

Motor Vehicle Pollution Control Board—Continued

6. Motor vehicle pollution control device testing will require access to fleets. Los Angeles County has already had offers from fleet operators to make their fleets available for such use.

7. While the initial number of devices submitted for testing and certification may exceed present estimates, it would be much easier to expand and subsequently contract one testing facility after the initial peak load has passed than expanding and subsequently contracting two or more testing facilities.

The balance of the contracts section of the proposed budget provides for other research or consulting services. This could involve the following:

1. Establishing criteria for odor.
2. Establishing sound level.
3. Other services related to the testing and approval of motor vehicle pollution control agencies.

We believe that a considerable amount of this research could be performed through a contract with the district for use of the facilities of the Environmental Laboratory, which is the research arm of the Vehicle Test Facility.

**Department of Public Works
DIVISION OF ARCHITECTURE**

ITEM 205 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 521

**FOR SUPPORT OF DIVISION OF ARCHITECTURE
FROM THE DIVISION OF ARCHITECTURE REVOLVING FUND**

Amount requested	\$9,426,214
Contribution to State Employees' Retirement System	689,115
 Total	 \$10,115,329
Estimated to be expended in 1960-61 fiscal year	10,170,187
 Decrease (0.5 percent)	 \$54,858

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION None

GENERAL SUMMARY

The major activities of the Division of Architecture consist primarily of the design and preparation of preliminary plans, working drawings, specifications, and construction supervision of practically all of the state building construction work with the exception of work performed by the University of California, the Division of Highways and the Department of Water Resources. Other exceptions of small consequence in total dollar volume are some of the construction projects carried out by various district and agricultural fairs and minor construction carried out directly by the various agencies. Prior to fiscal year 1960-61 the financing of the services provided by the Division of Architecture was accomplished under Section 14030 of the Government Code which in effect appropriated money to the Division of Architecture out of every construction project for which funds were placed into the Re-

Division of Architecture—Continued

volving Fund. This meant that for the services mentioned above, the Division of Architecture did not have to come before the Legislature each year with a budget or appropriation request for its support. In practice the division applied certain formula factors against each construction appropriation to cover its general overhead and assessed each construction appropriation with the actual out-of-pocket costs occasioned by the man-hours, materials and other services supplied in behalf of the project. Upon completion of the project a financial statement was and is rendered by the division setting forth all the costs and itemizing them according to construction, supervision of construction, design, working drawings, engineering services, etc.

In the Budget Bill presented at the 1960 Session of the Legislature, for the first time there was included a support item for the Division of Architecture payable from the Architecture Revolving Fund, and divided into two categories; (a) salaries and wages, and (b) operating expenses and equipment, similar to that of the support items for all other state agencies. The amount proposed was based essentially on an estimate of the size of the workload which would be imposed on the division for the fiscal year in question and an estimate of the categories of expenditure that would be made. The basic reason for this was to put the entire item before the Legislature and to set forth in the Governor's Budget the detail of positions, operating expenses and equipment intended to be expended in the budget year. In effect, this did not change the previous procedure since the funds that were being appropriated were those that were already available, or would be available, through the series of capital outlay items that would be transferred into the Architecture Revolving Fund. Consequently, it may be said that this approach was used primarily as a control measure and as such was desirable.

ANALYSIS

The same approach that has been mentioned above is proposed for the 1961-62 fiscal year, wherein \$9,426,214 is requested to be appropriated from the Division of Architecture Revolving Fund. This is exclusive of the automatic contributions to the State Employees' Retirement System. The amount represents approximately \$70,000 less than is estimated to be expended for the same purpose in the current fiscal year. The reduction is primarily based on an anticipated workload which is slightly less than that which is expected through the current fiscal year.

It should also be pointed out, however, that in the event the workload develops into one larger than that anticipated, additional costs are provided for by virtue of the fact that the item appropriates any available funds in the Division of Architecture Revolving Fund in accordance with Section 14030 of the Government Code. The effect is to provide whatever sums are required for the actual workload as it develops. However, this method of appropriation also provides a system of control whereby the State Department of Finance can establish reasonable assurance that no funds are being expended unnecessarily. *We recommend approval of the item as budgeted.*

**Department of Public Works
DIVISION OF ARCHITECTURE**

ITEM 206 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 526

FOR SUPPORT OF DIVISION OF ARCHITECTURE**FROM THE DIVISION OF ARCHITECTURE PUBLIC BUILDING FUND**

Amount requested	\$1,232,772
Contribution to State Employees' Retirement System	78,027
Total	\$1,310,799
Estimated to be expended in 1960-61 fiscal year	1,280,836
Increase (2.3 percent)	\$29,963

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION None

GENERAL SUMMARY

The organizational structure of the Division of Architecture includes a comparatively autonomous section whose principal function is the checking of plans and specifications of all public school building construction and alterations in the State, requiring changes to be made by architects when necessary and final approval before construction can be started. In addition, the unit actually inspects all projects during construction, on a spot check basis to make certain that construction techniques and plans are being followed. This service is required by law only for projects exceeding \$10,000 in estimated costs. The total function is basically authorized by the so-called "Field Act."

This function of the Division of Architecture is on a self-sustaining basis by reason of fees charged for each set of plans checked. The fees are based on a percentage of the estimated cost of the projects and are established in the California Administrative Code.

The fee also covers the cost of service provided by the State Fire Marshal in checking the plans for features essential to adequate fire safety. The Fire Marshal provides this service on the basis of a contractual arrangement with the Division of Architecture.

ANALYSIS

The estimated public school construction volume for the budget year is very little changed from the current year. While dollar value is somewhat higher, the actual volume of construction is probably about the same due to the fact that unit costs are expected to increase so that dollar volume will be somewhat higher. Consequently, the level of service proposed by the Division of Architecture is approximately the same as is being provided in the current fiscal year. However, the cost of this service is increased by \$29,963 or 2.3 percent over the amount anticipated to be expended in the 1960-61 fiscal year. This increase is primarily the result of merit salary adjustments and increased operating costs occasioned by the continuing upward trend of prices. *We recommend approval of the item as submitted.*

Department of Public Works
STATE BUILDING STANDARDS COMMISSION

ITEM 207 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 528

**FOR SUPPORT OF THE STATE BUILDING STANDARDS COMMISSION
 FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested	\$43,993
Contribution to State Employees' Retirement System	2,396
Total	\$46,389
Estimated to be expended in 1960-61 fiscal year	44,837
Increase (3.5 percent)	\$1,552

TOTAL RECOMMENDED INCREASE **\$16,000**

Summary of Recommended Increases

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Budget Page Line</i>
2 Associate code analysts	\$16,000	528 32
Plus operating expenses and equipment		

GENERAL SUMMARY

The State Building Standards Commission was first established by Chapter 1500 of the Statutes of 1953 which set up a commission consisting of 13 members, seven of whom were heads of state departments and six were from private industry and local government. The commission received no funds by way of direct budget appropriations, but its activities were to be supported as required from the funds of the seven major agencies whose heads were members of the commission.

The 1956-57 fiscal year budget established two positions attached to the Division of Architecture as part of its then cadre General Fund operation to provide a sort of executive officer and secretarial help for the commission. Additional help was still supposed to be forthcoming from the various agencies involved.

In 1959 the Legislature established the Building Standards Commission as a separate entity in the Department of Public Works and provided a specific appropriation item for it in the annual budget. Also the commission was changed to seven members, the Director of Public Works and six members appointed by the Governor.

The Legislature assigned two major missions to this commission. The first was the task of searching out and eliminating conflict, duplication and overlap in the State's codes, statutes or agency rules and regulations which dealt with building construction. This was entirely at the state level and had no direct relationship to local, city and county building codes.

The second mission was the publication of a single document which would list all state requirements, from whatever source, concerning construction and building. Since there were 17 state administrative agencies writing and enforcing building regulations and standards, together with ten code provisions and 19 general laws dealing with the same subject, it is obvious that the task of screening for the conflicts, duplications and overlaps was considerable. As of this time while most of the screening has been accomplished and most of the problems have been resolved, a single document to which all interested parties could refer for all state regulations covering building and construction has not yet been published.

**State Building Standards Commission—Continued
ANALYSIS**

The budget proposed for the State Building Standards Commission for the 1961-62 fiscal year is substantially at the same level of activity as has been provided for the current fiscal year. An increase of \$1,552 or 3.5 percent is involved which is principally in the area of merit salary adjustments and the purchase of some equipment which heretofore has had to be borrowed at considerable inconvenience. It is contemplated that a previously authorized position of junior counsel, which has never been filled and for which salary savings was taken in the current fiscal year, will be abolished and the service supposed to have been rendered by this position will be rendered by the Division of Architecture for which it will assess charges against the commission. The actual on-duty staff therefore will remain the same as in the current fiscal year. In view of the foregoing, we would ordinarily recommend the budget as submitted.

However, we would call attention again to the fact that one of the two major missions of the organization is still unaccomplished and at its present rate of progress, will probably remain unaccomplished until 1963 or later. This is the printing of a single document containing all of the laws, rules and regulations pertaining to building and construction as it is controlled at the state level. We suggest that such a document is long overdue. There are probably 15,000 registered architects and engineers in the State of California, plus many who are not registered, and over 80,000 contractors, many of whom are involved in the kind of work which is affected by the various state rules and regulations mentioned above. The present wide diversity of sources of information inevitably leads to substantial waste of manpower, time and money in the form of construction put in place and later modified because some existing regulation or rule was violated unintentionally. It would be difficult to estimate the losses accruing to the industry generally from this situation, but it probably runs into millions of dollars annually. Consequently, we feel that accelerating the publication of the document is justified.

From our discussions with the agency we are convinced that the addition of two positions, that of associate code analyst with a salary range of \$676-821 per month for not to exceed an 18-month period commencing with July 1, 1961 would hasten the publication by at least one year and probably make the document available shortly after January 1, 1962 rather than sometime in 1963 or 1964. Upon publication of the document these two positions could be abolished.

The document itself would probably sell for somewhere between \$6 and \$10 which should more than pay for the cost of publication and return a sufficient profit to offset the cost of preparing it and getting it ready for printing. In other words we believe that the extra money expended at this time would ultimately be more than recovered in addition to speeding up the process. Therefore, we recommend the establishment of two additional positions at the salary rates mentioned,

State Building Standards Commission—Continued

plus operating expenses and possibly some equipment as required. The actual total amount would be difficult to estimate at this time, but it would probably be \$16,000 plus operating expense.

AERONAUTICS COMMISSION

ITEMS 208 and 209 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 536

FOR SUPPORT OF AERONAUTICS COMMISSION
FROM THE GENERAL AND MOTOR VEHICLE FUEL FUNDS

Amount requested	\$106,175
Contribution to State Employees' Retirement System	4,375
Total	\$110,550
Estimated to be expended in 1960-61 fiscal year	92,684
Increase (19.3 percent)	\$17,866
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	None

GENERAL SUMMARY

The Aeronautics Commission was created by Chapter 1379 of the Statutes of 1947 for the purpose of aiding local jurisdictions in solving aviation problems and to promote civil aviation generally. Commission personnel inspect and issue operating permits for airports, make reports to the Department of Education as to the suitability of proposed school sites in the proximity of airports and study problems involving obstructions to air navigation.

ANALYSIS

The level of service proposed for the 1961-62 fiscal year is substantially the same as that offered currently. The \$17,866 increase over the expenditures estimated in the current fiscal year is primarily accountable to the \$14,750 proposed to be provided from the Motor Vehicle Fuel Fund which would be used to print air navigational maps for which the State would be wholly reimbursed from sales. Currently, sectional charts are available covering California's geography and pertinent aerial navigational data. However, seven separate charts are necessary. The commission proposes to print one sheet consolidating the same information on opposite sides which would entirely cover the State. There appears to be a real need and market for such a consolidated chart. The other minor increases in salaries and wages and operating expenses appear to be justified on the basis of operating experience and the need for normal merit salary adjustments.

We recommend approval of the Aeronautics Commission budget as submitted.

COLORADO RIVER BOUNDARY COMMISSION

ITEM 210 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 537

**FOR SUPPORT OF COLORADO RIVER BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FROM THE STATE LANDS ACT FUND**

Amount requested	\$16,000
Contribution to State Employees' Retirement System	846
Total	\$16,846
Estimated to be expended in 1960-61 fiscal year	14,538
Increase (15.9 percent)	\$2,308
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	None

GENERAL SUMMARY

The commission was established under the provisions of Chapter 1693, Statutes of 1953, for the purpose of making a joint investigation with the State of Arizona of the common boundary between the two states along the Colorado River and to report to the Legislature on the necessary data for a compact between the states defining or relocating said common boundary.

Membership in the commission consists of the Attorney General, Director of Water Resources, and the Executive Officer of the State Lands Commission. One member of the Senate, appointed by the Senate Rules Committee, and one member of the Assembly, appointed by the Speaker, are advisors to the commission.

Heretofore the commission has devoted the major part of its time to exploratory meetings and research respecting dislocation problems which have been particularly acute in the "Yuma Island area." In addition, however, it has been instrumental in obtaining an amendment to the State's Constitution (Article XXI) permitting relocation of the existing boundary, and in the passage of Public Law 1025, 84th Congress, by virtue of which the President has appointed a representative to act on behalf of the United States in the negotiations.

Meetings have been scheduled for the latter part of 1960 at which the commission expects to submit revised data and compromise proposals respecting features of the problem which have heretofore ended in impasse. In the event the meetings are not productive of an agreement, we are informed that the commission then expects to submit a report to the Legislature wherein it will recommend alternative procedures to effect a settlement.

On the other hand, further work following favorable action by the two commissions on the proposed boundary would consist of: (1) the preparation of maps defining the agreed-upon boundary; (2) the setting up of control points at key positions along the river for the entire boundary line agreed upon; (3) the adoption by the two states of a compact, based on commission actions; (4) the obtaining of congressional ratification of the compact adopted; and (5) the monumenting of the adopted boundary line along its entire course. It is estimated that this work would cost between \$60,000 and \$75,000 in excess of the amount of \$16,000 budgeted for 1961-62.

Colorado River Boundary Commission—Continued

ANALYSIS

The increase in the 1961-62 budget of \$2,308 (15.9 percent) over 1960-61 is entirely represented by a full year's salary for the executive secretary, which position had not been filled during the current year as of November 15, 1960. *We recommend approval of the amount requested.*

DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL

ITEM 211 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 540

FOR SUPPORT OF DEPARTMENT OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE CONTROL FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested -----	\$3,534,832
Contribution to State Employees' Retirement System -----	233,676
Total -----	\$3,768,508
Estimated to be expended in 1960-61 fiscal year -----	3,717,486
Increase (1.4 percent) -----	\$51,022

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION ----- None

GENERAL SUMMARY

The Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control was created, effective January 1, 1955, by an amendment to Section 22 of Article XX of the State Constitution. The appointment of its director by the Governor is subject to confirmation by a majority vote of the Senate.

Liquor control for the State is provided by the department through the licensing and regulation of the manufacture, importation and sale of alcoholic beverages.

Departmental organization includes a headquarters office, plus area, district and branch offices. There is a current authorized staff of 444 positions, of which 244 are Special Investigators, directly engaged in the enforcement of the Alcoholic Beverage Control Act.

The day to day activities of the department may be grouped into the general categories of licensing and enforcement. The licensing function involves the investigation of the proposed premises and surrounding locality, the investigation of the applicant's character and record, the determination of the true ownership of the prospective licensed premises, and the collection of license fees. The enforcement function involves the detection, investigation and prevention of violations of the detailed requirements of the law. Major enforcement attention is given to provisions of the law regarding sales to minors and intoxicated persons, operation of disorderly premises, advertising practices, and whole-sale and fair trade practices. A major aspect of the enforcement function is the maintenance of close relationships with local peace officers.

ANALYSIS

Proposed expenditures for the fiscal year 1961-62 total \$3,768,508, which reflects a \$51,022 or 1.4 percent increase over the \$3,717,486 estimated to be expended in 1960-61.

We recommend the budget be approved as submitted.