

## Capital Outlay

### CAPITAL OUTLAY

#### Summary

##### 1970 Program

The Budget Act of 1970 as approved by the Governor included a total of \$71,783,000 in new capital outlay appropriations for all purposes exclusive of the Highway Acquisition and Development Program, the Water Project Program and any programs based on continuing statutory appropriations. This total represented the lowest figure provided by the state since the war and immediate postwar construction restrictions. The state's major postwar effort in expanding its capital plant began about 22 years ago. The magnitude of the current amount is further diminished when inflationary factors are considered. From the summer of 1949 to the fall of 1970, the construction cost index has approximately tripled from 477 to 1,445. Putting it another way, the \$71,783,000 appropriation buys approximately the facilities that could have been purchased in the summer of 1949 with \$24 million.

The General Fund contributed a little less than 6½ percent to the 1970 total or about \$4,648,000. Special funds such as the Motor Vehicle Fund, the Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund, etc., contributed something less than 14 percent or approximately \$9,810,000. The major financing was from various bond funds totaling over \$57,324,000 or about 80 percent of the appropriation program.

Only \$859,515 was included from bond funds for projects in the Departments of Mental Hygiene, Corrections and Education. The bond appropriations with one exception exhausted virtually all remaining unappropriated bond authorizations. The exception was the bond program for the junior colleges which, after giving effect to the 1970 appropriations, had a remaining balance of approximately \$27 million which could be applied to junior college programs in the 1971 Budget Bill or spread into succeeding years at the will of the Legislature.

##### Higher Education

In the 1970 Act the three segments of higher education, the University of California, the state college system and the community college system received the major share of appropriations totaling over \$53,543,000 or almost 75 percent of all appropriations. These were almost entirely from bond funds with only \$1,800,000 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education which receives its revenues from oil royalties that would otherwise have accrued to the General Fund. The bond funds came from three authorization sources, the "State Higher Education Construction Program Bond Act of 1966," the "State Construction Bond Act Program" and the "Junior College Construction Program Bond Act of 1968." All of these separate bond authorizations are merged in the "State Construction Program Fund" so that actual appropriations are made from that fund but within that fund the separate authorizations are kept segregated for the special purposes delineated in the individual bond authorization acts.

A new source of financing higher education facilities entered the picture with the advent of the imposition of a student educational fee by the University. The Regents of the University elected to devote the

## Capital Outlay

resultant income to capital outlay purposes and the Legislature proposed to control the expenditure of this source by including Item 313.5 in the Budget Act which contained a schedule of 47 projects totaling \$14,745,000, with the understanding that the schedule represented a "shopping list" from which the University could pick and choose to the extent funds were actually forthcoming. At that time, it was estimated that only about \$8 million in cash would be realized from the fee. The schedule was in a priority order to assure that about \$5,800,000 would be devoted to health science facilities.

Subsequently, this item was superseded by the enactment of Chapter 1393 which included a schedule of 20 projects totaling \$13,489,000 and a section which declared that it was the intent of the Legislature that approximately \$3 million would be devoted to health science facilities. As of this writing, it appears that \$12 million will be available for capital expenditure. This appropriation is not included in the totals mentioned above.

### Expenditure Program

While the capital outlay appropriations in 1970 exclusive of the "Education Fee Fund," represented the lowest total in many years, it should be pointed out that the potential expenditure program was further depressed by very substantial reversions of prior year appropriations which in effect canceled projects previously approved by the Legislature. Section 11.1 reverted \$20,000,341, covering seven projects, to the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education which had the effect actually of reverting a like amount to the General Fund since the special fund was dependent upon the General Fund for most of its financing. Section 11.2 reverted to the State Construction Program Fund over \$8,690,000 which was appropriated in 1966 for the construction of a 480-bed medical-psychiatric institution in the Department of the Youth Authority but which had not moved ahead for various reasons. In addition, this section reverted a minor amount in connection with the community college program which represented a technical adjustment. There were a number of other reversions, most of them representing technical adjustments because of the advent of federal grants or scope reductions.

On December 10, 1970, memoranda were addressed by the Department of Finance to the office of the Chancellor of the State Colleges and to the office of the President of the University of California concerning "cancellation of uncommitted capital outlay projects." In each case it detailed projects which the administration proposed to halt and to revert the fund authorizations either by normal lapse on June 30, 1971 or in the proposed Budget Bill. In each case the memorandum closed with the request that if there were reasons to prevent these cancellations they should be indicated to the Department of Finance at once.

The state college list totalled in excess of \$14 million covering 24 projects plus an amount for a portion of the minor project appropriation made by the 1970 Budget Act. Seven of the projects were for construction based on previously funded working drawings and the balance was for working drawings for future projects.

## Capital Outlay

### Summary—Continued

The University's total was over \$19 million also covering 24 projects plus a portion of the minor funds appropriated by the 1970 Budget Act. However, in this instance, with the exception of four projects, all were for construction. The others were for equipment for projects previously funded for construction and/or working drawings.

The major effect was virtually to dry up the "pipeline" so that for practical purposes there would be a period of several years, particularly for the state colleges, when no construction program could move forward because of the lack of working drawings or funding. In the case of the University, the use of the "Education Fee Fund" does provide a limited program of working drawings, construction and equipment.

### Cost Inflation

For the last several years, we have been stressing in our analysis, the fact that the construction cost index has been increasing at a steepening rate greater than the general trend of the economy. For the calendar year 1970, the increase was 12 percent, the highest that has occurred since World War II. It should also be stressed that the construction cost index merely reveals increases in the out-of-pocket costs of labor and materials. It does not take into account labor productivity which has been worsening for the last several years so that the real cost escalation is actually greater than the figures would indicate.

In 1970, the cost index of common labor has increased by over 15 percent and that of skilled labor by almost 13½ percent. Fortunately, the index cost rise of 3 percent for construction materials has been significantly lower and has tended to offset the labor increases and hold down the construction cost index to 12 percent.

To the best of our knowledge, none of the usually reliable indicators hold out any hope that the 1971 calendar year will provide any relief in the rate of cost rise mentioned above. There will be no cost advantage in delaying the financing of projects for which there is a clear and acute need.

### 1971 Program

The 1971 Budget Bill now before the Legislature includes a total of \$109,695,960 from all fund sources for capital outlay proposals. This figure requires explanation. It provides little state program construction. The total includes \$1,737,000 for major projects from the General Fund, \$14,222,602 from the conventional special funds, \$54,777,891 from bond funds, \$34,738,300 from student fee funds and \$4,220,167 for minor projects from several fund sources.

The bond funds include \$16 million which provides no new capital outlay since it represents a payback to the General Fund of part of the "X" factor money that was appropriated to community colleges by Chapter 784, Statutes of 1969 (AB 606). Of the remainder of the bond fund appropriations, \$10,510,959 is for new community college construction and equipment and the balance for recreational or recreationally related projects.

The student educational fee funds represent, in part, activities with which the state has normally not concerned itself in the past. Over \$12

## Capital Outlay

million is for student health facilities at state colleges based on a special fee that was authorized to be levied for that purpose. The balance represents academic construction on University campuses which normally would qualify for full state funding. The minor construction for the University is from the same source.

The total includes, as it has in previous years, minor construction projects but with a significant difference. For the first time minor projects are now included in the support budget for each agency whether supported from the General Fund or special funds.

The total appropriation program in the Budget Bill, mentioned above, represents only a small part of the total expenditures for capital outlay proposed by the Governor's Budget document since the major portion of annual capital expenditures has been for programs based on continuing appropriations such as the State Highway Construction Program and the Water Project Program. These two alone will probably account for over \$500 million in state funds. In addition, there are very large amounts of federal funds added to the highway construction program.

In any case, the total appropriations proposed represent, by far, the smallest investment made by the state in its physical plant in many years. As previously pointed out, the program value is actually even smaller in terms of the facilities it will buy as compared with 1949. For the budget year projects are being estimated on the basis of a construction cost index of 1550 on July 1 of this year, an increase of almost 15 percent over the construction cost index of 1350 used for the budget submitted to the Legislature at the 1970 session.

The state colleges receive no investment in academic facilities, and the University obtains capital investment only from student fees. In the case of the state colleges, with the exception of those projects that are actually under construction or for which funds have been legally committed, the effect is a total moratorium on construction and equipment as well as working drawings for future academic development. Only the University of California will be enabled to go forward at a drastically reduced rate. This includes only \$21.8 million for academic related utilities, equipment and construction in the general campuses and health sciences. Even here the University will not be able to develop its health sciences facilities at the rate necessary to meet planned enrollment goals without additional financing beyond that which can be made available from the student educational fee. In view of the projected growth of population in the state, we believe it is appropriate to set forth for legislative consideration an investment program for the two segments which represents a minimum accommodation to well defined needs.

### Community Colleges

The single most significant investment proposal contained in this Budget Bill for higher education would provide \$10,510,959 from bond funds for a program of construction assistance for the state's community college system. It represents the full state's share by statute formula of each project set forth in the schedule and in the Governor's Budget. If the list of projects originally proposed by the community college system were to receive the full state's share in accordance with

## Capital Outlay

### Summary—Continued

the established formula, the state's total would be approximately \$43,450,000.

The total of bond funds available for community colleges is approximately \$27 million which would not be quite enough to meet the full state share of the program originally proposed. However, almost all of the remaining balance after making the appropriation mentioned above would be transferred to the General Fund. We have reservations concerning the propriety and desirability of this proposal in relation to legislative intent when General Fund moneys were made available by Chapter 784 Statutes of 1969, (AB 606). In any case, it should be pointed out that if the state is unable to meet its own obligations at the state college and University level, it will result in diverting more students away from state facilities and into local community facilities, and the local burden will increase both as to facility needs and operational costs. We suggest that this problem needs careful study and review, including a comprehensive examination of future enrollments at both undergraduate and graduate levels.

### Other Agencies

As previously noted, the plant expansion or improvement programs for agencies normally relying upon the General Fund for financing is reduced to \$1,737,000 (plus \$1,308,167 for minors). Only three agencies will have a plant expansion and/or replacement program of any significance. From special funds, however, both the California Highway Patrol and the Department of Motor Vehicles will receive appropriations totaling in excess of \$13 million for major facilities. In the case of the Highway Patrol, a substantial part covers the balance of construction of a new training academy on a new site to replace the existing one which is inadequate both as to facilities and size and shape of its land base. Furthermore, its location, in which it is virtually surrounded by residential facilities, makes it a hazardous and unpleasant neighbor. The new academy will receive substantial federal aid in construction cost and site purchase. In addition, the Highway Patrol will be purchasing sites and starting construction of area and zone office facilities.

In the case of the Department of Motor Vehicles, the proposals largely consist of purchase of sites for new offices and construction of new facilities on sites already owned or authorized. In both cases these investments will be from the Motor Vehicle Fund.

The Department of Parks and Recreation enjoys the largest total of appropriation proposals for capital outlay of any agency in the Budget Bill. These are from four sources and total \$27,558,112, consisting of \$100,000 from the General Fund, \$18,354,844 from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund (bonds), \$8,643,268 from the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Fund (bonds) and \$460,000 from the Special Deposit Fund. The latter represents federal funds received as matching for expenditures from the 1964 Park Bond Fund and deposited in the special fund for expenditure only upon legislative appropriation. In addition to these, there will be an allocation of \$2,105,500 from the Clean Water Bond Fund which does not appear in the total for the Department of Parks and

## Capital Outlay

Recreation but instead is included in the Water Resources Control Board Subvention Program. The bulk of the total program represents developmental construction and working drawings. The balance is for land acquisition and advance planning. It should be noted that the total appropriation for this agency represents a net figure since there will be available over \$5 million in federal reimbursements for land acquisition in addition to the amount mentioned.

The only other agency construction program worthy of mention is the Department of Fish and Game which is proposed to have an appropriation of \$410,000 for major projects and \$201,000 for minor projects from the Fish and Game Preservation Fund.

### Environmental Quality

The Legislature at its 1970 session enacted Chapter 1433 known as the "Environmental Quality Act of 1970." This legislation added Division 13 to the Public Resources Code, commencing with Section 21000. With respect to capital outlay projects, the most significant section in the act is 21100 which requires that all state agencies, boards and commissions shall include in any report on any project they propose to carry out which would have a significant effect on the environment of the state, a detailed statement by the responsible state official setting forth certain data reflecting the environmental impact of the proposed action. In short, some form of report or study indicating the possible effects of every proposed project on the environment is required to be furnished before appropriations are requested or expended for such projects.

To the best of our knowledge none of the projects proposed in this budget are accompanied by such studies or statements. In part, this failure probably stems from the lack of adequate funds to make such studies and determinations. In any case, we bring this omission to the attention of the Legislature.

### HIGHER EDUCATION

Earlier in this capital outlay summary, it was indicated that we would offer a minimum program of capital investment and facility expansion in the state colleges and University of California. In the case of the state colleges, the proposal represents a program where none is now included in the budget and in the case of the University, the proposal represents an augmentation, from state fund sources, of the proposals contained in the budget to be financed from the students Educational Fee Fund. It should be emphasized that the proposed program represents, in our opinion, only the most pressing needs, to permit continued expansion in enrollment with no significant impairment in the quality of the academic programs insofar as this is affected by the physical facilities on a campus.

#### Summary of Recommended Augmentation

	New appropriations	Reappropriations	Rejected reversions
State Colleges -----	\$17,855,000	\$1,382,746	\$7,414,000
University -----	\$12,680,000		

## Capital Outlay

### Summary—Continued State Colleges

The 1971-72 capital outlay program for the state colleges, adopted by the board of trustees in September 1970, proposed a \$168 million state funded program along with a \$39 million program utilizing non-state funds. However, as previously indicated, the Governor's Budget does not provide state funds to support a capital outlay program for the state colleges. Instead, the Budget Bill proposes to revert 10 previously funded projects totaling \$8,209,545 plus lapsing an additional 14 projects totaling \$2,890,747. Funds for the latter projects have been frozen by executive order and unless reappropriated will revert automatically on July 1, 1971.

The Governor's Budget indicates that application of increased utilization standards for classrooms, in response to Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 151, increases the capacity of existing and funded state college facilities to 236,955 full time equivalent (F.T.E.) students which will accommodate projected enrollments through 1973-74. However, our analysis of campus capacities and enrollment projections indicates an available systemwide capacity of 215,562 F.T.E. students. The 21,393 differential represents the capacity of new facilities that will be completed during the budget year but will not be available due to the lack of funds for required equipment and essential utility service. Thus, the actual available systemwide capacity will not even accommodate the total enrollment projected for 1972-73. However, in our opinion a comparison of systemwide capacities and enrollments presumes a situation that does not exist. Our analysis of individual capacities and enrollments revealed excess capacities as well as deficiencies within the state college system. In addition, the magnitude of the problem varies from campus to campus, with some campuses experiencing critical space shortages while others appear overbuilt. The budget reference to capacities also fails to account for the adequacy of noninstructional service space such as libraries, faculty offices and administration.

### Lecture and Laboratory Deficiencies

Table 1 indicates the actual capacities on each campus in terms of laboratory and lecture space.

We believe the presence of campuses with excess lecture capacity demonstrates the effect of increasing the utilization standards. However it should be pointed out that in spite of this increase, 11 of the 19 state college campuses show a deficiency in classroom space by 1972-73. Increased utilization standards have not been applied to laboratories and as a result 16 campuses will be deficient in lab space by 1972-73. Steps are currently being taken to adopt a standard similar to that applied to classrooms. However, our analysis indicates that this approach would not correct the most serious deficiencies and it will not be accomplished immediately or easily.

### Library Deficiencies

Table 2 illustrates the severe strain enrollment projections place on the capacities of existing campus libraries.

**Table 1**  
**Projected FTE (8-10) Capacity Needs**  
**Compared to Available**

		<i>Lecture</i>			<i>Laboratory</i>			
		1972-73	1973-74	1974-75	Available <sup>1</sup>	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75
<i>State college</i>	<i>Available<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Need</i>	<i>Need</i>	<i>Need</i>		<i>Need</i>	<i>Need</i>	<i>Need</i>
Bakersfield -----	1,104	1,353	1,704	2,030	161	189	237	283
Chico -----	11,962	8,945	9,917	10,636	790	1,412	1,566	1,687
Dominguez -----	1,889	3,175	3,416	4,276	192	442	476	596
Fresno -----	10,746	11,547	12,627	13,739	865	2,048	2,239	2,436
Fullerton -----	10,778	10,470	11,390	12,309	992	1,155	1,256	1,358
Hayward -----	7,806	10,107	11,278	12,677	454	919	1,026	1,153
Humboldt -----	6,132	4,666	4,957	5,492	1,117	1,000	1,062	1,177
Long Beach -----	15,555	17,224	18,150	19,000	1,212	2,478	2,611	2,734
Los Angeles -----	17,237	14,051	14,891	15,766	1,510	1,419	1,504	1,593
Sacramento -----	12,274	12,908	14,086	15,280	991	1,265	1,380	1,497
San Bernardino -----	3,875	2,748	3,224	3,783	190	383	494	527
San Diego -----	21,236	16,782	17,789	18,679	1,385	2,251	2,386	2,505
San Fernando -----	16,152	17,902	19,519	20,883	1,049	1,939	2,114	2,262
San Francisco -----	12,661	11,070	11,381	11,707	1,826	1,836	1,888	1,942
San Jose -----	22,881	15,770	16,071	17,276	3,154	1,779	1,813	1,949
Sonoma -----	4,073	3,615	4,582	6,517	323	529	641	753
Stanislaus -----	2,970	2,773	3,249	3,733	146	386	453	520
Kellogg-Voorhis -----	7,200	7,764	8,500	9,235	1,114	1,139	1,256	1,354
San Luis Obispo -----	10,182	10,438	11,185	11,924	1,468	2,436	2,610	2,782
<b>Total</b> -----	<b>196,623</b>	<b>183,297</b>	<b>197,915</b>	<b>214,992</b>	<b>18,939</b>	<b>25,005</b>	<b>26,957</b>	<b>29,108</b>

<sup>1</sup> Available capacity based on 1971-72 Governor's Budget.

Capital Outlay



## Capital Outlay

### Summary—Continued

**Table 2**  
**FTE Capacity of Campus Libraries Compared to**  
**FTE (8-10) Enrollment Projections**  
**Showing Major Deficiencies**

<i>State college</i>	<i>Design capacity<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>1971-72 Projected enrollment</i>	<i>Coverage<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>1975-76 Projected enrollment</i>	<i>Coverage<sup>1</sup></i>
Bakersfield -----	1,250	1,230	--	2,820	--
Chico -----	3,000	10,130	29.6%	13,920	21.5%
Dominguez -----	8,000	2,570	--	5,650	--
Fresno -----	5,500	13,400	41.0	13,490	29.7
Fullerton -----	10,000	10,970	--	15,180	--
Hayward -----	12,800	9,990	--	15,610	--
Humboldt -----	3,500	5,350	--	7,350	--
Long Beach -----	15,530	19,790	--	23,630	--
Los Angeles -----	16,800	15,370	--	19,360	--
Sacramento -----	5,000	13,360	37.4	19,150	26.1
San Bernardino-----	8,500	2,650	--	4,990	--
San Diego -----	20,000	18,720	--	23,170	--
San Fernando-----	17,740	18,670	--	25,370	--
San Francisco-----	16,000	13,120	--	15,090	--
San Jose -----	8,500	18,330	46.3	21,150	40.1
Sonoma -----	3,500	4,260	--	8,810	39.7
Stanislaus -----	2,000	2,750	--	5,040	39.6
Kellogg-Voorhis --	8,000	8,120	--	11,590	--
San Luis Obispo--	6,000	12,310	48.7	16,170	37.1

<sup>1</sup> Design capacity as a percentage of projected enrollment where enrollment exceeds capacity and identifying only the older campuses with the most critical deficiencies.

<sup>2</sup> Italicizing identifies facilities with interim use of excess space to satisfy instructional capacity needs.

Library capacity standards are currently based on 40 volumes per F.T.E. student with reader stations for 25 percent of the campus enrollment. We have reservations regarding the adequacy of these standards because they are applied systemwide and as such may not reflect the actual needs of a particular campus. However, we believe that some of the campuses have library facilities that are so grossly inadequate in terms of capacity as well as functional layout that they would not benefit appreciably by a change in the standards. In light of the trend towards increased utilization of classrooms and laboratories, we believe there is need for a thorough reevaluation of library standards and practices. For instance, consideration could be given to utilizing excess available classroom space for reader study stations and thereby permit more economical expansion of stack space.

#### Faculty Office Deficiencies

A comparison of faculty station capacity on each campus with the need based on enrollment projections revealed deficiencies on 15 campuses by 1972-73. It should be noted that 20 percent of the total 13,506 faculty stations available are provided in temporary and leased facilities. Temporary facilities include old houses and buildings which will eventually be razed as part of the long-range plan for the campus.

#### Proposed Capital Outlay Program

We believe there is demonstrated need for a state supported capital outlay program for the state colleges in 1971-72. Our analysis indicates that the lack of a capital outlay program could force curtailment of

## Capital Outlay

enrollment or reduction in the quality of the educational process or both. Consequently, we are proposing a minimum program to improve what we consider to be the most serious deficiencies.

The program would require a Budget Bill augmentation of \$17,355,000 for new projects, reappropriation of \$1,382,746 in previously funded projects and rejection of \$7,414,000 in proposed reversions in Section 11.2. We are also recommending the addition of \$150,000 in planning funds to provide for relatively simple and uncomplicated projects such as site development and utility extensions as well as for campus master planning to insure effective long-range planning at a time when it is most needed. To fund our recommendation will require a total budget augmentation of \$26,151,746 for the state college system.

The new projects we are proposing include \$5,317,000 for equipment and utilities, \$11,242,000 for construction and \$796,000 for working drawings. Our equipment proposal is limited to those facilities coming on the line which require the initial complement of items in order to operate. Otherwise, these new facilities will stand idle. Utility projects were selected if essential to the operation of new buildings or to the operation of the campus. Table 3 outlines the equipment and utility projects proposed.

**Table 3**  
**Proposed Equipment and Utility Projects for 1971-72**  
*F.T.E. Capacity Impact*

	Lecture	Laboratory	Faculty Office Stations	Amount
<i>State college</i>				
Bakersfield				
Construct central plant II }-----	419	85	6	{ \$546,000
Construct utilities 1971 }-----				{ 156,000
Chico				
Equip life science building, phase I ---	--	296	103	400,000
Equip applied arts unit II, phase I ---	--	156	30	300,000
Equip physical science addition ----	--	72	11	500,000
Dominguez				
Equip library-classroom-administra- tion -----	350	145	91	220,000
Equip social science building -----	1,785	179	114	220,000
Equip central plant -----	--	--	--	8,000
Hayward				
Equip library building -----	776	48	34	500,000
Equip speech-drama building -----	443	86	26	300,000
Equip administration building -----	1,552	--	15	265,000
Long Beach				
Construct utilities 1971 -----	2,274	351	153	522,000
San Diego				
Construct utilities 1971 -----	--	--	--	58,000
Sonoma				
Construct utilities 1971 -----	--	--	--	146,000
Stanislaus				
Construct utilities 1971 -----	471	128	28	914,000
Kellogg-Voorhis				
Construct utilities 1971 -----	--	--	--	162,000
Subtotal				
Equipment -----	--	--	--	\$2,713,000
Utilities -----	--	--	--	2,604,000
Total -----	8,070	1,546	616	\$5,317,000

## Capital Outlay

### Summary—Continued

It should be pointed out that we are not proposing to equip all of the buildings that are scheduled for completion during the budget year. Our review of campus capacity needs in 1972-73 compared to actual and potential capacity indicated that some of the buildings scheduled for completion do not provide critically needed capacity space. In fact, it would appear that some of the facilities could remain closed beyond 1972-73 without subjecting the campus involved to any hardship. This situation is most common where lecture space is involved and probably is due to increased utilization standards. On the other hand, most of the laboratory space and all of faculty offices are needed. In any case, we felt the equipment funds for some of the projects could be deferred. Statistically, this means that an additional 10,817 F.T.E. lecture capacity, 1,000 F.T.E. lab capacity as well as 486 faculty office stations will not be available until 1973-74, provided equipment funds are forthcoming in 1972-73.

**Table 4**  
**Proposed Construction and Working Drawing**  
**Projects for 1971-72**

State college	Project	F.T.E. Capacity			Amount
		Lecture	Laboratory	Faculty office stations	
Fresno	Construct Industrial Art Building -----	153	--	20	\$2,695,000
	Working Drawings—Library III -----	--	--	--	525,000
Chico Sonoma	Construct Library -----	50	20	10	8,547,000
	Working Drawings Classroom—Office Building -----	1,024	35	102	75,000
Hayward	Working Drawings Classroom Building -----	1,000	--	432	196,000
	No. 2 -----	2,227	55	564	\$12,038,000
Total					

**Table 5**  
**Currently Funded Projects Facing Cancellation <sup>1</sup>**  
**F.T.E. Capacity**

State college	Project	F.T.E. Capacity			Amount
		Lecture	Laboratory	Faculty office stations	
Fresno	Construct Engineering Building -----	70	56	11	\$1,051,746
	Working Drawings Business Classroom--	3,505	205	281	179,000
Long Beach	Construct Classroom Office Building -----	3,861	--	198	1,555,000
	Construct Library -----	187	--	--	5,680,000
Sacramento	Working Drawings Education Building--	2,627	134	170	138,000
San Fernando	Working Drawings Engineering Complex	913	180	45	193,000
San Luis Obispo					
Total		11,163	575	705	\$8,796,746

<sup>1</sup> Reversion by Section 11.2 or automatic lapse.

## Capital Outlay

Table 4 outlines the construction and working drawing projects proposed. This program, coupled with the currently funded projects identified in Table 5, will provide what we believe are critical instructional and library needs. We anticipate that these facilities will come on the line in 1974-75, or in the case of libraries in 1975-76. However, the working drawing projects will require budgeting \$33.3 million for construction in the 1972-73 budget. Our proposal is based on the instructional deficiencies identified in Table 6 and the library situation illustrated in Table 2 on page 1036. It is important to note that the administration plans to cancel the projects identified in Table 5 through failure to reappropriate in Section 10 or by reversion in Section 11.2.

In addition to the new projects proposed, we recommend that \$150,000 be allocated to the Trustees for project planning and master planning, to be administered on the basis of need. We estimate that \$75,000 should be sufficient to accommodate project planning needs for the 1972-73 fiscal year, anticipating that some of the projects proposed will have benefited from previous planning efforts. We recommend that the remaining \$75,000 be utilized for campus master planning on those campuses with critical space deficiencies and which should experience the greatest amount of construction activity in the immediate future.

It should be reemphasized that the capital outlay program we propose represents only the most critical capacity needs and does not take into account other high priority and desirable needs. We have concentrated our efforts in this direction and consequently suggest deferral of what may be considered critical noncapacity deficiencies. This primarily includes utilities and site development projects which do not have a direct impact on capacities such as improvements in the campus roadway network or completion of utility loops.

To some extent it is difficult to develop a program where one does not exist and accommodate all of the critical needs. In the case of the state colleges, this situation is aggravated by the cancellation of previously funded projects, and the application of increased utilization standards without taking time to reevaluate and replan an entire capital outlay program. Consequently, many of the projects that are in the planning stages do not provide capacity in the areas where we believe the greatest need exists. For example, examination of the space deficiencies on Table 6, page 1040, indicates a shortage of laboratory space. Yet, there are few projects proposed that come to grips with this problem. Instead of planning facilities to correct deficiencies in faculty office space, the state colleges have been forced to turn to leasing relocatable facilities as the most expeditious solution to a problem. In the long run, this could be a more expensive solution than constructing permanent facilities.

The program we propose does not purport to reconcile all these deficiencies. Rather, it reflects an attempt to satisfy the most urgent needs based on the information currently available.

Table 6  
FTE (8-10) Capacity Needs in 1974-75  
Compared to Available<sup>1</sup>

	Lecture			Lab		
	Available 1974-75	1974-75 Projected	Deficiency (Excess)	Available 1974-75	1974-75 Projected	Deficiency (Excess)
<i>State college</i>						
Bakersfield	1,433	2,030	597	246	283	37
Chico	13,523	10,686	(2,837)	1,314	1,687	373
Dominguez	4,403	4,276	(127)	707	596	(111)
Fresno	10,746	13,739	2,993	865	2,436	1,571
Fullerton	11,568	12,309	741	1,001	1,353	357
Hayward	10,577	12,677	2,100	588	1,153	565
Humboldt	6,578	5,492	(1,086)	1,205	1,177	(28)
Long Beach	17,829	19,000	1,171	1,563	2,734	1,171
Los Angeles	18,053	15,766	(2,287)	1,787	1,593	(194)
Sacramento	14,299	15,280	981	1,048	1,497	449
San Bernardino	3,875	3,783	(92)	190	527	337
San Diego	21,236	18,679	(2,557)	1,385	2,505	1,120
San Fernando	16,152	20,883	4,731	1,049	2,262	1,213
San Francisco	15,432	11,707	(3,725)	2,159	1,942	(217)
San Jose	23,524	17,276	(6,248)	3,375	1,949	(1,426)
Sonoma	4,073	6,517	2,444	323	753	430
Stanislaus	3,441	3,733	292	274	520	246
Kellogg-Voorhis	8,945	9,235	290	1,129	1,354	225
San Luis Obispo	10,182	11,924	1,742	1,468	2,782	1,314
Total	215,849	214,992	18,082 (18,867)	19,078	29,108	9,400 (1,976)

<sup>1</sup> Capacity based upon utilization of all currently funded construction projects including those requiring equipment and utility funding in 1971-72 and 1972-73.

University of California

The University has budgeted \$21,886,000 in Item 299 from student fees for major construction, equipment and working drawings. It is comprised of \$8,363,000 for health science facilities and \$13,523,000 for general campus academic facilities. However, in our recommendations, on that item, we made some changes in projects and applications of the funds but no change in the total amount.

The following is a suggested list of University projects, which are in addition to those in Item 299, which we consider necessary for construction as soon as additional state funds are available. These projects would require an additional \$12,393,000 beyond the amount proposed from the Educational Fee Fund. The total University funding would then be \$34,279,000. The additional working drawings included would also increase the projected 1972-73 construction funding from \$23,834,000 to \$29,219,000, an increase of \$5,385,000. They illustrate the character of projects left unfunded and justify funding at the earliest date possible.

(a) Construct—administration unit 1, Irvine----- \$2,585,000

This project was funded by the Budget Act of 1969, Item 377(k). The Budget Bill for 1971-72 under Section 11.1 indicates reversion of this appropriation.

Although this building has no direct effect on student capacity, the University estimates that by 1973 approximately 400 F.T.E. student capacity will have to be temporarily assigned to administrative purposes. The administration is currently housed in a portion of the campus library. This project will provide 60,000 new assignable square feet for administrative purposes and will allow the library to increase its volume capacity by 115,000 and its study stations by 383.

(b) Construct—Webber Hall addition, Riverside----- \$6,443,000

This project will provide a building rated at 329 F.T.E. students, principally in biochemistry and computer sciences. It will provide 3,611 A.S.F. (assignable square feet) in class seminar rooms, 3,600 A.S.F. in class laboratories and 64,665 A.S.F. in graduate and academic staff office and research space. The addition will reduce the deficiencies in class seminar rooms and undergraduate class labs, and will eliminate the deficiencies in graduate and academic staff labs and office space.

(c) Working drawings—social science unit 2, Riverside--- \$248,000

This building, at its current scope, will provide a total of 68,455 assignable square feet for use by five separate disciplines and would satisfy the 1974-75 campus deficiencies in class seminar rooms, class laboratories and graduate and academic office and research space by 97 percent, 71 percent and 59 percent respectively. However, with the funding of the Webber Hall addition, the space needs for graduate and academic staff lab and office would be less than the actual A.S.F. space on this category on campus. Hence, the program for the social science unit 2 should be rescoped to provide the needed space in the space categories which will be deficient after construction of Webber Hall addition.

## Capital Outlay

### Summary—Continued

#### *(d) Construct—utilities and site development, Davis----- \$543,000*

This project would be in augmentation of Item 299(g) as proposed in the Budget Bill and making a total project amount of \$680,000. We would recommend funding of alternate 12-KV electrical feeders to biological sciences unit 3 and unit 4 and to physics unit 1 and the chemistry addition.

These electrical feeders are necessary to assure electrical service to these facilities. At the present time, only one electrical feeder supplies the facility. If this feeder were to be damaged or fail for any reason, the electrical service to these buildings would be out for a period of two to five days. This electrical shutdown could cause not only the loss of valuable research projects but also make the building inoperable. The installation of the secondary circuit would permit switching, in case of failure, within one-half hour and the continued use of the facilities.

We would also support the expansion of a sanitary treatment facility and the development of roads and bicycle paths and an undercrossing at a state route. The construction of the roads and bicycle paths and undercrossings will provide for correction of existing hazardous conditions due to interaction of bicycle, pedestrian and automobile traffic.

#### *(e) Construct—utilities and site development, Irvine---- \$273,000*

The amount shown for this project is in augmentation of Item 299(o), for a total project of \$335,300. It will fund improvements in the campus road system to provide safe traffic and pedestrian flow.

The University in 1963 entered into an agreement with the Irvine Company to participate in the cost of widening the campus drive whenever the existing roadway could not safely and adequately carry the increased traffic volume. The average traffic volume has reached this point and the Irvine Company has scheduled to participate in the cost in the 1971-72 fiscal year. This portion of the project accounts for approximately \$250,000 of the total project cost. The remainder of the project will provide for additional road work and the installation of a traffic signal to correct hazardous conditions.

#### *(f) Construct—utilities and site development, Irvine*

##### *School of Medicine ----- \$254,000*

The amount shown for this project is in augmentation of the amount in Item 299(jj), for a total project of \$404,000. It would provide a pedestrian and vehicular access structure over a major campus roadway system, and also provide working drawings funds only for the extension of the utility tunnel structure and tunnel utilities, storm drainage and offsite grounds improvement in preparation for medical science unit 1.

The access structure is necessary to provide a direct link from the general campus to the medical surge facilities. This structure will be by necessity a grade separation structure. It is impractical to consider an ongrade crossing at the location because of a 40-foot grade differential and the need to cross over an existing roadway. The working drawings funds are for the utility tunnel and utility distribution which

## Capital Outlay

will serve the medical science unit 1. Working drawings are desirable at this time due to the complexity of the project, the long construction time and the long lead time required for high-voltage electrical equipment.

(g) *Construct—utilities system expansion, central campus,  
Step 1, Los Angeles*----- \$452,000

This project is in addition to the projects listed in Item 299. It consists of the installation of new underground ducts for power and signal lines and the installation of new feeder lines and high-voltage switchgear to provide better load distribution.

At the present time, the existing electrical feeders, on an average, are at approximately 20 percent over their normal capacity. In addition to this, the high ambient temperature in the utility tunnel greatly reduces the current-carrying capacity of the feeders. New high-voltage cables and the underground ducts would allow a more equitable loading of the cables by placing them in a lower ambient temperature as well as providing the ability to transfer loads between the various feeders. The existing feeders also serve the university hospital and under the existing conditions an electrical outage could occur at any time, which could cause an extreme hazard condition in the hospital. Hence, we feel this project is justifiable and should be funded at an early date.

(h) *Construct—utilities and site development, San Diego*— \$168,000

The funds indicated for this project would augment Item 299(u), for a total of \$214,800. It includes one element for soil erosion control and four elements for campus road improvements. The soil erosion control, which has been deferred for two years, will provide extremely important soil conservation for approximately 80,000 square feet of unimproved land. This land is along both sides and in the median strip of existing campus roads. Continual deferment of this project could cause serious erosion problems which would necessitate a much more extensive project.

The remaining campus road projects will eliminate serious hazard conditions which now exist due to concurrent pedestrian and motorized traffic. The projects include widening of existing roads, providing street lighting and the installation of signalization at an intersection. The installation of a campus loop road to serve the soon to be completed Veterans Administration hospital accounts for approximately \$103,000 of this project.

(i) *Construct—utilities and site development—  
San Diego School of Medicine*----- \$84,000

This project would provide for the extension of water lines, sewers, and storm drains and the construction of a service road and a pedestrian bridge to serve the clinical sciences building. The funding of this project at this time would provide a safe lead time in order to assure the occupancy of the clinical science building upon completion of that facility.



## Capital Outlay

### Summary—Continued

#### (j) Construct—access road (Step 2), San Diego

Medical School ----- \$184,000

This project would provide access to the University Hospital of San Diego County from the frontage road at Interstate Highway 8. Currently, the only access road to this hospital is on a surface street which enters from the south to and through a very congested residential area. The existing surface street is subjected to severe traffic congestion during rush hours which can cause considerable delay to emergency vehicles as well as service vehicles and hospital personnel. We consider this an urgent project and one which should be completed at the earliest possible time.

#### (k) Construct—utilities and site development,

Santa Barbara ----- \$217,000

In 1970 the University entered into an agreement with the County of Santa Barbara to participate in improvements to three roads in areas where they front University property. The University's share of the project was partially funded under the Budget Act of 1970-71, and \$84,000 of this suggested item would enable the project to be completed according to the agreement.

The remainder of the project would provide for a necessary separation of pedestrian and motor traffic, and also provide for soil erosion control. These improvements are proposed in areas of extremely high pedestrian, cyclist and motor vehicle traffic. The completion of this program will eliminate or decrease these hazardous conditions.

#### (l) Construct—utilities and site development,

Riverside, \$42,000 ----- (\$795,000)

This project would augment Item 299(q) for a new total of \$795,000. However, in our recommendations on Item 299, we eliminated this project in favor of using the funds for more health science facilities. Therefore if this proposal is accepted, it would represent an overall addition of \$795,000.

Approximately 81 percent of the cost of this project is directly related to the Webber Hall addition. Hence, if the addition were to be funded, approximately \$644,000 of this project would be needed in order to accommodate the addition. The remainder of the project would be to provide pedestrian walkways, walk lighting and soil erosion control. At the present time, pedestrians in some areas of the campus must walk on roads used by vehicles and in unlighted areas due to the absence of lighted walkways. The walkways would eliminate this hazardous condition in the more heavily traveled areas. The soil erosion control will be provided along both sides of the existing perimeter road. The sections of the perimeter road requiring this control were completed in 1962 and 1963. Funds for the necessary control were not provided as part of the original construction budget. It is our understanding that erosion is becoming quite serious in these areas and damage to the road could occur if the situation is not corrected soon.

#### (m) Construct—utilities and site development,

Santa Cruz ----- \$147,000

This project would augment Item 299(z) for a total project of \$397,000.

## Capital Outlay

As originally submitted by the University, it reflected a total project cost of \$718,000. The scope of the current project represents a deferral, on a timing basis, of the extension of utilities and road access to College 7. The remaining projects to be funded by the \$397,000 are part of an overall plan for utility and site development and continued extension of roads and utilities for buildings currently under construction. This project would provide for an orderly expansion of utilities, roads, pedestrian paths, lighting and erosion control. We feel this project is necessary and we would recommend approval.

### Space Utilization

The problem of more intense utilization of existing academic and auxiliary space and space under construction or to be constructed from authorized funds, has been discussed for a number of years at considerable length. The Legislature has established a new basis for the utilization of lecture space, but no really significant efforts have yet been made in the direction of the more intensive utilization of laboratory space, particularly those spaces concerned with the so-called "hard" sciences such as chemistry, physics, biology, etc. In this area there are physical barriers to better utilization that do not exist with respect to lecture spaces.

In referring to laboratory spaces, we intend principally the so-called class laboratories since graduate and research laboratories are self limiting as to utilization because each such station is assigned to a single individual or a team of individuals on a permanent basis and the station cannot be shared in any practical way. On the other hand, class laboratories, in many cases, are designed with stations which include locker space in which individual students store assigned equipment or equipment which is purchased by them for their work in that

Table 1  
California State Colleges Station Utilization, 1969

State colleges	Lecture	Lab	
		Lower division	Upper division
Chico	26.5 <sup>1</sup>	23.2 <sup>2</sup>	20.2 <sup>3</sup>
Dominguez	16.9	6.3	8.6
Fresno	30.2	28.5	24.0
Fullerton	32.1	12.0	17.1
Hayward	29.2	19.7	20.3
Humboldt	24.9	22.1	24.9
Long Beach	35.1	22.9	24.8
Los Angeles	33.4	20.4	20.5
Sacramento	29.9	15.9	16.0
San Bernardino	20.7	10.0	4.8
San Diego	30.4	22.5	21.8
San Fernando	27.2	18.9	15.1
San Francisco	27.4	20.1	21.4
San Jose	25.3	22.9	18.1
Sonoma	20.8	14.3	20.7
Stanislaus	26.7	15.7	26.0
Kellogg-Voorhis	26.8	16.4	19.5
San Luis Obispo	29.6	23.5	18.2

<sup>1</sup> C.C.H.E. (8-5) classroom utilization standard 22.4, legislative (8-10) classroom utilization standard 35.0.

<sup>2</sup> C.C.H.E. (8-5) lower division class lab utilization standard 21.3.

<sup>3</sup> C.C.H.E. (8-5) upper division class lab utilization standard 16.0.

## Summary—Continued

particular laboratory. The availability of such locker space is the physical barrier to increasing the utilization of each such station. We propose, as time becomes available to us later during the session and during the interim, to make an intensive study of selected campuses and selected class laboratory facilities on those campuses to find some economical solutions which would permit more effective utilization of such class laboratory stations. Almost inevitably, some costs would be involved in almost any solution that would permit additional students to use the same station. Minimizing such costs would be the goal which we intend to pursue by a team effort from our own staff.

Following is a table indicating space utilization achieved in 1969 by the California state college system. It will be noted that in only one instance, with respect to lecture space, has the legislative standard of 35 hours been achieved (Long Beach). University statistics are generally poorer.

## UNALLOCATED

Item 295 from the Harbors and  
Watercraft Revolving Fund

Budget p. 62

Requested 1971-72	\$10,000
Recommended for approval	10,000

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

This item provides funds from the Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund for preliminary plans and specifications to be used as supporting data in requests for working drawings or construction appropriations in succeeding budgets. The Department of Finance allocates these funds. The projects generally include boating facilities as part of a general recreation development project.

## CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Item 296 from the  
Motor Vehicle Fund

Vol. II p. 117 Budget p. 109

Requested 1971-72	\$9,336,802
Recommended for approval	9,123,852
Recommended reduction	212,950

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS

	Amount	Analysis page
(h) Construct five resident post facilities, Baker	\$108,750	1048
(i) Construct two resident post facilities, Mt. Reba	45,500	1048
(j) Construct two resident post facilities, Peddler Hill	45,500	1048
(k) Purchase communication equipment	3,200	1049
(l) Construction program planning	10,000	1049

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The amount requested is to finance 12 projects which provide for land acquisition, construction, purchase of lease facilities, communication equipment purchases and construction program planning.

(a) Construct—new academy (Phase II) ----- \$8,350,837

*We recommend approval.*

The amount requested for this item is the total estimated project cost for the second and probably final phase to construct a new California Highway Patrol academy. The site for the new academy is presently being acquired. The estimated construction cost will, in part, be funded by federal reimbursement in the amount of \$1,455,890. Thus, the net Motor Vehicle Fund appropriation required is \$6,894,947.

The patrol proposes to complete the new academy in the second phase rather than extend the project to three phases as originally planned. Construction costs have risen by 12 percent in 1970 and it is anticipated that this trend will continue and possibly accelerate in 1971. This factor, coupled with the difficulties in coordinating cadet classes between academy sites necessitated by a three-phase project, provides the basis for the decision to complete the academy in two phases. We concur with this decision.

While we support the need for a new academy, we have some reservations concerning the current program and estimated cost for the project. The new academy site had not been acquired as of this writing. Consequently, a valid cost estimate and an appropriate site plan has not been developed. The current program and site plan are largely based on a proposed master plan for expansion of the academy at the existing site. This master plan does not provide the essential flexibility which, in our opinion, must be incorporated into the new academy. The current program for the academy indicates a need to accommodate 360 resident trainees and 120 day trainees. This size was determined during the peak training period when the patrol was in the process of doubling its uniformed strength in accordance with Chapter 2301, Statutes of 1965. Since that time, the resident and day trainees have declined and stabilized at a much lower level. Although we have these reservations, we are confident that with the review and control by the Public Works Board prior to the release of construction funds, these problems can be resolved. *We recommend approval of the requested amount.*

(b) Lease facility acquisition, Westminster ----- \$286,335

(c) Lease facility acquisition, Baldwin Park ----- \$247,450

(d) Lease facility acquisition, Woodland ----- \$146,450

(e) Lease facility acquisition, Grass Valley ----- \$141,400

*We recommend approval of the above four items.*

These items propose purchases of lease buildings as the result of economic analysis prepared by the Department of General Services. We have reviewed the analysis and concur that, at this time, it is in the state's best interest to exercise the purchase option on the second anniversary of the lease (1972). However, we cannot vouch for the fact that the quality of the buildings is commensurate with the cost.

## California Highway Patrol—Continued

The Legislative Analyst in accordance with Senate Resolution No. 339 has prepared a report regarding the procedures for providing state office space. This report, in part, deals with the lease-purchase procurement procedures. It discusses in detail the inconsistencies of the economic analysis used for determining whether to lease or build a state facility. The report also discusses the circumvention of legislative review through the lease process and also questions the quality of lease buildings. We are very much concerned with this procedure and with the quality of the lease buildings which the state will be purchasing. *Hence, we recommend that all leases be reviewed by the Legislature before the state is committed to them.*

- (f) Land acquisition, working drawings and construction  
field office, Redwood City ----- \$450,000
- (g) Land acquisition, working drawings and construction  
field office, San Jose ----- \$496,150

*We recommend approval of the above two items.*

These items will provide field offices centrally located in the designated areas. The new facilities will be designed as standard 150-traffic-officer field facilities to replace existing lease facilities which are inadequate for continued operation.

The estimated cost for land acquisition is \$92,000 in Redwood City and \$106,000 in San Jose. The estimate for working drawings and construction at Redwood City is \$358,000 and \$390,150 at San Jose. The work at each site will include construction of a field office of approximately 7,700 gross square feet, approximately 2,500 square feet of carport space, paved parking areas, service yards and driveways, exterior lightings and landscaping. We have reviewed the economic analysis and program for both these facilities and we concur with the proposals.

- (h) Construct five resident post facilities, Baker----- \$258,750
- (i) Construct two resident post facilities, Mt. Reba----- \$103,500
- (j) Construct two resident post facilities, Peddler Hill--- \$103,500

*We recommend reduction of Item (h) in the amount of \$108,750 and Items (i) and (j) by an amount of \$45,500 each.*

The above three items are requests for construction of resident facilities for the purpose of housing enforcement personnel who will service the needs of the motoring public in these relatively remote areas. The areas for the residences are centrally located in the service zone and near a reasonably well developed Division of Highways maintenance station. It is contemplated that the residences when completed will be staffed with enforcement personnel who will pay established rentals for the facilities in accordance with the State Board of Control rules.

The program for these facilities requests that each residence include a living room, dining room, kitchen, three bedrooms, two baths, service porch and a two-car garage. It is also requested the residence have adequate heating and cooling systems and be adequately landscaped. The requested amount for construction of each residence is \$51,750, \$1,000

of which is the estimated cost for site acquisition. The estimated construction cost of \$50,750 for each residence appears quite high. The Department of Fish and Game has requested similar residences be built at one of their hatchery locations. The estimated cost for each of these residences is \$30,000 which is based on recent construction projects for similar residences. In keeping with these current standards for state-furnished residences, we recommend a funding more in line with the \$30,000 per resident cost. Hence, we recommend appropriation of \$150,000 for the five post residences at Baker. The residences located in the mountain areas of Peddler Hill and Mt. Reba would not require air conditioning, as is necessary at Baker. We therefore recommend an appropriation of \$58,000 for construction of the single residences at each of these locations.

(k) Purchase communication equipment----- \$183,320

*We recommend reduction in the amount of \$3,200.*

This project is for the purchase of equipment required for expansion, maintenance and replacement of the radio and microwave systems operated by the department. Examples of the type of equipment to be purchased would be base stations, emergency generators, receivers and miscellaneous radio and microwave equipment, etc. The requested amount includes \$46,800 for replacement of existing equipment and \$136,520 for purchase of additional equipment. Included in the \$136,520 for additional equipment is an item for chain link fencing at four field offices. This item is not an equipment item and would be more appropriately located in the department's minor capital outlay request. *Hence, we recommend that this portion of the request, at an estimated cost of \$3,200, be deleted from this item.*

(l) Construction program planning----- \$25,000

*We recommend reduction in the amount of \$10,000.*

This project is for the purpose of providing funds for preparation of preliminary plans for project major and minor requests. The department's projected requests for the 1972-73 fiscal year amount to approximately \$1,500,000. Funding in the amount of \$15,000 should be adequate for a projected program of this magnitude.

#### DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES

Item 297 from the  
Motor Vehicle Fund

Vol. II p. 147 Budget p. 114

Requested 1971-72 -----	\$3,750,800
Recommended for approval -----	2,492,800
Recommended for special review -----	1,240,000
Recommended reduction -----	18,000

#### SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS

	Amount	Analysis page
(k) Construction program planning-----	\$18,000	1051

Department of Motor Vehicles—Continued  
ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The amount requested will finance a schedule of 11 items for land acquisition, planning and construction of new field offices. The projects proposed will ultimately provide for eight new state-owned facilities. This includes \$2,243,500 for property acquisition, \$1,240,000 to construct two field offices, \$227,300 for augmentation of a previously funded project and \$40,000 for construction program planning.

- (a) Land acquisition for office building and parking facilities—Bell ----- \$390,000
- (b) Land acquisition for office building and parking facilities—Redwood City ----- \$423,500
- (d) Land acquisition for office building and parking facilities—Santa Cruz ----- \$390,000
- (e) Land acquisition for office building and parking facilities—Modesto ----- \$360,000
- (f) Land acquisition for office building and parking facilities—Santa Rosa ----- \$400,000

*We recommend approval of the above five items.*

The above items are for the purchase of necessary land for the establishment of a new state-owned departmental field office. The new facilities are to replace existing lease facilities which have become inadequate to handle the increased workload of their service areas. The department has prepared an economic analysis based on a 25-year occupancy which indicates that it is in the best interests of the state to construct a state-owned facility. The sites are to be selected where the greatest workload exists. It is proposed to purchase large enough sites to permit construction of an adequately sized building and adequate public parking area commensurate with the workload.

- (c) Land acquisition for additional parking facilities—San Francisco ----- \$270,000

*We recommend approval.*

This item is for the purchase of two corner parcels at the existing facility. The San Francisco office averages approximately 2,800 driving tests per month, one of the highest in the state. The existing parking, test area and "stack up" lane are inadequate. Many times it has been necessary for drivers waiting to be tested to park in the street. The incorporation of these two parcels into the existing parking lot will enable the department to alleviate this problem.

- (i) Additional land acquisition—Inglewood ----- \$10,000

*We recommend approval.*

This request is for the acquisition of a City of Inglewood surplus well site located on a corner of the Inglewood facility. Public access to this facility is now quite limited and the purchase of this corner will greatly ease public access to the facility.

- (g) Working drawings and construction of office building and parking facilities—Hawthorne ----- \$575,000

- (h) Working drawings and construction of office building and parking facilities—Anaheim ----- \$665,000

*We recommend special review of the above two items.*

The amount requested is for the construction of a 17,500-gross-square-foot field office in Anaheim and a 14,500-gross-square-foot field office in Hawthorne. Adjoining paved public parking area is to be included at both sites. The design for these facilities is based on a functional workload program and includes a public counter for vehicle registration and drivers licensing, an office area for driver improvement analysts and investigators as well as circulation space and service facilities.

The department prepared a functional building program for the Anaheim facility in 1969-70 and for Hawthorne in 1970-71. Since that time the requested physical size of the buildings has increased by 11 percent for Anaheim and 30 percent for Hawthorne with no apparent increase in projected workload. We have not received sufficient information justifying this increase, hence, we cannot at this time recommend these projects. We anticipate the required information will be made available prior to budget hearings.

- (j) Construct office building and parking facilities—  
San Leandro ----- \$227,300

*We recommend approval.*

This project was originally funded in the amount of \$439,300 by the Budget Act of 1969. At that time it was anticipated that the building would be approximately 10,743 gross square feet and located in the general area of San Leandro. However, due to local resistance it was decided to relocate the office and increase its size to serve a larger area. The project is now conceived as an office building of approximately 16,180 gross square feet located near the Oakland Coliseum to serve the areas of both San Leandro and Alameda. It is anticipated that the current leased facility in Alameda will no longer be required at the time this office is opened for operation.

The proposed structure is programed as a single story building with capability of horizontal expansion. The project will also entail site development which will include parking, driver testing area, exterior lighting and landscaping. The building construction will be of cement plaster and metal panel exterior walls, concrete slab-on-grade floor, and composition roof. The entire building will be air conditioned and the interior lighting will consist of a suspended fluorescent system. The current estimate indicates a cost of \$27 per gross square foot at building construction level and \$41 per gross square foot at total project level. This cost is consistent with recent projects of a similar nature.

- (k) Construction program planning ----- \$40,000

*We recommend a reduction in the amount of \$18,000.*

The department projects a building program for the 1972-73 fiscal year of approximately \$2.2 million. Funding in the amount of \$22,000 or 1 percent for program planning should be ample for a program of that magnitude.



**DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY****Item 298 from the General Fund      Vol. III p. 166    Budget p. 195**


---

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$150,000
Recommended for approval .....	150,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This request is for one project at the Northern Reception Center Clinic located approximately seven miles east of Sacramento near Perkins. The project is for correction of fire and life safety deficiencies at the institution. The amount is based on an estimate prepared by the Office of Architecture and Construction.

The State Fire Marshal inspected the facilities and issued a report in February 1967. This report revealed a number of existing fire and life safety hazards throughout the institution. The hazards in particular are the presence of much combustible interior finishes, the use of untreated wood in corridor ceiling construction in some buildings and the use of corridors and unprotected areas above corridors for return or exhaust air. The project will correct all deficiencies noted in the Fire Marshal's 1967 report, including replacement of combustible materials, painting of combustible materials with fireproofing paint where possible, and necessary revisions to the heating and ventilating system. We have reviewed it in detail and we concur with the proposed work and cost estimate.

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA****Item 299 from the Educational****Fee Fund****Vol. VI p. 173    Budget p. 279**


---

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$21,886,000
Recommended for approval .....	None
Recommended for special review .....	21,886,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item, will finance preliminary and working drawings, construction and equipment projects at six general campuses and five health science facilities. It represents the University's entire major capital outlay request and is to be financed solely by cash income from the 1971-72 educational fees. There are no project proposals for the Los Angeles general campus or the Berkeley health sciences. However, the proposed program has not been reviewed by the Regents and the educational fee funds are subject to allocation by the Regents for any purpose they designate. The scope of the proposed program, therefore, is not certain and a critique of the individual projects at this time would

not be meaningful. We will, however, present what we consider to be essentially a minimum program from this fund source, to meet the University's functional requirements and also the objectives of the 10-year plan for the health sciences.

#### General Campuses

To better evaluate the University needs on a campus-by-campus basis, a comparison was made of projected 1974-75 space needs versus actual space. Table 1 on page 1054 reflects this comparison. As can be seen from the table all campuses except Irvine, Riverside and Santa Cruz, have an excess capacity in class-seminar rooms. All campuses, except Los Angeles, have a deficiency in graduate and academic staff office and research laboratory and undergraduate class-lab space. In view of these facts we have attempted to recommend projects that will provide some relief to the areas of greatest deficiency. It should be noted that there are indications that even though an excess of space may be shown for an individual campus, a space deficiency could exist on that same campus within any specific discipline. However, we have no reason to believe that in most cases, the excess space could not be converted to the needs of the deficit discipline.

Our total general campus construction and working drawing proposal is less than that proposed in the Budget Bill by \$4,460,000. The effect is to shift funds to start working drawings on projects which will ease the deficiencies at least one year earlier than the current proposal. Also, we recommend deletion of the proposed Webber Hall addition at the Riverside campus because this project, in our opinion, should not have a high priority. Referring to Table 1, the Riverside campus needs are relatively close to the actual space available, hence we believe the large deficiencies at other campuses have a higher priority. For example, the mathematics-computer instruction facility at Irvine will provide 78,300 A.S.F. of instructional and research space and 10,500 A.S.F. of library space. The net effect, with some reshuffling will be to provide needed space for 12 disciplines on this campus.

The utilities and site developments projects proposed in the budget would have to be categorized as critical needs. These are either related directly to the essential utility requirements to make a building operable or to correct serious health or safety deficiencies. Our recommendation does not differ from the budget proposal in either projects or scope. However, it must be noted that several of the current proposed projects, have become critical due to deferral from prior years. The effect of this has not only been to create a critical need but also, in many instances, to increase significantly the cost of the project. Cognizance of this long-range implication must be recognized in future funding of projects of this type. Our recommendation for equipment funding is \$1,580,566 less than the item proposal. In our review of the equipment, sufficient information was not available to adequately evaluate the project needs. For the most part, the amount requested is based on a historical unit cost dependent on the function of the space to be equipped. This historical cost was developed by averaging the cost of existing equipment in existing spaces university-wide. As each

Table 1  
Projected A.S.F. Need for 1974-75<sup>1</sup>

University campus	Class-seminar			Undergraduate class-lab.			Grad., academic staff-lab. and office		
	Actual <sup>2</sup>	Need	Deficiency (excess)	Actual <sup>2</sup>	Need	Deficiency (excess)	Actual <sup>2</sup>	Need	Deficiency (excess)
Berkeley -----	203,299	155,308	(47,991)	496,587	301,071	(195,516)	1,230,117	1,807,500	577,383
Davis -----	95,289	80,942	(14,347)	229,073	235,713	6,640	865,141	924,020	58,879
Irvine -----	46,654	54,309	7,655	62,363	138,882	76,519	244,050	423,125	179,075
Los Angeles -----	210,801	144,871	(65,930)	233,982	300,253	66,271	997,952	1,469,320	471,368
Riverside -----	48,639	59,094	10,455	98,717	113,397	14,680	427,871	493,365	65,494
San Diego -----	59,192	46,029	(13,163)	96,576	125,856	29,280	370,008	438,965	68,957
Santa Barbara -----	110,628	102,641	(7,987)	183,769	189,376	5,607	453,492	715,045	261,553
Santa Cruz -----	29,987	39,707	9,720	75,564	83,835	8,271	129,326	215,180	85,854

<sup>1</sup> Projection determined from University "Space Analysis for 1971-76 Capital Improvement Program."

<sup>2</sup> Includes buildings under construction which will be occupied by 1974-75.

building has its own particular needs, we believe the respective equipment list should reflect that need. The average unit cost, while useful as an expected level of expenditure which could be used in preliminary planning, should not be used as justification of a level of expenditure. A review must be made of what is considered necessary equipment using the average unit cost as a guideline only. Our equipment recommendation will fund the respective projects at 50 percent of the requested total project equipment need. *We recommend the University submit detailed equipment lists for current and future projects.*

#### HEALTH SCIENCES

The University, in order to meet the goals of the "Ten-Year Health Sciences Plan" must begin construction of projects for which the working drawings are complete or will be completed by the summer of 1971. These projects, as a vital portion of the overall plan should be funded because a delay of one year will cause a minimum construction cost increase of 10 percent. A delay will also necessitate larger individual fiscal year expenditures due to a backlog of projects, if the goals of the plan are to be met. In actuality, the health sciences plan for capital outlay is now somewhat below the anticipated 1970-71 fiscal year construction level.

We are recommending an expenditure of \$12,020,400 for the health sciences. This will finance major construction projects at San Diego and San Francisco and preliminary and working drawings for five major projects, two of which will be ready for construction funding in 1972-73. Our main objective in preparing this recommendation is to establish a program this year that will obviate a backlog of construction projects to be funded in a shorter time period, and to economize by a savings in construction cost escalation. We have deleted the Irvine medical science unit No. 1 construction funds because working drawings will not be completed in time to go to bid in the budget year.

The equipment funds in our recommendation will finance 50 percent of the total project equipment requests. This amount is similar to that

Table 2  
Project Comparisons

	Budget proposal	Legislative Analyst proposal
General Campus		
Construction and working drawings -----	\$9,253,000	\$5,148,000
Equipment -----	3,478,000	1,897,434
Health Sciences		
Preliminary plans -----	--	460,000
Construction and working drawings -----	7,194,000	10,748,900
Equipment -----	1,169,000	701,500
Universitywide		
General campus—programing and preliminary planning -----	792,000	792,000
Health sciences—programing and preliminary planning -----	--	110,000
Universitywide—remodeling of underused space -----	--	2,028,166
Total -----	\$21,886,000	\$21,886,000

University of California—Continued

Table 3  
Legislative Analyst Proposed 1971-72 Major Capital Outlay  
Program for the University of California

Campus	Preliminary planning	Equipment	Working drawings	Construction	1972-73 Impact	1971-72 Total by campus
Universitywide -----	\$792,000	--	--	\$2,028,166	--	\$2,820,166
Berkeley						
Alterations, Cory Hall -----	--	--	--	\$71,000 <sup>1</sup>	--	--
Alterations, life science -----	--	--	--	493,000 <sup>1</sup>	--	--
Subtotals -----	--	--	--	\$564,000	--	--
Total -----	--	--	--	--	--	\$564,000
Davis						
Physics unit 1 -----	--	\$86,000	--	--	--	--
Bio-science unit 4 -----	--	361,800	--	--	--	--
Chemistry addition -----	--	394,350	--	--	--	--
Utility and site development -----	--	--	\$9,000	\$128,000	--	--
Central utilities building -----	--	--	46,000	745,000	--	--
Subtotals -----	--	\$842,150	\$55,000	\$873,000	--	--
Total -----	--	--	--	--	--	\$1,770,150
Irvine						
Natural sciences phase II -----	--	\$28,000	--	--	--	--
Social science unit 1, phase I -----	--	484,763	--	--	--	--
Utilities and site development -----	--	--	\$4,000	\$58,000	--	--
Math-computer building -----	--	--	413,000	--	\$6,887,000	--
Subtotals -----	--	\$512,763	\$417,000	\$58,000	--	--
Total -----	--	--	--	--	--	\$987,763
Los Angeles						
Life sciences unit 3 -----	--	--	\$132,000 <sup>1</sup>	--	\$2,965,000	--
Subtotal -----	--	--	\$132,000	--	--	--
Total -----	--	--	--	--	--	\$132,000

34-81387	Riverside	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	San Diego							
	John Muir College—Building 2D	--	\$43,140	--	--	--	--	--
	Central Library	--	41,294	--	--	--	--	--
	Utilities and site development	--	--	\$3,000	\$43,000	--	--	--
	Urey Hall conversion	--	--	--	209,000 <sup>1</sup>	--	--	--
	Subtotals	--	\$84,434	\$3,000	\$252,000	--	--	\$339,434
	Total	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	Santa Barbara							
	South Hall addition	--	\$152,340	--	--	--	--	--
	Alterations, physical science	--	--	--	\$148,000 <sup>1</sup>	--	--	--
	Alterations, bio-science	--	--	--	191,000 <sup>1</sup>	--	--	--
	Marine biology unit 2	--	--	\$156,000	--	\$2,339,000	--	--
	Subtotals	--	\$152,340	\$156,000	\$339,000	--	--	\$647,340
	Total	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
1057	Santa Cruz							
	Utilities and site development	--	--	\$15,000	\$235,000	--	--	--
	Performing arts	--	\$146,000	--	--	--	--	--
	Applied science	--	133,160	--	--	--	--	--
	Alterations to existing facilities	--	26,587	355,000	--	--	--	--
	College No. 6	--	--	--	299,000	--	--	--
	College No. 7	--	--	--	1,094,000	--	--	--
	University library unit 2	--	--	301,000	--	\$6,957,000	--	--
	Subtotals	--	\$305,747	\$671,000	\$1,628,000	--	--	--
	Total	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
	General campus totals	\$792,000	\$1,897,434	\$1,434,000	\$5,742,166	\$19,148,000	\$2,604,747	\$9,865,600
	Health Sciences							
	Universitywide	\$110,000	--	--	--	--	\$110,000	--

**Table 3—Continued**  
**Legislative Analyst Proposed 1971-72 Major Capital Outlay**  
**Program for the University of California**

<i>Campus</i>	<i>Preliminary planning</i>	<i>Equipment</i>	<i>Working drawings</i>	<i>Construction</i>	<i>1972-73 Impact</i>	<i>1971-72 Total by campus</i>
<b>Davis</b>						
Medical surge facilities -----	--	\$126,000	--	--	--	--
Alterations, Sacramento medical center -----	--	62,500	--	\$195,000	--	--
Medical science unit 1 -----	--	--	\$980,000	--	--	--
Subtotals -----	--	\$188,500	\$980,000	\$195,000	--	--
Total -----	--	--	--	--	--	\$1,863,500
<b>Irvine</b>						
Medical science unit 1 -----	--	--	\$966,000 (567,000) <sup>1</sup>	--	\$3,015,000	--
Medical science unit 2 -----	460,000	--	--	--	--	--
Subtotals -----	\$460,000	--	\$966,000 (567,000)	--	--	--
Total -----	--	--	--	--	--	\$1,426,000
<b>Los Angeles</b>						
Health science center—emergency power -----	--	--	\$80,000	--	--	--
Total -----	--	--	--	--	--	\$80,000
<b>San Diego</b>						
Improvements, U.C. hospital -----	--	\$1,000	\$100,000	\$1,629,900 (699,900) <sup>1</sup>	--	--
Central chiller plant -----	--	--	--	349,000	--	--
Animal hold facility, Elliott Field -----	--	5,000	8,000	152,000	--	--
Animal service building, Elliott Field -----	--	27,500	23,000	352,000	--	--
Addition to U.C. hospital -----	--	--	133,000	--	\$535,000	--
Subtotals -----	--	\$33,500	\$264,000	\$2,482,900 (699,900)	--	--
Total -----	--	--	--	--	--	\$2,780,400

University of California—Continued

Item 299

## San Francisco

School of nursing -----	--	\$50,000	--	--	--	--
Clinic expansion -----	--	315,000	--	--	--	--
Alterations, 2nd floor, medical science -----	--	10,000	--	--	--	--
Clinic facilities at general hospital -----	--	73,500	--	--	--	--
Clinic alterations for dental chairs -----	--	31,000	--	--	--	--
Moffitt hospital addition -----	--	--	\$506,000	--	--	--
Heating plant No. 2 -----	--	--	88,000	--	\$1,400,000	--
School of dentistry building -----	--	--	372,000	\$4,815,000	--	--
Subtotals -----	--	\$479,500	\$966,000	\$4,815,000	\$1,400,000	--
Total -----	--	--	--	--	--	\$6,260,500
Health sciences totals -----	\$570,000	\$701,500	\$3,256,000	\$7,492,900	\$4,950,000	\$12,020,400
University total -----	\$1,362,000	\$2,598,934	\$4,335,000	\$13,590,066	\$24,098,000	\$21,886,000

<sup>1</sup> Total amount or amount in parenthesis represents funds from prior years which the Director of Finance has indicated will be canceled.



## University of California—Continued

recommended for the general campuses. Again, we must have sufficient information to evaluate the scope of each request.

The point should be made that the capital outlay program expenditures will provide facilities which will in turn create a considerable increase in the current operating expenditures. It is estimated that the state share for health sciences operating expenses will increase by 109.6 percent between 1970-71 and 1979-80 to a total expenditure of \$114,815,000. This amount accounts for 42 percent of the total 1979-80 health sciences operating expense.

## Summary

The proposals we have made are an attempt to begin an easing of the major space deficiencies on the general campuses and to meet the goals of the health sciences 10-year plan in both an orderly and economical manner. A general comparison of our proposal and the budget item is shown in Table 2.

Table 3 is a detailed list of projects by campus which would be funded by our recommendation, and it also indicates the impact our proposal will have on the 1971-72 fiscal year. It should be pointed out that this impact is related to proposed working drawings only. It does not indicate funding of other projects which should probably be funded (i.e., Irvine administration building) nor does it account for necessary utility and site development projects or equipment needs.

The total expenditure of our proposal for specific projects as indicated in Table 2 is \$2,028,166 below the budget item amount. In our discussion of the general campus program, we indicated that on campuses where there is an excess capacity of a particular type of space, it would seem reasonable that a large portion of the excess space could be converted to a type of space for which there is a deficiency. For example, 65,930 A.S.F. of excess class-seminar space at the Los Angeles campus might very well be converted to undergraduate class-laboratory space. *Hence, we recommend appropriation of the excess \$2,028,166 for universitywide use for conversion work of this nature, and further that the proposed conversion projects shall be reviewed by the Legislative Analyst and approved by the Public Works Board prior to committing any of the funds.*

Our recommendations are based on the University's student enrollment projections as tabulated in the Governor's proposed budget and the assumption that enrollment growth thereafter will remain on the same trend. However, the University has appointed a special task force on University growth, to analyze long-range enrollment. Some of the problems to be investigated by the task force will be those concerned with establishment of a three-year bachelor's degree program, year-around campus operation, expansion of evening and weekend extension courses, deemphasis of graduate instruction with more concentration on undergraduate studies and establishment of individual campuses specializing in particular disciplines of study. It has been speculated that while some campus enrollment ceilings will be raised, others will be lowered. It is our understanding that the task force will concentrate

## Item 300

## Capital Outlay

its efforts on the general campuses and therefore the health sciences growth should not be affected.

It is apparent that the task force report could substantially change student enrollment projections and space needs on the general campuses. Hence, dependent on the report and the course taken by the University, radical changes in our recommendations may be necessary. We are hopeful that this report will be released in time for the budget hearings.

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

## For Minor Construction

Item 300 from the  
Education Fee Fund

Vol. IV p. 173 Budget p. 279

Requested 1971-72	\$2,014,000
Recommended for approval	2,014,000
Recommended reduction	None

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

The University is requesting \$2,014,000 from education fee funds for minor capital outlay expenditures. This amount will fund 54 projects at nine campuses and three agricultural field stations. The University in anticipation of funding constraints, reduced its original request by nearly \$5 million and 142 projects. Table 1 contains a summary of the projects proposed at each campus.

Table 1  
Summary of Minor Construction Proposals for 1971-72

	Number of projects	Justification				Amount
		Correct space deficiency	Improve space utilities	Utilities or mechanical improvement	Correct health and safety deficiency	
Berkeley	8	5	0	3	0	\$284,500
Davis	3	1	1	1	0	156,000
Davis Medical	1	0	1	0	0	60,000
Irvine	2	3	0	0	0	86,100
Irvine Medical	1	1	0	0	0	27,400
Los Angeles	7	1	1	3	2	272,500
Los Angeles Medical	2	0	1	1	0	14,600
Riverside	5	0	1	2	2	204,700
San Diego	5	2	2	1	0	183,200
San Francisco	7	5	2	0	0	174,000
Santa Barbara	5	1	0	3	1	195,500
Santa Cruz	5	1	1	2	1	205,500
Ag Field Stations	3	1	1	1	0	150,000
Total (Medical)	11	6	4	1	0	\$276,000
Total (General)	43	14	7	16	6	1,738,000
TOTAL	54	20	11	17	6	\$2,014,000

## University of California—Continued

In our opinion, this program is below the minimum that can be tolerated without progressive deterioration of the physical plant, the growth of functional deficiencies and inadequate space utilization. For comparison purposes, Table 2 indicates prior year funding related to the increase in construction costs.

Table 2  
Historical Minor Capital Outlay Funding

	Budget amount	Value based on 1964 construction costs	Deficit value
1964 -----	\$2,016,100	\$2,016,100	--
1965 -----	1,999,600	1,916,160	—\$100,000
1966 -----	1,527,200	1,395,860	—620,360
1967 -----	1,256,000	1,081,416	—934,684
1968 -----	1,794,738	1,428,611	—587,489
1969 -----	2,008,000	1,462,832	—552,268
1970 -----	900,000	594,000	—1,422,100
1971 (Request) -----	2,014,000	1,230,554	—785,546

As can be seen, the funding level has not kept pace with the rising construction costs. The result of this has been the accumulation of a significant backlog of minor construction and improvement projects. In fact, in the current year the University has been notified by the Department of Finance that \$491,780 of the 1970 budget amount is to be reverted. The University has stated that the 1971-72 minor project requests will necessarily have to be amended to accommodate the reverted projects. We concur with this since the current year projects would understandably have a higher priority. However, the effect of this will simply be to add to the backlog of minor construction and improvement projects.

## TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

Item 301 from the State College  
Facilities Revenue Fund

Vol. IV p. 403 Budget p. 299

---

Requested 1971-72 -----	\$12,852,300
Recommended for approval -----	None
Recommended for special review -----	12,852,300
Recommended reduction -----	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 800, Statutes of 1970 (Senate Bill No. 178), created the State College Facilities Revenue Fund and authorized the Trustees of the California State Colleges, at their discretion, to establish a fee to provide for the acquisition, construction and improvement of student health centers. The authorization also covered the acquisition of real property or the leasing of facilities for the same purpose.

The act further directed that any project costing in excess of \$65,000 would require "approval" by the Legislature. The act also authorized the use of the revenues generated as pledges for revenue bonds which could be issued under the authority contained in the "State College Revenue Bond Act of 1947." The revenues resulting therefrom were appropriated without regard to fiscal years.

In May of 1969, the trustees voted to impose a systemwide mandatory fee, contingent on the passage of legislation, of \$6 per academic year for regular students and \$3 for limited students to cover health service facilities. At the time the bill was under consideration, it was estimated that the fee would generate revenues of approximately \$800,000 in the 1970-71 fiscal year.

The item as contained in the present Budget Bill includes no language exempting it from Section 2.2 of the Budget Bill which limits the appropriation life of all capital outlay projects to three fiscal years. Furthermore, the item includes no language exempting it from the provisions of Section 8 of the Budget Bill which requires that all capital outlay items come under the control of the State Public Works Board.

The schedule attached to this item covers ten projects totaling \$12,852,300. This amount obviously exceeds the revenues that could reasonably be anticipated in three years or even longer. It must be assumed, therefore, that the intent is that the revenues will be used to support revenue bonds, the sale of which would provide the amounts required in the schedule.

We would point out, first of all, that there appear to be some legal contradictions between Chapter 800 of 1970 and this item which should be resolved. Secondly, the practice has been, in the past, that projects built from student funds such as student unions or cafeterias (with the exception of initial cadre facilities) or residence hall facilities have usually not been reviewed either by the appropriate staff in the Department of Finance or by our office on the premise that since direct state funds were not involved, the design and cost of the facilities were not our concern. We did, however, review such projects superficially to ascertain whether an unreasonable land base (state-owned) was being utilized in the design. *With respect to the proposed health facilities, we have seen no plans, outline specifications or cost estimates, and therefore we have no basis for making any recommendations other than "special review" by the Legislature.*

For background information, we might point out that of the existing 19 campuses, eight already have student health facilities which were built with state funds as independent separate entities on the campus. One campus (San Jose) has student health facilities built into a larger building which houses the student nurse program and other related activities. In five of the campuses student health facilities are occupying spaces within buildings built for other purposes such as classroom buildings, the science building at Fullerton, the fine arts building at Hayward, etc. In one instance (Chico) student health facilities are occupying a building which was part of a land purchase which will

## Trustees of the California State Colleges—Continued

ultimately have to be eliminated for the construction of a facility included in the master plan for that land space. In another case (Fresno) an old temporary building is being occupied. In the remaining three campuses, leased space is being occupied for the purpose using state funds in two of them and student fee funds in the third.

The schedule proposed in this item would provide new, replacement facilities for seven campuses and three expansions for campuses that already have dedicated facilities.

**DISTRICT FAIR CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM**

Item 302 from the Fair  
and Exposition Fund

Vol. I p. 331 Budget p. 69

---

For reappropriation of capital outlay from District,  
County and Citrus Fruit Fairs from the Fairs and Ex-  
position Fund.

For transfer to the General Fund 1971-72 -----	\$1,750,000
Recommended change in transfer -----	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

Section 19630 of the Business and Professions Code annually appropriates \$2,250,000 from the Fair and Exposition Fund to district, county and citrus fairs for capital construction. This amount may be expended for permanent improvements, equipment or real property for fair purposes. These funds are allocated by the Director of Agriculture upon approval of the State Public Works Board.

In the budget year, the Governor's Budget proposes a transfer to the General Fund of \$1,750,000 of the \$2,250,000 annually appropriated for fair construction. This type of capital outlay transfer has not occurred before. However, this practice has been followed before in the support appropriation item for district and county fairs (see Item 86).

The effect of this reduction in fair construction money will be to cause postponement in construction projects and major improvements at most fairs. District fairs would only receive about \$319,500 and county fairs about \$116,000 for capital outlay. In addition \$72,063 will be allocated for emergency capital outlay, \$72,437 for reimbursement for engineering services from the Division of Fairs and Expositions, and \$20,000 for architectural engineering services.

There is virtually no money available for any state General Fund capital outlay projects in 1971-72. It is logical that capital outlay for fairs, which has no higher priority value be reduced. We therefore recommend approval of this transfer.

## Department of Agriculture

## DISTRICT FAIR CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Item 303 from the Fair  
and Exposition Fund

Vol. I p. 331 Budget p. 70

---

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$72,437
Estimated 1970-71 .....	72,290
Requested increase \$147 (0.2 percent)	
Total recommended reduction .....	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*Approval is recommended.*

This item reappropriates the sum of \$72,437 from the Fair and Exposition Fund out of the \$2,250,000 continuing statutory appropriation for district agricultural fairs or citrus fruit fairs for engineering services performed by the Division of Fairs and Expositions of the Department of Agriculture. The \$2,250,000 for district agricultural fairs and citrus fruit fairs is appropriated under Business and Professions Code Section 19630 for (1) permanent improvements for fair purposes, (2) the purchase of equipment for fair purposes, and (3) the acquisition or purchase of real property, including costs for appraisal and incidental costs. This item is further discussed in the analysis of district fair construction in Item 302. A similar reappropriation was contained in the 1970 Budget Act.

## DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Item 304 from the Fish and  
Game Preservation Fund

Vol. II p. 373 Budget p. 135

---

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$410,000
Recommended for approval .....	410,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item is for funding of two equipment requests. Included are replacement of one patrol boat and the renovation of an existing airplane or, if possible, purchase of a new airplane to replace it.

(a) Replacement of patrol boat *Yellowtail* ..... \$110,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated funds for the replacement of three patrol boats. At that time, it was anticipated two additional patrol boats would eventually have to be replaced. The Budget Act of 1969 appropriated \$75,000 for replacement of one of these boats. This item is for the replacement of the remaining patrol boat, the *Yellowtail*.

## Department of Fish and Game—Continued

The *Yellowtail* was constructed of plywood 17 years ago at a cost of \$15,000. This vessel has reached a point where it is extremely costly to maintain and operate. Currently, the *Yellowtail* operates approximately 600 hours per year off the Ventura coastline. With the increasing number of commercial fishermen and sports anglers in this area, a reliable vessel is essential.

The proposed replacement vessel will be built to the Department of Fish and Game specifications. Generally, the vessel will be 40 feet in length and of aluminum construction. The powerplant will consist of two diesel engines capable of sustaining a cruising speed of 23 knots.

(b) Replacement or renovation of Beechcraft airplane ---- \$300,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Department of Fish and Game in its yearly operations plants fish in between 800 and 1,000 lakes using a specially adapted aircraft. In 1970, for instance, plants were made in 999 lakes involving 6,500,000 fish and 162 hours of flying. The maneuvering for planting fish by air requires rapid descent after clearing mountaintops, deceleration for the plant and rapid climbing and turning in the pull out and resumption of flight. The aircraft must have adequate power and structural integrity to withstand a flight pattern of this type. The existing aircraft is 13 years old with over 5,000 hours flight time. By comparison, this would be equal to well over 100,000 miles for an automobile.

A comprehensive study regarding the replacement of the existing aircraft was conducted by the department's senior pilot. It was found that at this time there are no commercially available aircraft suitable for use in the planting of fish. The manufacturer has discontinued production of the existing model. Hence, it was concluded that the existing aircraft be renovated to meet the requirements of planting fish by air, as they now exist. The renovation of the aircraft will be performed by factory representatives and the project will entail conversion to turbine engines, tri-gear conversion, new electronic instrumentation and miscellaneous minor renovations.

It should be pointed out that in the event a new aircraft suitable for this type work becomes available on the market, the department would purchase that aircraft. However, this would only be done in the case such a plane becomes available and could be purchased within the funds available.

**DEPARTMENT OF NAVIGATION AND OCEAN DEVELOPMENT****Item 305 from the Harbors and  
Watercraft Revolving Fund**

Vol. II p. 411 Budget p. 143

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$155,000
Recommended for special review .....	155,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS***Analysis  
page*

1. Special review, Millerton Lake State Recreation Area 1067 project.
2. Add funds for working plans and drawings for launching facilities at Perris and Pyramid Reservoirs. Needed amount to be determined by the department. 1067

**GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT**

One of the program objectives of the Department of Navigation and Ocean Development is to develop and improve the boating facilities in the state. The department accomplishes that objective mostly through loans and grants to local agencies, but the department is also authorized to construct facilities. Also, the Governor's Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1969 transferred to the department the responsibility for capital outlay planning and development of boating facilities in the state park system.

The Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund derives its revenue from boat registration fees and from the annual transfer of \$4 million from the Motor Vehicle Fuel Fund. The money from the Motor Vehicle Fuel Fund is based on the fuel taxes paid by boaters.

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The budget requests \$155,000 for an additional launching ramp and parking area at Millerton Lake State Recreation Area, a unit of the state park system in Fresno County. The request appears reasonable, but the project plans and cost estimates of the Office of Architecture and Construction are not available at this time. We are deferring recommendation on the project until the OAC plans are available and suggest special review for the request.

**Perris and Pyramid Reservoirs**

*We recommend funds be added to this item to provide working plans and drawings for launching facilities at Perris and Pyramid Reservoirs.*

There are no capital outlay expenditures scheduled for launching facilities at Perris and Pyramid Reservoirs in 1971-72. Water is presently scheduled for delivery at these reservoirs in 1973. In order to assure that construction of launching facilities is complete before water arrives, the department should be planning launching facilities and preparing working plans and drawings for these reservoirs in the budget year.



## Department of Navigation and Ocean Development—Continued

As of the time of this writing, the plans for the proposed boating facility projects at these two reservoirs had not been developed enough for the department to estimate the cost of working plans and drawings. The department should have this information prepared by the time of budget hearings so that funds can be made available in 1971-72 for working plans and drawings.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 306 from the funds accumulated  
under the provisions of Item 257,  
Budget Act of 1969 and Item 214,  
Budget Act of 1970**

**Vol. II p. 435 Budget p. 164**

---

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$100,000
Recommended for approval .....	None
Recommended for special review .....	100,000

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item appropriates \$100,000 from a reserve established in the 1969 and 1970 Budget Acts in which the excess of operating revenues over operating costs for Hearst San Simeon State Historic Monument is deposited. The reserve is to be used for unusual maintenance and structural repair. In the case of the budget year request, there is not yet any clear definition of the work which is to be done. Instead, there is a possibility that some of the funds will be used to initiate work on a larger project which the department has been considering that would provide a new water supply for the Hearst Castle and perhaps other areas. Until the purpose of the expenditure is clear, we recommend special review.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 307 from the Special Deposit  
Account, General Fund**

**Vol. II p. 427 Budget p. 164**

---

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$460,000
Recommended for special review .....	460,000

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item appropriates \$460,000 from the Special Deposit Account in the General Fund which was established by legislative action in prior budget bills to hold in reserve the reimbursements that the Department of Parks and Recreation receives from federal funds which match state expenditures under the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund. Along with Item 210, which appropriates minor capital outlay money from this Special Deposit Account, the two items

would utilize all the funds available in the account. However, as discussed under Item 210, it is unlikely that a series of small sewerage and sanitation projects can be financed fully or in some cases financed at all from the Clean Water Bond Fund in the manner the budget contemplates. Therefore, some adjustment either in Item 210 or Item 317 may be needed to include some costs of the sewage and sanitation facilities if they are all to be constructed.

Item 307 appropriates funds for working plans and drawings for seven major developments of the state park system. Included in the appropriation request is \$50,000 for further working plans and drawings at Point Mugu. Until the status of development of Point Mugu is clarified this analysis is not recommending further appropriations for Point Mugu. Other projects in the appropriation require further evaluation and study before money for working funds and drawings can be recommended. Furthermore, the priority of this new work needs to be evaluated against those projects for which the Governor's Budget proposes to revert prior year construction funds and thereby leave already existing working plans and drawings for those projects unused because of lack of construction money.

### RECLAMATION BOARD

Item 308 from the General Fund

Vol. II p. 448 Budget p. 166

Requested 1971-72	\$1,587,000
Recommended for special review	1,587,000

### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend special review for the amount of the appropriation and that the appropriation be made to the Department of Water Resources instead of the Reclamation Board.*

This item appropriates the capital outlay funds for acquisition of lands, easements and rights-of-way for U.S. Corps of Engineers flood control projects in the Central Valley. The administration is currently reviewing the amount of funds needed in this item based on reduced levels of expenditure contained in the President's budget. It is anticipated that the amount of money requested for the Sacramento River Bank Protection Project and perhaps other projects can be reduced. For this reason special review is recommended.

In addition, the funds appropriated by a similar item two years ago were shifted pursuant to legislative directive from the Reclamation Board to the Department of Water Resources and last year were appropriated directly to the Department of Water Resources as discussed under Item 211 of this analysis. The Budget Bill proposes to change the pattern of the last two years and once again make the appropriation under this item to the Reclamation Board with the requirement that the money be transferred by the Board to the Department of Water Resources. For reasons discussed under Item 211 this is not in accord with prior legislative decisions. It is therefore recommended that this item be amended to appropriate the money directly to the Department of Water Resources.

**COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

Item 309 from the

State Construction Program Fund

Vol. IV p. 635

Budget p. 303

---

Requested 1971-72 -----	\$10,510,959
Recommended for approval -----	10,510,959
Recommended reduction -----	None

---

**GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT**

The Junior College Construction Program Bond Act of 1968, approved by the electorate in June of 1968, authorized the sale of \$65 million in bonds for community college construction assistance.

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$15,609,533 from these funds for a schedule of 102 projects in 35 junior college districts. That appropriation was augmented by Chapter 931, Statutes of 1968, which provided an additional \$1,625,000 in bond funds to meet certain formula increases in the anticipated allocations.

The Budget Act of 1969 appropriated \$29,307,662 of the remaining \$47,765,467 in the 1968 bond issue. This provided for a schedule of 149 projects, grouped into nine priority categories designated by the Legislature and affecting 44 junior college districts. However, the state's inability to market its bonds led to the passage of Chapter 784, Statutes of 1969 (AB 606) which authorized the transfer of surplus funds from the State School Fund to the State Construction Program Fund for community college construction. The moneys were to be used in lieu of bond funds for eight of the nine categories designated in the Budget Act of 1969 and which totaled \$26,914,886.

The Budget Act of 1970 appropriated \$18,399,881 from the remaining 1968 bond funds for a schedule of 93 projects in 35 junior college districts. To date, the Legislature has authorized expenditure of \$38,027,140 of the \$65 million authorized by the 1968 bond issue. This amount together with the transfer from the State School Fund has financed a total construction program exceeding \$100 million, including district and federal funds.

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

The \$10,510,959 program proposed in this item, in conjunction with the \$16 million in Item 310 following, uses up the balance of the bond funds authorized by the electorate in 1968. Actually, the budget proposes to use the \$16 million to finance retroactively a portion of the projects authorized in the Budget Act of 1969 and subsequently financed by a transfer from the State School Fund. A further discussion of this proposal may be found in our analysis of Item 310. However, the consequence of this proposal is that the construction program financed by this item is limited to a total of \$18,262,849 with district funds making up the \$7,751,890 difference. Increases in the total cost of any projects scheduled is borne by the districts or is financed from

federal funds if they are available. In any event, the state's share is fixed at the amounts shown in the schedule. A total of 24 projects is listed in the schedule for this item, providing for the needs of only 14 of the state's 68 junior college districts. In terms of the total program mentioned above, the state's share represents an average of 57.8 percent. In terms of individual projects, this contribution ranges from a low of 33.8 percent for the San Francisco Junior College District to a high of 75.2 percent for the Fremont-Newark Junior College District. The state's participation is based on a formula established by Chapter 1550, Statutes of 1967 (Senate Bill No. 691) which is developed from the ratios of weekly student contact hours and assessed valuations districtwide and statewide.

The remainder of the five-year construction program outlined in the Governor's Budget for 1972-73 through 1975-76 projects the need for \$50 to \$60 million annually to supplement district contributions. While there is no commitment to any state participation, the projections indicate the need contemplated by the community colleges.

The program proposed for the 1971-72 fiscal year may be separated into three descriptive categories:

I. Working drawings and/or construction funds for the utilities and site development required before a new campus facility can function.

II. Equipment funds necessary to permit completion and utilization of state-supported capacity projects.

III. Working drawings and/or construction funds for projects providing classroom and laboratory capacity.

Table 1 summarizes the proposed program in terms of the three categories. It should be noted that the dollar amounts indicated represent the state's share requested and not the total estimated project cost.

As indicated in Table 1, 19 of the 24 projects proposed are of a mandatory nature essential to the completion of state-supported capacity projects which are scheduled for construction and/or occupancy during the budget year. For example, the proposed utility and site development projects in Butte, Contra Costa and Fremont-Newark Junior College Districts are critically timed and structured to coincide with the development of three new college campuses. In fact, the major part of the construction funds requested by the community colleges for the 1971-72 fiscal year involves construction of the initial academic facilities at Butte College and Contra Costa's East College campus. The \$1,463,430 requested for equipment in the summary provides for facilities which are scheduled for completion during the budget year. Included are science and vocational technology facilities, art facilities, libraries and resource materials centers as well as general academic and lecture facilities, providing a total of 385,505 assignable square feet of new space.

As further indicated in Table 1, \$6,874,503 or 65.4 percent of the community college's program accounts for five projects in three junior college districts. The projects requested affect only three campuses and

# Capital Outlay

Item 309

## Community College—Continued

Table 1  
Summary of Proposed Community Colleges  
1971-72 Capital Outlay Program

Category	Junior college district	Number of projects	Amount requested
I. Utilities and site development			
	Butte -----	1	\$863,667
	Contra Costa -----	1	197,756
	Fremont-Newark -----	1	923,409
	State Center -----	1	188,194
	Subtotal -----	4	\$2,173,026
II. Equipment			
	Contra Costa -----	1	\$82,709
	Kern -----	1	32,219
	Long Beach -----	1	193,900
	Merced -----	3	238,454
	North Orange -----	1	18,307
	Redwoods -----	1	52,368
	San Francisco -----	1	88,805
	San Joaquin Delta -----	1	452,856
	State Center -----	2	85,346
	West Valley -----	2	210,460
	Yuba -----	1	8,006
	Subtotal -----	15	\$1,463,430
III. Construction			
	Butte -----	3	\$2,455,929
	Contra Costa -----	1	3,243,574
	Pasadena -----	1	1,175,000
	Subtotal -----	5	\$6,875,000
Total		24	\$10,510,959

Table 2  
Proposed Capacity Projects to be  
Funded for Construction

Campus	Project	Size <sup>1</sup>	Capacity <sup>2</sup>	Amount requested
Butte	Physical science building -----	14,121 ASF	11,685 WSCH	\$666,926
	Engineering and technology building -----	17,284 ASF	5,487 WSCH	770,296
	Life science and agriculture -----	18,095 ASF	9,460 WSCH	1,018,707
East	Multi-discipline complex -----	103,242 ASF	30,083 WSCH	3,243,574
Pasadena	Paramedical-science building -----	33,732 ASF	13,067 WSCH	1,175,000
Total		186,474 ASF	69,782 WSCH	\$6,874,503

<sup>1</sup> Project size is given in assignable square feet which in effect is the net usable building area.

<sup>2</sup> Project capacity is measured in weekly student contact hours. It is difficult to convert to F.T.E. because of variations in application among the districts.

will ultimately provide a total of 186,474 assignable square feet of space and accommodate approximately 4,314-day graded students. Table 2 lists the five projects for which construction funds are requested with pertinent size and cost statistics for each.

We have reviewed the utility projects and those listed in Table 2 in detail, considering capacity needs as well as cost factors, and believe what is proposed is justified and that the estimated costs are in line with those experienced on other community and state college campuses for similar facilities.

### COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Item 311 from the State Beach, Park,  
Recreational and Historical Facilities  
Fund

Vol. II p. 426 Budget p. 149

---

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$16,000,000
Recommended for approval .....	None
Recommended for special review .....	16,000,000

---

#### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend special review.*

In our analysis of Item 308, we referred to the retroactive method of financing proposed by this item. In addition, in our capital outlay summary on page 1070, we expressed reservations concerning this proposal. In the first place, this financing technique seriously affects the construction timetable developed by the community colleges to satisfy the critical needs of districts which do not have sufficient capacity to meet projected enrollments and do not have sufficient resources to fund the projects on their own. An examination of the lists of projects originally proposed by the community college system indicates that the \$16 million appropriated in this item would have provided for a total construction program of approximately \$30 million. That amount would have financed a total of 24 capacity projects in 17 junior college districts. In terms of capacity, those projects represent an additional 165,330 weekly student contact hours or approximately 10,000 day-graded students. Consequently, the additional \$16 million would generate approximately 2½ times the capacity provided by Item 309. We believe the community colleges have demonstrated the need for the additional capacity. Therefore, we recommend that the transfer initiated by Control Section 19.2 as well as the offsetting appropriation proposed by this item receive special consideration by the Legislature.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

Item 311 from the State Beach, Park,  
Recreational and Historical Facilities

Fund

Vol. II p. 426 Budget p. 149

---

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$1,000,000
Recommended for approval .....	1,000,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item appropriates local grant funds from the Park Bond Act of 1964 for 58 projects. The projects are detailed under this item in the Budget Bill. This appropriation will exhaust the balance of the available grant funds of this bond act and consists largely of small amounts that use the remaining balance of funds allocated under the bond act to each county.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

Item 312 from the State Beach, Park,  
Recreational and Historical Facilities

Fund

Vol. II p. 426 Budget p. 163

---

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$88,820
Recommended for approval .....	88,820

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item appropriates \$88,820 from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund for the cost of administering local grant projects financed from the same fund. The money will be expended by reimbursing Item 207 which is the main support item for the Department of Parks and Recreation.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

Item 313 from the State Beach, Park,  
Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund

Vol. II p. 427 Budget p. 164

---

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$5,485,700
Recommended for special review .....	5,485,700

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item covers an appropriation for 10 projects to be acquired under the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Act. That act originally contained \$85,000,000 for acquisition of

property to expand the state park system. In prior year appropriations the Legislature has approved appropriations for all the funds that were then available.

Under terms of the bond act as stated in Section 5096.17 of the Public Resources Code, the Secretary for Resources is directed to review the status of the bond program after five years as follows: "On July 1, 1970 the Resources Agency Administrator (Secretary) shall cause to be totaled the unencumbered balances remaining in the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund. A program shall be submitted in the budget for the 1971-72 fiscal year to appropriate the balance."

The Secretary has made his review and has transmitted to the Governor for inclusion in the budget the acquisition projects contained in this item. Although the secretary could have recommended revisions in the statutory division of bond funds between the major purposes of acquisition, minimum development and local grants, he has not done this. As a consequence, the program continues in the same pattern as in previous years and with the same allocations of money as originally stated in the bond act.

The acquisitions in Item 313 total \$10,500,000 and are to be funded first by \$5,485,700 in savings and reversions of money from prior acquisition projects. The largest reversion would be \$3,000,000 from the Topanga Canyon Beach Project. Second, \$5,014,300 would be financed from federal reimbursements for past or prospective acquisitions, some of which have not yet been completed. Thus, the item is only partially funded at this time and the actual receipt of all the funds will be some time in the future.

The 10 projects listed in this item are intended to be acquired on a priority basis as funds become available, which presumably means that the acquisitions will be made in the order listed in the item. The language of the item does not include any such limitation, and it is doubtful that such a priority system can, in practice, be administered. The bond act requires that the Secretary *recommend projects* for acquisition on a priority basis but this has not in the past *controlled the order of acquisition*. However, in the case of this item the funds to be expended for the acquisition will become available over a period of time. Therefore, the funding will require some priority for actual purchase. It is desirable that the administration clarify its intentions with regard to the meaning and practical application of the priority approach to these acquisitions.

Table I shows the status of acquisition on the projects which have received appropriations in prior years from the Legislature. It should be noted that the rate of acquisition is very slow. In a number of instances appropriations originally made in 1965 and 1966 show no progress. Although there are several instances where valid reasons exist for the lack of progress, in other instances the Legislature should be furnished the reasons for no progress in acquisition.

Items 316 through 324 cover reappropriations for bond act projects including those on which no acquisition progress is being made. In the analysis of those reappropriation requests, we are recommending that



**Table 1**  
**State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund Acquisition**  
**Appropriations and Expenditures as of December 31, 1970<sup>1</sup>**

Original project appropriations and prior reappropriations	1971 Reap- propriation	Amount available	Expendi- tures	Balance	Acres	
					Acquired to date	To be acquired
Bolsa Chica (Item 423/66, Item 431/69, Item 352/70)-----	Item 320/71	\$4,078,000	\$1,405,131	\$2,672,869	—0—	35
Calaveras Big Trees (Item 423/66, Item 431/69, Item 352/70)-----	Item 320/71	448,500	16,148	432,352	—0—	981
Carpinteria S.B. (Item 377.1/68)-----	Item 323/71	191,000	7,062	183,938	—0—	7.5
Coyote River Parkway (Item 423/66, Item 431/69, Item 352/70)-----	Item 320/71	2,500,000	12,398	2,487,602	—0—	370.06
Delta Meadows (Item 362/65, Item 381/68, Item 426/69, Item 351/70)-----	Item 319/71	765,000	81,509	683,491	—0—	710
Augmentation (Item 343.7/67, Item 356/70)-----	Item 322/71	320,000	—0—	320,000	—0—	—0—
El Presidio de Santa Barbara (Item 422/69)-----	—	450,000	—0—	450,000	—0—	0.5
Emma Wood S.B. (Item 422/69)-----	—	1,425,000	5,114	1,419,886	—0—	33
Gaviota Refugio (Item 423/66, Item 431/69, Item 354/70)-----	Item 320/71	4,540,000	4,286,461	253,539	3,037.9	6.1
Huntington S.B. (Item 362/65, Item 381/68, Item 426/69, Item 351/70)-----	Item 319/71	2,528,000	35,053	2,492,947	—0—	45
MacKerricher S.B. (Item 423/66, Item 431/69, Item 352/70)-----	Item 320/71	62,500	13,034	49,466	0.51	0.49
Mitchell Caverns (Item 423/66, Item 431/69, Item 352/70)-----	Item 320/71	30,350	5,247	25,103	16	600
Montana de Oro (Item 423/66, Item 431/69, Item 352/70)-----	Item 320/71	1,784,700	1,316,758	467,942	1,326.71	510
Montgomery Woods (Item 423/66, Item 431/69, Item 352/70)-----	Item 320/71	138,000	133,398	4,602	271.5	27.5
Augmentation (Item 343.7/67, Item 356/70)-----	Item 322/71	65,500	58,000	7,500	—0—	—0—
Old River Islands (Item 423/66, Item 431/69, Item 352/70)-----	Item 320/71	790,150	9,971	780,179	—0—	980
Old Sacramento (Item 423/66, Item 431/69, Item 352/70)-----	Item 320/71	1,223,000	401,442	821,558	1	7
Pfeiffer Big Sur (Item 362/65, Item 381/68, Item 426/69, Item 351/70)-----	Item 319/71	1,217,000	1,129,364	87,636	2,073	27
Augmentation (Item 333.7/67, Item 356/70)-----	Item 322/71	100,000	—0—	100,000	—0—	—0—
Picacho S.R.A. (Item 423/66, Item 431/69, Item 352/70)-----	Item 320/71	236,300	230,544	6,256	165.2	76
Santa Monica Mountains (Item 423/66, Item 431/69, Item 352/70)-----	Item 320/71	8,000,000	5,586,776	2,413,224	1,403	372
Topanga Canyon (Item 362/65, Item 381/68, Item 426/69, Item 351/70)-----	Item 319/71	9,489,500	118,249	9,371,251	—0—	19.4 <sup>2</sup>
Torrey Pines (Item 343.6/67, Item 355/70)-----	Item 321/71	900,000	544,532	355,468	73.32	76.68
Twin Lakes (Item 378.3/68)-----	Item 324/71	300,000	108,473	191,527	3.5	2.5
Statewide (Item 422/69)-----	—	958,000	—0—	958,000	—	—
<b>Totals-----</b>		<b>\$42,541,000</b>	<b>\$15,504,664</b>	<b>\$27,036,336</b>		

<sup>1</sup> The following projects have been completed and do not appear above: Ano Nuevo, Drum Barracks, Malibu Lagoon, Marin Headlands, Mount Tamalpais, North Coast Redwoods, Pepperwood, Point Mugu, Salt Point, Sugar Pine Point.

<sup>2</sup> The Topanga Canyon Beach acquisition has been completed subsequent to the December 31, 1970 preparation date for this table.

the department explain to the Legislature the lack of acquisition progress. This appears timely in view of the submission of a list of 10 new acquisitions for authorization by the Legislature. The department originally recommended the acquisitions which it is not now pursuing. The department should explain if and why it has changed its position with regard to acquisition of these projects. Then the decision whether or not to terminate acquisition of those projects and revert the money can be made in order that the money for those terminated projects can be considered in evaluating the scope and desirability of the present proposal for the ten new acquisitions in this item.

Some of the ten projects are augmentations of previously authorized projects while others are new acquisitions which we have not yet been able to review in the field because of the lateness of budget preparation this year. In view of the scope and variety of remaining unresolved questions involved in this item, it appears advisable to defer any specific recommendations until further analysis can be given to the entire acquisition problem.

#### DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 314 from the State Beach, Park,  
Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund

Vol. II p. 427 Budget p. 164

Requested 1971-72	\$12,734,144
Recommended for special review	12,734,144

#### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This \$12 million item constitutes the major appropriation of minimum development funds from the \$20,000,000 allocated for that purpose in the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Act. In past years, several appropriations have been made, with the principal ones being at Sugar Pine and Point Mugu.

There are many problems in this budget request. For example, Item 313(a) requests \$510,000 for acquisition of land in cooperation with a private land developer in order that Highway 101 can be moved inland at Cardiff Beach in San Diego County and thereby make more land available for development of recreation facilities along the beach. Since the acquisition funds are being requested for next year and the department has not submitted a program report for the proposed development at Cardiff Beach, it is not known what is the urgency of appropriating for the Cardiff development or what is proposed to be done with the money.

The item also contains \$5,978,336 for further development at Point Mugu. The department has submitted some information and a program report on the proposed development but now indicates that the project is being revised. The revision is at least partially due to the controversy

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

which has arisen over the nature and scope of development. Our Analysis in 1969-70 on page 1113 carried a discussion of the commercial nature of the department's proposed development at Point Mugu. At that time we recommended that the minimum development funds previously appropriated for the project be reverted and that the Legislature review the entire development plan. The Legislature determined that the Parks and Recreation Commission should review the project plan and provided that the previously appropriated funds could not be expended until the commission approved the plan. As of early February the proposed development plan had become the center of considerable public interest and there have been indications of legislative interest in reviewing the project development plan. We are not recommending approval of any additional expenditures until there is some resolution of the problems involved in the nature and scope of development at Point Mugu.

There are other problems involved in analyzing the projects in this item. In some instances preliminary plans and specifications have not been received from the Office of Architecture and Construction. Although the department has prepared project development reports on most of the projects, most of these were received too late to permit a review of the project in the field prior to the preparation of this analysis. Finally the department is preparing environmental impact reports on the projects, but none have been received prior to completion of this analysis.

For the above reasons, the entire item is being placed in the category of special review and a supplemental analysis will be prepared as soon as further information on the projects permits.

## DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 315 from the State Beach,  
Park, Recreational and Historical  
Facilities Fund

Vol. II p. 436 Budget p. 164

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$135,000
Recommended for approval .....	135,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

This item will finance project planning costs for projects which will utilize the remaining balance of the \$20,000,000 available in the 1964 Park Bond Act for minimum development of lands acquired with funds from the same bond act. The appropriation is a reimbursement to item 207 which is the support appropriation for the Department of Parks and Recreation.

## ITEMS PROPOSING REAPPROPRIATIONS

<i>1971 Budget Bill item</i>	<i>Reappropriations by Item Number, Schedule and Budget Act</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Legislative Analyst recommendations.</i>
316	424(c), Budget Act of 1966 as amended by Item 431.5, Budget Act of 1969, and Item 353, Budget Act of 1970	Point Mugu minimum development.	Delete item, see comments under Item 314(g)
317	349.1(gg) and (aa) Budget Act of 1970	Local grants for Lake Yosemite Park, Lake Solano Park.	Approval
318	378(a), Budget Act of 1968	Old Sacramento Development.	Approval
319	362(a), (b), (c) Budget Act of 1965	Acquisition and augmentation costs for Delta Meadows*, Huntington Beach, Pfeiffer Big Sur, and Topanga Canyon.	Dept. should explain lack of acquisition progress on Item marked (*), Approval for balance of items.
320	423(a), (c), (f), (g), (h), (i), (m), (q), (r), (t), Budget Act of 1966	Bolsa Chica, MacKericher, Montana de Oro, Montgomery Woods, Calaveras Big Trees*, Coyote River Parkway*, Gaviota-Refugio, Mitchell Caverns, Old Sacramento, Picacho S.R.A., Old River Islands,* Augmentation and acquisition costs for 12 projects, Santa Monica Mountains.	Dept. should explain lack of acquisition progress on Items marked (*), Approval for balance of items.
321	343.6(a), Budget Act of 1967 as reappropriated and amended by Item 355, Budget Act of 1970	Torrey Pines.	Approval
322	343.7 (b), (c), (e), Budget Act of 1967	Augmentation costs for Delta Meadows,* Pfeiffer Big Sur, Montgomery Woods.	Dept. should explain lack of acquisition progress on Item marked (*), Approval of Item (c) and (e).
323	377.1, Budget Act of 1968	Acquisition costs for Carpenteria S.B.	Dept. should explain lack of acquisition progress.
324	378.3(a), Budget Act of 1968	Acquisition costs for Twin Lakes S.B.	Approval
ITEM PROPOSING REVERSION			
325	423(b), Budget Act of 1969	Sugar Pine Point Minimum Development	Approval

**Department of Fish and Game**  
**WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD**

**Item 326 from the Recreation and Fish  
 and Wildlife Enhancement Fund**      **Vol. II p. 390**      **Budget p. 136**

---

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$180,000
Recommended for approval .....	180,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item will finance the preparation of preliminary and working drawings for the expansion and/or reconstruction of seven fish hatcheries throughout the state to increase fish production. The additional production is necessary to accommodate the additional recreational facilities to be provided by the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Bond Act passed by the electorate in the 1970 election.

The projects in general will include additional concrete raceways and ponds and associated equipment for trout-rearing. Onsite residences are to be provided at two remote hatchery locations. The drawings will support an ultimate construction program of approximately \$3,440,000 to be funded from the bond act. The project effect will be to increase the production of catchable trout by approximately 5,100,000 per year.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 327 from the Recreation and Fish  
 and Wildlife Enhancement Fund**      **Vol. II p. 427**      **Budget p. 164**

---

Requested 1971-72 .....	\$7,020,140
Recommended for approval .....	974,640
Recommended for special review .....	6,045,500

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Last November the electorate approved Proposition 20 which authorized the sale of \$60,000,000 in general obligation bonds for recreation and fish and wildlife enhancement at units of the State Water Project. The bond act allocated \$54,000,000 of the bonds for construction of on-shore recreation facilities by the Department of Parks and Recreation. The fact that the bond approval came after the time that capital outlay projects would normally be prepared for budget submission has meant that the Department of Parks and Recreation did not have the time nor the opportunity to prepare this program adequately for appropriation in 1971.

In addition, the General Fund shortage has caused the administration to propose reverting a number of prior General Fund appropriations and to propose that these appropriations be replaced with the new bond

funds. In so doing, the Legislature is being requested to appropriate funds for two projects which are not clearly defined with respect to a number of changes that have occurred since the original appropriation of General Fund money. The following recommendations are made for the projects in this item:

(a) *For Development, Castaic Reservoir*----- \$1,695,500

*We recommend special review.*

Two years ago the Legislature appropriated the above funds based on a plan for a downstream pool development which was changed during budgetary hearings to an unplanned ridge-route boating facility. Since then the boating facility has been shifted to the left abutment of the Castaic Dam and will require less money. An appropriation of \$677,000 for sewerage facilities has not been expended and is being shifted to the Clean Water Bond Fund in the 1971-72 budget. However, that fund probably can pay only 80 percent of the project costs and the remainder will have to come from this appropriation. The department is working on revised plans and cost estimates for this project and an analysis cannot be completed until the new information is available.

(b) *For development, Del Valle Reservoir*----- \$1,700,000

*We recommend special review.*

This project is for an extensive onshore recreation development at Del Valle Reservoir near Livermore. To date only a boatlaunching facility has been constructed at this reservoir and additional recreation facilities are badly needed. Although a project planning report has been received, it does not contain any estimates from the Office of Architecture and Construction nor has there been time to review the project in the field.

(c) *For construction, Feather River Area Office*----- \$100,000

*We recommend approval.*

Although this project is labeled construction, it actually is to purchase the former construction headquarters building and corporation yard of the Department of Water Resources at Oroville. The Department of Water Resources has been unable to sell the property to private interests. At \$100,000 it is a good buy for the state park system. The facilities are too large for the Department of Parks and Recreation and every effort should be made to encourage other state agencies to use part of the space and facilities.

(d) *For development, San Luis Reservoir State Recreation Area*—  
\$620,592.

*We recommend approval.*

This appropriation replaces a General Fund appropriation for the construction of onshore recreation facilities at the O'Neal Forebay located below the San Luis Reservoir. The project is ready to be constructed, there is a need for it and the construction should proceed.

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

(e) For development, Silverwood Lake \_\_\_\_\_ \$2,650,000

*We recommend special review.*

This appropriation essentially replaces money appropriated last session and supplements it with funds for construction at the Sawpit Recreation Area. As in the case of Castaic Reservoir, the funding of the sewerage facilities is being shifted to the Clean Water Bond Fund and it is not certain that more than 80 percent of those costs can be paid from that fund. The result may be some change in the amount of this item. Until these details and several others can be resolved, we recommend special review.

(f) For repayment to the Department of Water Resources \$254,048

*We recommend approval.*

For several years the Department of Parks and Recreation has had an obligation to the State Water Project to repay certain expenditures made as part of the water project construction for the benefit of on-shore recreation originally at Oroville and more recently at Silverwood. Due to the shortage of General Fund money, this obligation was never fully paid. This appropriation will pay off that obligation.

## DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 328 from the Recreation and Fish

and Wildlife Enhancement Fund

Vol. II p. 427 Budget p. 164

Requested 1971-72 _____	\$1,047,728
Recommended for special review _____	1,047,728

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend special review.*

This item finances planning and other staff work on projects to be constructed by the Department of Parks and Recreation using funds from the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Fund. The appropriation will be a reimbursement to item 207, which is the department's major support appropriation, and therefore is directly related to the amount of money provided under that General Fund item. One reason why the department does not have a General Fund increase in item 207 next year is because a large portion of its planning work is transferred from General Fund support to this bond fund item. Because the department is now preparing a program and schedules to justify the amount of staff and funds needed for its entire planning effort, the amount of money needed in this item cannot be finally determined until this supporting budgetary data is available. We therefore recommend special review.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 329 from the Recreation and Fish  
and Wildlife Enhancement Fund**

**Vol. II p. 427 Budget p. 164**

Requested 1971-72 -----	\$575,400
Recommended reduction -----	575,400

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS***Amount*

Delete the item -----	\$575,400
-----------------------	-----------

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item finances two different types of augmentations. The first in (a) is an unallocated augmentation of \$300,000 to be used for any project (onshore recreation) in item 327 which may be short of funds because of the lack of estimates prepared by the Office of Architecture and Construction. As has been indicated in the individual discussion of projects in item 327, we are not recommending approval of those projects until the amount of money which is actually needed based on Office of Architecture and Construction estimates is determined.

The second augmentation in (b) is \$275,400 which can be used to augment planning costs for projects included in item 327 or for any other projects financed from the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Fund. This money could be transferred to a local agency or to the federal government for cooperative development of the recreation facilities. If such transfers are needed, they should be identified and included or authorized under item 328 which provides the planning money for the onshore recreation facilities.

If the amount of money needed is determined and budgeted in the proper item, this item can be deleted from the Budget Bill.



## **CONTROL SECTIONS**

Sections 4 through 36 of the Budget Bill are the so-called "control sections" which place limitations upon the expenditure of certain appropriations, extend or terminate the availability of certain specified prior appropriations, define the authority of the Director of Finance with respect to reductions and transfers within and between categories of expenditure and contain the usual severability and urgency clauses.

Although significant fiscal policy is contained in these sections, particularly with respect to extending the availability of prior appropriations, these sections have not been received by us in time to permit adequate review for purposes of recommendations to be incorporated in this analysis. These control sections will be analyzed and a recommendation thereon made to the committees in hearings on the Budget Bill.