most part, to correspond with equivalent or generally similar sections in the prior budget act to simplify comparisons. This accounts for the gaps in the numbering where sections have been dropped for various reasons. Usually this is because the missing sections no longer apply.

#### **Section 4.5**

##### **RECOMMENDATION**

*We recommend approval.*

This section, which is similar to Section 4.5 in the Budget Act of 1967, provides that, subject to the provisions of this act and approval by the Director of Finance, obligations for expenditure during 1968-69 may be incurred prior to July 1, 1968, to be paid after June 30, 1968.

#### **Section 5**

##### **RECOMMENDATION**

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1961 first established a policy, which has since been continued each year, by which the Department of Finance is provided with authority to permit the placing of advance orders for equipment to be used in funded construction projects. Usually this entails the types of units which take very long lead time between order and delivery, generally highly complex and technical scientific equipment. The section authorizes the encumbrance of a maximum of \$1,500,000 to be expended sometime after July 1, 1969.

This will be the third time that the \$1,500,000 limitation has been allowed, since for the first five years it was only \$1 million. The higher allowance is based almost entirely on the fact that scientific equipment, particularly, has been rising very rapidly in cost so that today the larger sum probably buys no more pieces of equipment than the \$1 million did six or seven years ago.

#### **Section 6**

##### **RECOMMENDATION**

*We recommend approval.*

Section 1579 of the Government Code sets up the procedure which requires that all major capital outlay projects be approved by the State Public Works Board before any expenditures can be made. The Legislature has followed this policy for many years. This section continues that policy by reference to the Government Code.

#### **Section 7**

##### **RECOMMENDATION**

*We recommend approval.*

This section requires that all appropriations for the acquisition of land or other real property contained in the bill be subject to the provisions of the Property Acquisition Law. This also continues a long-