

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

ITEM 164 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 452

FOR SUPPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE
FISH AND GAME PRESERVATION FUND

Amount requested.....	\$9,759,825
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year.....	8,866,005
Increase (10.1 percent).....	\$893,820
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	\$155,582*

Summary of Recommended Reductions

Administration	Amount	Budget	
		Page	Line
1 Planning officer	\$12,600	454	72
1 Assistant administrative analyst.....	6,360	454	73
1 Training and safety assistant.....	6,360	454	79
2 Intermediate stenographer-clerk	7,440	454	74-80
Staff Operations			
Trout production—Tahoe fish studies.....	10,000	456	47
1 Fisheries biologist III.....	6,360	455	74
1 Fisheries biologist II.....	5,496	455	75
1 Fisheries biologist I.....	4,740	455	76
27 Man-months seasonal aid.....	7,586	455	77
1 Associate hydraulic engineer.....	8,112	456	16
1 Game management supervisor.....	8,316	455	79
3 Game manager III.....	23,184	455	80
1 Assistant microbiologist	7,728	455	81
Regional Operations			
Water Projects			
2 Fisheries biologist III.....	12,720	459	32
4 Fisheries biologist I.....	18,960	459	34
4 Intermediate stenographer-clerk	14,880	459	35
Inland Fisheries			
1 Fisheries manager I.....	4,740	464	28
1 Fisheries biologist II.....	5,496	466	7
Total recommended reductions.....	\$171,078		
Add:			
Staff Operations			
Contract for Tahoe fishery improvement project \$10,000			
1 Fisheries biologist II.....	5,496	15,496	
Net reductions *		\$155,582	

* Plus related operating expense and equipment

GENERAL SUMMARY

Since Chapter 1887, Statutes of 1957, was put into effect, the department's accumulated surplus has ceased its downward trend and has been gradually increasing. At the time the bill to increase license fees was being considered, this office estimated the annual increased revenue, attributable to the bill, would amount to approximately \$3,178,000 at the 1957 level of license sales on a full-year operation of the increased fee structure.

General Summary—Continued

The following table is a more accurate tabulation of what has actually been experienced and what is estimated to accrue as a result of Chapter 1887:

<i>Fiscal year</i>	<i>Increase in revenue attributable to Chapter 1887, Statutes of 1957</i>
1957-58-----	\$1,335,038
1958-59-----	3,097,030
1959-60 (est.)-----	3,231,920
1960-61 (est.)-----	3,362,210
Total-----	\$11,036,198

The provisions of Chapter 1887 also required that 50 percent of the increase in revenue to the department resulting from the revised fee structure was not to be available for expenditure unless specifically appropriated by the Legislature. Therefore, of the increased revenue in that category from the initiation of the bill through the 1960-61 fiscal year, approximately \$5,513,099 was made available to the department for its operations and a like amount should have been frozen unless specifically appropriated by the Legislature, reduced only by approximately \$100,000 which was expended for the study of the Department of Fish and Game conducted by the management consultant firm of Booz, Allen and Hamilton. This study and the moneys expended therefor were also authorized by Chapter 1887.

Had Chapter 1887 not been enacted, there would have been an estimated deficit of \$1,277,019 for operational costs over total resources for the 1957-58 fiscal year operation of the department. As shown in the above table, the department has experienced an increase in income attributable to Chapter 1887 of approximately \$1,335,038 in the 1957-58 fiscal year. This amount is less than the ensuing fiscal year operations because the schedule of effective dates of the fee increases did not permit a reflection of the total consequent income until the 1958-59 fiscal year. In applying this latter figure against the estimated deficit for the 1957-58 fiscal year, a net of \$58,019 was added to the then accumulated surplus figure of \$2,856,970. The total of these two figures, less \$100,000 for the Booz, Allen and Hamilton study, evolves the actual accumulated surplus as of July 1, 1958, of \$2,814,989.

The following table depicts the chronological history of the Fish and Game Preservation Fund condition, 1958-59 fiscal year (actual) through 1960-61 fiscal year (estimated):

<i>Categories</i>	<i>1958-59 F.Y.</i>	<i>1959-60 F.Y.</i>	<i>1960-61 F.Y.</i>
Accumulated surplus -----	\$2,814,719	\$3,533,449	\$4,280,934
Total revenue—state funds-----	10,655,123	10,887,150	11,344,745
Total resources -----	\$13,469,842	\$14,420,599	\$15,625,679
Total expenditures—state funds---	9,909,931	10,139,665	10,822,823
	\$3,559,911		
Less transfer to General Fund----	26,462		
Accumulated surplus -----	\$3,533,449	\$4,280,934	\$4,802,856 *

* Less any proposed capital outlay.

General Summary—Continued

Therefore, it can be seen that the \$5,413,099, which would theoretically be available at the end of the 1960-61 fiscal year in the frozen one-half of the Fish and Game Preservation Fund, has actually been reduced by \$610,243.

Appropriations by the Legislature for the operations of the department would, of course, be compatible with the provisions of the bill, which required specific legislative approval of any funds expended from the frozen 50 percent of the fund.

In comparing the 1957-58 fiscal year with the 1960-61 proposed fiscal year support expenditures, the latter exceeds that of the 1957-59 fiscal year by \$1,357,673, while the revenue for the same years shows an increase of \$2,602,212, with the net effect of enhancing the accumulated surplus of the Fish and Game Preservation Fund by \$1,244,539 in that period.

Even though the accumulated surplus is estimated to be \$4,802,856 at the end of the 1960-61 fiscal year, it should be noted that this is only approximately \$500,000 more than the estimated surplus at the end of the 1959-60 fiscal year. This is considerably less than the annual surplus which would have accrued at the 1957-58 level of service.

Therefore, it is imperative that each proposed increase in the level of service of the Department of Fish and Game should receive careful screening to insure that the added annual increment to the Fish and Game Preservation Fund surplus does not fall below the currently anticipated \$500,000. It is important to note that the normal merit salary adjustments alone will account for approximately \$286,000 in subsequent years at the level of salaries and wages in the 1960-61 proposed budget. This, then, on the level of the 1960-61 proposed budget would provide a leeway of only \$200,000, which could be completely dissipated by the addition of a few more positions in subsequent years with their related operating expenses and equipment. If a level of service is established which would start reducing the approximate \$5,000,000 estimated to be available at the close of the 1960-61 fiscal year, the Legislature would be faced with the same situation that resulted in the necessity for Chapter 1887, Statutes of 1957.

Our analysis which follows recognizes this potential condition in its review of the additional positions proposed by the department.

ANALYSIS

The department proposes an increase in its support budget of \$893,828, or 10.1 percent from the \$8,866,005 estimated to be expended in the current fiscal year to the \$9,759,825 proposed for the 1960-61 fiscal year. This increase is primarily attributable to the addition of 70.1 new positions with the operating expenses and equipment applicable thereto.

There are several factors which we feel are necessary to bear in mind in appraising this proposed budget. Among them are (1) there have been three different directors heading the department's operations in the short space of one year, which necessarily must have had its effect on the program formulation which resulted in the proposed budget;

General Summary—Continued

also (2) the study presented by the management consultant firm of Booz, Allen and Hamilton has had very few of its major recommendations initiated, although certain of its proposals on internal organization are reflected in the proposed budget, without the benefit of a review by the Legislature of those recommendations; and (3) such a review was initiated by the Senate Committee on Natural Resources, whose report it is understood will be forthcoming during the 1960 Session of the Legislature, with recommendations relative to the proposals by that firm, which, as stated, do appear to a certain extent in the proposed budget. Similarly the Assembly Committee on Fish and Game is reviewing the study for reporting purposes.

Administration

The departmental administration section provides executive direction and overall business housekeeping functions for the department. It is proposed to increase the cost of this section by 10.3 percent, or \$76,514, from the \$742,209 estimated for the current fiscal year to \$818,723.

The new positions proposed are, one planning officer, one assistant administrative analyst, two intermediate stenographer-clerks, one assistant budget analyst, three intermediate typist-clerks, and one training and safety assistant.

The planning officer is proposed to initiate systematic short- and long-range planning within the department. We recognize the need for planning, and certainly some individual should be directly responsible for formulating the objectives, plans and programs for sound wildlife preservation, conservation and general wildlife enhancement. However, as stated above, a study of this proposal has been made by the Senate Committee on Natural Resources. It was observed that testimony before that committee raised some doubt as to the necessity for adding an individual to the department for this purpose, since once the methodology of planning has been established, it is debatable whether or not the supervision of planning will require a position devoting its full time to this function. *We recommend the deletion of the planning officer for a savings in salary and wages of \$12,600, plus related operating expenses and equipment.*

The department is also requesting an Assistant Administrative Analyst to provide for the preparation and maintenance of the operational manual in department headquarters. Our appraisal of this position is that it will be used primarily to collect the material to be included in the manual from the various functional subdivisions of the department, to organize it and process its distribution. We feel that the present method used to distribute this material is satisfactory and could not possibly entail the use of full-time personnel for its compilation. *It is felt that this is a definite increase in service which is not justified, and therefore we recommend disapproval of this position for a savings in salary and wages of \$6,360 plus related operating expenses and equipment.*

Under the personnel section of the administrative function, a Training and Safety Assistant is being requested. There is already in this

General Summary—Continued

section a Training Officer position which coordinates the department's training function and which was specifically authorized by the Legislature for that purpose. The department's justification for the training assistant is that he will be used for providing safety training in the in-service training program of the department. It is inconceivable that the training program of the department has not considered the safety aspect which we feel must be an integral part of any training program and as our appraisal of the training program has revealed to us is, in fact, now included. Actual training is provided at several different supervisory levels all through the department. The present training officer has devised a set of training materials. This then would not reflect a workload need, since any changes in the concepts of training would necessarily only require refinements in the existing material. *We therefore recommend deletion of the training and safety assistant for a savings in salary and wages of \$6,360 plus related operating expenses and equipment.*

Since the two intermediate stenographer-clerk positions are contingent upon the addition of the training and safety assistant and the planning officer, we recommend the deletion of these two positions, consistent with our above recommendations, for a savings in salary and wages of \$7,440 plus related operating expenses and equipment.

We are in accord with the department's request to add an assistant budget analyst and three intermediate typist-clerks for workload evolving in that section.

Staff Operations

This unit, which provides field direction and coordinating supervision to its functional counterparts in the regions, is requesting \$950,518, which is \$418,715, or 79 percent in excess of the \$531,803, which it is estimated will be expended in this area in the current fiscal year. The increase is primarily attributable to a proposed addition of 32.6 new positions with their related operating expenses and equipment as well as to a considerably stepped-up participation in the water pollution, special investigations by the department, initiation of a sea lion investigation, a Tahoe fish studies project, and \$46,625 for contractual services for water projects.

Inland Fisheries Branch

This unit of staff operations is requesting five fisheries biologists positions and 4.3 man-years of seasonal aid.

Three fisheries biologists and 27 man-months of seasonal aid plus \$20,000 for increased trout production are proposed in the budget to carry on an intensive fisheries management program at Lake Tahoe to improve the fishing there. We recognize the recreational importance of the Lake Tahoe area, but we are satisfied that its recreational use is not primarily dependent upon the degree of fishing success. It is difficult to accept the allegation that this individual body of water is of so much more importance than others throughout the State that a special project should be initiated of the proportions requested by the department. The contractual arrangement for establishing a fishery in Salton Sea was

General Summary—Continued

extremely satisfactory and productive. In that case, however, the project was designed to establish a fishery where none existed before. In the case of Lake Tahoe, there now exists a fishery and the proposed program has as its objective the improvement of that fishery. There are many waters of the State where fishing is almost the sole attraction for recreation. A precedent may well be established if the department approaches the Lake Tahoe problem in this manner, which would provide, justification for many other such projects for improving fishing in individual waters. This could well result in many groups of positions isolated from regional operations having one body of water as their sole responsibility. This would be organizationally and economically inadvisable.

However, in recognition of the pressures on the Lake Tahoe fishery as well as previous legislative expressions of interest in improving it, we recommend the initiation of a contractual arrangement with the University of California or other such institution having the ability and equipment necessary to engage in a study of Lake Tahoe, designed to terminate in a specific period of time. *We recommend that \$10,000 be included in the support budget for this purpose and that the specific stocking request of \$20,000 be reduced to \$10,000 for a total outlay of \$20,000 for this endeavor.* After there has been some experience under this contractual arrangement proposed, the department can re-assess its needs and present further justification in subsequent budgets.

The result of this recommendation would be the deletion of one fisheries biologist III, one fisheries biologist II, one fisheries biologist I and 27 man-months of seasonal aid for a reduction of \$24,182 in salaries and wages plus related operating expenses and equipment.

Unlike the request for the specific Lake Tahoe study, the department is asking for two additional biologist positions and 2 man-years of seasonal aid to launch a program for improving fisheries statewide in cold-water reservoirs. This has been recognized as one of the more important needs for increasing the fishing potential in the many existing and planned reservoirs. Since this study may develop more effective utilization of fish stocked in these bodies of water for more economical application of hatchery production, we feel that this request is justified and therefore recommend approval.

Game Management Branch

Five new positions are being requested for this unit comprised of one Game Management Supervisor, three Game Managers III and one Assistant Microbiologist. These positions are now being utilized in the Pittman-Robertson Federal Aid Program, and the department justifies their transfer to the support budget primarily on the basis that the federal contribution to the P-R program is being reduced. As stated by the department, the responsibilities will be expanded for each position, and each will become a co-ordinator over some existing specific program.

We have emphasized in past years the fact that the P-R program, even in consideration of all of its benefits, should not be allowed to re-

General Summary—Continued

sult in increased costs to departmental operations. A workload justification has not been established which would dictate the need for these positions, and we feel that the department cannot justify the need for additional co-ordinators in the game management branch. This would tend to further isolate and specialize functions which can be integrated at the present time.

We have stated before that the federal aid program should fluctuate within the funds available from the federal government, and although certain programs may have to be reduced in order to retain the positions proposed for transfer to the support budget, we feel that it is the only justified approach.

We therefore recommend the deletion of the five positions requested for the game management branch for a savings in salaries and wages of \$39,228 plus related operating expenses and equipment.

Wildlife Protection Branch

The department is requesting three new positions for this unit, consisting of one warden captain and two wardens. The warden captain is proposed to formulate and initiate a more concentrated warden training program than now exists, as specifically requested by the Legislature. The two warden positions are requested for more intensified investigations of all types of Fish and Game Code infractions. *We recognize the need for each of these activities and therefore recommend approval.*

Marine Resources Branch

Seven new permanent positions and 5.3 man-years of seasonal aid are being requested for the marine fisheries branch operation in the proposed budget.

This branch is primarily concerned with research on specific ocean fish to aid in the management for sustained yield of the marine fisheries. This program is of vital concern to the economy of the State, having a direct effect on both commercial and sport fisheries. Since the Legislature retains jurisdiction over most of the marine fisheries regulations, it must, of necessity, lean quite heavily upon the results of investigations by this branch.

The increase is reflected primarily in the centralization of all salmon and steelhead investigations and management procedures to attempt to sustain and enhance this important fishery.

In recognition of the objectives of this branch and its consequent effect upon the extremely important commercial fishing industry in the State as well as its impact on the sport fishery, *we recommend approval as budgeted.*

Marine Resources Operations

This unit conducts research on fish life in the Pacific Ocean and provides statistical compilation and evaluation of the commercial fishing industry. This unit is requesting 5.8 new positions, one of which is requested for surveillance of the shrimp and oyster industry. The research

General Summary—Continued

assistant and associate statistician positions are being requested on a workload basis to process data which has already been collected. *We recommend approval.*

Water Projects Section

The department proposes to divide the responsibility in the water projects section and to identify this activity as a water projects branch in the future. The two sections which would be in this branch are water use and pollution control. Three additional positions are requested for these activities, consisting of a fisheries biologist IV, an associate hydraulic engineer, and an intermediate stenographer-clerk.

The fisheries biologist IV is to co-ordinate the activities of the department in investigating water projects. Because of the continued increased workload in this activity and in view of our recommendation under regional operations to assign fisheries biologists to the headquarters section rather than to regional operations for assignment to areas needing immediate attention, *we feel that this fisheries biologist IV position is justified and recommend approval.*

We do not, however, feel that the department is justified in adding an associate hydraulic engineer to its staff. It is the department's responsibility to determine the needs below certain dams and water diversions and then to make known these needs to the agency planning the physical structure. A hydraulic engineer is not needed for this process, and it is not the responsibility of the department to examine the construction specifications for adequacy once its needs are filed with the construction agency. Because of recent legislation which specifies that fishing is a beneficial use, the provision for which must be included in the plans of any structure, it is incumbent upon the State Department of Water Resources to make the necessary adjustments in structural plans. The Department of Fish and Game states as one of its justifications for this position that the Department of Water Resources may make a presentation which would not necessarily satisfy the needs as outlined by the Department of Fish and Game. In view of the mandate of the Legislature, we cannot see how this condition could exist. *We therefore recommend deletion of the associate hydraulic engineer position for a savings in salaries and wages of \$8,112 plus related operating expenses and equipment.*

Regional Operations

Proposed in the budget for regional operations is the addition of 22.7 new positions, 16 of which are allocated to the field water projects and pollution activities of the department.

The request for water project positions in regional operations represents a very concentrated approach toward coping with anticipated stepped-up activity in dam construction and water diversions.

We recognize these activities as being extremely important to insure protection of the inland fisheries. However, sufficient evidence has not been presented which could support the current need for this expanded field staff. Also, there has not as yet been provided to the

General Summary—Continued

Legislature for review a co-ordinated plan of all agencies involved in the development of water projects and the responsibility of each in this activity. It appears that each participating agency is attempting to gear to meet an individual rather than a co-ordinated workload.

We are in accord with the department's request for pollution bioanalyst positions in regional headquarters operations since the ability to make analyses in the shortest time possible of supposed pollution violations aids the department in taking quick action.

However, we do not feel that the regional water project activity should be expanded at this time. We are cognizant of the fact that more demands will be made on the department in this area, but we feel that a group of water project biologists should be assigned to department headquarters instead of regional operations to permit their application at points throughout the State needing immediate attention. Basic facts and waterflow measurements can be provided by existing field personnel in the regions.

To accomplish this concept, we recommend that three fisheries biologist II positions be assigned to the water projects section in Sacramento headquarters. Following a year of utilization of these positions in this manner, the department can more logically assess its needs. It is also recommended that one of the five requested clerical positions be assigned to the departmental water projects section to cope with the workload anticipated with the addition of the three fisheries biologist positions.

The net effect of these recommendations would be to allow three fisheries biologist II positions and one intermediate stenographer-clerk for assignment to the water project section of department headquarters; allow the three pollution bioanalyst III positions for regional operations; and delete the remaining requested clerical and fishery biologist positions originally requested for regional water projects, for a net savings in salaries and wages of \$41,064 plus operating expenses and equipment related thereto.

A fisheries manager position is being requested to provide regional support for the increased salmon management program in Region IV. In considering the increase afforded the marine resources branch in the salmon program which permits surveillance by that branch of the salmon needs from the spawning areas to the ocean, we feel that this position would clearly provide an increased level of service which is not justified at this time. Following experience in the new realignment for management of the salmon-steelhead program in the marine resources branch, more data will be available for appraising any needs within the regional operation. *We therefore recommend deletion of a fisheries manager I position for a savings in salary and wages of \$4,740 plus related operating expenses and equipment.*

General Summary—Continued

The department is also requesting a fisheries biologist in Region V for a management program of the reservoirs in that area. However, we would like to point out that in the case of the cold water reservoirs, positions are being added at department headquarters to make such studies, and in the case of warm water reservoirs a new program initiated under the Dingle-Johnson co-operative activity, entitled "Experimental Management of Warm Water Fluctuating Reservoirs," should answer this need. Also, we again would like to express our position in recommending against the assignment of personnel for management of any particular reservoir or reservoirs, and in consideration of these factors *we recommend the deletion of the fisheries biologist II for a savings in salaries and wages of \$5,496 plus related operating expenses and equipment.*

Department of Fish and Game

GAME MANAGEMENT IN CO-OPERATION WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

ITEM 165 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 467

FOR SUPPORT OF GAME MANAGEMENT IN CO-OPERATION WITH THE
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FROM THE FISH AND GAME PRESERVA-
TION FUND

Amount requested	\$274,458
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year.....	315,170
Decrease (12.9 percent)	\$40,712
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION.....	None

ANALYSIS

The federal government authorized a program of financial assistance in state projects for wildlife restoration, pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, or, as it is more popularly known, the Pittman-Robertson Act.

This program was effected in 1937, and California first availed itself of the opportunity to participate in 1940. It provides that on projects classified as applicable to the provisions of the act the federal government will defray 75 percent of the costs of the project and the State will provide the remainder.

The department proposes to expend \$274,458, which is \$40,712, or 12.9 percent less than the \$315,170 estimated for expenditure in the current fiscal year. In addition to a general reduction to the several states of moneys that had accumulated but are now exhausted, and because of the addition of Hawaii and Alaska as participating states in this program, the funds available to California in the P-R program have been reduced. At the present time, there are 15 active projects involving a total outlay of \$1,150,150, with a federal participation of \$862,612 of that total.

Game Management in Co-operation With the Federal Government—Continued

As we have pointed out under our analysis of department headquarters operations, the cutback in available funds has prompted the department to request the transfer of five positions from this program to the department's support budget. In recent years, we participated in a co-operative study to insure that each of the federal aid programs was independent of the department's regular support budget. This study resulted in relieving the support budget of a number of positions which were absorbed in the federal aid programs to which they were assigned. Since the result of this survey indicated that this was the proper approach to take, we do not feel that the department is justified in attempting to reassign positions from the federal aid program to the support budget. We therefore feel that the federal aid program in areas acceptable to the federal aid co-ordinator must be cut back to absorb this reduced income from the federal government, without moving positions into the support budget.

Department of Fish and Game

FISHERIES MANAGEMENT IN CO-OPERATION WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

ITEM 166 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 472

FOR SUPPORT OF FISHERIES MANAGEMENT IN CO-OPERATION WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT FROM THE FISH AND GAME PRESERVATION FUND

Amount requested	\$76,900
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	81,012
Decrease (5.1 percent)	\$4,112
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	None

ANALYSIS

The federal aid fisheries management program was implemented by the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration, or Dingle-Johnson Act, in 1950. California began its participation in the program in the fiscal year 1951-52 and at the present time there are 9 active projects with a total estimated outlay of \$324,330 with a federal participation of \$243,225 of that amount.

As in the Pittman-Robertson program, the federal government participates up to 75 percent of the total of all the projects.

A minor reduction in this program has as its basis the same condition facing the Pittman-Robertson program in the addition of two participating states. Proposed for the budget year is the transfer of the salmon and steelhead study to the marine resources branch operations, which was discussed previously. Also, the warm-water forage study is proposed for discontinuance in the 1960-61 fiscal year. However, future work with warm-water forage species will be continued under the new program proposed for initiation in the 1960-61 fiscal year, entitled "Experimental Management of Warm Water Fluctuating Reservoirs."

We recognize the importance of this program for determining wise management of the state's fish species, and we recommend approval.

Department of Fish and Game
PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

ITEM 167 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 475

**FOR SUPPORT OF PACIFIC MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION FROM
 THE FISH AND GAME PRESERVATION FUND**

Amount requested	\$17,900
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	17,900
<hr/>	
Increase	None
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	None

ANALYSIS

To bring about co-operation between the States of Washington, Oregon, and California for the conservation and management of the off-shore fisheries, the Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission was created in 1947. The responsibility of developing interstate co-operation and co-ordination in the research and regulation of these fisheries of common interest to the citizens of the member states comprises the primary responsibility of the commission. It is an investigating and co-ordinating body only, having no regulatory powers; however, it has the authority and implied obligation to submit specific recommendations to the three states involved.

Subsequent co-operation has been afforded the commission by the Alaska Department of Fisheries, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Fisheries Research Board of Canada, extending the coastwise range of the various research projects.

On the basis of priority, the commission undertook research programs relative to ocean salmon, bottom fish and albacore.

It is proposed to continue this commission's activities with an expenditure of \$17,900 in the budget year, which is the same amount expended during the current fiscal year. This represents California's share of the total program of \$25,000. The percentage of each member state's contribution is based on the value of the respective commercial catches. *We recommend approval as budgeted.*

Department of Fish and Game
KELP BED INVESTIGATION

ITEM 168 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 475

**FOR SUPPORT OF KELP BED INVESTIGATION FROM THE
 FISH AND GAME PRESERVATION FUND**

Amount requested	\$50,000
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	50,000
<hr/>	
Increase	None
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	None

Kelp Bed Investigation—Continued

ANALYSIS

The kelp bed investigation was initiated by specific authorization in the 1956 Budget Session to determine the cause and effect of various ocean phenomena on the kelp beds and the related effect on fisheries. It was originally estimated that some \$200,000 and five years would be necessary to complete the investigation. The budget year represents the fifth year and actual expenditure in that period of time will have been \$230,000. Investigations to date indicate that considerable progress has been made toward the solution of problems which prompted the study. *Since this is the final year of the program, and the co-operating agencies are geared to continue at the same level as in the current fiscal year, we recommend approval of the entire \$50,000, even though the total amount exceeds the original estimate by \$30,000.*

Department of Fish and Game
MARINE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

ITEM 169 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 478

**FOR SUPPORT OF MARINE RESEARCH COMMITTEE FROM THE
FISH AND GAME PRESERVATION FUND**

Amount requested	\$99,880
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	212,636

Decrease (53 percent)	\$112,756
-----------------------------	-----------

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

ANALYSIS

The Marine Research Committee is an integral part of the department. It is composed of nine members, five appointed to represent the commercial industry and in addition, by law, at least one is to represent the sporting interests and one to represent organized labor.

The committee was initiated in 1947 through legislation supported by the commercial fishing interests to attempt to determine methods to halt the serious decline in the sardine fishery. To support the activities of the committee, a tax is levied on licensed fish packers and processors amounting to five cents for each 100 pounds or fraction thereof of sardines, Pacific mackerel, jack mackerel, squid, herring, and anchovies, whether purchased, received or taken. This tax was extended for a two-year period pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 429, Statutes of 1959.

Because of a lessening of the cannery demand for the species of fish involved in the tax program, a considerably reduced income to support the committee has occurred. Consequently, contractual arrangements were cut to keep expenditures within revenues and since this adjustment has been made to insure against withdrawals from the Fish and Game Preservation Fund for the operation of this committee over the anticipated revenues attributable thereto, *we recommend approval.*

**Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES**

ITEM 170 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 480

**FOR SUPPORT OF DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested	\$428,644
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	368,509
 Increase (16.3 percent)	 \$60,135

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION **\$26,988***

* Plus related operating expenses and equipment.

Summary of Recommended Reductions

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Budget</i>	
		<i>Page</i>	<i>Line</i>
Assistant director (reclassification of existing administrative service officer III)	\$600	481	47
Assistant to director (planning)	12,600	481	48
Senior administrative analyst	9,384	481	49
Senior stenographer-clerk	4,404	481	51

ANALYSIS

The Division of Administrative Services is not a statutory unit of the Department of Natural Resources, having been created by administrative order originally in 1927. Chapter 93, Statutes of 1939, further clarified the authority of the director to organize the department in such a manner as deemed necessary for the proper conduct of the departmental operation.

This division performs housekeeping services for all of the divisions of the department as well as for the California Public Outdoor Recreation Plan Committee which terminates in March of this year, and for the State Water Pollution Control Board. Pro rata reimbursement is provided by the special fund divisions and the outside organizations.

For budgetary purposes only, the director, deputy director, and related executive staff of the department are included in the requests for this function.

This service unit is requesting \$428,644 for the budget year, which is \$60,135 or 16.3 percent more than the \$368,509 which it is estimated will be expended in the current fiscal year.

The increase is primarily attributable to the proposed addition of 8.1 new positions and the reclassification of an existing position plus related operating expenses and equipment. Each individual proposed position will be considered separately.

**Reclassification of Existing Administrative Service
Officer III to Assistant Director**

The department proposes this reclassification to provide a higher salaried individual that the administrative service officer III position to serve as management adviser to the director, to establish methods and policies for the operation of the department and to exercise line authority over departmental operations including acquisition, budget contracts, and routine personnel problems.

We feel that the request based on these needs represents a basic increase in the level of operations which should be proposed during a general session.

Division of Administrative Services—Continued

It must be kept in mind that, exclusive of the director, deputy director, and the conservation education supervisor, this unit is a statistical and budgetary control organization to centralize accounting and reporting activities for the several divisions within the department. There has been a tendency for this unit to assume certain responsibilities for management controls that are the primary responsibility of the individual divisions within the department and for which those divisions have been staffed.

The activities of each division are of such a consistent nature that specific guidelines and administrative procedure should have been formulated long ago and, if they have not been, it is incumbent upon the department to do so within its present framework.

Following is a consideration of each of the proposed duties presented for justifying this reclassification, the first of which is "Acts as business management advisor to Director and assists him by performing high level administrative tasks." We would like to point out that the administrative service officer III, who is on approximately the same salary level as the chiefs of the statutory divisions, must of necessity, in the normal performance of his duties, provide business management advice and counsel to the director. Over the years, this position has been relieved of specific accounting management activity by the addition of a fiscal officer and supervisory positions over each section within this unit. Many additional controls have been initiated into the responsibilities of the administrative service officer which we feel could be modified after a re-appraisal of the necessity for such controls and a department-wide participation in a formulation of specific administrative guidelines. The second part of this first duty statement involves assisting the director in performing varied high level administrative tasks. These tasks have not been outlined. However, in any event, the deputy director position is available for this service, and another proposed position contained in this budget request will relieve the deputy director of certain confining activities and permit him to be of a greater benefit to the director to perform any administrative tasks.

We have alluded to the next duty of this proposed position for establishing methods and policies for personnel, fiscal, legal and management analysis staff operations of the department, in stating that this duty is now an integral responsibility of the administrative service officer, who has legal counsel at his disposal, a personnel officer and many fiscal assistants. It is recognized that management analyses need to be accomplished for this unit; however, the Department of Finance, through its organization and cost control section, is available for this service.

The next duty outlined for this position is to direct the departmental headquarters staff and service units engaged in personnel, fiscal and management analysis work. This is a restatement of the function of the administrative service officer, constituting his major responsibility at the present time.

The last duty proposed for this position is "Exercise line authority over the departmental operations or programs of acquisition (Beaches

Division of Administrative Services—Continued

and Parks), budget, contracts and routine personnel problems." In many respects, this statement implies the creation of an additional supervisory level and the assumption of responsibilities now spread through the various divisions. The Legislature has authorized positions within the statutory divisions to cope with the individual problems of each. If the need is so critical for an additional review and supervisory level, apparently the operations of the several divisions are not functioning adequately. If this is the case, each activity must be thoroughly analyzed before the proposed remedy is initiated which, if allowed, could very well complicate such an analysis.

In view of the foregoing, we recommend against the proposed re-classification for a savings in salary and wages of \$600. Although the savings are minimal, our objection is primarily to the concept of management proposed.

Assistant to Director (Planning)

This new position is being proposed for co-ordinating all planning within the department, and to assume the responsibility for its conservation education program.

It must be recognized that the composition of the Department of Natural Resources reflects a heterogenous makeup unlike the Departments of Fish and Game, Agriculture, Corrections, Youth Authority and others. Each division is essentially unrelated in objectives and activities. Each division must attack its planning problem within the specialized personnel services assigned to it, and planning must be a continuing function integrated throughout its operation. Depending upon the degree of activity within each division, the Legislature has authorized personnel to perform this planning function. Some personnel are specifically identified with planning activities and others have been allowed on a workload basis wherein planning constituted a portion of the workload. The advisory and policy boards and commissions to each division provide very important planning services and controls also. Therefore, it would appear that the departmental planning responsibility is primarily a broad objective and review function which must of necessity originate from the director and deputy director who are given advice and policy assistance by the department's various boards and commissions.

In regard to the conservation education portion of the duties to be assigned to the proposed position, each division has its conservation education or public information staff, where necessary, to formulate and disseminate the material necessary to present the objectives of the individual division involved. Also, in department headquarters there is a supervisor of conservation education to provide the departmental co-ordinating aspects of this function.

This position is also being requested to co-ordinate "all welfare drives and other types of state community projects." We are not aware of any position in state service which includes this aspect as a primary or secondary function to justify its existence.

Division of Administrative Services—Continued

In view of these factors we recommend the deletion of the assistant to director (planning) position for a savings in salaries and wages of \$12,600 plus related operating expenses and equipment.

Senior Administrative Analyst

This position is a component of the request for an assistant director which we have recommended for deletion. This mirrors the same concept of management which we discussed previously and involves services, the performance of which are available to the department both within its own organization and from the Department of Finance and other review and service state agencies.

For basically the same reasons as are stated with respect to the assistant director position we also recommend deletion of the senior administrative analyst for a savings in salaries and wages of \$9,384 plus related operating expenses and equipment.

Administrative Assistant II

This position is being requested to relieve the deputy director of many duties which detract from his availability to perform activities of greater import to the operation of the department.

We recognize the many and varied essential tasks which this administrative assistant position can accomplish to relieve both the director and the deputy director of collecting data, writing speeches, attending meetings requiring representation from this department, etc.

We feel that there are many possible benefits to be derived and therefore recommend approval.

A senior stenographer-clerk and intermediate stenographer-clerk are being requested, the senior for the assistant director (planning) and the intermediate for the administrative assistant. *Since we have recommended against the addition of the assistant director, we also recommend the deletion of the senior stenographer-clerk position to be assigned thereto for a savings in salaries and wages of \$4,404 plus related operating expenses and equipment.*

We are in accord with the addition of one intermediate typist-clerk position to assist the recommended administrative assistant position.

Department of Natural Resources

EXHIBIT AT STATE FAIR AND EXPOSITION

ITEM 171 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 482

FOR SUPPORT OF EXHIBIT AT STATE FAIR AND EXPOSITION
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	\$3,500
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	1,700
Increase (105.8 percent)	\$1,800
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	None

Exhibit at State Fair and Exposition—Continued

ANALYSIS

This item provides the amount necessary to defray the cost of constructing the Natural Resources exhibit at the State Fair in Sacramento chargeable to the proportionate General Fund operations of the department. In prior years this portion was appropriated from the Fair and Exposition Fund.

The fluctuations in this item from year to year reflect the requirements established by the board governing the exhibits. The special fund agencies contribute the balance as their share of the total cost of the exhibit of \$5,000.

We recommend approval.

Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF BEACHES AND PARKS

ITEM 172 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 483

FOR SUPPORT OF DIVISION OF BEACHES AND PARKS
FROM THE STATE BEACH AND PARK FUND

Amount requested	\$8,556,447
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	7,333,638

Increase (16.7 percent)	\$1,222,809
-------------------------------	-------------

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	\$225,707
-----------------------------------	-----------

Delete		Summary of Recommended Reductions		Budget	
		Amount	Page	Line	
1	ranger V and substitute 1 administrative assistant I	\$2,160	484	5	
2	associate landscape architects	15,456	484	78	
1	assistant construction inspector	7,728	484	80	
1	land surveyor	7,511	484	79	
1	senior delineator	6,360	484	80	
2	delineators	16,464	484	80	
4	drafting aids	18,960	484	80	
5	instrumentmen	27,480	484	80	
2	engineering aide II	9,480	484	80	
1	engineering aide I	3,720	484	80	
1	assistant supervisor of recreational planning (P)	8,112	485	10	
3	intermediate stenographer-clerks	11,430	484	80	
1	associate research technician	7,728	485	9	
5	ranger V (P)	35,040	485	73	
1	intermediate account-clerk (P)	3,630	485	75	
2	park rangers III (P)	11,544	487	13	
2	park rangers II (P)	10,464	487	14	
7	park rangers I (P)	33,180	487	15	
11	state park attendants (P)	45,012	487	16	
1	junior stenographer-clerk (P)	3,456	487	18	
1	intermediate typist-clerk (P)	3,630	487	20	
1	junior assistant landscape architect (P)	6,060	487	21	
1	carpenter I (P)	5,772	487	23	
1	tractor operator laborer (P)	4,980	487	22	
6	months seasonal park aid (P)	1,686	487	34	
	(P) proposed new				

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

Summary of Recommended Reductions—Continued

Add	Amount	Budget	
		Page	Line
2 assistant landscape architects -----	13,344	-	-
4 junior assistant landscape architects -----	24,240	-	-
1 associate civil engineer -----	8,112	-	-
1 recreational planner III -----	7,356	-	-
1 senior landscape architect -----	8,940	-	-
2 assistant civil engineers -----	13,344	-	-

GENERAL SUMMARY

The Division of Beaches and Parks is responsible for the acquisition, development and operation of California's state park system as an administrative unit of the Department of Natural Resources. Previously, the responsibility of administering the overall functions of the California state park system rested with the State Park Commission. Through enactment of Chapter 2164, Statutes of 1959, the Department of Natural Resources acting through the Division of Beaches and Parks succeeded to all the powers, duties, purposes, responsibilities and jurisdictions vested in the State Park Commission. The commission is now charged with only the responsibility of establishing general policies for the guidance of the Director of Natural Resources and Chief of the Division of Beaches and Parks in administration, protection and development of the state park system.

The rapid expansion of the division's facilities, sparked by the acquisition program authorized in the 1956 Budget Act has now reached the point where the cost of merely operating its plant without allowing for additional acquisition or additional development of currently undeveloped acquisitions is approximately equal to the total annual income accruing to the State Beach and Park Fund which is composed of oil revenues, park fees, concession income and other small miscellaneous items. The steadily increasing cost of operating the park system will now definitely begin to outstrip the total revenue since the major portion of the revenues, oil royalties, is slowly declining. Under the present distribution plan, the oil royalties provided the State Beaches and Parks Fund with \$8,050,000 in the 1957-58 fiscal year and \$12 million in the 1958-59 fiscal year principally because of substantial one-time bonuses of \$55 million in the latter year. In the current year, income from oil royalties is expected to fall below \$6,500,000 and for the 1960-61 fiscal year, below \$5,500,000. As of July 1, 1960, it is anticipated that the cash surplus in this fund will amount to \$2,626,994. For the 1960-61 fiscal year the revenues from all sources are expected to total \$7,338,566, consisting of \$1,870,000 in fees, concessions, rentals, etc., and \$5,468,566 (subject to downward revision) in oil royalties. These figures, together, will provide a total resource of \$9,964,560 during the 1960-61 fiscal year. Against this will be a demand in excess of \$9,968,078 for support of the existing facilities alone. This takes no cognizance of additional or new development required in existing or newly acquired areas. The current year fund surplus of \$2,626,994

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

mentioned above does not take into consideration an unexpended but still legal authorization of \$10,383,234 for acquisition and \$2,564,823 for development. Thus, as of July 1, 1960, there will be a deficit of over \$12,900,000 in relation to appropriations made to date. Since the normal annual development requirements for the expanding needs of the division should average about \$3 million, this would mean that the deficit is approximately \$16 million.

The following table shows the appropriations made by budget acts from the Act of 1950 through the Act of 1959, in two columns, the first of which is for support and other operating expenses and the second for capital outlay. The second column also includes appropriations made by special legislation.

<i>Fiscal year</i>	<i>Support and other expenses</i>	<i>Capital Outlay</i>
1950-51 -----	\$2,096,320	\$719,890
1951-52 -----	2,061,116	689,760
1952-53 -----	2,492,354	2,162,124
1953-54 -----	2,507,444	1,942,699
1954-55 -----	2,684,289	519,700
1955-56 -----	3,051,974	3,901,109
1956-57 -----	4,100,991	45,251,771
1957-58 -----	5,373,754	4,544,908
1958-59 -----	6,523,160	10,526,876
1959-60 -----	7,256,169	2,764,648
Total -----	\$38,147,571	\$73,021,485

It will be noted that the annual support appropriations have been growing at the rate of over \$1 million annually for the past five years. The figures in the first column do not include the amounts automatically provided for employees' retirement. At present this is running in excess of \$380,000 annually.

The Capital Outlay program as indicated in the second column does not include the substantial expenditures which were made, in years prior to the 1956 Budget Act, for acquisition from Chapter 1422, Statutes of 1945 which provided \$15 million from the General Fund. The figures for the years prior to 1956 cover substantially only development and construction which were largely on a loan basis from the General Fund.

It may be seen from the foregoing that the Division of Beaches and Parks has now reached a point at which either there must be a drastic reduction in its operating costs and almost total curtailment in additional acquisitions and development in order to stay within the present revenue structure or a new or expanded source of revenue must be developed. In the current fiscal year, the anticipated revenue from park service fees and concessions is slightly over \$1 million. This represents something slightly less than 15 percent of the total cost of maintaining and operating the state park system. We suggest that this is a totally unrealistic relationship. We believe that serious consideration should be given to substantial fee increases which would return at least 50 percent of the total cost of operation. It might be pointed out that the

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

State of Indiana has for many years operated its state park system on the basis of fees and concession income which exceeded 90 percent of the cost of operating the system.

Even were the fees and concession resources increased to the point where at least 50 percent of the cost could be recovered, there would still be an inadequate total income to take care of the remaining balance of the acquisition program and the necessary development work, not to mention further acquisitions which appear to be under consideration for the future. Consequently, it would seem to be advisable to consider bringing this agency into the group of General Fund supported activities.

The oil revenues do not provide a consistent basis for financing the regular operating requirements of the beaches and parks. It would be more appropriate to place all oil revenue into the General Fund and finance beach and park facilities out of that fund. As a General Fund supported function, it would take its place in the entire scheme of the General Fund support, which would require the agency to justify its needs in competition with other General Fund supported activities. We believe that this would have a salutary effect on the entire operation of the agency, and result in a more orderly and economical acquisition and development program.

Until quite recently the Division of Beaches and Parks lacked a policy relative to the development of the concession program. The only established guidelines were the provisions of Public Resources Code, Section 5003 which merely permitted the division to grant concession contracts for one year or longer. As a result, very little attention was given to concessions within the state park system. On September 21, 1959, the State Park Commission adopted a new, broad concession policy.

It is anticipated that this policy will materially assist the division in improving its revenue structure. However, at this time concession revenue is running at approximately \$215,000 annually, which is a proportionately small amount in terms of the size of the state park system and the many millions of visitor days. We would recommend that the Legislature urge the commission to solicit large concession projects such as hotel and cabin facilities, restaurants, and gift shops, supply shops to provide foodstuffs, camping equipment, recreational equipment, etc.

In the matter of park use fees, it should be pointed out that at the present time, these are not uniformly charged throughout the system. In those locations where fees are presently charged, they are \$1 per night per car for camping, 50 cents per day per car for picnicking, 50 cents per day per car for parking, 50 cents per boat for boat launching and \$1.50 per night for a housetrailer with hookups. During the 1960-61 fiscal year it is estimated that the revenue under the present fee system will total \$1,382,100. However, the Division of Beaches and Parks has submitted several proposals intended to enhance income from this source. The first proposal contemplates an additional revenue by levy of 50 cents per car for use of day facilities to

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

be uniformly applied throughout the state park system. This would replace specific charges for picnicking and parking, and would provide an \$800,000 increase, bringing the estimated total revenue for the 1960-61 fiscal year to \$2,182,100. The division expects to receive \$203,732 during the 1960-61 fiscal year from concession rentals, which coupled with the enhanced fee revenues would provide \$2,385,832 or 23.9 percent of the operating costs of the division.

A second proposal contemplates additional revenue, by doubling present rates and applying them uniformly throughout the State. This proposal would net \$2,466,300 over the present structure, bringing the total estimated revenue to \$3,848,400. In considering the additional \$203,732 from concession rentals, the total would be \$4,052,132, representing 40.7 percent of the proposed operating expenses of the division.

The third proposal is supplemental to the first and second and would produce additional revenue by a levy of 10 cents per person for admission to state historical monuments, which would apply to 22 state historical monuments, bringing an increase of \$150,000. When added to proposal number one, the total revenue from park use fees and concession rentals would be \$2,535,832 representing 25.4 percent of the proposed operational costs of the division. When applied to the second proposal, it would bring the total park use and concession revenues to \$4,202,132, representing 42.2 percent of the proposed operation costs of the division for the 1960-61 fiscal year.

ANALYSIS

Administration

This phase of the division's budget provides for the operations of the state park commission, chief of the division and the division's business management activities. It contemplates a continued level of existing service with 37.3 positions, and a total expenditure of \$769,345. During the 1959-60 fiscal year, the position of executive secretary to the park commission was reclassified to the state park ranger V and assigned as assistant as aid to the deputy chief in charge of field operations. This is a material change in the terms and conditions of the 1959-60 fiscal year budget and was done without the benefit of legislative review. It is doubtful that we would have recommended such a change in program had it been submitted through routine budgetary processes. We would have proposed the assignment of an administrative assistant I at a salary range of \$530-644 instead of the state park ranger V classification of \$584-710. It is our contention that the ranger V is working outside of the scope of his job classification and should be assigned to the type of duties generally delegated to the ranger classes. *We therefore recommend that this ranger V position be deleted and substituted with an administrative assistant I for a savings of \$2,160.* With this one condition we recommend approval of the administration portion of the division's budget.

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

Technical Services

The Technical Services unit is responsible for the division's acquisition, development, forestry and interpretive programs. The budget contemplates the continuation of the existing level of service in all but the development services where it proposes an expansion.

In the past several years, the planning efforts of the division have come under a number of legislative reviews. Under the present planning procedures the initial appropriation for a project means little in relation to the end product. These procedures also require the division to work against a predetermined dollar amount when planning the area to be acquired for a park rather than permitting planning for realization of the optimum recreation potential of the general area involved.

In the analysis of the 1958-59 fiscal year budget we pointed out that the planning efforts of the division warranted revision. In keeping with the general findings of a Department of Finance survey of the Division of Beaches and Parks planning effort, we recommended that the planning effort of the division be decentralized to the six administrative districts. The division assigned a pilot team to the then district IV which constituted an experiment in decentralizing to the district level for both the project investigation and the development planning functions. This pilot team consisted of a state park ranger V who was in charge, and an associate landscape architect. The assistant landscape architect and assistant civil engineer assigned to the district staff were to become part of the pilot team. But the latter two did not participate in the pilot program.

As a result of this experiment certain conclusions regarding this approach to planning were drawn:

1. The chief advantages of having planning carried on at the district level is the benefit which can be derived from enabling the planner to have a more intimate contact with the areas to be planned and the opportunity to develop better understandings of all levels of park administration from district superintendent to supervisor. Also, better liaison with other state and local government agencies concerned with many specific park projects can be maintained by working teams, in the field.

2. The assignment of planning teams to the various districts and to the administrative control of the district superintendent can greatly complicate the maintenance of the uniform approach to park planning throughout the State. A district superintendent is not necessarily qualified to pass final judgment on park planning. While the experience of the district superintendent in practical park operation should be brought to bear on future parks or park additions, there is no apparent necessity for his participation in planning beyond advising on practical operational problems which may arise from a given plan.

3. The advantages of placing the planners in close physical proximity to the geographical areas being planned, while at the same time maintaining uniformity of approach throughout the State, can best be had by the branch office approach to decentralization. This approach would

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

involve the establishment of planning teams administered as branch offices of the division headquarter's planning section and located strategically throughout the State. Four such planning units utilizing the professional staffs then in the division headquarters and the various districts should be able to carry existing and anticipated planning workload. Repair, maintenance and contract supervision requiring the services of an architect-engineer or draftsman could be furnished a district by the planning unit assigned to service that district.

4. A supervisory level staff should be retained at division headquarters to program, co-ordinate and review the work done in the branch units.

5. While the district superintendents ought to have an opportunity to review the park plans for operational problems prior to the plans being forwarded to division headquarters, this function can be performed during the formative stages as a part-time duty by a park ranger on the district staff. This arrangement would obviate the necessity of assigning a park ranger full time to each planning unit, thus releasing for duty elsewhere the ranger V's then assigned to the project investigation unit and the ranger V assigned to the existing pilot team. The staffing of a range VI at the division level as a member of the review unit would further obviate the necessity of placing the planning and development function under the administrative control of the various district superintendents.

As a result of these conclusions in the analysis of the budget bill for the 1959-60 fiscal year we recommended to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee that there should be four separate planning teams located geographically according to the projected workload. These teams were to be composed of presently employed personnel and supervised by an associate landscape architect.

In addition to that position the team was to include one civil engineer, one assistant landscape architect, one junior landscape architect, two delineators, and one typist-clerk. It was proposed the teams be physically located in existing district headquarters on park or historical monument or spaces available with minor alterations if possible. But they were to remain under the sole administration of the division headquarters in Sacramento.

A review team composed of an associate architect, a ranger VI, a senior civil engineer, a senior delineator and two associate landscape architects was to be located at Sacramento.

It was further pointed out in the analysis that the recommended structure would provide for the continuation of an existing architectural position in each district to appraise local conditions but the primary responsibility for planning work was to be with the four planning teams which would receive continuing direction from division headquarters.

The Department of Natural Resources strenuously objected to this proposal before the Senate Finance and the Assembly Ways and Means Committees considering the budget. However, the Legislature approved the recommendation beginning on page 570 of the above referred to

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

analysis of the budget bill. The amendments to the budget bill made in accordance with this decision are shown in the change booklet on the budget bill as prepared by the Department of Finance on page 30.

Contrary to specific legislative direction and appropriations made to the Division of Beaches and Parks for project investigation and development planning the Department of Natural Resources has authorized creation of six planning teams who report directly to the district superintendent instead of division headquarters. Hence, the planned decentralization of development planning within the division has not been accomplished in accordance with the concept approved by the Legislature. This has resulted in an unsatisfactory planning effort and increased administrative problems within the Division of Beaches and Parks.

The pilot experiment described previously and interviews with the Division of Beaches and Parks personnel strongly indicate a rivalry existing at division level between the ranger classes and professional park planners. The apparent rivalry seems to stem from two causes:

1. A basic difference of opinion or philosophy regarding the primary purpose of the state park system. The rangers, as a group, tend to be conservationists in their philosophy, saying that the essential purpose of our state park system is to preserve the outstanding landscapes with all they contain in flora and fauna which are so significant to the entire State that they should be preserved inviolate. Very little recognition is given to the need for recreational facilities. The professional park planners, made up of landscape architects and architects, engineers, etc., have a different view and philosophy regarding the state park system. This group tends to think in terms of developing a state park system to its optimum potential for enjoyment of the scenic beauties afforded and at the same time providing for active recreation and family occupancy while giving full consideration to sound conservation practices. The professional park planners would open more trails and campsites and would provide recreational areas for those who remain in the parks overnight or longer. Their view is that parks are for adults and their children, both of whom need facilities for active recreation while they are in the state parks. This faction further contends that the scenic beauty of many parks goes unenjoyed by the public for lack of sufficient paths and trails.

The park planners appear to think their opportunity for advancement and the building of a career within the division has been blocked at the senior level in order to provide opportunities for the rangers. Several members of the Division of Beaches and Parks staff pointed out that all personnel above the senior level except the chief and administrative services officer come from the ranger class. It is also noted that a ranger V was placed in charge of the planning team sent to District IV as a pilot study even though the associate landscape architect serving under him received higher pay.

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

We believe our recommendations of last year are still sound. However, we have found that the division has experienced some trouble in hiring the technicians required for their planning effort because of the salary structures and possibilities for advancement existing within the present organizational structure.

It is now our recommendation that there be established a headquarters state park planning unit made up of a supervising landscape architect, one supervisor of recreational planning, one senior engineer, an architectural design group and another group of the licensed land surveyors. The architectural design group should be made up of one senior architect, one associate architect, two architectural assistants and one junior architectural assistant. The land surveyor group should be made up of two supervising land surveyors, three instrument men, three engineering aides, one senior delineator and two delineators. Three branch survey teams should be created and geographically centralized but remain under the immediate supervision of the supervisor of state park development. Each branch planning team should be supervised by a senior landscape architect and broken down into a master planning group, an advanced planning group and an engineering group. The master planning group should be made up of two associate landscape architects, two assistant landscape architects, two junior assistant landscape architects and one drafting aide II. The advanced planning unit should be made up of one recreational planner III. The engineering group should be made up of one associate civil engineer, one assistant civil engineer, one instrument man, two engineering aides, and one delineator.

It should be noted that our proposal contemplates the employment of several positions having higher salary rates than those recommended by the Division of Beaches and Parks. The proposal of the division contemplates a total of 103 positions as opposed to our recommendation for 84 positions. Our proposal will yield a savings of \$100,805.

It should also be pointed out that the makeup of the teams we propose has been discussed with people engaged in the state park planning business and those discussions highlighted the point that because of the large sums involved in the development of our state park system, it is imperative that we obtain the best planning effort possible. It is for this reason that we recommend the higher salaried team members as opposed to a greater number of teams of lower salaried personnel.

Recommended Changes

<i>Increases</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Recreational planner III -----	1	\$7,356
Senior landscape architect -----	1	8,940
Assistant landscape architect -----	2	13,344
Junior assistant landscape architect -----	4	24,240
Associate civil engineer -----	1	8,112
Assistant civil engineer -----	2	13,344

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

<i>Recommended deletions</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Associate landscape architect -----	2	\$15,456
Junior civil engineer -----	1	6,672
Assistant construction inspector -----	1	7,728
Land surveyor -----	1	7,511
Senior delineator -----	1	6,360
Delineator -----	2	10,464
Drafting aide -----	4	18,960
Instrument man -----	5	27,480
Engineering aide II -----	2	9,480
Engineering aide I -----	1	3,720
Assistant supervisor of recreational planning -----	1	8,112
Intermediate stenographer-clerk -----	3	11,430
Associate research technician -----	1	7,728
Ranger V -----	5	35,040

Maintenance and Operation District Headquarters

The actual field operations of the state park system are managed by the deputy chief of operations in Sacramento through an administrative organization consisting of six districts supervised by superintendents located at Eureka, Santa Rosa, Stockton, Monterey, Santa Barbara and San Clemente in Orange County.

To supplement its planning decentralization to district headquarters, the division is requesting five state park rangers V, six intermediate stenographer-clerks and five drafting aides II, all of which were covered previously in our discussion concerning the division's planning effort under "Technical Services" and the deletion of these 16 positions are included in that presentation.

The budget proposes the addition of a carpenter position for the district 1 headquarters located at Eureka. At the present time, they have a carpenter foreman and journeyman carpenters are hired from time to time to handle maintenance and workload beyond the capacities of regular maintenance forces. The principal justification given for the position is that the division would prefer to have a year-round man rather than hiring local carpenters to do the work. While the increase indicated is \$5,772, the actual increase for this personnel change will be \$7,265 due to the additional operating and equipment expenses. In light of the fact that every effort must be made to curtail State Beach and Park Fund expenditures and the division is able to employ local carpenters to fulfill these tasks, *it is recommended that this item be deleted, saving \$5,772, together with the operating and equipment expenses concerned.*

The budget also contemplates the addition of two park ranger III positions, one to be assigned to district 2 and another to district 4, to provide administrative assistance to the district superintendent. The division claims that these two districts do not have any personnel to co-ordinate various activities with outside agencies or make special studies, such as safety, aquatic and other special projects that are needed. It is claimed that a capable administrator is needed to plan the many projects requested of the district, prepare and execute all necessary maintenance construction agreements and supervise and co-ordinate the activities of the various projects being carried out by the division.

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

If the decision is made to delete the ranger V positions requested under the heading of planning, we will recommend adoption of these two positions. *However, if the ranger V positions are granted, then we can see no justification for these two positions and would also recommend deletion of the four ranger III positions now assigned to districts 1, 3, 5 and 6.*

The division is also requesting an intermediate account clerk for district 6 to handle the increased workload occasioned by the decentralization of the planning effort to the district offices. Justification is based on the fact that during the 1959-60 fiscal year all of the district headquarters with the exception of district 6 were authorized an intermediate account clerk, but through an oversight no position was requested for the latter office. No other justification for this position is given. *We therefore recommend deletion, for a salary savings of \$3,630 together with operating and equipment expenses.*

Maintenance and Operation—Field Services

This segment of the division's budget provides for the actual operation of the units of the state park system and the roadside rest program. Before considering the increased program request submitted by the division, it would be well to point out that at the present time the division does not have a uniform nor objective approach to its manpower requirements for state park operation. A review of the budget requests from the district superintendents reveals considerable diversity in the assumed manpower requirements for operation of state park units. No workload measures have been developed that would give weight to visitor attendance, size of the park or complexity of the facilities.

From discussions with the present chief of the Division of Beaches and Parks and representatives of the Department of Finance, it has been determined that both the division and the Department of Finance recognize this weakness and we have been assured by both agencies that a survey of the division's manpower needs will be made during this next summer to ascertain from an objective standpoint the actual manpower needs for operating a unit of the state park system.

In view of the above and the fact that the State Park Fund is in such precarious condition, we are recommending only those positions for which ample and objective justification has been provided.

1. *Positions proposed for opening and operating new or enlarged units.*

Salton Sea. Request is made for one state park ranger III, one state park ranger I, one state park attendant, six man-months of seasonal beach lifeguard services and 18 man-months of seasonal park aid. At the present time, this unit consists of 227 campsites and a personnel complement of one state park ranger II, one state park ranger I, five state park attendants, eight man-months of seasonal lifeguard services and 24 man-months of park aids. Justification for these additional positions is as follows. "The crowds of people who are using the undeveloped area along the shore of Salton Sea are creating a sanitary problem as well as a police problem, because there are no facilities for their use.

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

Neither is there any personnel to patrol this area to discourage robberies, vandalism and all sorts of other crimes. Between February 15, 1959 and May 2, 1959, the average number of cars using this undeveloped area at Salton Sea State Park have been over 250 cars each day for every Friday, Saturday and Sunday in the period. During the middle of the week, this figure will be around 50 cars per day." It would appear that ample justification has been provided for the additional one state park attendant, six man-months of seasonal beach life-guard and the 18 man-months of seasonal park aid. Therefore, *we recommend deletion of one state park ranger III and one state park ranger I, for a savings of \$10,512, together with the related operating and equipment expenses.*

Colorado River. The division is requesting one state park ranger III, one state park ranger I, one state park attendant and 12 man-months of seasonal park aid for minimal operation of this newly acquired area. It is now undeveloped. The division will receive approximately 20 sections of land or about 12,800 acres from the federal government. This land consists of desert and river frontage. There are no state facilities on the land but there is some public camping and day use. The park actually consists of two areas, one being the Gavitan Wash Ranch area and the other the Picacho Wash and townsite areas. The areas are not connected by a road although there are only about $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles airline between them. The travel distance is approximately 65 miles by vehicle or between six and seven miles along the river. The division proposes to establish two patrol stations for housing and administrative purposes. One would be constructed in the Gavitan Wash area and the other in the Picacho area. The nearest community is Winterhaven, California, and this is the only location where housing is presently available. At the present time, the area is the focal point for fishing and boating along the Colorado River and about 20 families reside in the Picacho area. Mining is a major activity and there are many active claims and mines now in operation. Cattle graze on the lands and hunting has also been allowed on certain portions of the project. It is our understanding that the Division of Beaches and Parks intends to eliminate these nonpark uses by establishing stations located at the southeastern and northeastern area of the park. The district superintendent states that three employees will be sufficient to provide seven day a week patrol and also compensate for illness, vacations and compensating time off. *Therefore, we recommend deletion of the one state park ranger III for a salary savings of \$5,772 together with the related operating and equipment expenses.*

Frank's Tract. The division is requesting one state park ranger II and one state park ranger I. No workload justification is provided nor has any master plan been arranged for the administration of this unit of the state park system. Until such are provided, *we recommend disapproval for a savings of \$9,972.*

Henry W. Coe. The division is requesting one state park ranger II, one state park ranger I and 16 man-months of seasonal park aid. This is a newly acquired segment of the state park system and has no facil-

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

ities at the present time. Justification for the above positions is that there is presently a need for patrolling to protect the inflammable localities, to make extensive studies, research and planning. In view of the fact that the research, planning and extensive studies will be undertaken by the branch planning teams, it is our *recommendation that the one state park ranger I position be deleted for a saving of \$4,740.*

Woodson Bridge. The division is requesting one state park ranger II and six man-months of seasonal park aid. At the present time, no facilities exist on this segment of the state park system. Justification for these positions is to provide a holding action during which time the supervisor will determine what is needed to operate the park. We contend that any such holding action would merely amount to the usual police activities provided by the county sheriff's office and until such time as facilities are provided, the State should not provide yearlong personnel. *We therefore recommend disapproval of these positions for a savings of \$6,918.*

2. *Additional staffing for existing areas on the assumed basis of workload and completed facilities.*

Hearst Castle. The division is requesting four state park rangers I, three state park attendants, one senior account clerk, one intermediate typist-clerk, 2.9 seasonal historical monument guides, two groundsmen, two janitors and 60 man-months of seasonal park aid. The division proposes to increase the number of visitors to the monument during the heavy use periods by extending the tour periods from 8 a.m. to 5.40 p.m. instead of 9 to 5 and running the tours every 15 minutes rather than every 20 minutes. It is estimated that this will increase the number of tours per day from 25 to 40 and increase the number of visitors each day from a maximum of 1,325 to 2,100. To handle this increased visitor workload justification has been provided for the three state park attendants, the 2.9 seasonal historical monument guides, the two groundsmen, the two janitors and 60 man-months of seasonal park aid. The state park rangers I, are requested on the basis of need for supervision, there being 3,620 hours of supervisory time required. Inasmuch as one position is available for 1,784 hours a year a little more than two supervisory positions are therefore required, hence the unit now has one state park ranger II whose job it is to provide this basic supervision, it is apparent that only one of the three requested state park ranger I positions can be justified at this time. We are unable to appreciate how the remaining three state park ranger I positions could in any way enhance the number of visitors that could be handled at this facility. *We therefore recommend deletion of the three state park ranger I for a saving of \$14,580.*

A review of the justification for the intermediate typist-clerk reveals that the existing clerical staff is able to handle five-sevenths of the workload. This includes the workload contemplated for the senior account clerk requested above. We are therefore unable to appreciate the need for the one intermediate typist-clerk and *recommend its deletion together with the related operating and equipment expenses for a salary savings of \$3,630.*

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

Folsom Lake. The division is requesting two dispatcher clerks, one carpenter, one junior stenographer clerk, and six man-months of seasonal park aid. The carpenter position is requested to provide maintenance for 22 structures, 800 picnic tables and eight lifeguard towers. We point out that this is a fairly recently developed state park and that none of the facilities are in poor condition. Since there are 24 year-round personnel available to maintain the 800 picnic tables and the lifeguard towers during the off season, and further since there is one carpenter foreman and one carpenter assigned to the district headquarters at Stockton, we are unable to see the need for this position and *therefore recommend its deletion for a savings of \$5,772.*

In support of the request for a junior stenographer-clerk, the division submits that there is a backlog of 440 man-days of clerical work which cannot be done with the current clerical personnel available at this state park unit. Inasmuch as we are recommending the two dispatcher clerks whose functions include the handling of clerical matters, we are unable to see the need for this position and *therefore recommend its deletion for a savings of \$3,456 for salaries and wages.*

The division is also requesting a state park attendant at each of the locations of Clear Lake, Samuel Taylor, Sonoma State, Van Damme Beach, D. L. Bliss and Emerald Bay, Natural Bridges, Plumas-Eureka, San Mateo Beaches, Angel Island, and Pismo Beach. Until such time as the Joint Division of Beaches and Parks—Department of Finance survey of the division's manpower needs is completed we cannot recommend adoption of these items and *therefore recommend deletion of them in this budget for a savings of \$40,920 and the related operating and equipment expenses.*

Additional staffing has been requested for utilization of the conservation camp programs in Humboldt and Del Norte Counties. The division is requesting one junior assistant landscape architect, one state park ranger I, one park attendant and one tractor-operator-laborer. The junior assistant landscape architect is justified on the basis that additional landscape architectural services will be required to enhance the conservation camp program services. It is our contention that such architectural services can be adequately provided by the existing architectural staff at district headquarters and also by the branch planning teams previously discussed in this report. *We would therefore recommend deletion of this one junior assistant landscape architect for a savings of \$6,060.*

The state park ranger and state park attendant are justified on the basis that park personnel are required to supervise the conservation camp inmates. A review of this proposal indicates that it is unwise to remove the inmate supervision from the Division of Forestry and in keeping with a previous report to the Legislative Budget Committee we would recommend that all supervision provided over the inmates from the conservation camps come from the Division of Forestry. What co-ordinating efforts may be desirable can be provided by the state park ranger II now assigned to the District I headquarters in Eureka

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

for this purpose. *We therefore recommend deletion of the one state park ranger I and the state park attendant for a savings of \$8,832.*

The one tractor-operator-laborer is justified on the basis that he is needed to operate the equipment in conjunction with the conservation camp programs. It is submitted that such operators are assigned to the Division of Forestry unit at the conservation camp and therefore this one tractor-operator-laborer position cannot be justified. *We therefore recommend its elimination for a savings of \$4,980, together with the related operating and equipment expenses.*

An item of \$10,000 is included in the operating expenses of the District I office to continue the ecological studies on the redwoods by contract with the University of California previously financed from funds available for the redwood highway relocation. The original proposal for this research program contemplated \$10,000 a year for over a period of five years and to be financed from the redwood highway relocation project. However, it is now the division's intent to remove the five year limitation and allow for a more thorough study over longer periods of time. Funds are no longer available from the relocation project therefore the division is asking to defray these research costs from the division's support budget. It is submitted that such a research program could very well be desirable from an academic standpoint but in view of the shortage of beaches and parks funds and the fact that the division now tells us that this project could continue on for a number of years, which was not originally manifested in the primary proposal, *we would recommend deletion of this item for a savings of \$10,000 until additional funds become available for such projects.*

Squaw Valley. Chapter 1069, Statutes of 1957, specified that the Squaw Valley facilities which were constructed for the Olympics, as well as all area under control of the Olympic Commission at the close of the games, shall be turned over to the State Park Commission for inclusion in the state park system as a permanent state park immediately following the games or in no event later than June 30, 1960.

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 186, filed with the Secretary of State June 13, 1957, resolved that this site was to be called the Snowshoe Thompson State Park at the time of its acceptance by the State Park Commission and the Department of Natural Resources. However, the division has referred to this unit in its budgetary request as Squaw Valley State Park.

To date, \$7,990,000 have been appropriated from the State Beach and Park Fund for construction of the Olympic facilities. It was originally represented that a portion of these funds would be returned to the Division of Beaches and Parks. However, it is clear at this point that not only will there be no funds returned, but it has been stated that additional funds will be requested of the Legislature to satisfy the commitments made by the California Olympic Organizing Committee, a non-profit organization with which the California Olympic Commission has contracted to put on the games.

Even though the site was to become a state park, at no time did the State Park Commission or the Division of Beaches and Parks partici-

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

pate in the planning of the area to insure that state park requirements would be considered in the development for the Olympics. Furthermore, the California Olympic Commission let a 10-year lease on the state lifts and a 30-year lease on another area under their control to an organization in the Valley, thereby committing the State Park Commission, as the succeeding responsible agent of state government, to the provisions of the leases.

These conditions have seriously prejudiced the intention of the Legislature in designating the Squaw Valley Olympic area for inclusion in the state park system.

The area and facilities which will accrue to direct administration by the Division of Beaches and Parks following the games consist of four athlete housing units, a large restaurant center, two spectator centers, a large administration building and press building, a massive ice arena, and the sewage disposal unit as well as the water system, to name the most important units. Most of the land underlying the facilities is under a 30-year term lease from the U.S. Forest Service. The State owns, or has permanent easement to, only 29.1 acres. It is an apparently accepted fact that in any winter sports area, the ski lifts are the primary sources of income and often carry the costs of maintaining other facilities. The Division of Beaches and Parks will thus inherit facilities requiring high annual costs of maintenance while being denied the benefits of the high income facilities.

Although the federal government constructed the ice arena at a cost of approximately \$3,500,000, it requires the State to maintain the structure as a monument to the Olympic Games. This facility in itself will require extensive maintenance outlays by the State, but will not likely produce appreciable revenue by itself.

Many recommendations have been offered to alleviate the problems facing the division in this new unit. However, at this time, no decision has been made, and considerable study must be engaged in before a supportable recommendation can be presented.

In recognition of this fact, the Division of Beaches and Parks is recommending in its regular support budget what it considers a minimum budget to protect the State's physical facilities at Squaw Valley and to provide minimum public use. This is in the amount of \$271,926, which includes \$95,386 for salaries and wages, \$151,540 for operating expenses and \$25,000 for equipment. It is interesting to note that of the total requested, \$100,000 is included as an estimate for defraying the cost of recurring repairs and maintenance.

No real assessment of the adequacy of the requested amount can be made until the division has accumulated more experience in this area. In recognition of the State's already tremendous investment in Squaw Valley, it appears that before any substantial appropriation for expansion or alteration of the facilities can be justified there must be a basis in experience and professional study. It should also be reiterated that the Beach and Park Fund is already in financial difficulties. In view of the foregoing, *we recommend approval of the budget for a holding action.*

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

Equipment

As has now become customary, we reviewed the equipment requests of the division with its representatives as well as representatives from the Department of Finance prior to the final formulation of the budget by the Governor. This review resulted in a reduction of over 32 percent from the amount of approximately \$675,000 originally proposed to the \$452,769 now included in the budget.

Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF BEACHES AND PARKS

ITEM 173 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 489

FOR ADDITIONAL SUPPORT, REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION AND
DEVELOPMENT AT SQUAW VALLEY STATE PARK FROM THE STATE
BEACH AND PARK FUND

Amount requested	\$1,000,000
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	None
Increase	\$1,000,000

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION \$1,000,000

ANALYSIS

The Division of Beaches and Parks has proposed acquiring certain areas within Squaw Valley to make the Olympic site a more operable unit of the state park system. It also proposes certain revisions in the facilities to improve their use by the public. For this purpose the division is requesting an additional \$1 million.

We do not believe that there is sufficient evidence at this time to justify additional expenditures of this kind. In the first place, there is no evidence that the property owners in the valley will agree to expanded acquisition in the area without resort to eminent domain. Under the existing provisions of Chapter 1069, Statutes of 1957, the division is specifically enjoined from exercising eminent domain. Although legislation was adopted making Squaw Valley a part of the state park system, the Legislature has not been provided with comprehensive planning information which would indicate the most appropriate use of the area and facilities as a state park from the standpoint of its service to the public, its prospective revenues, or the basis upon which it will be operated (for example, by concession or otherwise). The budget provides additional funds under the support item for beaches and parks for a holding operation during which period of time it is contemplated that these policy questions will be examined and presented to the Legislature for decision. It may be necessary to spend some money to minimize the loss from maintaining and operating these facilities during this holding period. *However, pending receipt of sound factual data on what these minimum expenditures might be, we would recommend disapproval of this request.*

**Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF BEACHES AND PARKS**

ITEM 174 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 489

**FOR SUPPORT OF ROADSIDE REST PROGRAM FROM THE
STATE BEACH AND PARK FUND**

Amount requested	\$12,500
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	12,500
<hr/>	
Increase	None

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION None

ANALYSIS

The division's roadside rest program has received very little emphasis since the Legislature in 1958 felt a reappraisal of the division's approach to constructing and maintaining these areas was in order.

In line with recommendations by this office reflecting expressions by the Legislature, the division has proceeded to construct some 24 roadside rests of minimum-type facilities on state beach and park property, which are being maintained by local park personnel. We feel that by this procedure, the objectives of the program are being realized at a minimal construction and maintenance cost to the State.

There has been no expansion in the number of rests beyond the 10 that are located outside of park boundaries and the same amount of money for maintenance thereof is being requested as will be expended for this purpose in the current fiscal year.

We therefore recommend approval of this item as budgeted.

**Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF FORESTRY**

ITEM 175 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 490

**FOR SUPPORT OF DIVISION OF FORESTRY
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested	\$17,482,627
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	17,103,615
<hr/>	
Increase (2.2 percent)	\$379,012

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION \$30,866

Summary of Recommended Reductions

	Amount	Page	Line
1 Meteorologist II	\$7,728	492	7
1 Fire prevention officer	6,542	492	10
1 Forest technician	6,542	492	12
2 Forest fire fighter foreman	10,054	493	17

GENERAL SUMMARY

The Division of Forestry is the state agency responsible for the prevention and suppression of fires in those timber, watershed and range areas of the State designated by the Board of Forestry as being eligible to receive forest fire protection at state expense. Through a contractual

Division of Forestry—Continued

arrangement with certain counties which have elected to provide their own fire protection services, the State pays for the protection of the state-responsibility lands falling within those counties, based on the level of service afforded areas receiving direct state protection. The State also contracts with the United States Forest Service for the protection of most of the private lands falling within U.S. Forest Service boundaries, the remuneration for which is provided on the same basis as in the contract counties.

The Division of Forestry in recent years took over the protection of the Butte Meadows area and the Calaveras section from the U.S. Forest Service and is planning to take over protection of other areas of private lands within National Forest boundaries in future years. In arguing for the transfer of protection responsibility of the Butte Meadows and Calaveras areas from the U.S. Forest Service to the division, it was represented that the cost to the State would be comparable or less than that paid to the U.S. Forest Service under contract for protection of those areas. However, since assumption of this responsibility, costs have materially increased. Therefore, any future recommendations of this nature should be critically reviewed to determine if the benefits to be derived will justify the costs involved.

Since 1955, there has been a total support budget increase for the Division of Forestry of 78 percent, with a 38 percent increase in personnel in that period. The greatest incremental increase occurred in the 1957-58 fiscal year, at which time the Legislature authorized the implementation of a portion of the 1956 Fire Plan, which was compiled by the Division of Forestry at the request of the Board of Forestry.

The majority of the budget increases have occurred in the fire-suppression function. Actually, very little increase is reflected in that period in the fire prevention phase of the department's responsibility. It is felt that the fact that there has been a 61 percent increase in fire occurrences as between the 1955 and the 1959 fire seasons reflects this. It is true that each division employee is responsible for fire prevention in a certain degree. However, training in fire suppression consumes such a large portion of the time of the personnel before being placed on an active duty status that fire prevention would necessarily have to receive less emphasis.

It can be argued that the State's population, which has grown tremendously over this period of time, has influenced the increase in fire occurrence. However, the division in compiling the statistics for its 1956 Fire Plan found that 60 percent of the fires were caused by the people who actually resided in the area where these fires occurred and the population increase in these areas has been relatively small. It is felt that the division has hardly scratched the surface of its fire-prevention potential, and we feel that it is incumbent upon the division to present a fire prevention plan related to its problems. It was sincerely hoped by us that the providing of jeeps to certain fire station foremen would have a salutary effect on fire prevention in the wild land areas where most of the fires occur and where most of the people who cause them live. It was originally intended that these jeeps were to be used by the

Division of Forestry—Continued

station foremen during the periods of low fire danger in their individual sectors to get acquainted with the people in the area and to carry the message of fire prevention to them, as well as to become thoroughly acquainted with all roads, potential fire dangers, and water source locations. However, it has been found that a great majority of these jeeps are being used for administrative purposes or for purposes which reduce their effectiveness as a means of fire prevention.

It is felt that the division must show that each of its field foremen and assistant ranger positions are being used to the maximum possible extent for fire-prevention purposes before any significant increases in active suppression facilities and personnel should be provided. It is economically impossible to provide the field forces necessary to cope with every fire situation occurring in the State, but it is not inconceivable that fire occurrences cannot be significantly reduced.

ANALYSIS

The Division of Forestry is requesting \$17,482,627 for its operation in the budget year, which is \$379,012, or 2.2 percent in excess of the \$17,103,615 estimated for expenditure in the 1959-60 fiscal year.

The majority of the increase of 81.5 man-years is for the conservation camp program expansion.

Administration

This section provides the executive direction and business management functions of the division, including the State Forester and supervision of the housekeeping, fire control and engineering functions as well as direction of the operation of the Davis warehouse and equipment repair shop. This function of the division shows a net decrease of approximately four percent reflected primarily in a reduced equipment budget.

New positions requested for the various units of this section are a meteorologist II, a forest fire prevention officer, a forest technician, a lead groundsman and an intermediate typist-clerk.

The meteorologist II, under fire control, is to develop fire weather information for use by the division in alerting all field units of fire conditions so that those units can place their crews on standby when necessary. However, the fire weather section of the U.S. Weather Bureau provides the forecasts which the division can use for this purpose. The division will be able to make even more effective use of the currently available information after installation of the microwave contacts to each of its district offices. It appears that the meteorologist position will be used primarily to collect and collate statistics so that a correlation can be made between the particular fire danger that exists and the historical behavior of fires in the various fuel types under previous similar conditions. It is the opinion of this office that since the division rotates certain ranger personnel through the division as a training medium and since the objective of the division in this program is primarily to accumulate and catalogue data, which we feel does not seem to require a technical background, the machinery can be set up for the collection and collation of the material desired and the responsi-

Division of Forestry—Continued

bility for this work can be integrated into the duties of the rangers being rotated through for training purposes, as well as into other headquarters positions, making it unnecessary to add a position for this purpose. *We therefore recommend the deletion of the meteorologist II position for savings in salaries and wages of \$7,728 plus related operating and equipment expenses.*

Under the fire prevention education section of the administration unit a forest fire prevention officer is being requested. In further support of our remarks in the summary to this analysis, it is felt that the division has not presented to the Legislature a comprehensive program for reaching the groups of people who are primarily responsible for setting the majority of the fires in the State. It is true that a considerable effort has been expended toward educating the masses in the metropolitan areas. However, as pointed out, this does not reach the core of the problem. It is felt that until the division can supply the information or the action program desired, aimed toward reducing fire occurrences at their source, that no expansion to this section should be allowed. Also, it should be pointed out that a law enforcement co-ordinator was added in the 1958-59 fiscal year, basically for the same justifications presented for the position being requested. To aid the co-ordinator in each district headquarters office, there is a fire prevention officer to meet the needs of those districts. *We therefore recommend the deletion of the forest fire prevention officer for a savings in salaries and wages of \$6,542 plus related operating expenses and equipment.*

A forest technician is being requested under the forest management program to handle increased workloads resulting from the revised Forest Practices Act of 1957, which established a timber-owner and timber-operator permit system as well as to assist in the workload resulting from the expanded research program of the division. At the present time, the division states that the duties which would be assigned to this position are being accomplished by diverting the work of a senior forest technician who is in charge of state forest activities. We recognize the necessity for the senior forest technician to devote the majority of his effort to the operation of the state forests. However, it must be realized that most of the work related to the Forest Practices Act is performed in the field. Establishing the details of the Forest Practices Act applicable to the various regions in the state is a very technical and integrated process involving the over-all administrative function and the individual timber operators. When the specifications are issued, they are clear and concise and are made available to the forestry field men, whose primary duty it is to make the inspections and collect the data desired for appraisals. Under the forest management function, there are at present four senior forest technicians and eight other forest technicians and, in addition, under other responsibilities and services of the division there are a total of thirty forest technician positions. It would appear that there would be an excellent opportunity for training by rotating the current complement of forest technicians through division headquarters, as is done now in the ranger classification, who could prepare the information necessary for dissem-

Division of Forestry—Continued

ination to the field. It is felt that an appraisal of the activities and workload of all of these technicians will support this approach. In addition, the majority of the research programs of the division are now being co-ordinated by a position assigned to the Forest and Range Experiment Station. It is felt that any addition of personnel in the division to supplement this function would clearly be an increase in services. In recognition of these factors, *it is recommended that the forest technician position be eliminated at a savings in salaries and wages of \$6,542, plus related operating and equipment expenses.*

In regard to the other positions requested by the administration section, involving the forestry equipment engineer, the lead groundsman at the division nursery and the intermediate typist-clerk, *it is recommended that they be approved on a workload basis.*

Forest Protection—District Headquarters

This function provides administrative direction and co-ordination over the field activities of the division.

A proposed budget of \$1,954,422 is being requested for this function, which is \$39,761 or two percent over the \$1,914,661 estimated to be expended in the current fiscal year. The increase is attributable primarily to annual merit salary adjustments and the request for eleven new positions.

The division is again requesting two forest fire fighter foreman to bring its complement of relief dispatchers in all administrative units up to the level set by the 1956 Fire Plan.

The division has for many years used various field personnel during fire seasons as relief dispatchers. We do not feel that this is a misuse of the time of these individuals, inasmuch as it serves as excellent training for those intending to go into the dispatching function, and, in addition, it permits more integrated use of personnel, which we feel is necessary and very beneficial. We do not feel that these positions are vital to the operation of the division and that they fall clearly into the category of increased services. It should be pointed out that the Legislature has authorized the addition of relief dispatchers in all of the major administrative units, and that it has never given "carte blanche" approval of the 1956 Fire Plan in its entirety. For these reasons, *we again recommend the deletion of the two forest fire fighter foremen positions for a savings in salaries and wages of \$10,054 plus related operating and equipment expenses.*

We are in accord with the request for five intermediate stenographer-clerks for use in all districts except District 5, to handle the documents and other matters which require attention in the conservation camp program. We would question that the workload involved in district headquarters would consume the time which will be provided by the addition of these clerks. However, our visits to the conservation camps have indicated that the various conservation camp supervisors are required to handle many documents, sub-purchase orders, etc., that should and could be taken care of in district headquarters to permit more effective use of their time. Therefore, *we are recommending the*

Division of Forestry—Continued

addition of these clerks, provided that the division make a thorough review of all the work now handled in the offices of the conservation camp supervisors, to determine what can be handled by district headquarters more easily, thereby relieving the supervisors of their office duties, and permitting them to perform more effective camp co-ordination functions.

We are also in accord with the request by the division for one and a half man years of camp crew cook and one and a half man years of food service assistant for the training center food service problem.

We also recommend approval of the division's request for a state forest ranger I, to be assigned to District 5 to co-ordinate the conservation camp program in that part of the State as has been provided in the other districts.

Forest Protection—Field Services

This subdivision of the Division of Forestry provides for the operation of the fire suppression stations, the lookout stations and the county headquarters offices.

This function is requesting \$11,051,591 for the budget year, which is \$858,258 or 7.8 percent more than the \$10,193,333 which it is estimated will be expended in the current fiscal year.

The majority of the increase in this function is reflected in the requested addition of 13.7 positions, most of which are forestry equipment operators for new and existing bulldozer units, in equipment purchases which shows an increase of approximately \$570,000 for radios, bulldozers and replacements of automotive equipment, and an increased allotment for rental of airplanes in the aerial retardant program.

The aerial retardant program request is designed to extend the same services to all of the districts of the division that have been afforded three of the districts in the experimental stage in the past two years. We recognize the value of the use of aerial retardants under certain conditions, but all public fire agencies using this fire attack tool will admit that there is a considerable lack of knowledge of all of its problems and potentials, which must be obtained before any major expansions in this area can be allowed. Actually, the amount requested by the division for this program does not exceed the amount expended in the current fiscal year. Although \$139,000 was budgeted for this program, some \$360,000 was spent, the difference being drawn from the Division of Forestry's emergency fire fund and also from the State's General Emergency Fund. We are in accord with the recommendation made by the Senate Fact Finding Committee on Natural Resources that since this is a controllable use of funds, no additional moneys than that included in the support budget shall be used to expand this program during the 1960 fire season. This concept will be discussed further under the emergency fund appropriation request.

We therefore recommend approval of the budget for the forest protection field services as requested.

Division of Forestry—Continued

Forestry Conservation Camps

The Forestry Conservation Camp Program, which is a joint program involving the Division of Forestry and the Departments of Correction and Youth Authority, has experienced a considerable growth in the last few years, and it is anticipated that as of July 1, 1960, 1,650 Department of Corrections inmates and 265 Youth Authority wards will occupy 22 permanent conservation camps and three "spike" camps. It is the objective of these co-operating agencies that during the 1960-61 fiscal year, five additional permanent camps and three mobile camps will be completed and staffed.

The proposed budget of \$3,006,316 for this activity of the division reflects a decrease of \$452,630 from the \$3,458,946 estimated to be expended in the current fiscal year. Even though the division is requesting 67 new positions to staff the camps to be completed in the budget year for an increase in salaries of \$343,578, a net decrease arises from the reduction in the inmate work crew payments from the division to the Department of Corrections in the amount of approximately \$1,000,000. This reduction results from an interdepartmental agreement between these two agencies relating to the cost of inmate service.

There are many benefits to be derived through the conservation camp program not only by the inmates in this valuable rehabilitation approach but also by many public agencies whose primary responsibility is to achieve conservation in the State. *We recommend approval as budgeted.*

Department of Natural Resources

DIVISION OF FORESTRY

ITEM 176 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 497

FOR ALLOTMENTS TO COUNTIES FOR WATERSHED
PROTECTION FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	\$1,337,638
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	1,248,020
Increase (7.2 percent)	\$89,618

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

ANALYSIS

Section 4006 of the Public Resources Code authorizes the State Forester to enter into contracts with those counties desirous of providing fire protection on state-responsibility lands within their jurisdiction.

Counties participating in this plan are Kern, Los Angeles, Marin, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, and Ventura. The amount requested by the division for payment to the counties under contract is designed to permit the counties to provide the same level of protection on qualifying state-responsibility areas within their individual counties as the State provides on lands to which it is giving direct protection. If the Division of Forestry were to take over the protection responsibility

Division of Forestry—Watershed Protection—Continued

in these six counties and provide the same level of protection now given by the counties through their own fire protection organizations, the cost to the State would be considerably more than that under contract.

Any reduction by the Legislature in the division's support budget would cause a corresponding percentage reduction in the contract to the individual counties. *We therefore recommend approval of this item, subject to a change in the total amount budgeted resulting from any legislative concurrence with our recommendations in the division's support budget.*

Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF FORESTRY

ITEM 177 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 497

FOR SUPPORT OF PROTECTION OF PRIVATE LANDS WITHIN AND
ADJACENT TO NATIONAL FORESTS FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	\$1,062,126
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	992,178
Increase (7 percent)	\$69,948

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION..... None

ANALYSIS

The State Forester is authorized to contract with the U.S. Forest Service for the fire protection of private lands within and adjacent to the U.S. National Forests, for which the State would otherwise provide direct protection.

This program has been very beneficial to the State in insuring the protection of private lands within the national forests, which are so remote from any of the division's administrative units that control and effective protection could not be afforded by the State. Within recent years, the division has worked out a program with the U.S. Forest Service which would insure that the moneys expended by the State under contract to the U.S. Forest Service would be used for the support of forest fire fighting crews placed in or near the areas to be protected for the State on a continuous standby basis during the contract period.

The division has made a survey of all of the isolated parcels of private holdings within the United States forests and is devising a plan whereby the State would take over the protection of those which the division feels can be economically administered by the division within the present framework of its organization. As we have pointed out, two such transfers have been made, one in Butte Meadows and the other in the Calaveras area. The results of these changes have proven that the State would incur an increased cost in the event it took over any other such protection. No additional transfers are proposed for the budget year. However, it is anticipated that such proposals will appear in the near future, at which time it will be necessary to review them in detail to

Division of Forestry—Protection of Private Lands—Continued

insure that the State will not incur additional costs over the benefits to be derived therefrom.

We recommend approval of this item, subject to any change which may be effected by the Legislature in the division's support budget, inasmuch as the level of service provided through contract to the U. S. Forest Service by the State is theoretically the same that the State provides in protecting lands directly within its area of responsibility.

Department of Natural Resources

DIVISION OF FORESTRY

ITEM 178 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 497

**FOR SUPPORT OF WHITE PINE BLISTER RUST CONTROL PROTECTION
IN CO-OPERATION WITH THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested	\$97,000
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	94,600
Increase (2.5 percent)	\$2,400
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	None

ANALYSIS

The State has participated in the blister rust control program with the Department of Agriculture since 1936 and has expended well over \$1,500,000 in cash contributions and over \$300,000 in labor since 1941. In 1946, the State established this program on its current co-operative basis whereby California and the U.S. Department of Agriculture participate on a fifty-fifty basis.

In 1953, the Legislature amended the Forest Pest Law to include disease control, in order to give continuing statutory authority to the white pine blister rust control program. A thorough field review was made by the co-operating agencies to determine what lands should qualify for receiving this service. Only those areas which had adequate stocking and favorable control cost conditions were selected. This review resulted in an approximately even distribution of qualifying lands under state and federal jurisdiction.

The U.S. Forest Service administers most of the various phases of the program, including surveys, delineation of control areas, disease investigation, technical direction and eradication work. This is another area in which the state utilizes forestry conservation camp inmate labor for some of the control work, particularly on state lands.

In the event the co-operating agencies determine that private lands should receive this treatment, or if they are requested by private land-ownerships to initiate any control activity on their lands, these individual owners are requested to provide up to at least 25 percent of the total cost of eradication on their properties. A considerable amount of money has been expended by the state and federal government on eradication on private lands. However, the contribution by the individuals concerned has not nearly approached the 25 percent desired. The co-operating agencies, however, have rationalized the cost involved

Division of Forestry—Blister Rust Control—Continued

in eradication work on private lands as contributing to the general economy of the State and lessening the danger of spread of blister rust into areas of state and federal control responsibility. Therefore, this program has been continued on private landownerships, even in the face of the lack of co-operation of the individual owners in helping to defray a portion of the cost.

In recognition of the necessity for this program to protect the large acreage of marketable sugar pine in California, even in the absence of landowner co-operation, *we recommend approval.*

Department of Natural Resources

DIVISION OF FORESTRY

ITEM 179 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 497

FOR SUPPORT OF EMERGENCY FIRE SUPPRESSION AND
DETECTION FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	\$320,000
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	1,019,450
Decrease (69 percent)	\$699,450

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION----- None

ANALYSIS

It is unecomomical and impractical for the State to provide a support budget to the Division of Forestry designed to cope with any extraordinary demands on the suppression force. Because there is considerable variance in fire occurrences and conditions and because past experience has required the division to augment its fire suppression forces from outside sources in order to contain extensive or extremely dangerous fires for which it is not normally geared, the State has provided an emergency fund for such situations.

The reduction of \$699,450 in the amount budgeted for the 1960-61 fiscal year from the \$1,019,450 estimated to be expended in the current fiscal year does not properly reflect the anticipated needs of the division. Actually, historically the division has drawn on the emergency fund to an extent considerably greater than it has budgeted. The source of the additional expenditures is the State's General Emergency Fund.

The 1959 fire season was one of extreme emergency and requirements on the division's suppression forces. The division had previously indicated that as increments of the 1956 Fire Plan were added to the support budget undoubtedly the need for emergency funds would decrease. This has not been borne out. One reason is that the division has expanded its use of the aerial tanker program over that which was budgeted for support expenditures.

We have recommended approval of the increase in the division's support budget to permit approximately the same use of aerial tankers in the budget year as was actually provided in the current fiscal year. However, we would like to point out that the aerial tanker program is still in an experimental stage. It is a controllable tool in the sense

Division of Forestry—Fire Suppression—Continued

that the division can expend a certain amount of money and then cease using that particular tool. There is no satisfactory substitute for ground forces and logically the division must expend the funds necessary to contain wildfires. If the need is greater than the forces that are employed by the division in its normal support budget, it is only logical that the division should have access to an emergency fund. *It is therefore recommended that this item be approved.*

Department of Natural Resources

DIVISION OF FORESTRY

ITEM 180 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 498

FOR SUPPORT OF FOREST INSECT CONTROL
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	\$20,000
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	20,000

Increase	None
----------------	------

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

ANALYSIS

The Division of Forestry engages in a program for the control of forest insects, principally pine beetles. This endeavor occurs on both state and private lands, and unlike the white pine blister rust control program, in the event that control efforts are expended on private lands the landowner is required to match the state expenditure, either by cash or labor, under the rules established by the Board of Forestry.

While white pine blister rust usually takes some time to inflict any real damage on the economic potential of a stand of trees. Conversely, forest insects cause an immediate damage, which it is felt accounts for the fact that landowner co-operation is secured much more easily in this program than on the blister rust control project.

The average annual outlay for forest insect control approximates \$16,000. A considerable amount of the appropriation is designated as unallocated, to cope with any emergencies which may arise and which need immediate attention. *We are in accord with this program and the methods of its budgeting and recommend approval.*

Department of Natural Resources

DIVISION OF FORESTRY

ITEM 181 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 498

FOR SUPPORT OF WILD LAND VEGETATION AND SOIL MAPPING
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	\$113,068
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	111,045

Increase (1.8 percent)	\$2,023
------------------------------	---------

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

Division of Forestry—Wild Land Vegetation and Soil Mapping—Continued

ANALYSIS

The State of California and the federal government conduct a number of programs designed to promote better management, by private enterprise and public agencies, of the agricultural and timber lands of the State. Land management, like the management of any other business enterprise, requires an inventory of its productive capacity and available raw materials. Soil and vegetation surveys are currently being carried out by public agencies to provide this inventory. At the present time three separate agencies are conducting surveys in California, two of which are supported from federal funds. The Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is mapping the privately owned and state-owned lands lying within the organized soil conservation districts. The Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is mapping the national forest lands. The privately owned and state-owned lands situated outside the organized soil conservation districts are being mapped by the state co-operative soil vegetation survey. There appears to be no overlapping of geographical territory by the three agencies.

The state co-operative soil vegetation survey is concerned primarily with privately owned and state-owned wild land. It is financed entirely by appropriations to the Division of Forestry. The division, the Department of Agronomy of the University of California at Davis, the Department of Soils and Plant Nutrition of the University of California at Berkeley and the U.S. Forest Service experiment station located in Berkeley are the co-operating organizations.

Upon conclusion of the 1959-60 fiscal year the State of California will have invested over \$1 million in the survey. When the program was initiated in 1947, the Department of Natural Resources estimated that it would be completed in three to four years. In 1953 a reassessment of the program indicated that 10 years would be needed and a 1958 re-evaluation estimated that another 28 to 30 years would be required to cover the State. Hence, it can be conservatively estimated that another \$3 million will be invested in the survey.

Since at the last general session the Legislature expressed its intent that the program be continued, by making the necessary appropriation, and since the amount proposed provides essentially the same level of service as previously authorized, *we recommend approval.*

Department of Natural Resources

DIVISION OF FORESTRY

ITEM 182 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 498

FOR SUPPORT OF WATERSHED RESEARCH IN CO-OPERATION WITH CALIFORNIA FOREST AND RANGE EXPERIMENT STATION OF THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	\$24,000
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	24,000

Increase	None
----------------	------

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

Division of Forestry—Watershed Research—Continued

ANALYSIS

This item is to continue the contract relationship between the division and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to carry out the watershed treatment project which has been in progress for some 20 years. The goals of this project are to increase water yield through intensive watershed control and brush manipulation as well as to determine the proper vegetation to be seeded in burned-over areas of Southern California.

The California Forest and Range Experiment Station now feels that it has secured sufficient data from its research program to place several watersheds in the Southern California area on a management basis. This is one of the most concentrated projects of its kind and very vital to the Southern California area, 60 percent of the water supply for which comes from local watersheds.

We recommend approval.

Department of Natural Resources

DIVISION OF FORESTRY

ITEM 183 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 499

FOR SUPPORT OF FOREST AND FIRE RESEARCH
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	-----	\$69,696
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	-----	28,000
Increase (148.9 percent)	-----	\$41,696
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	-----	\$41,696

ANALYSIS

The division is engaging in a forest and fire research program of a type designed to approach most of the economic and fire emergency problems facing the division and the industry. Its participation in research has expanded rapidly in the past few years receiving major impetus from Chapter 2408, Statutes of 1957, which added Section 6816.3 of the Public Resources Code to provide for an annual transfer of \$100,000 from the State Lands Act Fund for research purposes.

The primary responsibility of the Division of Forestry is in the field of wild land fire prevention, detection and suppression. In the course of the division's expansion to cope with the primary objective, the division has also become actively concerned in research which has developed from an equipment improvement program to one which covers many areas.

It is important to point out that industry is presently engaging in research projects to enhance its interests, and we feel that many of the research projects proposed by the division are more of an industry economic interest type than for refinement of existing and development of new tools for more effective fire prevention, detection and attack.

The division is permitted to engage in other types of research through the provisions of Section 4361 of the Public Resources Code. However, it would appear that those interests having diverse primary objectives

Division of Mines—Continued

ice officer I. At the present time this function is accomplished by an accounting technician II under the supervision of a senior mining geologist. The principal justification given for the business service officer is the increased workload occasioned by the expanded mineral research program and the fact that the senior mining geologist expends a great deal of his time on routine business management functions which it is claimed materially detracts from his technical duties. If this request is granted the division intends to combine the activities of the storekeeper and the accounting technician under the supervision of the business services officer.

In view of the above, we recommend approval of the request as submitted.

**Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF MINES**

ITEM 185 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 501

**FOR SUPPORT OF MINERAL RESEARCH AND FIELD STUDY
FROM THE STATE LANDS ACT FUND**

Amount requested	\$211,779
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	126,083

Increase (68 percent)	\$85,696
-----------------------------	----------

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	\$91,863
--	-----------------

Summary of Reductions		Amount	Budget	
			Page	Line
Salary and Wages:				
1 Geophysicist		\$8,112	501	60
1 Geochemist		8,112	501	61
2 Geologic aids		9,720	501	62
1 Intermediate typist-clerk		3,630	501	63
Operating Expenses:				
Contractual services		10,000	501	76
Equipment		52,289	501	82

ANALYSIS

During the 1959 General Session the Division of Mines recommended to the Legislature that the State's mineral research program be considerably expanded. The expansion was to be made in yearly increments for five years through augmentation of the research programs administered by the Division of Mines and the University of California. The accumulated costs at the end of the five-year period were projected to be \$959,000 for the Division of Mines and \$635,000 for the University of California, for a total cost of \$1,594,000. Annual operating costs subsequent to the five-year period are estimated to be \$280,000. It should be mentioned that the above figures fail to anticipate any increased level of salary or operating costs.

The proposed budget contemplates a 72.6 percent increase in the mineral research program through employment of the five positions listed above, operating expenses associated therewith, increased con-

Division of Mines—Mineral Research—Continued

tractual services of \$10,000 and \$52,289 of additional equipment. We recommend against its adoption for the following reasons:

1. Traditionally, program expansions have been restricted to general session years.
2. Initiation of the program provided for two professional mineral research people, two laboratory technicians and one typist-clerk. The division has experienced a great deal of difficulty in recruiting personnel for the highly technical research positions which has materially inhibited expected development of the first phase.
3. Since the first phase is not yet operative, imposition of an additional increment at this time probably will not produce a level of service commensurate with the increased cost for equipment and facilities. It would, therefore, be reasonable to delay purchase of the additional equipment until the personnel can be recruited. We believe that each phase of any new program should first show progress and results before a subsequent phase is added.
4. There has been a substantial reduction in revenues accruing to the State Lands Act Fund.

In view of the above, it is recommended that the mineral research program be continued at its presently authorized level.

Department of Natural Resources

DIVISION OF MINES

ITEM 186 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 502

FOR SUPPORT OF GEOLOGICAL EXPLORATION IN CO-OPERATION
WITH U.S. GEOLOGICAL SURVEY FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	\$35,000
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	35,000
<hr/>	
Increase	None
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	None

ANALYSIS

For a number of years the Division of Mines has co-operated with the U.S. Geological Survey in a survey of mineral deposits in California. The cost of these projects at the field level is about \$70,000, half of which is shared by the State of California. By participating in the cost of this geological survey the State receives data, maps and reports which would otherwise cost the State considerably more. It is recognized that maps and surveys are one of the most important tools employed by geologists in the mining industry generally. *We recommend approval of this item as submitted.*

Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF MINES

ITEM 187 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 502

FOR SUPPORT OF STATE GEOLOGIC MAP
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	\$15,795
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	18,875
Decrease (16.3 percent)	\$3,080
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	None

ANALYSIS

This request provides funds for the fourth increment of the program to prepare a colored edition of the State of California geologic map. The new state geologic map incorporates the large amount of geologic mapping completed since the 1938 edition was published.

The primary objective in preparing a state geologic map is to demonstrate regional relationships of the various rock and time rock units. Second is to indicate the detailed geology commensurate with the scale of the map for as many areas as the information is available. A third objective is to convey to the public the geologic data contained in unpublished work which is otherwise unavailable or limited in its distribution. A byproduct of preparing a geologic map is the inventory made of unmapped or inadequately mapped territory. Such an inventory serves scientists, industry, government service, university staffs, and the Division of Mines as a reminder in planning future detailed geologic work.

The new map will depict 105 geologic units by distinctive colors and pattern and the underlying topographic base will be printed in a neutral color. Modern scribing techniques used by the division's drafting department will provide quality and consistency of line work that is superior to pen and ink techniques. The result will be a more attractive and even more legible map at a lower cost. Certain maps will be combined with adjacent ones to form single sheets for convenience in handling and for reducing the map area lying outside California's borders. A total of 28 geologic map sheets will thus be required, each of them designed to match the adjacent sheets and the continuity and geology in color and in scale so that adjacent sheets can be trimmed and joined if desired. If the entire map were assembled it would cover an area of about 14 feet square. Upon completion of all the individual map sheets the geologic atlas is planned to consist of all 28 geologic map sheets irrespective of explanatory charts and a full-page detail of geologic legend. The overall dimension of the atlas will be 17" x 22" and each map sheet will be folded to the required size.

As individual sheets are completed, they are made available for purchase by the public. When the total project is finished the division expects to realize a profit. This income is a reimbursement to the appropriation which accounts for the decrease indicated above. *We recommend approval.*

Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF OIL AND GAS

ITEM 188 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 503

FOR SUPPORT OF DIVISION OF OIL AND GAS
FROM THE PETROLEUM AND GAS FUND

Amount requested	\$747,218
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	740,939

Increase (0.8 percent)	\$6,279

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION..... None

ANALYSIS

This agency was established in 1915 and was made a division of the Department of Natural Resources in 1929. It maintains a headquarters in San Francisco and field offices located in Bakersfield, Coalinga, Inglewood, Santa Maria, Santa Paula, Taft and Woodland. The functions of the Division of Oil and Gas are:

1. To supervise the drilling, operation, maintenance and abandonment of wells so as to prevent damage to underground oil and gas deposits from infiltrating water and other causes, loss of oil and gas, and damage to underground and surface waters suitable for irrigation and domestic purposes by the infiltration of detrimental substances by reason of the oilfield activities.
2. To administer and co-ordinate repressuring operations which will tend to arrest subsidence and compaction of land in those areas overlying producing oil or gas pools within the State where valuable buildings, harbor installations or other improvements are being injured or imperiled, or where subsidence is interfering with commerce, navigation and fishing, or where portions of such areas may be inundated if subsidence continues.

The budget contemplates a continuation of the existing level of service.

Support of the division is derived entirely from charges imposed upon the operators of oil and gas wells in the State. The charges are apportioned among all such operators in amounts proportional to their respective interests, computed at a uniform rate per barrel of oil produced or per thousand cubic feet of gas produced during the preceding calendar year. Prior to the first Monday in March of each year, the Department of Natural Resources acting in conjunction with the Department of Finance, is required to make an estimate of the amount of money which will be required to support the Division of Oil and Gas. On or before the first Monday in July of each year, the Department of Natural Resources is required to determine the rate or rates which will produce sums necessary to support the division and within the same time extend into the proper record of assessments the amount of charges due from each operator. The Director of Natural Resources, the Director of Finance and the Chairman of the State Board of Equalization constitute a board of review, correction and equalization and have all the powers and perform such duties as usually devolve upon the county board of equalization.

Division of Oil and Gas—Continued

From the above, it can be appreciated that the amounts approved for support of the Division of Oil and Gas, in fact, establish the rates imposed upon the oil and gas producers for the administration of the division's functions. It should be pointed out that statistical data presented by the Division of Oil and Gas indicate that the workload of the division has substantially decreased since the 1955-56 fiscal year. The following table indicates the change in the division's general operations workload:

Workload item	1955-56 fiscal year	1958-59 fiscal year	Percent of change
Oil well inspections -----	4,214	2,972	—29.47
Approval to drill -----	2,384	1,383	—41.99
Approval to rework -----	1,283	977	—23.85
Approval to abandon -----	961	815	—15.19
Well reports written -----	9,191	6,391	—30.46

During the same period, the division's personnel complement was expanded from 76.2 positions to 82.4 for an increase of 8.1 percent. The number of personnel directly engaged in production of the division's workload has remained at 41 during this period. It would appear that the number of well reports written would be an adequate measure of the division's workload. When analyzing the number of well reports written during the 1955-56 fiscal year, we find that 224.1 reports were written for each employee directly engaged in the division's workload, whereas in the 1958-59 fiscal year the average field employee produced 158 well reports. This represents a 30.4 percent decrease in the individual fieldman's productivity. However, it does not consider the possibility of an increase in the complexity of the well reports submitted. To date we have not examined this division's activities in sufficient detail to recommend an adjustment to the division's personnel complement which would properly compensate for the indicated reduction in workload. However, we make the following recommendations:

1. That any personnel vacancies occurring during the budget year not be filled.
2. That a comprehensive survey of the division's workload be undertaken by the Department of Finance to ascertain the proper staffing formula.

Subject to the above conditions, we recommend approval of the budget request as submitted.

Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF OIL AND GAS

ITEM 189 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 504

FOR SUPPORT OF DIVISION OF OIL AND GAS FROM THE
SUBSIDENCE ABATEMENT FUND

Amount requested -----	\$110,844
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year -----	103,731
Increase (6.9 percent) -----	\$7,113
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION -----	None

Division of Oil and Gas—Continued

ANALYSIS

As previously pointed out the Division of Oil and Gas is also responsible for administration of the State's program to repressure subsided and compacted oil lands. The costs of administering the program are defrayed from the Subsidence Abatement Fund which is supported from levies on oil and gas producers over and above the normal charges directed to the Petroleum and Gas Fund.

In initiating the program the Legislature appropriated \$250,000 from the Investment Fund with the provision for repayment when the unbudgeted surplus in the Subsidence Abatement Fund reaches \$400,000. However, Chapter 1877, Statutes of 1959, requires that repayment be made when the sum of \$350,000 is accumulated in the Subsidence Abatement Fund and that the Department of Natural Resources may follow a different procedure than that originally proposed. The sum of \$250,000 will be repaid during the 1959-60 fiscal year.

This year's budget contemplates a continuation of the existing level of service in this area with the 8.6 positions employed during the 1959-60 fiscal year.

We recommend approval.

**Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF SMALL CRAFT HARBORS**

ITEM 190 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 507

**FOR SUPPORT OF DIVISION OF SMALL CRAFT HARBORS
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested -----	\$73,489
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year -----	88,360
Decrease (16.8 percent) -----	<u>\$14,871</u>

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION ----- None

ANALYSIS

Through enactment of the Federal Boating Act of 1958, known as the Bonner Bill, the federal government established a system for small craft registration and accident reporting which was to be enforced by the United States Coast Guard unless the various states adopt systems which have been approved by the Coast Guard. To supplement this act the California Legislature through enactment of Chapter 1454, Statutes of 1959, added Chapter 5 to Division III of the Harbors and Navigation Code relative to the operation, equipment and registration of vessels.

The enabling state legislation appropriated \$600,000 from the General Fund to the Department of Finance for allocation to the Department of Natural Resources and the Department of Motor Vehicles for the purpose of administering the newly added division of the Harbors and Navigation Code. This \$600,000 figure was the amount recommended by the Department of Natural Resources for enforcement of the act. The actual registration of the vessels will be handled through the Department of Motor Vehicles which will require \$375,298 in the 1959-60 fiscal year for the program.

Division of Small Craft Harbors—Continued

The \$600,000 program envisioned employment of 22 positions in the Division of Small Craft Harbors during the 1960-61 fiscal year for a total cost of \$110,000. It also contemplated operating expenses in the sum of \$423,000 which included \$280,000 to be given to the Department of Motor Vehicles in 1959-60 and approximately \$50,000 during the 1960-61 fiscal year. Additionally, the recommendation included approximately \$50,000 for equipment during the 1959-60 fiscal year and \$6,000 during the 1960-61 fiscal year. However, it should be stressed that the enabling legislation provided the \$600,000 without any specific limitation on how that money was to be expended, other than to enforce the applicable provisions of the Harbors and Navigation Code. Accordingly, the division has employed nine additional personnel, namely, one supervisor of boating regulations, two boating regulations representatives, one registration assistant, one senior clerk, two intermediate stenographer clerks, one intermediate file clerk and one man-year of temporary help, for a total cost of \$90,847. Of the \$600,000 originally appropriated \$133,855 remains unexpended.

It should also be pointed out that the legislation requires that in the event of any collision, accident or other casualty involving an undocumented vessel resulting in death or injury to a person or damage to property in excess of \$100 it shall be reported to the Department of Natural Resources in the same manner that a similar accident must be reported to the Department of California Highway Patrol. The Division of Small Craft Harbors has manifested an intention to develop an accident statistical system similar to that undertaken by the Department of California Highway Patrol. The division estimates that 280,000 vessels will be registered this year. In view of the fact that the injury accident rate per 100 registered vehicles on California's highways is 1.134 it might be assumed for rough computational purposes that the so-called reportable accident experience on California's lakes and waterways will be no more than that figure and may possibly be much less. If such were the case, we might expect no more than 3,175 accidents during the calendar year or less than 10 such reportable accidents each day.

An analysis of the statistical system of the Department of California Highway Patrol reveals that the Highway Patrol could absorb the statistical workload of this small number of boating accidents. Moreover, it is pointed out that the Department of California Highway Patrol has had considerably more experience in the field of gathering, handling and evaluating accident statistical data than has the Division of Small Craft Harbors and is probably in a better position to provide the caliber of statistical reports that should be required. In this light, it is strongly recommended that the Division of Small Craft Harbors request the Department of California Highway Patrol to handle on a contract basis all of the statistical work to be undertaken in connection with boating accidents.

**Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF SMALL CRAFT HARBORS**

ITEM 191 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 507

**FOR SUPPORT OF DIVISION OF SMALL CRAFT HARBORS FROM THE
SMALL CRAFT HARBORS REVOLVING FUND**

Amount requested -----	\$182,937
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year -----	177,815

Increase (2.9 percent) -----	\$5,122
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION -----	\$7,728

Summary of Recommended Reductions

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Line</i>
1 Assistant statistician -----	\$7,728	508	34

GENERAL SUMMARY

The Division of Small Craft Harbors and the Small Craft Harbors Commission were created by enactment of Chapter 2362, Statutes of 1957. The enabling legislation has vested the Small Craft Harbors Division and the Small Craft Harbors Commission with all the powers, functions and jurisdiction of the State Lands Commission with respect to the acquisition, construction, development, improvement, maintenance and operation of small craft harbors. However, the State Lands Commission retained its jurisdiction with respect to the leasing of state lands for the extraction and removal of oil and gas and other minerals.

The division is empowered to prepare plans for and acquire, construct, develop and improve small craft harbors facilities in connection therewith and connecting waterways. Any small craft harbor so acquired or developed must be transferred and its operation relinquished to a county, city or any district having the power to operate a small craft harbor in which any part of it is located, upon the request of such lesser governmental entity, providing it enters into agreement with the division for repayment to the State of all costs incurred by the division in acquiring and developing this small craft harbor, including the planning costs. The lesser governmental unit shall be required by the division to repay such cost by means of deferred payments in such amounts and at such times as may be provided by the agreement. In the event that the division acquires, constructs, develops or improves a small craft harbor, but receives no request for transfer of its operation to a city, county or district willing and able to meet the requisite conditions for such a transfer, the division may maintain and operate the harbor. The division may also provide for the granting of concessions within the boundaries of harbors under its jurisdiction in order to furnish the public with fuel, food or other facilities and may grant easements, rights-of-way and permits with respect to such harbors.

The division may also make loans to cities, counties or districts having power to acquire, construct and operate small craft harbors for the planning, acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance or operation of the small craft harbors and facilities in connection therewith and connecting waterways if the division finds that the project is fea-

Division of Small Craft Harbors—Continued

sible. The Small Craft Harbors Commission must establish by rules and regulations, policies and standards to be followed in making loans under the law so as to further the proper development and maintenance of the statewide system of small craft harbors and connecting waterways. All such loans must be repaid.

The Small Craft Harbors Commission, which is composed of seven members appointed by the Governor, is created within the Department of Natural Resources for the purpose of establishing general policies for the guidance of the division in the planning, acquisition, construction, development, improvement, maintenance and operation of small craft harbors under the jurisdiction of the division.

ANALYSIS

The 1958 general election ballot, Proposition No. 4, providing for the issuance of general obligation bonds up to \$10 million, and legislative authorization to use \$5 million from the Investment Fund has provided a total of \$15 million available for loans to local governmental entities for the purpose of constructing small craft harbors. Through adoption of Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 30 (Chapter 61 of the Concurrent and Joint Resolutions and Constitutional Amendments adopted at the 1959 Regular Session of the Legislature), the Legislature specifically approved appropriations for construction and loans totaling \$5,639,000 and earmarked an additional \$9,250,000 for possible loans to be made in the 1959 calendar year, committing a total of \$14,889,000 of the \$15 million made available. The ACR 30 projects for which loans have been claimed are as follows:

Port San Luis, San Luis Obispo County-----	\$100,000
Monterey, Monterey County -----	300,000
Noyo, Mendocino County -----	15,000
San Leandro Phase I, Alameda County-----	110,000
Ventura, Ventura County -----	900,000
Total -----	\$1,425,000

It should be noted that ACR 30 made the funds available for loans to be made only during the 1959 calendar year. Therefore, \$13,575,000 remains to be expended, provided legislative approval is granted. It is now estimated that the following ACR projects will qualify for their loans prior to the time that the Legislature will have an opportunity to grant legislative approval for their distribution:

Broderick, Yolo County -----	\$60,000
Eagle Lake, Lassen County -----	65,000
Sausalito Canal, Marin County -----	300,000
Mill Valley, Marin County -----	300,000
Mono Lake, Marin County -----	25,000
Park Moabi, San Bernardino County-----	300,000
Pittsburg, Contra Costa County -----	450,000
Redwood City, San Mateo County -----	300,000
Total -----	\$1,800,000

Item 191

Natural Resources

Division of Small Craft Harbors—Continued

There is a possibility that the following Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 30 projects will qualify for their project loans prior to the end of the 1959-60 fiscal year:

Crescent City, Del Norte County	\$250,000
Martinez, Contra Costa County	1,100,000
Moss Landing, Monterey County	1,200,000
Needles, San Bernardino County	167,000
Total	\$2,717,000

Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 30 made \$300,000 each available to the Vallejo and South San Francisco projects. However, subsequent investigation reveals that these amounts must be increased and with the increased authorizations it is estimated that they might qualify for their construction loan requests prior to the end of the 1959-60 fiscal year.

Vallejo, Solano County	\$1,500,000
South San Francisco, San Mateo County	500,000
Total	\$2,000,000

It is estimated that the following Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 30 projects cannot be undertaken prior to the 1960-61 fiscal year:

Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz County	\$1,650,000
Oceanside, San Diego County	1,000,000
Blythe, Riverside County	500,000
Total	\$3,150,000

The Division of Small Craft Harbors informs us that the following projects probably cannot be undertaken prior to the 1960-61 fiscal year:

Bodega Bay, Sonoma County	\$700,000
San Francisco, City and County	2,000,000
Dana Point, Orange County	1,000,000
Total	\$3,700,000

We are also informed that the following Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 30 projects will probably never be undertaken with state funds:

Imperial Beach, San Diego County	\$1,200,000
Riverview, Yolo County	72,000
Total	\$1,272,000

If the authorizations to the Vallejo and South San Francisco projects are increased, and even though the Imperial Beach and Riverview projects are never undertaken with state funds, an additional \$1,064,000 will be necessary to complete the projects contemplated by Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 30.

The division further reports that loan requests have been received for the following projects not contemplated in Assembly Concurrent

Division of Small Craft Harbors—Continued

Resolution No. 30 of which the first group might qualify for their construction loan requests prior to the end of the 1959-60 fiscal year:

Alameda County, San Leandro Phase II-----	\$1,300,000
Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara County-----	685,000
Total -----	\$1,985,000

The following could probably be undertaken in the 1960-61 fiscal year:

Berkeley, Alameda County -----	\$1,500,000
Eureka, Humboldt County -----	500,000
Petaluma, Sonoma County -----	581,000
Larkspur, Marin County-----	300,000
Total -----	\$3,181,000

The following projects probably could be undertaken during the 1961-62 fiscal year:

Alviso, Santa Clara County-----	\$2,000,000
Antioch, Contra Costa County-----	500,000
Chula Vista, San Diego County-----	300,000
Belmont, San Mateo County-----	500,000
Fremont, Alameda County-----	500,000
Total -----	\$3,800,000

In order to satisfy the loan requests now on file with the Division of Small Craft Harbors over and above those contemplated in Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 30, an additional \$8,966,000 will be required during the next three fiscal years. If the Legislature approves the increased authorizations to the Vallejo and South San Francisco projects, withdraws its authorizations for Imperial Beach and Riverview and approves appropriations for the non-Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 30 projects listed above, an additional \$8,758,000 will be required during the next two fiscal years.

It should be pointed out that Chapter 822, Statutes of 1955, appropriates \$750,000 annually from the Motor Vehicle Fuel Fund to the Small Craft Harbors Revolving Fund for planning loans and support of the division. At the conclusion of the 1959-60 fiscal year it is estimated that the Small Craft Harbors Revolving Fund will show a balance of \$813,812 and at the conclusion of the 1960-61 budget year, \$1,376,554.

Chapter 1454, Statutes of 1959, provides that the moneys received pursuant to the registration of undocumented vessels using the waters of this State shall be deposited in the General Fund. It has been estimated by the Department of Natural Resources that the revenue from this registration will amount to approximately \$1,521,000 in the 1959-60 fiscal year and \$484,000 in the 1960-61 fiscal year, totaling \$2,005,000. *In view of the fact that this income is derived primarily from that segment of the public using the Small Craft Harbor facilities, it is recommended that any future appropriations made to support the Small Craft Harbors construction program beyond currently available funds be restricted to those amounts produced by the sources referred to above.*

Division of Small Craft Harbors—Continued

The functions of the Division of Small Craft Harbors are separated into two sections, administrative services and engineering services. Within the administrative services section, there is authorized one associate economist position and one assistant statistician position. As of January 1, 1960, the division had been unable to fill the assistant statistician position and an analysis of the workload of the economist reveals that he will be able to accomplish his assigned functions within 50 percent of the time available to him providing the flow of his workload is properly regulated. In addition to his functions as an economist, the incumbent has also been carrying the assistant statistician's workload. In view of the foregoing and the fact that the statistical workload of the Division of Small Craft Harbors is relatively insignificant and an associate economist is required by Personnel Board classification standards to have a sufficient background in statistical work to accomplish the functions of an assistant statistician *it is recommended that the presently authorized position of assistant statistician be eliminated for a savings of \$7,728.*

Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF SOIL CONSERVATION

ITEM 192 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 509

**FOR SUPPORT OF DIVISION OF SOIL CONSERVATION
 FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested	\$466,793
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	433,340
Increase (7.7 percent)	\$33,453
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	\$163,434

Summary of Recommended Reductions		Budget	
	Amount	Page	Line
Program Development			
Associate equipment engineer	\$9,852	510	6
Intermediate typist-clerk	3,630	510	18
Watershed Plan			
All watershed planning positions	149,952	510	11

GENERAL SUMMARY

In 1938 the California Legislature authorized setting up a soil conservation committee to advise and assist in the organization of soil conservation districts. In 1940 the act was repealed and replaced by Division 9 of the Public Resources Code which contained provisions of the original act and changed the name of the organization to the State Soil Conservation Commission. Chapter 1680, Statutes of 1955, created the Division of Soil Conservation as an agency within the Department of Natural Resources and the Soil Conservation Commission continued as a policymaking body.

The functions of the Division of Soil Conservation as outlined in Chapter 9 of the Public Resources Code are:

1. To promote leadership in formulating and putting into effect the statewide programs of soil and water conservation.

Division of Soil Conservation—Continued

2. To provide a means by which the State may co-operate with the United States and with soil conservation districts organized pursuant to law in securing the adoption of farm, range and woodland practices best adapted to save soil resources of the State from unreasonable and economically preventable waste.
3. To provide for the organization and operation of soil conservation districts for the purposes of soil and water conservation that control runoff and the prevention and control of soil erosion.
4. To investigate any proposed new soil conservation districts and report these findings and conclusions to the requesting authority and the proponents of such district for addition. This activity includes providing assistance to soil conservation districts with the inclusion of lands, exclusion of lands, the consolidation of districts, partition of districts, the transfer of land from one district to another and to assist with the dissolution of established districts.
5. To administer the Soil Conservation Equipment Revolving Fund which was created for the purpose of purchasing, renting and selling of equipment and machinery to organized soil conservation districts for work relating to soil conservation.

A soil conservation district is a local unit of state government voluntarily organized by land owners under Provision 9 of the Public Resources Code. Through a soil conservation district it is possible for individual farms and ranchers, communities and entire watershed areas to undertake programs to conserve soil and water resources by prevention and control of soil erosion and soil deterioration. Improved farm irrigation land drainage, land leveling, land clearing, diversion of runoff, construction of stock waterponds and reservoirs, gully control, channel alignment and bank protection and promotion of land use in accordance with recognized capabilities are some of the activities included in district programs and assistance operations. Districts are also concerned in comprehensive programs for watershed protection, flood prevention, woodland, wildlife and water conservation.

A board of directors consisting of five landowners in the district has the local responsibility to manage and conduct the affairs of the district. The board members are elected to office by landowners in the district for terms of four years each. The board requests the County Board of Supervisors to levy a tax, the maximum amount of which is limited in any one year to two cents on each \$100 valuation of land alone, exclusive of improvements and mineral rights. This tax is not mandatory nor automatic. The directors must request that it be levied should they determine that the tax is the best means of raising funds. Some districts operate without funds whatsoever, others prefer to raise any needed funds through voluntary contributions, equipment rental and by other means. A county board of supervisors may appropriate money from the county general fund for the use of the district in lieu of raising money by taxation. There is no provision for special assessments. Districts may sell revenue bonds if the assets acquired by such

Division of Soil Conservation—Continued

sale constitute the entire security for such bonds, and may receive grants, appropriations or contributions from any person, organization or agency for use of soil conservation work.

The individual farm conservation work is ordinarily financed by the farmer doing the work. In some districts contractors are available or the district develops an operating organization to make equipment available to do the work. After the technical recommendations have been worked out, the conservation practices are generally performed as part of the regular farming operations.

After the district has been organized, through assistance provided by the Division of Soil Conservation, the U.S. Soil Conservation Service provides technical services to the organized district. Among these services are:

1. Surveys which show land capabilities and the practices needed to improve and protect the soil under varying conditions of use.
2. Technical assistance in the design and layout of conservation measures to districts upon request.
3. Plans for upstream conservation work and downstream flood control in some selected watersheds.
4. Help to make snow surveys to indicate probable water supplies.
5. Co-operation with the agricultural experiment station in soil and water conservation research.

Upon request of the district directors, the Soil Conservation Service assigns the necessary technicians to work with farmers in district planning, establishing and maintaining soil conservation farming and ranching systems. In addition, considerable amounts of conservation equipment of all kinds have been loaned or granted to districts by the service. It should be pointed out that the services provided by the Federal Soil Conservation Service, following organization of a soil conservation district, are not the only governmental soil conservation services available to a private land owner. Here in California the agricultural extension service of the University of California and the California State Division of Forestry also provide similar and overlapping services. In some portions of the State, the soil conservation district movement has been very slow in progressing, because of the outstanding services provided by the other agencies. An example of this is in Humboldt and Del Norte Counties, where there is not one soil conservation district, mainly because the other agencies have adequately filled the needs of the local farmer and rancher.

Small Watershed Planning

In addition to those functions delegated by the Public Resources Code, the Governor has assigned supervisory responsibility over the State's co-operation with the federal government in the planning and carrying out of work for soil conservation and watershed protection in conjunction with the federal government's watershed protection and flood prevention act, commonly referred to as Public Law 566. Under this act, the United States Soil Conservation Service is author-

Division of Soil Conservation—Continued

ized to (1) conduct investigations and surveys as may be necessary to prepare plans for such works of improvement, (2) make such studies as may be necessary for determining the physical and economic soundness of plans for works of improvement including the determination as to whether the benefits exceed the costs, and (3) co-operate and enter into agreements with local organizations.

In order to obtain the federal assistance made available under Public Law 566, the following conditions must be met for each proposed project: Acquire without cost to the federal government such land, easement or rights of way as will be needed in connection with the project; assume such proportionate cost share as is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be equitable in consideration of the direct identifiable benefits of installing the project, which is applicable to the agricultural phase of the conservation, development, utilization and disposal of water, and assume all of the costs of installing any portion of the project applicable to other purposes except any part of the construction costs applicable to flood prevention. There is the further restriction that no such project shall contemplate the treatment of a watershed exceeding 250,000 acres or any single structure which provides more than 5,000 acre-feet of flood water detention capacity and more than 25,000 acre-feet of total water capacity, and it is our understanding that the Bureau of the Budget has promulgated the additional restriction that no project shall cost in excess of \$5 million.

Through Chapter 1886, Statutes of 1955, the Legislature enacted the California Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Law which provides for the State's participation in the Public Law 566 program. This act provides that the State may pay the costs of lands, easements and rights of way for projects qualifying for Public Law 566, providing that the Secretary of Agriculture and the local organizations have agreed on a plan for the project pertinent to Public Law 566, and the other requirements established by the federal government have been satisfied. The procedure for obtaining this federal assistance is as follows: the political entity, such as a soil conservation district, submits a request to the State Soil Conservation Commission for the subvention. A reconnaissance-feasibility investigation is then made to determine whether the basic requirements for the federal subvention have been satisfied. When the basic requirements have been satisfied, the Soil Conservation Commission approves the project for planning and the application is forwarded to the Soil Conservation Service Administration for its approval for planning. When such approval is granted, a project work plan is developed by the watershed planning section of the Division of Soil Conservation or a similar section of the state office of the United States Soil Conservation Service.

Upon completion of a watershed work plan it is submitted to the Washington office of the Soil Conservation Service, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Budget for approval, thence to the appropriate congressional committee for consideration. When a project has received congressional approval the moneys are then appropriated for its construction.

Division of Soil Conservation—Continued

As of July 1959, four work plans have been approved for California. Construction has been nearly completed on one of these and the other three are in various stages of final design and contract negotiations preparatory to beginning actual construction.

Since inception of Public Law 566 in 1954, actual construction expenditures in California have barely exceeded \$250,000 in any one year. In other states smaller than California, annual construction expenditures have already exceeded \$2 million. Federal construction obligations in California for the 1958-59 fiscal year were \$1 $\frac{1}{4}$ million. Thus, the total accumulative obligation in California is only slightly in excess of \$1 $\frac{1}{4}$ million. The total accumulative watershed appropriation obligations nationwide are now in excess of \$50 million. As of November 23, 1959, the State Soil Conservation Commission had accepted 47 applications for assistance under Public Law 566. Of this number, 39 have been accepted by the Soil Conservation Commission, 19 have been approved for planning by the commission, 17 have been approved by the administrator of the United States Soil Conservation Service for planning, the final work plans have been completed on six, and as previously noted, five have been authorized for construction.

During early stages of the Public Law 566 program, there was a distinct lack of proposed small watershed projects being submitted to Congress for approval and appropriation of construction funds. However, it is now our understanding that the number of project proposals being submitted has exceeded the availability of funds and as a result the Bureau of the Budget is imposing a stricter limitation upon the proposals submitted to Congress.

Since the feasibility of the individual project is heavily dependent upon existing economic factors and land uses, it is quite probable that many of the plans that have been submitted will become outdated in a relatively short period of time, thereby requiring revision and reconsideration by the several approving agencies.

ANALYSIS

As a practical matter, Public Law 566 was not designed for application to the far western states. The 5,000 acre-foot restriction placed upon the size of the dam designed for flood control purposes is totally unrealistic in the rough and mountainous terrain of California. The high costs of construction in California's rough topography make it very difficult to obtain the required cost benefit ratio.

It would appear desirable to assign all of the small watershed projects investigation activities to the Department of Water Resources for the following reasons:

1. The Federal Act (Public Law 566) specifically requires that the state agency charged with the supervision of co-ordinating the state's water program must administer the PL 566 program. Chapter IV, Part VI, Division VI of the Water Code (Chapter 1886, Statutes of 1955) makes it the responsibility of the State Water Rights Board to administer that element of the PL 566 program relating to state participation in the purchase of lands,

Division of Soil Conservation—Continued

easements and rights-of-way for projects approved by Congress. From a practical standpoint, the law merely requires that the state participate in the purchase of lands, easements and rights-of-way for the PL 566 projects. The planning effort undertaken by the state is merely supplemental to the federal government's planning teams.

2. All works of water conservation and runoff retardation whether large or small must complement each other and the Legislature has seen fit to create a Department of Water Resources with all the powers, duties, purposes, responsibilities and jurisdiction pertaining to water or control structures. Under the present administrative organization, which incidentally has not been sanctioned by direct legislative action, the powers and duties pertaining to water and dams delegated to the Department of Water Resources are, in fact, split between the Department of Water Resources and the Department of Natural Resources. Under our proposal all of the watershed planning activities would be centered in one agency, the Department of Water Resources as envisioned by the Legislature in its enactment of Chapter 1886, Statutes of 1955.
3. The Division of Soil Conservation has experienced considerable trouble in hiring adequately trained personnel to fill both of its small watershed survey teams, whereas, the Department of Water Resources has employed a number of the nation's outstanding experts on water developments. By transferring the small watershed projects investigation activities to the Department of Water Resources, the recruitment problem will be considerably alleviated and the thinking and experience of the nation's outstanding water experts will be more readily available to the small watershed planning efforts.

In view of the above, it is our recommendation that the 22 positions now assigned to watershed planning in the Division of Soil Conservation and the incumbents in those positions be transferred to the Department of Water Resources, that the Department of Finance make adequate budgetary provisions to accomplish the transfer and that the appropriation from the General Fund to the Division of Soil Conservation be reduced by \$149,952.

Program Development

The ultimate goal of the Division of Soil Conservation is that all agricultural, range and timberland in the State be covered by soil conservation districts. To achieve this the Division of Soil Conservation has developed a five-year plan which provides that the formation of soil conservation districts is of top priority. This function is assigned to the program development section of the division.

At the present time, the program development section is supervised by a senior soil conservationist who directs the activities of nine associate soil conservationists located at Santa Rosa, Marysville, Redding, Placerville, Lafayette, Fresno, Paso Robles, Ventura and Riverside.

Division of Soil Conservation—Continued

The program development staff also includes three junior soil conservationists, each one of whom reports to an associate soil conservationist. From contacts made in the field, we have been led to believe that the field representatives of the Division of Soil Conservation are not now receiving adequate supervision. This observation is substantiated by the fact that the establishment of soil conservation districts has fallen far behind the schedule set by the division's five-year plan, which predicted that there would be 266 districts at the end of the 1960-61 fiscal year, whereas the present estimate is for only 176 organized districts. To overcome this "span of control problem," the division contemplates transferring the present senior position to Fresno and placing him in charge of the six soil conservationists located at Placerville, Lafayette, Fresno, Paso Robles, Ventura and Riverside, and the establishment of a supervising soil conservationist at Sacramento, who would be responsible for the supervision of the three associate soil conservationists located in Santa Rosa, Marysville and Redding, the senior soil conservationist at Fresno, plus the drafting unit and the equipment section in Sacramento. Additional justification provided by the division for this position rests upon the point that the present senior level position was originally justified as deputy to the division chief and charged with the responsibility for co-ordinating the activities of the associate level positions. Since that time the watershed planning section has been added to the division resulting in the diversion of the chief's time. Moreover, the grants to local districts under Chapter 2406, Statutes of 1957, have added additional workload to the supervisory level. It is contended by the division that this additional workload has been the principal responsibility of the present senior soil conservationist. Even though we have recommended the transfer of the small watershed program to the Department of Water Resources, which should give the chief of the division an opportunity to expend his entire efforts towards the soil conservation program, we are of the opinion that the request for the supervising soil conservationist is justified and should be granted.

Soil Conservation Equipment Development Fund

Under the provision of Chapter 1032, Statutes of 1949, the Soil Conservation Equipment Revolving Fund was created for the purpose of enabling the Soil Conservation Commission to purchase, rent and sell equipment or machinery to established soil conservation districts. At that time the sum of \$1 million was appropriated for this purpose, but in 1958, \$400,000 of this amount was returned to the General Fund as the full amount was no longer required for operation of the fund. As of June 30, 1959, the total assets of the fund were \$236,173.12 of which \$194,463.22 was due from local governments. After administrative expenses and loans to soil conservation districts in the amount of \$24,319 and receipts totaling \$28,200, it is estimated that the cash balances of June 30, 1960, will be \$795. During the 1960-61 fiscal year, it is estimated that repayment by districts will amount to \$3,600 and fund-owned equipment purchases by districts will amount to \$23,900, bringing the total receipts for the 1960-61 fiscal year to \$27,500. It is

Division of Soil Conservation—Continued

further estimated that the general administrative expenses will amount to \$2,610 and the loans to districts \$25,685, leaving an estimated zero cash balance on June 30, 1961.

The Soil Conservation Equipment Development Fund is administered by an associate equipment engineer whose salary during the budget year will be \$9,852, which represents 38.4 percent of the funds available for loans to soil conservation districts. In considering the \$2,610 general administrative expenses and the associate equipment engineer's salary of \$9,852, which is paid from the General Fund, the actual service charges for administering the loans to the soil conservation districts represents 48.6 percent of the moneys made available. *It appears that such an administrative cost is unreasonable and it is therefore recommended that the associate equipment engineer position be deleted at a savings of \$9,852 and that the program be administered by other soil conservationist personnel within the division.*

The division is also requesting one intermediate typist-clerk at \$3,630. The justification provided for this position alludes to the increased workload of the division occasioned by the small watershed program and the grants-in-aid program on about a 50-50 basis. Inasmuch as we have previously recommended transfer of the small watershed program activities to the Department of Water Resources, we are unable to find sufficient justification for approval of this position. *It is, therefore, recommended that this position be deleted.*

Grants-in-Aid Program

The activities of the Division of Soil Conservation include administration of the provisions of Chapter 2406, Statutes of 1957, contained in Section 6816.1 of the Public Resources Code which provides \$100,000 yearly for direct subventions to the soil conservation districts and other lesser governmental units for any work that they are authorized to undertake and which the Soil Conservation Commission determines is necessary for the welfare of the people of the State of California. The Soil Conservation Commission contemplates distribution of \$91,180 during the budget year to cover partial costs of 17 projects ranging from the planting of windbreaks in the Mountain View-Cucamonga Soil Conservation District in San Bernardino County to Scotch Broom Containment in the Georgetown Divide Soil Conservation District in El Dorado County.

Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF SOIL CONSERVATION

ITEM 193 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 510

FOR SUPPORT OF THE PLEASANTON PLANT MATERIALS
CENTER FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	\$35,000
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	35,000
Increase (0.0 percent)	None
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	\$35,000

Division of Soil Conservation—Plant Materials Center—Continued

ANALYSIS

As a result of the expended federal soil conservation program the U.S. Department of Agriculture established two soil conservation nurseries in the State during the late 1930's. One was located in Southern California and the other in Pleasanton. Since the 1954-55 fiscal year the State of California has been contributing a share of the cost of operation of the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center located in Alameda County. The center is administered by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service.

Following an appraisal of the economic justification of the plant materials centers the U.S. Department of Agriculture closed the centers except in California and at that time there was some conjecture as to whether the center at Pleasanton would also be closed. The State of California however acted to appropriate annually the sum of \$30,000 from the Soil Conservation Equipment Revolving Fund to the U.S. Soil Conservation Service for continued operation of the Pleasanton center. This fund will soon be depleted; therefore, the support in this year's budget is proposed to come directly from the General Fund. In the 1958-59 fiscal year the State's contribution was increased to \$35,000.

The center is located on a 60-acre tract situated near Pleasanton, California which has an elevation of 360 feet and experiences an annual precipitation of approximately 17 inches. The center also administers outlying nurseries on rented plots at Sunol, King City, Butte Valley and Los Banos. The primary objective of the center is to develop and distribute grasses for soil conservation purposes. It carries on its program in very close co-operation with the California agriculture experiment station located at the University of California at Davis.

The program of the center provides for:

1. Preliminary screening of native and introduced planting materials.
2. Secondary testing and field evaluation of plantings.
3. Final testing on farms in soil conservation districts.
4. Feed production through distribution of seed to soil conservation district co-operators, free of charge.
5. Maintenance of foundations feed stocks.

Formerly the selected seed grower was required to make available 80 percent of his resulting crop to other users. But this stipulation is no longer in effect. Inasmuch as the initial seed supply is free to the grower who is allowed to sell the resulting crops at market prices, the individual soil conservation district seed growers are now in an excellent position to realize a substantial margin of profit on the sales.

It should be noted that the University of California at Davis undertakes a program including experiments under varying soil and climate conditions across the State which is similar with the following three exceptions:

1. The grasses and other plants developed by the University of California are not only developed for soil conservation purposes but also for the plants' forage value.

Division of Soil Conservation—Plant Materials Center—Continued

2. All of the seeds distributed by the University are sold on the cost basis.
3. The seeds produced by the University are available to any farmer, rancher or seed producer in the State.

Contacts with a number of soil conservation district members indicated generally that seeds obtained from the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center were of a lower quality than those produced by the University. These views are supported by the comments of University research staff who have indicated that the center fails to maintain the necessary scientific controls over its research experiments. University officials have stated that they could absorb the center's seed production with the addition of perhaps one nurseryman to assist in the foundation seed program without interfering with other research projects now being undertaken. In fact, some of the University officials feel that this additional research load would enhance the University's overall agricultural research program.

In view of the fact that the University of California has established a wildland research center the function of which is to co-ordinate the overall research activities in the field of wildland management, it would appear feasible for the State of California to withdraw its support from the center and invest a lesser sum in the research efforts being undertaken by the University. In our opinion, after discussing this with certain University agricultural staff members, an allocation of \$15,000 to the University would provide essentially the same or better results than the present program. Such an investment would insure the people of the State of California a well-rounded and properly co-ordinated research program and will develop grasses and range plants designed to serve the multiple purpose of providing a soil conservation tool in addition to improving the plants for their own values.

It should be reiterated that the foundation seed program of the University is administered on a cost basis. The fact that the seeds produced by the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center are distributed free of charge creates an inequity in the State's supported research program by giving free seed to one farmer seed producer and not to another. This inequity should be remedied either by withdrawing state support from the federal government's nursery or by stipulating that the U.S. Soil Conservation Service sell its products at cost. Only one argument has been presented in support of the seed giveaway plan and that is that the subsidy would encourage soil conservation practices. Many recipients of the free seed have said that they would prefer to pay a reasonable cost and obtain a reliable product. In view of the foregoing it is recommended:

1. *That the State of California withdraw its support from the federal government's plant materials center at Pleasanton.*
2. *That a sum of \$15,000 a year be appropriated to the University of California wild land research center for applied research in soil conservation and range forage crops and management of the foundation seed program.*

Division of Soil Conservation—Plant Materials Center—Continued

3. *Alternatively it is recommended that should the State of California continue to support the Pleasanton Plant Materials Center, that all seed distribution be on a cost basis and the proceeds therefrom be placed in a revolving fund so that the State General Fund share can be correspondingly reduced.*

Department of Natural Resources

DIVISION OF RECREATION

ITEM 194 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 506

FOR SUPPORT OF DIVISION OF RECREATION
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	\$113,903
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	108,559
Increase (4.9 percent)	\$5,344

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

GENERAL SUMMARY

The Division of Recreation is the most recent addition in the Department of Natural Resources. It was created by Chapter 1808 of the 1959 Statutes of which also continued the Recreation Commission as a policy formulating body within the Department of Natural Resources. The enabling legislation directs the Recreation Commission to:

1. Cause to be studied and to consider the whole problem of recreation of the people of the State of California as it effects and may affect the welfare of the people and especially the children and the youth.
2. Formulate in co-operation with other state agencies, interested organizations and citizens and recommend to the Director of the Department of Natural Resources, for adoption by him a comprehensive recreational policy for the State of California.
3. Recommend to the Director of Natural Resources, for adoption by him, policies for the guidance of the Chief of the Division of Recreation in the performance and exercise of his powers and duties.
4. Confer with and advise the director and the chief with respect to matters relating to recreation.
5. Report annually to the Governor through the Director of Natural Resources the needs of the State and local subdivisions thereof for recreational facilities programs and activities.

The Division of Recreation is administered by a chief who is required to be technically trained with adequate administrative experience in the field of public recreation. The chief is appointed by the Governor subject to confirmation by the Senate and serves at the pleasure of the director.

The enabling legislation establishes the following mandatory functions of the division:

1. Assist the Recreation Commission in the performance of its functions.

Division of Recreation—Continued

2. Investigate and report to the Director of Natural Resources and the Recreation Commission upon the facilities and services which are needed or which exist in the public recreational areas within the State and by consultation with the authorities in charge, assist in the co-ordination and development of recreation programs, provided, however, that surveys of the recreational facilities and programs of local agencies shall be made only upon their request.
3. Advise and co-operate with and encourage community recreational agencies interested in the use of or development of recreational facilities and programs for public benefit.
4. Advise the administrative officers of all the state agencies authorized by law to perform recreational services of regular meetings of the commission or special meetings which may consider matters relating to their specific responsibilities and invite such officers to attend and participate in deliberations of the commission without the authority to vote.
5. Make studies and surveys and long-range plans of recreational facilities and programs necessary to meet recreation needs throughout the State and participate with other federal, state and local governmental agencies in advance planning with respect to the development and co-ordination of recreational facilities and programs.
6. Aid and encourage but not conduct public recreation activities.

The division is also permitted to engage in the following activities:

1. Encourage and render assistance in the promotion of training programs for volunteer and professional recreation leaders with co-operation of other agencies, organizations and institutions, and encourage the establishment of standards for recreation personnel.
2. Assist every department, commission, board, agency and officer of the State in offering recreational services in conformity with their respective authorized powers and duties and encourage and assist in the co-ordination of federal, state and local recreational activities.

As a matter of historical interest, it might be well to point out that Chapter 2318, Statutes of 1957, which established the California Public Outdoor Recreation Committee, charged it with the responsibility of preparing a master plan of all the factors affecting public outdoor recreation to include recommendations as to the general location, size of recreational areas, and facilities to be acquired, developed and operated by all levels of government now and in the foreseeable future. The master plan is to be submitted to the Legislature on March 1, 1960. The contents of this master plan together with the recommendations will have a substantial bearing on the future activities of the Division of Recreation.

ANALYSIS

The division's personnel complement now consists of the chief, four recreation specialists and four clerical positions. Its program con-

Division of Recreation—Continued

templates continuing statewide studies on the needs, demands and requirements of the major types of recreational interests as set forth in the California Public Outdoor Recreation Plan. The division's budget request reflects a level of service equivalent to the current year authorization. The increased cost is due to salary adjustments and higher prices generally for goods and services.

We recommend approval.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

ITEM 195 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 512

FOR SUPPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	\$7,759,126
Estimated to be expended in 1959-60 fiscal year	7,602,139
Increase (2.1 percent)	\$156,987
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	\$75,578

Summary of Recommended Reductions

	Amount	Budget	
		Page	Line
Administration			
Bureau of Business Management			
2 Intermediate typist-clerks	\$8,268	513	68
1 intermediate clerk	4,092	513	69
Bureau of Personnel and Training			
1 Associate personnel analyst	8,940	513	71
Operating Expenses			
Specialized training	6,500	514	29
Preventive Medical Services			
Bureau of Hospitals			
1 Chief, Planning Section	8,520	516	32
Division of Alcoholic Rehabilitation			
1 Assistant public health analyst	6,360	517	14
2.5 Temporary help	14,400	517	16
Division of Laboratories			
1 Assistant chief, microbiology laboratory	8,112	517	69
Division of Environmental Sanitation			
(Kosher Food Labeling)			
1 Food and drug inspector	7,356	521	6
Operating expenses	3,030	521	9
Total: 10.5 positions	\$75,578		

ANALYSIS

Reorganization of Department

On November 10, 1958, the Organization and Cost Control Division of the Department of Finance presented a proposed reorganization report to the State Department of Public Health. This report was prepared at the request of the Director of the State Department of Public Health. At the time of the presentation of the budget last year, only two relatively minor recommendations had been put into effect. Since that time, more recommendations have been adopted; namely, the establishment of a Division of Research and the reorganization of the Division of Local Health Services into the Community Health Services Division. In order to accomplish this, 14 positions were abolished