

CAPITAL OUTLAY

The program of appropriations for capital improvements to the State's various institutional plants which is proposed in the budget for the 1961-62 fiscal year represents an almost total dependence on borrowed financing. Exclusive of such special fund agencies as the Department of Employment, the Division of Highways, the Department of Motor Vehicles, the Highway Patrol, District Agricultural Associations, the Department of Fish and Game and the Department of Water Resources, the Governor's proposal is to use \$100 million of bond funds, representing the major portion of the remaining unused authorization of \$150 million. The balance of the proposed new appropriations requires approximately \$12,800,000 from the General Fund. Slightly over half of the latter covers minor construction projects almost exclusively. The other half represents the financing of the beaches and parks acquisition and development program. This is a "first" since in this budget the Division of Beaches and Parks becomes entirely a General Fund obligation with what remains of its special revenue from oil royalties being diverted directly into the General Fund.

It is proper to point out that yet another appropriation which will not appear in the budget total should be considered part of the capital outlay program for the purpose of considering the fiscal impact of the program and its method of financing. This involves the proposal, which appears near the end of the Budget Bill, to borrow \$10,100,000 from state trust funds by means of certificates, for the financing of the construction of additions to the Public Health Building in Berkeley. As used in this connection these funds have the same fiscal effect as bond funds for other projects and should therefore be counted as part of the total program which is financed either directly from the General Fund or by means which must ultimately be repaid from the General Fund. Thus the grand total of this "General Fund" program is approximately \$122,900,000 rather than \$112,800,000. We should point out that the bulk of the space to be generated by the expenditure of the \$10,100,000 for the Public Health additions represents expansion or new additional specialized space rather than the conversion of leased space to state-owned space.

The grand total mentioned above is distributed by agency approximately as follows:

Department of Agriculture-----	\$361,000
Department of Corrections -----	3,709,000
Youth Authority -----	3,202,000
Department of Education-----	1,709,000
University of California -----	48,000,000
State College System -----	40,331,000
Department of Finance -----	422,000
Department of Mental Hygiene-----	4,456,000
Military Department -----	164,000
Department of Natural Resources (Forestry)-----	3,557,000
Department of Public Health-----	10,150,000
Department of Veterans Affairs -----	49,000
Beach and Park Program -----	6,055,000
Unallocated, plans and miscellaneous -----	600,000
	<hr/>
	\$122,765,000

Capital Outlay

General Summary—Continued

It will be noted from the above that the program for expanding the facilities of the state's institutions of higher learning totals over \$88 million and represents more than 72 percent of the entire capital outlay proposal. We see no reason to assume that this high proportion will not continue for many years and possibly increase in some years. Approximately 10 percent of the total amount proposed for the University and the state colleges represents equipment for previously funded projects. About 2 percent represents minor construction projects. Fully 70 percent represents either working drawings or working drawings and construction for buildings that will provide teaching capacity, most of which is new capacity and only a small part is replacement of substandard space or alterations to existing space.

For state colleges the proposals involve either the construction of or the preparation of working drawings for additional capacity totaling in excess of 20,500 F.T.E., based on current space utilization achievements. For the University the capacity that is programmed will be approximately 5,500 F.T.E. The difference between the two institutional systems points up the substantially greater cost per student unit capacity at the University as compared with the State College System. This difference will probably continue to grow as the University moves towards ever greater emphasis in upper division, graduate, and post doctoral work. One of the greatest areas of difference between the two lies in the fact that the University's program contains substantial amounts of research space, whereas the state college program contains little or none of this type of space.

SUBSEQUENT OBLIGATIONS

It was indicated above that approximately \$50 million of bond authorization would remain if the program were financed as proposed. Let us examine the "built in" obligations contained in the present proposal. Projects proposed for financing of construction in this budget will carry with them almost automatic obligations in the next budget for upwards of \$12 million in equipment. We believe this to be a conservative estimate. Projects proposed to be financed for working drawings only in this budget, carry with them the implied obligation for construction financing in the next budget in an amount probably exceeding \$70 million. This, too, we believe to be a reasonably conservative estimate. The total of the two would be \$82 million; this without provision for a beaches and parks program, without provision for other working drawings projects for still future construction, without provision for numerous projects costing under \$1,500,000 or possibly under \$2 million for which as a rule both working drawings and construction are asked at the same time, without provision for property acquisition, and without provision for minor construction projects. The grand total could very easily approach \$140 million. Against this potential, reasonably hard core demand there will be the \$50 million of bond authorization mentioned above. It seems evident therefore that the whole structure and problem of General Fund capital outlay source which is interrelated with the financing of the entire support program, merits the most critical review.

General Summary—Continued

EQUIPMENT

The total proposals for bond financing mentioned above include approximately \$10,500,000 to equip previously funded buildings. This would cover all kinds of equipment including initial complements of expendable material. For example, equipment for Youth Authority domiciliary buildings would include such things as bed sheets, pillow-cases, towels, etc. We have no exact knowledge of the life expectancy of bed sheets and towels in institutional use, but we would seriously doubt that they could reach three years. Equipment for gymnasiums and swimming pools would include swim suits, towels, certain kinds of outdoor athletic equipment such as volley balls, badminton birds, etc. Here, too, we have no exact knowledge of the life expectancy of such items but we seriously doubt that they would go much beyond three years. *The point is that we will be financing, by borrowing, the purchase of many kinds of equipment which would go out of existence while the debt still remains.*

In the Budget Act of 1959 the capital outlay program was also financed on a dual basis with a substantial portion of it being from bond funds and the balance from the Capital Outlay and Savings Fund which in effect was the General Fund. In this act each proposal for equipment was carefully divided into two categories; one, those items having the life expectancy at least equivalent to the life of the debt and the other consisting of those items having a life reasonably less than the life of the debt. The latter were financed by the General Fund, the former by bond funds. This appeared to be a reasonable and logical concept. We suggest that the proposed departure from this method of financing is without merit and in almost every instance of equipment proposals in this budget we have recommended a similar categorization and dual financing.

SPACE UTILIZATION

House Resolution No. 16 of the First Extraordinary Session of 1960 requested the Director of Finance and the Legislative Analyst, with the assistance of the Department of Education and the University of California, to conduct or cause to be conducted, "a study of standards for utilization and occupancy of instructional areas in the state college and the University of California." The resolution further requested that a report be submitted to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee during the 1961 General Session with recommendations as to the standards to be applied.

The Department of Finance chose to contract for such a study with an outside consultant. The Legislative Analyst participated in the early deliberations with the consultant but the final study and report was basically the work of the consultant. This report has now been submitted to the committee without formal recommendation or endorsement either by the Director of Finance or the Legislative Analyst.

We have not yet had sufficient time to fully evaluate this report and its recommendations.

However, the data compiled show very clearly that additional utilization is possible. For example, the scheduling of classes falls signifi-

Capital Outlay

General Summary—Continued

cantly short of maximum efficiency. It fails, certainly, to show the same sense of urgency with which requests are made for additional construction.

Tables I and II indicate that reasonably high utilization (79 percent) takes place at the 10 a.m. class hour for nonlaboratory rooms and diminishes rapidly after 3 p.m. Laboratory utilization exceeds 50 percent only slightly at the 10 a.m. and 2 p.m. class hours for the state colleges and only at 2 p.m. for the University. Such scheduling gives too much weight to the traditional dislike of faculty and students for early morning and late afternoon classes. It is recognized that there are other reasons for diminishing scheduled use after 3 p.m., but these do not justify the relatively vacant rooms which can be found on any campus at the later afternoon hours.

Table I—Classroom Utilization at State Colleges at Each Hour of the Day for a Week

NON-LAB.								LABS.							
Total rooms—707				Total student stations—30067				Total rooms—839				Total student stations—20231			
Hour of day	No. sched. classes	Rate of Utiliz.*		No. student sta. sched.	Rate of Utiliz.*			No. sched. classes	Rate of Utiliz.*		No. student sta. sched.	Rate of Utiliz.*			
		%	Class hours		Enrld.	%			%	Class hours		Enrld.	%		
8 -----	2,208	63	28	99,764	70,213	70		1,523	36	16	36,408	28,641	79		
9 -----	2,724	77	35	119,680	83,123	70		2,082	48	22	50,900	39,562	78		
10 -----	2,795	79	36	122,752	85,168	70		2,261	54	24	54,935	44,489	81		
11 -----	2,627	74	33	113,362	77,111	68		1,875	45	20	46,299	36,401	79		
12 -----	1,024	55	25	77,207	56,455	73		1,117	27	12	28,299	21,580	76		
1 -----	2,229	63	28	98,460	61,941	63		1,655	40	18	39,342	29,346	75		
2 -----	2,046	58	26	87,519	51,601	59		2,242	53	24	54,822	38,761	71		
3 -----	1,189	34	15	51,664	28,215	55		2,017	48	22	48,086	33,291	69		
4 -----	782	22	10	32,198	15,668	49		1,470	35	16	34,342	23,156	67		
	18,524	58	26	802,606	529,495	66		16,192	43	20	393,433	295,227	75		
		Average room size—42							Average room size—24						
		Average class size—28							Average class size—18						

* Data represents one week.

Table II—Class Room Utilization at the University of California at Each Hour of the Day for a Week

NON-LAB.										LABS.									
Total student stations—41766										Total student stations—13290									
Total rooms—660										Total rooms—527									
		Rate of Utiliz.*				Rate of Utiliz.*				Rate of Utiliz.*		Rate of Utiliz.*							
Hour of day	No. sched. classes	%	Class hours	No. student sta. sched.	Enrld.	%	No. sched. classes	%	Class hours	No. student sta. sched.	Enrld.	%							
8 -----	1,836	56	25	122,404	60,743	50	457	18	8	16,294	10,345	64							
9 -----	2,372	72	32	168,162	88,252	52	865	33	15	30,921	19,117	62							
10 -----	2,452	74	33	169,798	84,099	50	936	35	16	32,499	19,219	59							
11 -----	2,392	72	32	162,971	79,831	49	835	31	14	29,558	16,928	57							
12 -----	1,234	37	17	71,958	35,380	49	233	9	4	9,992	5,387	54							
1 -----	2,046	62	28	131,696	60,720	46	1,028	39	18	30,598	19,197	63							
2 -----	1,752	53	24	110,182	50,351	45	1,392	53	24	40,325	27,561	68							
3 -----	1,075	33	15	54,218	21,881	40	1,291	49	22	34,366	24,941	72							
4 -----	620	19	9	28,519	9,991	35	726	27	12	19,969	13,441	67							
15,779		53	24	1,019,908	491,248	48	7,763	33	15	244,522	156,136	64							
Average room size—63						Average room size—25													
Average class size—30						Average class size—16													

* Data represents one week.

General Summary—Continued

Similarly, a comparison with a large private college contained in Table III shows that the state institutions are not scheduling classes enough hours in the week, as well as failing to schedule efficiently during the day. The independent college attained 79 percent utilization over 36 hours during the week, achieving 90 percent utilization in terms of student stations. By contrast, the state colleges achieved on a 24-hour average week only 69 percent utilization of student stations and the university, on a 20-hour average week, only 51 percent utilization.

Table III—Actual Utilization 1959 (Fall)
Hours 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.

	NONLAB			LAB		
	Rooms %	Hours per wk.	Stu. sta. %	Rooms %	Hours per wk.	Stu. sta. %
STATE COLLEGES						
Cal. Poly. K.V.-----	48	22	73	40	18	73
Cal. Poly. S.L.O.-----	70	32	53	42	19	78
Chico -----	55	25	63	48	22	78
Fresno -----	61	28	74	35	16	78
Humboldt -----	44	20	65	45	20	55
Long Beach -----	48	22	70	36	16	71
Los Angeles -----	51	23	63	20	9	76
Sacramento -----	52	23	67	34	15	79
San Diego -----	65	29	70	40	18	83
San Francisco -----	58	26	80	47	21	81
San Jose -----	68	30	57	57	26	71
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA						
Berkeley -----	54	24	49	33	15	77
Davis -----	61	27	36	29	13	70
U.C.L.A. -----	53	24	48	31	14	60
Riverside -----	53	24	59	30	13	69
Santa Barbara -----	42	19	50	31	14	50
COMBINED AVERAGE			Rooms %	Hours per wk.	Stu. sta. %	
State colleges -----			53	24	69	
University -----			44	20	51	
College X * -----			79	36	90 †	

* College X is an independent college of western U.S. with 12,000 FTE.

† Actual figures not available on student stations. Building Coordinator estimates rate in excess of 90 percent—verified by observation.

It should be noted, also, that there are wide variations among the various state colleges and university branches as to average hours per week for which classes are scheduled. It is apparent that centralized attention should be given to this problem, and that capital outlay requests based on existing standards do not reflect actual needs. This fact will be reflected in our review of the requests contained in this budget. The report was completed too late for the budget to benefit from the findings of the report. In addition, we have recognized that more information is needed as to the use which is made of individual rooms, as well as averages, and our office is proceeding with a study which will utilize this greater detail.

A new procedure for capital outlay review is needed:

The relative degree of independence which has been accorded to the university and state college trustees in architectural services makes necessary a revised procedure to deal effectively with what is the largest

Capital Outlay

General Summary—Continued

area of capital outlay expenditures in the state program. If the Legislature is to have an opportunity to make adequate review of basic policy in construction costs, more time for review and better reporting are necessary.

While the procedure herewith proposed is particularly aimed at the universities and state college capital outlay program, it is equally applicable to the capital outlay program of any state agency. At the outset, it is important that there be a clear understanding of the meaning of certain key terms or phrases and, consequently, a series of definitions is in order.

The term "project program" means a written statement, prepared by the agency requesting the project, which will set forth in detail the relationship of the new project to existing or other requested projects, the basic functions of the new project, the inter-relationships of spaces within the project, the functions which will take place within the project and the effect such functions might have on the physical characteristics of the project, agency estimates as to the sizes of individual spaces in the project required to perform the stated functions, space estimates for both fixed (built-in) and agency furnished equipment, statements as to the characteristics of interior finishes and surfaces critically related to functions, statements as to occupation numbers and allowable densities of occupation, statements as to specialized utilities and facilities required for various functions within the building, statements as to the necessity or desirability of certain broad characteristics such as number of floors, maximum floor sizes, orientation, etc., directly related to the proposed function to be carried on in the project.

Such a program is essential to an architectural interpretation of the project whether the services are performed by a private architect or by an architect in the State Division of Architecture and whether the agency requiring the project furnishes it or the architect in question produces it, by himself, by dredging it out of the minds of agency individuals concerned with the project. Any attempt by an architect to interpret the agency needs for a given project without such a clearly detailed program will result in a finished product which will be unsatisfactory to the agency for years to come and will cause repeated alterations, modifications and additions to accomplish what could have been accomplished in the first place by the establishment of an appropriate, clearly understood program.

"Initial" or "schematic" preliminary plans are the first generalized plans produced by an architect which he considers satisfactory to demonstrate his interpretation of the program which has been submitted to him. Such plans would also include sketchy preliminary specifications giving the broad outlines of the types of construction involved, materials to be used, general mechanical and electrical characteristics, general utility developments required, and general site preparation and landscaping characteristics. Such preliminaries might also be termed "progress" preliminary plans, as they are essential to an understanding of the architect's interpretation of the program and to an evaluation of whether the approved scope of the program is understood and being followed.

General Summary—Continued

"Budget" preliminary plans are those plans and specifications which would be sufficiently developed to provide to all interested and responsible parties a clear picture of what is proposed, in reasonable detail, which will substantially "freeze" the design so that any further changes which might occur as a result of the detailed development of working drawings will be minor in nature and occasioned principally by actual measurements and other characteristics which usually develop only in the course of preparing detailed working drawings. Such plans will also have the characteristic of being amenable to fairly accurate cost estimates which will usually hold good when construction is started except for uncontrollable cost index fluctuations and unforeseen site problems.

One other term requires definition and understanding. This is "scope," which implies the size, capacity and functional characteristics which have been agreed to in advance, upon adequate justification, by all concerned and which fundamentally is being approved by the Legislature. Unforeseen problems and cost rises should not result in curtailment of the scope of the project in order to attempt to stay within the appropriated funds, if such curtailment would negate the basic justifications which led to the approval of the project. To put it another way, the finished product must be able to perform the functions and services which were set forth, justified and approved as legitimate needs of the agency.

Procedure

In order to assure that adequate budget preliminaries, mentioned above, are available in time for final evaluation and inclusion in the Governor's printed budget, the procedure must provide that all budget preliminary plans and specifications will be in the hands of fiscal and other authorities by not later than October 1st of the year immediately preceding the session of the Legislature which is to consider them for funding.

In order to allow adequate time for architects, whether private or of the State Division of Architecture, to complete budget preliminary plans and specifications by not later than October 1st, the programs for all projects should be in the hands of all architects by not later than January 15th of the same year. A copy of the programs and instruction to the architect should be furnished to the Department of Finance and Legislative Analyst for information. The program as approved by the responsible administrative agencies should then be certified to the architects to proceed with preparation of schematic or initial preliminary plans and a copy furnished to the Legislative Analyst. Since the projects would obviously vary widely in size and complexity, some of them would achieve schematic preliminaries much sooner than others. As soon as architects have prepared initial or schematic preliminary plans and specifications which they consider satisfactory for submission, they should be submitted to the agency, the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst for evaluation as quickly as possible.

Capital Outlay

General Summary—Continued

As soon as satisfactory agreements have been reached by the agency and the Department of Finance (if Finance is involved) concerning the initial or schematic preliminary plans and specifications, the architects concerned should then prepare budget preliminary plans and specifications which should be approved by the requesting agency for budget submission. All projects which are proposed to be considered for inclusion in the budget should be made available to the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst not later than October 1st. This would provide all concerned with an adequate span of time in which to thoroughly evaluate the work that has been done, raise and resolve questions and otherwise decide whether the projects are ready for inclusion in the Governor's Budget. In effect, the total span of time between the submission of project programs and the submission of adequate budget plans and specifications should be approximately nine months which should be ample time to render a thorough, first-class, professional service to the State. It will permit the Legislature to be furnished with an adequate review by the Legislative Analyst prior to appropriating funds for working drawings and construction.

Private Architects

It is obvious that the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges can have no advance knowledge of the total amount of money which the Governor would be willing to propose for capital improvements in any given budget. Consequently, the board must, in its own best judgment, prepare preliminary plans for those projects which it believes are justified for inclusion in the next budget. This implies that certain of the projects may not be included by the Governor because of lack of funds or for other considerations. Nevertheless, the board must prepare these plans in the belief that they will be included.

In dealing with private architects, the board must establish some form of contract procedure whereby the architect will prepare the necessary initial preliminary plans and specifications as well as the budget preliminary plans and specifications with the understanding that should the project fail to be financed, payment to the architect for the services he has rendered up to that point would be based on some mutually agreeable formula, technique or possibly a fixed amount arrived at in advance of the contract.

This problem has not arisen in the State Division of Architecture because its charges are based on actual out-of-pocket expenditures made for man-hours, materials and overhead at any point in time when further work on the project ceases.

Inadequacy of Plans, Specifications and Data

Elsewhere in this statement preliminary to our capital outlay analysis, we point out the need for a new procedure, particularly in the case of the new state college system, to assure adequate time for review and report to the Legislature. In our present analysis, there are an unusually high number of instances in which we are unable to recommend the project. This is as distinguished from an outright recommendation for disapproval. It merely indicates that we have not had the

General Summary—Continued

time, because of the lateness of the arrival of the information, nor has the material been adequate, on which to make a firm recommendation. In most cases, we recognize that the project is basically justified, but because it contains details and excessive costs which we have challenged but for which no replies have as yet been forthcoming, we have been unable to recommend the project. Generally, this refers to its cost rather than its scope.

In our analysis of the capital outlay budget of the university, we have gone into considerable detail as a preface to the individual project descriptions. These details will be largely indicative of the problems we have encountered.

Military Department

A series of Budget Acts commencing with the Budget Act of 1950 and Chapter 145 of the Statutes of 1946 provided funds for the construction of armories on the basis that a portion of the cost in each case would be borne by the federal government.

The last Budget Act to provide a specific appropriation for this purpose was the Budget Act of 1957, Item 397.1. The Budget Act of 1957 also reappropriated any unexpended savings from all prior armory appropriations, to be expended for additional armories to the extent that funds were available. The Budget Act of 1960, by Section 10, again reappropriated any savings for additional armory construction within the limits of the available funds.

The Governor's Budget as now presented does not include any expenditures for the 1961-62 fiscal year from the available funds mentioned above. On page 843 of the printed budget, line 40, there will be found a balance of \$1,407,868, of General Fund money, that is available in subsequent years for additional armory construction. To the best of our knowledge this amount is uncommitted and unencumbered.

In view of the condition of the General Fund, it would appear that the future expenditure of these available funds for armory construction represents a very low priority of need. Consequently, we recommend that the Legislature recapture these funds by authorizing their reversion to the General Fund as of June 30, 1961.

Department of Corrections**CONSERVATION CENTER AND BRANCHES**

ITEM 284 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 714

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, CONSERVATION CENTER AND BRANCHES, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$35,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change
Reduction	\$35,000

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for one project of minor construction which would allow for the construction of one increment of the microwave

Conservation Center and Branches—Continued

system which is discussed in detail under the Division of Forestry's support budget earlier in this analysis. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval of this item.*

Department of Corrections

CORRECTIONAL TRAINING FACILITY—SOLEDAD

ITEM 285 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 715

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, CORRECTIONAL TRAINING FACILITY, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$145,785
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for 11 minor construction projects, seven of which will allow for the repair and reconditioning of existing facilities to increase the overall efficiency and utilization of the physical plant. The remaining four projects will provide for construction of new projects to aid the agricultural program at this institution. We have had the opportunity to inspect each of the projects in detail while on a recent field trip to this institution. *We recommend approval of the item as requested.*

Department of Corrections

DEUEL VOCATIONAL INSTITUTION

ITEM 286 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 717

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, DEUEL VOCATIONAL INSTITUTION, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$54,710
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for six minor construction projects, five of which are for repairs and alterations to existing facilities to increase their overall operating efficiency. One project will allow for the construction of a dairy animal shelter in the farming area.

We have had the opportunity to check each of these projects in detail while on a recent field visit to this institution and, *we recommend approval of this item as requested.*

Department of Corrections

STATE PRISON AT FOLSOM

ITEM 287 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 718

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, STATE PRISON AT FOLSOM, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$21,300
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

State Prison at Folsom—Continued

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for two minor construction projects, the first of which will allow the construction of a new guard tower at No. 5 post which is in need of replacement while the second project will eliminate certain safety hazards in the handicraft shop.

We have had the opportunity to inspect each of these projects while on a recent visit to this institution. *We recommend approval of the item as requested.*

Department of Corrections

INSTITUTION FOR MEN

ITEM 288 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 719

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
INSTITUTION FOR MEN, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$43,890
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for three projects of minor construction designed to improve the overall efficiency of the existing facilities.

We have examined the projects and *recommend approval of the items as requested.*

Department of Corrections

MEDICAL FACILITY

ITEM 289 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 721

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
MEDICAL FACILITY, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$8,930
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for one minor construction project which will allow a seal coat to be placed on institution roads thus prolonging their usefulness.

We have had the opportunity to review this project at the institution and *recommend approval of this item as requested.*

Department of Corrections

MEN'S COLONY—EAST FACILITY

ITEM 290 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 722

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
MEN'S COLONY—EAST FACILITY, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$4,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

Men's Colony—East Facility—Continued
ANALYSIS

This item would provide for one project that would correct an erosion condition caused by site grading of the original site.

We have viewed this project with the institution staff while on a recent field trip to this area. *We recommend approval.*

Department of Corrections
STATE PRISON AT SAN QUENTIN

ITEM 291 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 723

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
STATE PRISON AT SAN QUENTIN, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$86,056
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for seven minor construction projects, six of which will allow for alterations and corrections to existing facilities to increase the operational efficiency of the physical plant. One project will provide for the initial complement of equipment for the Deadwood and Spruce Grove conservation camps at a cost of \$10,500. We have examined the projects and *recommend approval of the item as requested.*

Department of Youth Authority
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA RECEPTION CENTER AND CLINIC

ITEM 292 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 730

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA RECEPTION CENTER AND CLINIC
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$125,500
Legislative Analyst's Recommendation	79,500
Reduction	\$46,000

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for three minor construction projects, one for revising the electrical distribution system at \$49,500. The second project for alterations to the refrigeration and lighting system at a cost of \$30,000. The third will provide for the relocation of the existing laundry building at \$46,000 which would be used for maintenance shops and storage. While we are satisfied with the first two projects, we cannot recommend the third. The cost of this project appears excessive and we cannot recommend it. *With the exception of the third project, we recommend approval.*

**Department of Youth Authority
FRICOT RANCH SCHOOL FOR BOYS**

ITEM 293 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 732

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, EQUIPMENT, FRICOT
RANCH SCHOOL FOR BOYS, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$23,000
 Legislative Analyst's recommendation----- No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for two projects of minor construction, the first of which allows for the construction of an addition to the existing gymnasium and the second for alterations and improvements to other portions of the physical plant.

We have had the opportunity to inspect these projects while on a recent field trip to this institution. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Youth Authority
FRED C. NELLES SCHOOL FOR BOYS**

ITEM 294 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 734

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$63,000
 Legislative Analyst's recommendation----- No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for three minor construction projects required to eliminate hazardous and functionally unsatisfactory conditions and to improve the security of the institution. The projects have been inspected on the site and appear to be justified. The costs are commensurate with the work to be done. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Youth Authority
PASO ROBLES SCHOOL FOR BOYS**

ITEM 295 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 736

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
PASO ROBLES SCHOOL FOR BOYS, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$85,900
 Legislative Analyst's recommendation----- No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for four minor construction projects, two of which will enlarge and alter existing facilities to increase their usability. The remaining two will allow for the replacement and correction of existing equipment necessary for proper operation of the plant.

We have had the opportunity to inspect each of these projects in detail during the current fiscal year. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Youth Authority
PRESTON SCHOOL OF INDUSTRY**

ITEM 296 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 737

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
PRESTON SCHOOL OF INDUSTRY, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$40,200
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for two projects of minor construction, the first of which will correct, at a cost of \$35,000, an electrolysis condition in cable and water pipes at the institution which is causing them to deteriorate rapidly. The other will provide for alteration and improvement projects to increase the overall efficiency of the institution, at a cost of \$5,200.

We have inspected these projects in detail while on a recent field trip to this institution and *recommend approval*.

**Department of Youth Authority
YOUTH TRAINING SCHOOL**

ITEM 297 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 739

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$8,125
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item will authorize the construction of a small, simple canteen building which will provide a source of supply for personal needs of the boys. The project appears justifiable and the cost is reasonable. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Youth Authority
LOS GUILUCOS SCHOOL FOR GIRLS**

ITEM 298 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 740

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
LOS GUILUCOS SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$75,600
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item consists of four minor construction projects designed to remodel, alter and improve existing facilities to increase overall plant efficiency.

We have inspected each of these projects in detail during the current fiscal year and *recommend approval of the item as requested.*

**Department of Education
CALIFORNIA SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND**

ITEM 299 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 744

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
CALIFORNIA SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$17,400
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for two minor construction projects, the first of which would replace steam lines that are now in a bad state of repair. The second project will allow for the installation of a fire alarm system which appears to be badly needed. *We recommend approval.*

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

ITEM 300 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 746

**FOR MAJOR AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND
EQUIPMENT FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$50,550
Legislative Analyst's Recommendation	9,250
Reduction	\$41,300

ANALYSIS

This item provides augmentation for a previously funded minor construction project converting it to a major one and several minor projects as follows:

a. Construct swimming pool (partial) **\$41,300**

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$45,000 for a minor project to construct a swimming pool at this institution. This was based on an estimate procured locally by the institution and not concurred in by the Division of Architecture. We were aware at that time of the differences of opinion that were involved, however, the institution insisted that it could procure the swimming pool for that price.

It has now been established that because of the topographic difficulties of the location where the pool must be placed, immediately adjacent to the gymnasium, no local pool contractor can construct the facility for the amount provided. The cost is now estimated to be nearly twice the amount provided or approximately \$86,300. We seriously question the justification for providing a swimming pool for an institution of this type when facilities are available at the adjoining school for the blind, even though they may be inconvenient and difficult to use. It should be pointed out that the new proposal, as did the original one in the minor construction, involves an open pool, although one to which a cover could be added in the future. On the other hand, the existing pool at the school for the blind is an enclosed pool and hence can be

School for the Deaf—Berkeley—Continued

used under many conditions when an open pool could not. *Consequently, we recommend that this proposal be disapproved and that the item for minor construction in the 1960 Budget Act be reverted to the General Fund.*

b. The minor construction requested by this institution consists of two projects. The first of which would replace steam lines that are in a bad state of repair in the gymnasium area, at a cost of \$8,000. The second project would allow for the installation of a grease filter in the kitchen at a cost of \$1,250. We have reviewed these projects as to justification and propriety of cost estimate. *We recommend approval.*

Department of Education

CALIFORNIA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF, RIVERSIDE

ITEM 301 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 747

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, CALIFORNIA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF, RIVERSIDE, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$3,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for a minor project to install attention lights in classrooms. From the detail on this project it appears that it is a necessity for efficient operation. *We recommend approval.*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ITEM 302 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 748

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$1,732,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for a series of minor projects distributed in total amounts by campuses as follows: Statewide, \$109,000; Mount Hamilton, \$52,100; Berkeley, \$415,700; Davis, \$199,000; La Jolla, \$103,000; Los Angeles, \$341,000; Los Angeles Medical Center, \$78,500; Riverside, \$191,800; San Francisco, \$122,300; Santa Barbara, \$119,300.

The entire proposal represents some 66 separate and distinct projects on the various campuses involving a wide variety of alterations, modernization, additions and equipment. The least costly project, for example, involves \$4,200 for altering a room in the clinics building at the San Francisco Medical School to make it useable as a dental clinic laboratory. The most costly project is \$50,000, of which there are several, such as the construction of a sawmill shed and the conversion of

University of California—Continued

shop area to laboratories and office use in the Forest Products Laboratory on the Richmond Field Station near Berkeley. Another example of a \$50,000 project would be on the Los Angeles campus where it is desired to reconstruct roof trusses and other areas in the Mechanics Building to make the area reasonably safe from earthquake damage. On the Riverside campus there are several \$50,000 projects; one of them is to modify two classrooms to provide eight small offices and two special use laboratory rooms for the Department of Psychology in the Social Sciences-Humanities Building. On the Santa Barbara campus there is a \$50,000 project involving a series of jobs in the outdoor physical education set-up, such as constructing two tennis courts and bang-board for teaching, providing portable bleachers and protective fence between spectators and the track.

In prior years we have had the opportunity to discuss the minor projects at each campus, at considerable length with the agency and the Department of Finance, following visits of our staff to the campuses to view the problems. This was not possible in the new approach to the budget, being presented at this time, in which the decision as to the total amount of money available for minor construction was made fairly late and the Department of Finance reviewed the projects on the basis of prior knowledge of them, but as to need only, not as to cost. The costs have not been reviewed and they represent the university's estimates only. We are familiar with some of the projects since they have been discussed in the past and previously deferred. However, in the case of most of the projects we have only the program justifications submitted by the university, on which to depend. In view of the fact that the total amount proposed, on an empirical basis, appears to be equitable for the magnitude of the total plant of the university on all its campuses and in view of the fact that constantly changing emphasis in the university's teaching program does make necessary minor changes each year to accommodate these changing emphases *we would recommend tentative approval of this item, subject to a more intensive review before the committees take final action.*

**State College System
CHICO STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 303 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 764

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
CHICO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$123,850
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for three minor construction projects of which the first two would provide for equipment for the farm and engineering programs. The remaining project is for alteration and improvements to existing facilities to better suit campus needs. We have examined the data submitted and feel that the projects are justified. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

**State College System
FRESNO STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 304 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 766

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
FRESNO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$140,950
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for five minor construction projects for alterations and improvements found necessary for increased enrollments and the educational program of this institution. *We recommend approval.*

**State College System
HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 305 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 769

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$118,050
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for five minor construction projects of alterations and improvements and site development. From the detail we have examined concerning these projects, they appear to be justified and the cost estimates appear to be reasonable. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

**State College System
LONG BEACH STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 306 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 772

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
LONG BEACH STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$23,100
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for two minor projects, the first of which is for alterations to an existing laboratory at a cost of \$21,600, the second project is for minor alterations and improvements at a cost of \$1,500. From the details submitted to us, it appears that the projects are necessary and that the cost estimates are reasonable. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

State College System

LOS ANGELES STATE COLLEGE OF APPLIED ARTS AND SCIENCES

ITEM 307 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 774

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
LOS ANGELES STATE COLLEGE OF APPLIED ARTS AND
SCIENCES, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted \$72,300
Legislative Analyst's recommendation..... No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for three minor projects of improvement and alterations to the existing physical plant to increase operational efficiency in light of student enrollment growth and needs. *We recommend approval.*

State College System

SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 308 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 776

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted \$85,250
Legislative Analyst's recommendation..... No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for four minor projects to alter existing facilities and to provide equipment necessary to carry on the educational program at this campus in view of predicted enrollment increases. The data presented appears to justify the need and the cost estimates are reasonable. *We recommend approval.*

State College System

SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 309 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 778

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted \$58,100
Legislative Analyst's recommendation..... No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for six minor construction projects to alter and improve the existing facility so as to better serve the educational programs conducted at this institution. During the current fiscal year, we had the opportunity to inspect each of these projects in detail while on a visit to this institution. *We recommend approval.*

State College System
SAN FERNANDO VALLEY STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 310 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 781

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
SAN FERNANDO VALLEY STATE COLLEGE
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$107,100
Legislative Analyst's recommendation----- No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for five minor projects, three of which are initial complements of equipment for the engineering, geography and psychology programs. The remaining two projects would provide for alterations to existing facilities to meet changes in the educational program. We have examined the details submitted and feel that they are justified and that the estimates are reasonable. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

State College System
SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 311 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 783

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$120,750
Legislative Analyst's recommendation----- No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for seven minor construction projects of alterations and improvements to the physical plant intended to increase the plant efficiency in view of enrollment needs and changing programs. We have examined the projects and *recommend approval.*

State College System
SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 312 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 785

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$118,100
Legislative Analyst's recommendation----- No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for four minor projects, two of which will provide for initial complements of equipment for the geology and meteorology programs. The remaining two will allow for certain alterations and improvements to be made to existing facilities to better adapt the physical plant to the needs of the projected enrollments. *We recommend approval.*

State College System

CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE

ITEM 313 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 789

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted \$107,675
Legislative Analyst's recommendation..... No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for eight minor projects at both the San Luis Obispo and Kellogg-Voorhis campuses. The projects would provide for equipment and alterations and repairs to existing facilities to better meet the needs of their changing educational programs. During the current fiscal year, we had the opportunity to inspect each of these projects in detail while on field visits to the campuses. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY

ITEM 314 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 794

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted \$5,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation..... No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for one minor project of site development work which would be the first of two increments. We have examined this project and *recommend approval.*

DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT

ITEM 315 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 795

FOR MAJOR AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND
EQUIPMENT, FROM THE EMPLOYMENT CONTINGENT FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted \$185,000
Legislative Analyst's Recommendation..... 175,000
Reduction \$10,000

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for two major alteration projects and one minor project as follows:

a. *Alter and equip existing building—Hollywood*..... \$100,000

In another item, payable from the Unemployment Trust Fund, there has been proposed the construction of another building to house some

Department of Employment—Continued

of the functions now included in the Hollywood office. We have recommended that this additional building not be constructed but that instead the additional space be leased since it appears that certain functions can be housed separately from others. Consequently, if additional space is leased, the vacated space in the existing building will require remodeling to be used for those functions that remain in the building. While we have seen no plans or specifications for the remodeling project, the program information which we have received would appear to indicate that the proposed costs are in line with the amount of work required. *Consequently, we would recommend approval subject to State Public Works Board approval of the plans.*

b. Alter and equip existing buildings—San Bernardino----- \$75,000

In another item financed from the Unemployment Trust Fund there has been proposed the construction of an additional but separate building to house certain functions of the Employment Office in San Bernardino. Since these functions are separable from the main operation we have recommended that the building not be constructed and that instead space be leased to satisfy the needs. In either case space vacated in the existing building would need to be altered for proper use by those functions that would remain. While we have not seen preliminary plans or specifications, the program indications are such that the amount proposed appears to be in line. *Consequently, we would recommend approval subject to approval of the preliminary plans by the State Public Works Board.*

c. The repair of building equipment—Sacramento warehouse \$10,000

In another item payable from the Unemployment Trust Fund there has been proposed an extremely expensive and unjustifiable increase in space in the existing warehouse in Sacramento. We have recommended against this expenditure. Consequently, we must also recommend against doing the work proposed, which would largely be occasioned by tearing up the existing floor in the warehouse, which is part of the proposed alteration job. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval.*

DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT

ITEM 316 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 795

FOR SITE ACQUISITION, MAJOR AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT FROM THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$7,518,114
Legislative Analyst's Recommendation	672,695
Reduction	\$6,845,419

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for four site acquisitions for future expansion of existing buildings, eight site acquisitions for totally new buildings where state buildings are not now in existence, three construction proj-

Department of Employment—Continued

ects which are additions to existing buildings, nine construction projects for new buildings, preliminary plans allowances for the next budget and a group of minor projects.

State-Owned Versus Leased Office Space

Several years ago when proposals were presented by the Department of Employment to the Legislature that it be permitted to use its Employment Contingent Fund for the construction of new office buildings to take the place of lease space, the Legislature rejected the proposal on several counts. First it was pointed out that the Employment Contingent Fund surpluses were available for other uses by the State and in fact the Legislature subsequently siphoned off the surplus each year, for transfer to the General Fund, after leaving an annual balance of \$100,000. Secondly, the Legislature apparently believed that it was not necessary or proper to take properties off local tax rolls when adequate space could be provided by leasing private property and that the costs of these leases would be defrayed entirely by the federal government as part of its grant for administrative services. The third point, which the Legislature apparently considered was the fact that changing needs in a community could be more readily accommodated by moving from one leased space to another than would be the case if the State owned the building and therefore had to stay wherever it happened to be built, irrespective of changing needs. In any case the Legislature stopped any further replacement of leased space by state-owned space in the Department of Employment.

Subsequently, at the 1960 Budget Session, the Department of Employment proposed the idea of using the Unemployment Trust Fund (Reed Act) for expanding existing state-owned buildings or for providing additional parking at existing state-owned buildings. This involved both construction of buildings and the purchase of sites presumably adjacent to existing buildings on which to construct added space or on which to provide parking. The Legislature accepted this proposal principally on the basis that it involved only expanding existing buildings by adding to them or providing additional parking at existing buildings. It was recognized that the Reed Act moneys available to the State could be used for such purposes for only a limited time; five years from the time they were credited to the State's account. Thereafter while they remained in the State's account they could be used only for additional benefits.

The proposal now before the Legislature in this budget involves a substantial break with the previously accepted policies in that it requests the use of the Reed Act moneys for the purchase of sites for totally new and separate buildings or the construction of new and separate buildings either to provide additional space near an existing state-owned building or to replace, in most cases, leased space. For the same reasons mentioned above, on which we believe the Legislature acted before, *we recommend against this proposal*. We point out also that the unemployment situation in the State of California is such that the Reed Act moneys may very well be required for direct benefits. We

Department of Employment—Continued

suggest that adequate leased space can be readily found either already in existence or constructed more or less to the department's order and that the rentals will be defrayed, as long as required, by the federal government. For these reasons, we can see no necessity to use funds, otherwise available to the State for the payment of unemployment compensation benefits, for a program of capital outlay when the needed facilities can be supplied by private capital with the annual rent charged to the federal government as a proper cost of administration of the unemployment program.

The Budget Act of 1960 appropriated capital outlay funds to the Department of Employment from the Unemployment Trust Fund (Reed Act), for the first time. The appropriation was made in a lump sum without a clearly defined schedule having a price tag attached to each item in the schedule. As of this writing we do not know whether the same approach will be used. Consequently, we propose to set forth each project separately as though the item in the Budget Bill had a conventional schedule.

*a. Site acquisition, parking lot and future building expansion,
Pasadena ----- \$85,000*

We find this proposal quite puzzling since the Budget Act of 1957 provided \$108,500 for "parking and building expansion site acquisition—Pasadena" from the Employment Contingent Fund and \$31,000 for working plans for a building in Pasadena. The appropriation for site acquisition has apparently been expended as well as the money for working plans. Further down in this schedule there is a proposal to construct and equip a new office building in Pasadena at \$435,000. Consequently, project A appears to be the purchase of additional site for a building that has not yet even been constructed.

Since we will recommend that the new building not be constructed, we can see no justification for the purchase of additional land. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval of project a.*

b. Site acquisition, parking lot—Sacramento ----- \$150,000

This proposal involves the acquisition of a little over one-half acre of ground located in the block bounded by Seventh and Eighth, O and P Streets in Sacramento to provide for additional employee parking capacity. This will take the place of present capacity that must be reassigned for general public use because of the amount of public traffic being experienced at the Sacramento local office. Construction of the lot will be taken care of as a minor project further in this schedule. *We recommend approval.*

*c. Site acquisition, parking lot and future building expansion,
Vallejo ----- \$50,000*

This proposal involves the purchase of property approximately 100 feet by 130 feet adjacent to the existing Vallejo building in order to provide for additional parking area to meet public needs. The area would also serve as future site for expansion of the building. *We recommend approval.*

Department of Employment—Continued

d. *Site acquisition, parking lot and future building expansion, San Francisco*----- \$143,000

This proposal involves the purchase of an area approximately 120 feet by 105 feet to provide additional parking for both public and employee use. It is our understanding that the property is not contiguous to the existing building and, therefore, could not serve as expansion space for a future building addition. *However, since the need for additional parking is comparatively acute, we recommend approval.*

e. *Site acquisition for building, Oakland*----- \$535,000

This proposal involves the purchase of a site approximately 300 feet by 335 feet on which to construct a building for the department's industrial office which is now housed in leased space. *We recommend disapproval of this proposal.*

f. *Site acquisition for building, Richmond*----- \$175,000

This proposal involves the purchase of a site of approximately 200 feet by 300 feet on which to construct a building having something in excess of 15,000 square feet. The Richmond office of the Department of Employment is now housed in a leased building of 9,000 square feet which is considered overcrowded. *We recommend disapproval of this proposal.*

g. *Site acquisition for building, Modesto*----- \$420,000

This proposal involves the purchase of a site 250 feet by 300 feet on which to build a structure having approximately 13,000 square feet plus providing for parking area. The present local and audit district office of the department is housed in a leased building of 10,500 square feet.

We recommend disapproval of this proposal.

h. *Site acquisition for building, Berkeley*----- \$220,000

This proposal involves the purchase of a site 200 feet by 200 feet on which to build a structure of approximately 10,000 square feet with the balance of the property being used for parking. The present local office of the department is being housed in a leased building of 7,920 square feet.

We recommend disapproval of the proposal.

i. *Site acquisition for building, El Centro*----- \$125,000

This proposal involves the purchase of a site 200 feet by 250 feet on which to build a structure having approximately 10,000 square feet with the balance of the area to be used for parking. The department's local and audit district office is located in two separate leased buildings of 4,000 and 544 square feet respectively.

We recommend disapproval of this proposal.

j. *Site acquisition for building, Marysville*----- \$200,000

This proposal involves the purchase of a site 200 feet by 200 feet on which to build a structure having approximately 9,000 square feet with

Department of Employment—Continued

the balance of the area being used for parking. The department's local and audit district offices are presently housed in a leased building of 7,000 square feet.

We recommend disapproval of this proposal.

k. *Site acquisition for building, Merced*----- \$75,000

This proposal involves purchase of a site 200 feet by 200 feet on which to build a structure having approximately 6,000 square feet with the balance of the area to be used for parking. The department's local and audit district offices are presently housed in a leased building of 5,140 square feet.

We recommend disapproval of this proposal.

l. *Site acquisition for building, Porterville*----- \$75,000

This proposal involves the purchase of a site 200 feet by 175 feet on which to build a structure having approximately 5,300 square feet with the balance of the area to be used for parking. The department's local office is now housed in a leased building of 4,832 square feet.

We recommend disapproval of the proposal.

m. *Construct and equip building addition and parking lot, Hollywood*----- \$400,300

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$100,000 for the purchase of additional land adjacent to the existing Hollywood Employment Building on Santa Monica Boulevard to allow for additional parking space and expansion of the existing building which now has an area of 15,184 gross square feet. It is proposed to expand this building by something in excess of 10,000 gross square feet since it has been calculated that there will be a need for approximately 25,500 net square feet by 1970. We have seen no preliminary plan and no specifications for this project and actually we do not know at this time whether it is proposed to expand the building to the needs for 1970 at one time or to do it in increments. The amount being proposed would indicate a single complete expansion. *In the absence of any material on which to form any opinions, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

n. *Construct and equip building addition, San Bernardino*--- \$376,592

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$90,000 for the purchase of additional properties on which to expand the existing employment office building. At that time the presumption was that the additional property would be immediately adjacent to the existing building and that any future expansion would be attached to the existing building. It now develops that the property being purchased is removed from the site and separated from it by an alley. This will require that the expansion take the form of a totally new and separate building. The new building would house the disability insurance office, the audit district office and a referee office. If it is possible for these functions to be carried on in a separate and distinct building then we suggest that it can be done in a leased building in line with our earlier statement. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval of this proposal.*

Department of Employment—Continued

o. Construct and equip additional office building and parking lot, Los Angeles ----- \$643,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$1 million for the purchase of additional land on which to build an addition to the existing Los Angeles building as well as providing off-street parking. It was presumed at that time that this involved property immediately contiguous to the existing property and that expansion of the existing building would take the form of a structure attached to it. The property being purchased is a complete square block bounded by 14th, 15th, Broadway and Hill Streets. It is now proposed to build a structure on the site, independent of the existing building, and having approximately 25,000 square feet of gross area in which to house the commercial office and the professional-scientific employment service office. If it is possible for these services to be physically removed from the existing building then there appears to be no reason why they cannot be housed in leased space in accordance with our earlier statement. In any case we have received no preliminary plans or specifications for this project other than some program data. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval of this proposal.*

p. Construct and equip building addition, Sacramento warehouse ----- \$102,100

This project proposes to increase the floor space in one end of the existing warehouse by removing and depressing the existing floor which measures roughly 7,500 square feet, and building a mezzanine floor which will have approximately 6,000 square feet. The net result of this action, which is estimated to cost over \$102,000, would be to provide additional warehouse space at over \$17 per square foot, in an existing building. The cost involves a hydraulic elevator which would be necessary to move material to and from the mezzanine.

We suggest that this cost is out of all proportion to the value of warehouse space. We question whether the need for additional warehouse space is so great, at this location that such a cost can be justified. It is suggested that space can be either rented or built at another location for substantially less than this cost. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval of this project.*

q. Construct and equip new office building, Pasadena ----- \$435,000

This project proposes the construction of a building having a net usable area of approximately 13,435 square feet. It represents the replacement of an existing leased facility.

We recommend disapproval of the proposal.

r. Construct and equip new office building, Oakland ----- \$725,673

This project proposes the construction of a new building having 22,000 net square feet of useable space. It will take the place of an existing leased facility as mentioned in project (e) above. We have not seen preliminary plans or specifications for this project although we have had some program material.

We recommend disapproval of the proposal.

Department of Employment—Continued

s. *Construct and equip new office building, Richmond*----- \$503,464

Project (f) above contemplated the purchase of a site and this project contemplates the construction of a building on it having approximately 15,500 net square feet of useable area. The balance of the site would be used for parking. The present local office of the department is housed in a leased building of 9,000 square feet.

We recommend disapproval of this proposal.

t. *Construct and equip new building, Modesto*----- \$455,900

Project (g) above proposed the acquisition of a site and this project proposes the construction of a building on it having approximately 13,000 square feet of net useable area. The balance of the lot would be used for parking. The present local and audit district offices of the department are located in a leased building of 10,500 square feet. We have received no preliminary plans or specifications other than some program data on this project. The same is true of practically every every construction project in this schedule.

We recommend disapproval of this proposal.

u. *Construct and equip new building, Berkeley*----- \$319,192

Project (h) above proposed the acquisition of a site and this proposes the construction of a building on the site, to have approximately 10,000 square feet of net useable space. The balance of the site to be used for parking. The present local office of the department is housed in a leased building having 7,920 square feet.

We recommend disapproval of the proposal.

v. *Construct and equip new building, El Centro*----- \$303,000

Project (i) above proposed the acquisition of a site and this project proposes the construction of a building on it to provide approximately 9,000 square feet of net useable area. The balance of the site to be used for parking. The present local and audit district offices of the department are in two leased buildings totaling 4,544 square feet.

We recommend disapproval of the proposal.

w. *Construct and equip new building, Marysville*----- \$280,349

Project (j) above proposed the acquisition of a site and this project proposes to construct a building on it having approximately 9,000 square feet of net useable area. The balance of the site would be used for parking. The present local and audit district offices of the department are housed in a leased building of 7,000 square feet.

We recommend disapproval of this proposal.

x. *Construct and equip new building, Merced*----- \$200,000

Project (k) above proposed the acquisition of a site and this proposes the construction of a building on this site having approximately 6,000 square feet of net useable area. The balance of the site would be used for parking. The present local and audit district offices of the department are housed in a leased building of 5,140 square feet.

We recommend disapproval of this proposal.

Department of Employment—Continued

y. *Construct and equip new building, Porterville*----- \$170,849

Project (l) above proposed the acquisition of the site and this project proposes the construction of a building on it having less than 6,000 square feet of net useable area. The balance of the site would be used for parking. The present local office of the department is housed in a leased building of 4,832 square feet.

We recommend disapproval of this proposal.

z. *Preliminary plans for fiscal year 1962-63*----- \$20,000

Since our basic position is to recommend disapproval of acquisition of sites and construction of totally new buildings in lieu of leased facilities, we must recommend against providing funds for preliminary plans for projects which should not even be considered. *Therefore, we recommend disapproval of this proposal.*

aa. *Construct and equip parking lots*----- \$329,695

This involves the construction of parking lots to provide additional parking for existing buildings at 15 locations. The lowest cost would be at Indio for \$8,000 and the highest at Stockton for \$63,700. *We recommend approval.*

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

ITEM 317 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 800

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION AND IMPROVEMENTS
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted -----	\$233,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation -----	143,000
Reduction -----	\$90,000

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for six minor projects the smallest of which is \$14,000 and the largest \$50,000. Four of the projects are reasonably well justified on the basis of need to bring certain areas up to an acceptable standard or to save operating costs to the extent that the cost of the projects would be amortized in a reasonably short number of years.

However, we take exception to two of the projects as follows. (1) install automatic sprinkler system for part of Capitol grounds, \$40,000.

For a number of years the Department of Finance has advocated the installation of automatic sprinklers in Capitol Park on the basis that it would conserve manpower which now spends considerable time in moving portable sprinklers and hoses about the grounds as required. However, the department has never conceded that by the installation of a completely automatic sprinkler system they would be able to eliminate some of this manpower. Since the general size and configuration of the Capitol grounds have not changed over recent years and since to the best of our knowledge the department has not offered to help amortize the cost of a sprinkler system by reducing manpower, *we must con-*

Department of Finance—Continued

tinue to recommend disapproval of this type of expenditure unless there is a corresponding reduction in manpower. We do, however, believe that such a step should be taken with appropriate reduction in support costs.

(2) Construct microwave radio vaults, \$50,000.

In the support budget of the Division of Forestry we have discussed at some length the fact that the State is developing, by piecemeal means a microwave system without specific legislative approval. We direct your attention to this discussion. *In line with our recommendations in that discussion that we defer any further expenditures for this system, we recommend disapproval of this project.*

SIXTH DISTRICT AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION

ITEM 318 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 803

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
SIXTH DISTRICT AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$74,700
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	24,700
Reduction	\$50,000

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for three projects, the first of which would improve the water supply system as recommended by the State Fire Marshal and the Los Angeles Fire Department. The project itself would be carried on jointly with the County of Los Angeles which is paying 40 percent of the total cost. The second project would provide for improving the facade of the museum proper at a cost of \$50,000. The improvements themselves serve no structural purpose, being purely decorative. This project is only the first increment of a total facelifting program. It could easily exceed \$150,000. We fail to see the justification for this expenditure in light of more pressing budgetary requirements. *Consequently, we recommend its deletion.* The third project would be for alteration and improvements to existing facilities at a cost of \$3,000. *With exception of the \$50,000 reduction, we recommend approval.*

CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

ITEM 319 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 816

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL FROM THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$388,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

California Highway Patrol—Continued
ANALYSIS

This item will provide for two construction projects as follows:

a. *Construct zone and area office building, Fresno*----- \$240,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided funds for the purchase of a site in Fresno on which to build an office facility to replace the existing leased facilities on two widely separated and unsatisfactory sites. The Budget Act of 1960 also provided \$10,000 for working drawings for the project.

Difficulties in acquiring a suitable site have made it impossible to prepare adequate preliminary plans for ordinary budgeting purposes. However, it is anticipated that the problems of site acquisition will be resolved during the current fiscal year and that working drawings can be completed and actual construction started within the budget year.

On an empirical basis, in view of the fact that the project must provide facilities for approximately 50 people, many of whom are in and out rather than permanent occupants of the building, and in view of the fact that the basic building will probably be about 5,000 square feet with extensive parking and carport facilities, it would appear that the amount being requested is reasonable. Furthermore, before any funds can be expended even for working drawings, the State Public Works Board will review preliminary plans before allocating funds. In the event any unusual site problems develop, any augmentation of the project would also have to be reviewed and approved by the State Public Works Board. *Consequently, we recommend approval of the request.*

b. *Construct area office building, Merced*----- \$148,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided funds for the purchase of a site for a new office building in Merced occasioned principally by the fact that a new freeway bypass is under construction and it is desirable to have the office of the Highway Patrol adjacent to a heavily traveled artery of this kind. *The same problems mentioned above have occurred in connection with this project and for the same basic reasons, we recommend approval.*

Department of Mental Hygiene

LANGLEY PORTER NEUROPSYCHIATRIC INSTITUTE

ITEM 320 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 821

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
LANGLEY PORTER NEUROPSYCHIATRIC INSTITUTE
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	-----	\$22,700
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	-----	No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for three minor construction projects designed to remodel and alter the existing facilities to provide for greater utilization of the existing physical plant. We have had the opportunity to

Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute—Continued

visit this institution during the current year to determine the justification for the projects as well as the propriety of the cost estimates involved. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene
NEUROPSYCHIATRIC INSTITUTE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

ITEM 321 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 822

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
NEUROPSYCHIATRIC INSTITUTE AT UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$10,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for alterations and improvements to newly constructed physical facilities at this institution which would correct oversights and deficiencies in the plan. We have examined the projects and *recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene
AGNEWS STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 322 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 822

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
AGNEWS STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$123,050
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for six minor construction projects, five of which provide for alterations to the existing plant for increased operating efficiency while the remaining project will allow the hospital to complete another increment of landscaping and ground improvements in the east area of this institution, at a cost of \$45,000. During the current year, we had an opportunity to make a field inspection of these projects with representatives of the Department of Mental Hygiene and *recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene
ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 323 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 824

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$56,450
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

Atascadero State Hospital—Continued

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for five remodeling and improvement projects of which two are for the farm operation. The balance are to help eliminate recent hazards and inadequate ventilation. We have examined these projects on the site and *we recommend approval.*

Department of Mental Hygiene

CAMARILLO STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 324 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 825

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
CAMARILLO STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$136,910
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for seven minor construction projects designed to modernize, renovate and alter existing facilities to improve over-all plant operation. During the current fiscal year, we had the opportunity to inspect each of these projects in detail and *we recommend approval.*

Department of Mental Hygiene

DeWITT STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 325 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 827

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
DeWITT STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$67,725
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for eight minor construction projects which will remodel, repair and improve the existing facilities at this institution.

During the current fiscal year, we have had the opportunity to visit this institution and to inspect each of these projects in detail. The projects are needed and the cost estimates are in line. *We recommend approval.*

Department of Mental Hygiene

MENDOCINO STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 326 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 828

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
MENDOCINO STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$23,650
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

**Mendocino State Hospital—Continued
ANALYSIS**

This item would provide for two minor construction projects for improvements and alterations to the physical plant to increase its over-all operational efficiency. During the current fiscal year, we had the opportunity to visit this institution and to inspect these projects in detail. They appear to be necessary and the cost estimates are in line. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene
METROPOLITAN STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 327 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 829

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
METROPOLITAN STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$124,500
Legislative Analyst's recommendation.....	No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for six minor projects of improvement, alteration and construction necessary to improve the hospital's operational efficiency.

During the current fiscal year, we have had the opportunity to visit this institution and to inspect these projects in detail. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene
MODESTO STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 328 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 830

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
MODESTO STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$51,240
Legislative Analyst's recommendation.....	No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for four minor construction projects of modernization, improvements and repairs to the existing facilities necessary to maintain these temporary facilities in a reasonably useable state.

During the current fiscal year, we have had the opportunity to visit this institution and to inspect these projects, both from the standpoint of need and cost. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene
NAPA STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 329 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 831

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
NAPA STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$64,550
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for six minor construction projects for the remodeling and improvement of certain facilities in the physical plant. We have examined the projects as to necessity and cost. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene
PATTON STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 330 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 833

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
PATTON STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$80,950
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item consists of seven minor projects of alterations, improvements and repairs designed to increase the operational efficiency of the physical facilities. During the current year, we had the opportunity to visit this institution and to inspect each of these projects along with representatives of the Department of Mental Hygiene. The cost estimates are reasonable and the projects are justified from the standpoint of need. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene
STOCKTON STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 331 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 835

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
STOCKTON STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$85,400
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for seven minor projects designed to improve the overall operating efficiency of the physical plant and to meet the needs of modern, clinical operating methods.

During the current fiscal year we have had the opportunity to visit this institution and to review each of these projects in detail with members of the hospital's staff. *We recommend approval.*

Department of Mental Hygiene
FAIRVIEW STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 332 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 836

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
FAIRVIEW STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted \$75,900
Legislative Analyst's recommendation No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for eight minor projects designed to correct oversights in the original design of the institution and to make certain changes necessary to increase the utilization of the physical plant.

During the current fiscal year, we have had the opportunity to visit this institution and to inspect each of these projects in detail with members of the staff of the institution in order to determine that the cost estimates are in line and that the projects are justified. *We recommend approval.*

Department of Mental Hygiene
PACIFIC STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 333 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 838

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
PACIFIC STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted \$78,200
Legislative Analyst's recommendation No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for seven minor projects to improve operating conditions by providing new equipment and improving existing facilities. We had the opportunity to visit this institution during the current fiscal year and to inspect each of these projects. Consequently, we are of the opinion that they are needed and that the cost estimates are reasonably in line. *We recommend approval.*

Department of Mental Hygiene
PORTERVILLE STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 334 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 839

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
PORTERVILLE STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted \$28,270
Legislative Analyst's recommendation No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for four minor construction projects which would improve existing patient facilities.

We have examined these projects and find that they are justified both from the standpoint of need and cost. *Consequently we recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene
SONOMA STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 335 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 840

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
SONOMA STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$82,450
Legislative Analyst's recommendation ----- No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for nine separate minor construction projects found necessary to decrease maintenance costs and improve operating conditions from the standpoints of safety and sanitation. During the current year, we had the opportunity to inspect each of these projects in detail with representatives of the Department of Mental Hygiene during a field trip visit to this institution.. The projects are necessary and the cost estimates are in line. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

MILITARY DEPARTMENT

ITEM 336 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 842

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$25,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation ----- No change

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for three minor projects, the first of which would allow certain roof repairs to be made to various armories at a cost of \$10,000. The second project would provide steel shelving for supply rooms at a cost of \$11,200 and the third project would allow \$3,800 to be used in surveying new armory sites and to pay the cost of insurance. We have examined the detail accompanying these projects and find that they are justified and that the cost estimates are in line. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES

ITEM 337 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 844

**FOR MAJOR AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION, ACQUISITION, IMPROVE-
MENTS AND EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES,
FROM THE MOTOR VEHICLE FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$1,936,900
Legislative Analyst's recommendation ----- No change

Department of Motor Vehicles—Continued
ANALYSIS

This item will provide for two site acquisitions, five construction projects and a group of minor projects as follows:

a. *Purchase of additional parcels for headquarters parking area, Sacramento* ----- \$460,000

This is part of the orderly process of providing an adequate parking situation in connection with the large, new headquarters building being constructed in Sacramento immediately adjacent to the older headquarters building. When the new building is fully occupied, and for some years some of its space will be rented to other state agencies, there will probably be in excess of 3,000 state employees between the two buildings. In addition, there are large numbers of visitors to the buildings for various reasons such as license and registration procurement, etc. This indicates the need for a very substantial parking facility in order to avoid local traffic problems and local public relations problems due to excessive street parking.

Consequently, we recommend approval of this request.

b. *Purchase additional parking area, Yuba City* ----- \$17,500

The existing parking area for the Yuba City office has only 17 stalls which are inadequate to handle normal traffic volumes, let alone peak volumes. *Consequently, we believe that there is justification for providing additional space and approval is recommended.*

c. *Construct office building, North Hollywood* ----- \$300,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$280,000 for the purchase of a site for a new office building in North Hollywood to replace leased facilities which are inadequate to house the staff and which have inadequate parking area. Difficulties in obtaining a site have made it impossible to prepare definitive preliminary plans for budget purposes. However, based on prior experience and assuming that a building of approximately 10,000 gross square feet with adequate surrounding parking area is involved, the amount requested appears to be in line. Furthermore, we should point out that before any funds can be used either for working drawings or construction, the State Public Works Board is required to approve preliminary plans and make the necessary allocations. Also, if unusual site difficulties should arise resulting in augmentation requirements, the State Public Works Board would have to pass on this matter and provide the augmentation. *In view of the fact that it is anticipated that the site problems will be cleared up during the current fiscal year and that it will be possible to prepare working drawings and start construction during the budget year, we would recommend approval of the request.*

d. *Construct office building, Santa Ana* ----- \$237,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$200,000 for the purchase of a site for a new building in Santa Ana to replace inadequate leased facilities and inadequate parking facilities. *The same situation exists with the site and the plans as in the project mentioned above. We make the same recommendation.*

Department of Motor Vehicles—Continued

e. Construct office building, San Bernardino..... \$348,400

Chapter 2380 of the Statutes of 1957 provided that proceeds from the sale of the existing Motor Vehicles building in San Bernardino were appropriated for the purchase of a new site. Approximately \$180,000 was made available for this purpose from this source. The sale of the old building was occasioned by the expansion of the needs of the Division of Highways which required the property on which the Motor Vehicles building stood. At present, the activity is being carried on in leased quarters which are inadequate and have inadequate parking facilities. The same problems have arisen with respect to the purchase of a new site as has been mentioned in the projects above. *On an experience basis we make the same recommendation for approval.*

f. Construct office building, Pasadena..... \$303,200

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$250,000 for the purchase of a new site on which to build a building to take the place of the present, inadequate leased facilities. *The same acquisition problems have arisen as mentioned above and we make the same recommendation for approval.*

g. Construct office building, Stockton..... \$174,000

The Budget Act of 1958 provided a lump sum for property acquisition from which \$250,000 was allocated to the purchase of a site for a new building in Stockton to take the place of existing leased facilities which were inadequate and had inadequate parking capacity. The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$24,000 for working drawings for this project. *The same site acquisition problems have arisen as in the projects mentioned above and on the same basis, we would recommend approval.*

h. Minor projects \$96,800

There are five minor projects involved in this request, two of which are for alterations of the office space and re-working of the lighting system in the Los Angeles Motor Vehicles Building. Two others are for minor projects in Oakland and Eureka and a third one involves preliminary plans for the remodeling of the existing headquarters building in Sacramento. We have reviewed them all and we believe that they are justified and the costs are in line. *We recommend approval.*

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

ITEM 338 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 846

FOR ACQUISITION, MAJOR AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE FISH AND GAME PRESERVATION FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$409,250
Legislative Analyst's recommendation.....	338,750
Reduction	\$70,500

Department of Fish and Game—Continued
ANALYSIS

This item will provide for one land acquisition project, one rehabilitation project and a series of five minor projects as follows:

a. Purchase land for bioassay laboratory----- \$60,000

It is proposed to acquire a site on which to construct a laboratory in which bioassay work can be carried on by the Department of Fish and Game in connection with its water pollution program. It has been said that there are no comparable facilities either private or public where the department's needs could be satisfied. We question whether this is so in view of the tremendous laboratory facilities of both the State Department of Public Health and the various university campuses. Furthermore, we suggest that it should not be necessary to buy property for this purpose since such a building would be comparatively small and could conceivably be placed on locations already owned by the State even though they might be partly occupied for some other purpose. For example, there might be sufficient ground area immediately adjacent to the Department of Agriculture laboratory on Meadowview Road in Sacramento. There might be locations available on some of the college sites. *In any case, we believe that the problem should have further review before committing funds for a project which will probably run several hundred thousand dollars by the time that it is completed from a fund source which is already experiencing difficulties.*

b. Rehabilitate Hot Creek Hatchery----- \$312,500

The Hot Creek Hatchery, which was originally constructed in 1938, is one of the more important and most productive units in the system of this department. Due to the original use of unsuitable aggregates in the concrete, many of the concrete structures are failing and causing very high maintenance costs and loss of water. Attempts to repair the concrete have not proven successful. Consequently, it appears that the most economical thing to do at this time is to replace the entire plant at one time in view of its isolated location which would make it prohibitively costly to phase the work. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

c. Minor projects----- \$36,750

The minor projects involve the installation of new fish screens, structural strengthening of a flow maintenance dam in Tuolumne County, architectural fees for the design of a new patrol boat and the remodeling of office space and a conference room at Terminal Island.

We are in accord with all of these minor projects with the exception of the last involving the remodeling of space at Terminal Island at a cost of \$10,500. In view of the depleted condition of the Fish and Game Preservation Fund, we believe that there is not sufficient urgency to justify this expenditure at this time. *Consequently, we recommend that it be disapproved.*

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

ITEM 339 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 851

**FOR REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION, MAJOR AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION
DIVISION OF BEACHES AND PARKS FROM THE GENERAL
FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$6,055,587
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	5,309,907
Reduction	\$745,660

ANALYSIS

The Division of Beaches and Parks is responsible for the acquisition and development of the state park system. This item provides for eight acquisition projects, a contingency fund for excessive awards, 19 major construction projects and a series of minor projects.

In previous years the acquisition and development of the state park system has been financed from the Beaches and Parks Fund. For reasons discussed in the support phase of the budget analysis the financing has been shifted to the General Fund.

Public Resources Code, Section 5017 directs that whenever the Legislature or the Director of Natural Resources instructs the Division of Beaches and Parks to plan any state beach or park or other recreational development, the division shall forthwith cause investigation studies and surveys to be made and generalized plans to be prepared with respect to the proposed development and shall report thereon to the Legislature at the next succeeding session of the Legislature, including in such report a description of the property to be acquired and the improvements to be constructed in connection with the proposed development, an estimate of the cost thereof, an estimate of visitor days projected and the division shall consult and advise with the appropriate planning agency with regard thereto. The proposals contained in this budget item fail to satisfy the requirements of Section 5017 in that the presentations made and included in the Governor's Budget fail to define the improvements to be constructed in connection with these proposed acquisitions. Moreover, they fail to give an estimate of the development costs and an estimate of visitor days projected. Additionally, there is no comment as to whether the appropriate local planning agency has been contacted and the results of that liaison.

a. Funds for excessive awards **\$525,000**

Justification given for this request is that all of the funds appropriated by Chapter 1, Statutes of 1956, including savings will revert on June 30, 1961, leaving no moneys available in the event there are condemnation awards that exceed the appropriated amounts for each project. As of December 16, 1960, \$2,100,000 of condemnation suits were in process. Experience has demonstrated that recent awards have averaged 25 percent over the Division of Beaches and Parks appraisal. Consequently, the figure of 25 percent of the appraised value of the projects now in the hands of the Attorney General for condemnation should be made available on a contingency fund basis.

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

Such a contingency fund already exists under a provision of the Government Code which provides that the unexpended balance in any appropriation from the Capital Outlay and Savings Fund or the General Fund may be transferred on order of the Director of Finance to an augmentation of the appropriations for acquisition of real property which cannot be acquired because acquisition costs are in excess of the amounts provided in the original appropriation. The moneys available in the augmentation fund which is set up under the authority of Government Code Section 16409 are sufficient to cover this contingency. *In view of the above, we recommend deletion of this contingency provision.*

b. Carpenteria Beach State Parks, Santa Barbara County— \$240,000

This project provides for the acquisition of 16 lots, six of which are improved, to complete the acquisition program at Carpenteria Beach State Park as authorized by Chapter 1, Statutes of 1956. The lots are scattered throughout the acquisition project effectively blocking utilization of plans previously acquired. An additional 400 feet of beach front will be included in this acquisition. Previous appropriations fell short of accomplishing the overall acquisition program. As of July 1, 1961, the appraised value of the lots was \$124,150. The improvements consisting of six single family residences are appraised at \$67,200. A \$38,650 contingency representing 20 percent has been set aside for probable increases in value during the period of negotiation. The appraisal and other incidental costs will amount to \$10,000 being the total to \$240,000.

c. Golden Gate Project, Marin County----- \$80,000

Chapter 11, Statutes of 1960, appropriated \$250,000 for acquisition of approximately 290 acres of surplus military land on the north shore of the Golden Gate. Recent appraisals indicate that the funds are insufficient and that \$80,000 additional will be required to complete the program. Ultimately it is anticipated that more land will be declared surplus from which it is planned to develop a major park having about 40,000 acres with 60,000 feet of ocean frontage.

d. Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument, San Luis Obispo County ----- \$28,000

The division proposes to purchase approximately nine acres of land from the Hearst Corporation which is immediately adjacent to the lower parking area. The land presently owned by the State at the staging area is now being used to capacity for parking purposes. It is contemplated that the additional land will be used for the development of a visitor's staging facility and a park administration office.

e. MacKerricher Beach State Park, Mendocino County----- \$25,000

The division proposes to purchase a road easement which bisects the park for 3,000 feet that materially interferes with the development and management of the park unit.

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

f. Natural Bridges State Park, Santa Cruz State Park----- \$60,000

The division proposes to purchase 25 acres immediately north of the existing park so as to complete a geographic unit that is ideal for placement of public use facilities. Representatives of the Division of Beaches and Parks indicate that this will complete the acquisition program for the Natural Bridges State Park.

g. Mt. San Jacinto State Park, Riverside County----- \$535,000

This project provides for the acquisition of 977 acres of lands having a high overnight campground potential.

The park consists of approximately 13,000 acres of which 12,500 are set aside as a primitive area.

The present-day estimated value of the 977 acres is \$439,250. The Division of Beaches and Parks estimates that the land will increase in value by 20 percent or \$87,850 during the period of negotiations. The remaining \$7,900 is budgeted for appraisal purposes.

h. San Mateo Beaches State Park, San Mateo County----- \$120,000

This project contemplates continuation of the acquisition program of obtaining various ocean front properties on the San Mateo County coast. The lands involved for 1961-62 fiscal year acquisition are highly desirable for overnight camping facilities.

i. Twin Lakes State Beach Park, Santa Cruz County----- \$100,000

This proposal contemplates continuation of the acquisition program of the Twin Lakes Beach State Park. Approximately 40 individual properties remain unacquired within the approved project boundaries. This project was originally authorized under Chapter 1, Statutes of 1956.

Except for the excessive award contingency fund, we recommend approval of this item as budgeted.

Major Development

Public Resources Code, Section 5017, provides that whenever the Legislature or the Director of Natural Resources directs the Division of Beaches and Parks to plan any state beach, park or other recreational development, the division shall forthwith cause investigations, studies and surveys to be made and generalized plans to be prepared with respect to the proposed development and shall report thereon to the Legislature at the next succeeding session of the Legislature including in such report the description of the property to be acquired and the improvements to be constructed in connection with the proposed development, and estimate of the cost thereof, an estimate of the visitor days projected; and the division shall consult and advise with the appropriate local planning agency with regard thereto.

None of the presentations made in this budget item comply with requirements of the Public Resources Code, Section 5017. Neither the preliminary budget requests nor the Governor's Budget include an estimate of the visitor days projected or a report as to the liaison the division has undertaken with the local planning agencies involved.

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

Moreover, Section 5019 of the code provides that before any park or recreational area developmental plan is made, the Department of Natural Resources shall cause to be made a land carrying capacity survey of the proposed park or recreational area including in the survey such factors as soil, moisture and natural cover. The presentations made in this budget item fail to indicate whether such a survey has been conducted.

Since this agency is now and henceforth to be supported from the General Fund, it is even more necessary that its development proposals be presented in the same way that is required of all other agencies.

On the \$195,660 recommended reduction, \$80,040 concern design features of the projects and \$115,620 relates to excessive engineering fees and contingency reserves.

We find considerable disparity between the "engineering" and "contingency" costs of the several projects themselves and even more serious deviation from standard practices in the construction industry. In one project, a 25 percent "engineering and supervision" fee is contemplated. In several others, a 25 percent reserve is established for "engineering and contingencies." In other projects, the "contingency" is 10 percent, whereas others have only a 5 percent or no provision at all for the contingency and engineering.

Generally speaking, for projects of the size and complexity contemplated here, the construction industry (and the Division of Architecture) charge no more than 10 percent for "engineering and supervision" and 5 percent for contingencies.

We recommend that all engineering and supervision fees be held to 10 percent, and that all contingency reserves be held to 5 percent.

The projects are as follows:

a. *San Buenaventura Beach State Park*----- \$361,250

This project is located in Ventura County. It contemplates the continued development of an existing unit, through the addition of 300 parking spaces, 300 picnic units, related facilities, and an improved water system.

Under roads and parking there is a 25 percent "engineering and contingency" item. *For reasons discussed above, we recommend that the engineering fee be set at 10 percent, and the contingency at 5 percent, thereby accruing a savings of \$11,471.*

No engineering or contingency item has been set aside for the remaining \$246,680.

b. *Salton Sea State Park*----- \$92,300

The project is located in Riverside County. The division proposes to expand the parking and road network, construct an additional boat launching facility and landscape an existing parking lot. Visitor attendance and the fact that the park receives heavy boat use justify the extension of the road network, the additional parking, and the additional boat launching facility. It is estimated that this phase of the project will cost \$69,825. A 25 percent engineering and supervision

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

charge is budgeted amounting to \$17,475. In line with our discussion above, *we recommend that the engineering and supervision be held to 10 percent and that a contingency of 5 percent be allowed, thereby accruing a savings of \$6,982.*

The division proposes to landscape three islands of approximately 50 feet in width between a roadway and existing parking areas. Justification is solely on the basis of providing a visual buffer between the parking area and the road. It is the plan of the division not to allow picnicking or camping under the trees. Moreover, it should be pointed out that the parking lots will be used primarily by boaters, who will first of all launch their boats, park their cars and trailers, and then leave the parking area. In view of the scarcity of funds we believe this is unjustifiable. *The project budget contains \$5,000 for this landscaping, and for the reasons discussed, we recommend its deletion.*

c. San Mateo Beaches State Park----- \$140,430

The project is located in San Mateo County, and specifically contemplates improvements at San Gregorio Beach and Half Moon Bay Beach. It is planned to add 100 picnic units and related facilities at each beach.

The contingency items are set at 5 percent.

d. Leo Carrillo Beach State Park----- \$205,050

The project is located in Los Angeles County. It is proposed to add 40 overnight camp units and related facilities, 164 beach parking spaces, a comfort station-dressing room facility on the beach, and two residences.

For roads and parking, the estimated cost is \$85,640. There has been a 25 percent or \$21,410 item set aside for engineering and contingencies. For reasons set forth in our remarks prefacing this budget item, *we recommend that the engineering and contingency item be reduced by \$8,564.*

Of the total amount, \$43,740 is budgeted for two residences, for park personnel. *We recommend their deletion, for a savings of \$43,740,* for the following reasons: Staffing at this park is such that 24-hour coverage is being provided during the heavy use months, thereby eliminating the need for requiring that the park supervisor and his assistant live on the premises. Secondly, due to the proposed location of the residences and the size of the park, the mere fact that there are residences in the locality will not prevent vandalism. Thirdly, the park is relatively close to developed residential areas thereby permitting the park employees to obtain privately owned housing.

e. Sunset Beach State Park----- \$82,235

This project is in Santa Cruz County. It contemplates the addition of 65 overnight camp units, with related roads, sanitary facilities and utilities.

The only contingency item is \$459 representing 5 percent in the proposed water system expansion. No engineering or supervision fees are set forth.

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

f. *Pismo Beach State Park*----- \$90,530

This project is located in San Luis Obispo County. It contemplates the construction of two restroom facilities, and the resurfacing of existing roadways and parking areas.

The estimated cost of the road work is \$56,425. A 25 percent engineering cost has been added. In line with our recommendation in the preface to this budget item, *we recommend that it be reduced by \$5,642.*

g. *Plumas-Eureka State Park*----- \$242,970

This project is located in Plumas County. It contemplates the addition of 150 overnight camp units with related facilities, an improved water system, the continued restoration of the historic Eureka Mine mill building, and the clean up of an area previously used as a community dump, and another area which was logged off just prior to acquisition by the Division of Beaches and Parks.

The provision for contingency reserves is 5 percent.

h. *Hendy Woods State Park*----- \$293,767

This project is located in Mendocino County. At the present time the park is virtually inaccessible to the public. The contemplated project will provide 92 overnight campsites, 25 picnic units, day use parking for 50 cars, 2 residences for the park supervisor and his assistant, sanitary facilities, utility systems, maintenance buildings and two office buildings.

Under roads and parking there is a 25 percent engineering and construction supervision item for \$19,810. In conformance with our remarks prefacing this budget item, *we recommend that this be reduced by \$7,923.*

As previously stated, the Division is asking for two separate office buildings, one of which is a combination office space and reception building and the other a standard entrance check station. We recommend that the check station be eliminated and that the office building be situated so as to serve the dual purpose of a check station and office space. A park of this size will have a clerk-stenographer on duty at least five days a week. Our interviews of park supervisors indicate that the clerk-stenographer is capable of handling the check station activities during the daylight hours, thereby relieving a ranger to undertake other activities, who would otherwise be tied down to the entrance check station. The Division has a standard office-checking station that costs approximately \$5,000 to construct. *Use of this latter plan will accrue a savings of \$7,000.*

i. *Bolsa Chica Beach State Park*----- \$132,290

This project is located in Orange County. It is the initial capital development. The beach itself has been cleaned up and is being used by the public. The Division has staffed it with ranger and lifeguard personnel, and temporary sanitary facilities have been provided.

This budget will provide for 435 parking spaces, a water system, and an office and contact station.

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

Under roads and parking there is a 25 percent engineering and contingency item for \$18,840. In line with our remarks prefacing this budget item, *we recommend that this be reduced by \$7,516.*

j. San Elijo Beach State Park..... \$623,600

The project is located in San Diego County. It contemplates the construction of 250 trailer or overnight campsites, day use areas with parking spaces for 275 cars, sanitary facilities, utility area, stairways to the beach, and lifeguard facilities. Under "utilities-sewage," and "roads and parking" there are contingency and engineering items representing 25 percent of the cost. In line with the discussion of this subject in our prefacing remarks, *we recommend that these items be reduced in the amount of \$39,959.*

k. McGrath Beach State Park..... \$330,300

This project is located in Ventura County. It is the initial development consisting of 75 overnight camp units with related facilities, and day use parking for 375 cars.

Except for the construction of the sanitary facilities, there is a 20 percent engineering and contingency item. In line with our remarks prefacing this budget item, *we recommend a reduction of \$13,762.*

l. Woodson Bridge State Park..... \$152,148

This project is located in Tehama County. It is the initial development consisting of 46 overnight camp or trailer units, 50 picnic units, and related utility and sanitary facilities.

The contingency items here are set at 10 percent which is twice the amount usually set aside for contingencies. Therefore, *we recommend a reduction of \$1,881.*

m. Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument..... \$95,000

This project is located in San Luis Obispo County. It is an augmentation of project approved by the Legislature in the 1960-61 Budget. Due to a critical sewage disposal problem at the visitor reception center, the Division of Beaches and Parks diverted about \$41,000 from the original appropriation of \$130,500 for the construction of a sewage treatment plant. The remaining \$54,000 in this item will be for covered walks, landscaping, and a restroom facility at the parking area.

n. Columbia Historic State Park..... \$124,875

This project is located in Tuolumne County. It proposes an addition to the water system.

The park water system also supplies many private residences and business establishments, who pay a flat monthly rate. The present 126,000 gallon supply tank is inadequate, and for this reason we recommend approval of the principle involved.

However, we seriously question the plan presented by the Division of Beaches and Parks. The division proposes to construct a 500,000 gallon tank 1,600 feet from the lower end of the system, which means that the water must first flow through the entire length of the system before

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

reaching the new storage tank, and flow back up into the existing system for ultimate delivery to the consumer.

It would appear to us that the new 500,000 gallon tank should be built immediately adjacent to the existing source of the water and the existing storage tank, thereby eliminating the need for the 1,600 feet of connecting pipe, the land clearing and access to the new site, and the acquisition of the new site. The connecting pipe will cost \$12,800, the clearing and road building \$3,000, and acquisition of the new site \$5,500. Pending an evaluation by a qualified hydraulic engineer, *we recommend a reduction of \$21,300 in view of the observations made above.*

Exclusive of the sum for site acquisition, a 25 percent engineering cost has been itemized amounting to \$23,875. Contemplating the reductions we discussed immediately above, and the remarks prefacing this budgeting item, *a further reduction of \$11,920 is recommended.*

o. Brannan Island State Park----- \$128,776

This project is located in the delta region of Sacramento County. It contemplates a continued development consisting of 45 overnight camp sites, parking for 200 cars and boat trailers, eight concrete boat launching ramps, and related sanitary and utility facilities.

The contingency reserves that are listed amount to 5 percent.

p. Columbia Historic State Park (restoration)----- \$60,000

The project is in Tuolumne County, and represents the continued restoration of an old gold mining community. As of the close of the 1960-61 fiscal year 14 buildings of the 28 in the master plan will have been completely restored.

Due to the type of construction work involved, the division has not established an contingency fee.

q. San Clemente Beach State Park----- \$65,810

This park is located in southern Orange County. It contemplates the addition of 50 overnight camp units and related facilities.

The division intends to have the work done by contract, and the contingency fee is listed 5 percent.

r. Doheny Beach State Park----- \$52,350

The park is located at the junction of U.S. 101 and U.S. 101 Alternate in Orange County.

The beach is slowly eroding away due to wave action, and this project is a joint venture among the Division of Beaches and Parks, the California Department of Water Resources, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to construct a 250-foot groin into the ocean and a protective beach 100 feet wide upcoast from the groin. The total estimated cost is \$157,000 of which one-third is paid by the Corps of Engineers, one-third by the California Department of Water Resources representing two state's share and one-third by the Division of Beaches and Parks representing the local interest since Doheny Beach State Park is the local beneficiary of the project.

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

s. *Restoration of historical ships*----- \$90,000

This project is part of a continuing program in the restoration of historic ships which will eventually be displayed as part of the San Francisco Maritime Historical Monument at the Hyde Street Pier in San Francisco. These ships are representative of the types which sailed the waters of San Francisco Bay and the Pacific Coast during the 19th century.

Specifically, the project consists of continued restoration, refitting and rebuilding of three historic ships: The C. A. Thayer, a wood schooner, The Wapana, a steamboat, and the Eureka, a ferryboat. We recommend approval of this project as budgeted.

Minor Development

The projects consist of construction of administrative outposts, channel erosion and bank correction projects, fire hazard reduction, installation of a glass elevator at Hearst San Simeon State Historical Monument, installation of life guard facilities, construction of museum and display shelters, the repair of a pier at Buenaventura Beach State Park, minor roadway and parking projects, additional sanitary facilities, additional sewage facilities and water systems. We have reviewed the projects as to their basic justification, design and cost factors. With the exception of the purchase of "memorabilia" at the Shasta State Historical Monument, we recommend approval.

We recommend deletion of the personal property acquisition at the Shasta State Historical Monument for a savings of \$25,000.

The division plans to purchase a collection of artifacts, relics, and lore of the cultural American life in Shasta County from 1850 to 1900. The purchase of this collection was arranged by a purchase agreement in conjunction with the purchase of the Litsch Store and property as an addition to the Shasta State Historical Monument. The purchase agreement states that the sum is not to exceed \$25,000.

The Litsch Store, which is a small brick and stone building, was purchased by the State from Mr. Robert Litsch and his wife on March 28, 1960, at a cost of \$47,000. The additional \$25,000 is to purchase the "memorabilia" that remains in the store. An appraisal was conducted by Mr. George T. McIntosh from San Francisco. He placed a value of \$27,497 on the personal property.

There are several thousand items. Examples are as follows: three tomahawk stones valued at \$25; one corkscrew used to open champagne, \$10; 338½ dozen buttons valued at \$225; 830 Wells Fargo shipping tags valued at \$500; 11 pounds of cancelled checks dating back to 1852 to 1855 valued at \$200; 2¾ pounds of justice court records from the Shasta Judicial Justice Court dated 1890, valued at \$300; three cast iron waffle irons valued at \$20.

We are unable to recommend approval of the purchase of the "memorabilia," particularly in light of the condition of the General Fund at this time. We do not feel that this expenditure will enhance the recreational program of the State of California to the extent of \$25,000.

Department of Natural Resources

DIVISION OF FORESTRY

ITEM 340 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 869

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, DEVELOPMENT, ENGINEERING,
PLANNING AND INSPECTION, DIVISION OF FORESTRY
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$900,884
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	767,019
Reduction	\$133,865

ANALYSIS

This budget item provides for capital outlay projects costing less than \$50,000 each, plus engineering, planning and inspection services for all projects handled by the Division of Forestry.

Of the total amount budgeted, \$247,529 is scheduled for inmate labor projects. It is the intention of the Division of Forestry to employ inmates from the conservation camps to construct such projects as roads and fire breaks, telephone lines, a leaching field, water storage facilities, and mobile camp site developments.

The remaining projects will be handled either on a contract basis or constructed by fire control personnel of the Division of Forestry during the nonfire season. These projects consist of the construction of barracks, mess halls, seed processing facilities at the Davis nursery, warehouses, equipment buildings, employee residences, and fire lookout structures.

We have reviewed the projects as to their basic justification, design and estimated cost. We recommend approval of most of them. However; we believe that some are questionable from the standpoint of need, and that others should be deferred at this time due to the condition of the General Fund. Our recommended reductions are as follows:

a. We recommend deletion of the exterior sunshade, the partial re-roofing of the administration building and the replacement of a boiler at the Santa Rosa District Office for a savings of \$2,540.

This project also includes resurfacing of 7,200 square feet in the parking area, for which we recommend approval.

The operating expenses of the support budget contain a specific item for "recurring repairs and maintenance of facilities," which is determined on a formula basis, for the purpose of repairing such items as the roof and the boiler. The listing of this maintenance work in the capital outlay budget is, in fact, double budgeting. The sunshade is not essential.

b. We recommend deletion of the antenna structure and generator vault at the Blue Ridge Lookout for a savings of \$3,700.

Justification given for this project is that present pole facilities for radio antennas are overloaded and that a single structure will permit consolidation of the existing assembly of the individual poles.

It should be pointed out that major justification for this project is the furtherance of the microwave system. In the support phase of the

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

budget analysis we have recommended that the expansion of the microwave system be deferred until the Legislature has had an opportunity to evaluate it.

c. We recommend deletion of the seed processing shed at the Davis Nursery for a savings of \$41,800.

The proposal is to construct a building specifically designed for the extraction and storage of tree seeds in connection with the Division of Forestry's service forestry program. Major justifications that have been presented, with our observations, are as follows:

Species such as the Monterey, Coulter and Beach Pines, which are collected in the fall, cannot be opened by the fall and winter sun—thus requiring artificial heat to open the pine cones at that time. However; the cones will open during the summer months when placed in the sun, which means that they must be stored during the winter months as is now done.

It is also said that early rains in September will interrupt the drying of cones of the firs and Ponderosa pines on the concrete slabs. The occurrence of rains during September in Yolo County is most unusual and should not unduly affect the operation.

In summation, this project constitutes a definite expansion of the division's program. In light of the General Fund condition, this project should be deferred, particularly since the budget also contains an item for additional concrete slab drying space.

d. We recommend deletion of the office remodeling at the King City station for a saving of \$5,000.

The proposal is to provide additional space and facilities for the existing staff, which has not been increased for a number of years and has been operating in the existing office space without an adverse effect upon its efficiency. During our visits to this unit we have been impressed with the large amount of space in the office compared to other offices of the Division of Forestry. In our opinion this item should be deferred.

e. We recommend deletion of fencing for the Madera station for a savings of \$1,350.

A six-foot chain link fence with triple strand barb-wire topping is proposed for two sides of the station. A similar fence was recently installed by the Division of Highways on the rear of the property. Records of the Division of Forestry fail to indicate whether a security problem has been encountered at this location. In view of the condition of the General Fund, this item should be deferred.

f. We recommend deletion of a new warehouse at the Red Bluff station for a savings of \$43,000.

The division proposes to replace two existing older warehouse buildings which were constructed in the 1930's. The division's support budget provides adequate maintenance moneys for these buildings and in view of the General Fund condition this should be deferred.

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

g. We recommend deletion of the spray application of insulation on the Sacramento warehouse for a savings of \$7,275.

The division proposes to spray an application of asbestos fiber on the underside of the roof of a metal warehouse building located adjacent to the state college campus in Sacramento. Justification is to protect the supplies from condensation in the winter and excessive heat in the summer. It should be pointed out that the warehouse has a special compartment within the building for storing equipment that might be damaged by moisture. This request appears to be unjustified in view of the General Fund condition.

h. We recommend deletion of the office addition at Red Bluff for a savings of \$9,000.

The division proposes to add 600 square feet to an existing office building having 1,440 square feet. Basic justification given is that there is now only one room available for the assistant rangers. As we have pointed out in the support budget analysis, the assistant rangers ought to be spending more of their time in the field undertaking true fire prevention activities and less time behind a desk. It should also be pointed out that the assistant rangers have done without a private office for each in the past without materially affecting their efficiency.

i. We recommend deletion of the access road improvement at the Iron Mine conservation camp for a savings of \$13,500.

The proposal is to repair, shape, compact and resurface 1.8 miles of access road and 42,000 square feet of service area. Representatives from this office have inspected the Iron Mine Camp and are of the opinion that the existing road surface is in reasonable condition and that the project envisioned here cannot be justified.

j. We recommend deletion of the paint storage and spray booth at Slack Canyon conservation camp for a savings of \$6,500.

This proposal contemplates construction of a spray booth and paint storage facility to be used in a vehicle rehabilitation unit at the conservation camp. The labor is done by prison inmates. As we have pointed out in the analysis of the support budget of the Division of Forestry, this type of activity should not be handled by the inmate conservation camp program. Instead, the inmate should be employed only on direct fire control and fire prevention activities. In allowing the build-up of activities such as the sheet metal shops, automotive repair shops, sign shops, and furniture shops we are in fact establishing a small prison at each of the conservation camps. As we see it, this was not the intent of the Legislature in setting up a conservation camp program.

Engineering, planning and inspection services..... \$132,917

It has been a long established policy in the Division of Forestry to provide for engineering services in connection with that portion of its capital outlay program which is handled directly by the division, by means of an appropriation in the capital outlay portion of the

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

budget rather than by the establishment of permanent positions in the support budget.

The proposal here involves eight technical positions, a survey crew of five and three clerical positions, plus operating expenses. *We recommend continuation of this program.*

**Department of Veterans Affairs
VETERANS HOME OF CALIFORNIA**

ITEM 341 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 934

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$49,500
Legislative Analyst's recommendation ----- No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for six minor projects one of which will provide for equipment to the hospital medical treatment center which is now under construction. The remaining five are for alteration and improvements to the physical facilities designed to increase its efficiency and safety of operation.

We have had the opportunity to make a physical inspection of the institution and to review each of these projects in detail. *We recommend approval.*

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

ITEM 342 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 940

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES,
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$84,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation ----- No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for three individual minor projects each exceeding \$5,000 and a group of small minor projects each being less than \$5,000 in cost. With the exception of one project which is for repair on the Fremont Weir of the Sacramento River, the balance of the projects are mostly for additions and improvements to the laboratories and storage facilities at Bryte. We have reviewed them all and they appear to be justified and reasonable in cost. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

**Department of Corrections
CONSERVATION CENTER**

ITEM 346 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 714

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, CON-
SERVATION CENTER, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$1,850,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	600,000
Reduction	\$1,250,000

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for two initial equipment projects for previously funded construction, one new construction project and an initial equipment project for it as follows:

a. Equip conservation center, partial..... \$500,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$8,147,086 for the construction of the basic conservation center in Lassen County. The Budget Act of 1959 also provided money for this purpose although it was lumped together with working drawings, equipment and construction of two branches. However, of the total appropriation of \$3,960,014 that was made in the Budget Act of 1959, probably at least \$2 million was applicable to this particular project. The capacity of this unit is intended to be 1,200 inmates who will be trained in various phases of conservation work.

It is now proposed to provide most of the operating equipment for the institution. While we have not seen the complete list of items involved, the sum requested appears to be in reasonable relationship to the size of the project. However, we question whether the list might contain items which are normally considered expendable or as having a short life and, therefore, not properly financed from bond funds. This is in line with our statements concerning this subject preceding the Capital Outlay Analysis Section. We suggest that these lists be reviewed and divided into two categories, one to be financed from bond funds and the other from the General Fund. *In any case we would recommend approval of the amount only subject to a more intensive review by the Department of Finance before the actual expenditures are made.*

b. Equip Tuolumne conservation center branch, partial..... \$50,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$1,039,300 for the construction of a branch center in Tuolumne with a capacity of 160 inmates. To this must be added a share of the funds that were provided in the 1959 Budget Act for the same purpose, possibly \$750,000.

It is now proposed to provide the initial complement of equipment for this facility. While we have not seen the detailed equipment list, the amount proposed appears to be reasonably commensurate with the size of the project. However, we question whether the list might contain items which are normally considered expendable or as having a short

Department of Corrections—Continued

life and, therefore, not properly financed from bond funds. This is in line with our statements concerning this subject preceding the Capital Outlay Analysis Section. We suggest that these lists be reviewed and divided into two categories, one to be financed from bond funds and the other from the General Fund. In any case we would recommend approval of the amount only subject to a more intensive review by the Department of Finance before the actual expenditures are made.

c. *Construct north coast conservation center branch*----- \$1,250,000

This project is a continuation of the program for expanding the facilities for housing adult authority inmates under conditions less than that of the conventional prison. This project will have a capacity of 160 inmates who will be of a low security risk amenable to working in the outdoors on various forestry, beaches and parks, fish and game and other natural resource projects.

The Budget Act of 1960 provided over \$10,264,000 which was added to a prior appropriation of over \$3,960,000 for the construction of a conservation center in Lassen County, a conservation branch in Tuolumne County and a conservation branch in Mono-Inyo Counties. These facilities differ from the conventional 80-man conservation camps in that they are fully under the control of the Department of Corrections, whereas the conservation camps are under the control of the Division of Forestry with some corrections personnel for security purposes.

The amount requested is substantially greater than was provided for each of the other two branches which ran \$1,039,000 and \$1,077,000 respectively. We have seen no plans for this project nor do we have any indication as to its proposed location. *Consequently, we cannot recommend this requested amount.*

d. *Equip north coast conservation center branch*----- \$50,000

This request would provide for certain kinds of initial construction equipment which would enable inmate labor to perform some of the rough site development work for the new branch mentioned above. Ultimately, the equipment will be used on various projects in the field outside of the branch. Basically, we would recommend this request, however, it is dependent upon the action taken with respect to the construction of the branch itself.

**Department of Corrections
DEUEL VOCATIONAL INSTITUTION**

ITEM 347 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 717

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
DEUEL VOCATIONAL INSTITUTION, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$110,400
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	None
Reduction	\$110,400

Department of Corrections—Continued
ANALYSIS

This item will provide for one construction project as follows:

a. *Construct inservice training building*----- \$110,400

This project involves the construction of a type V wood frame, stucco and concrete block building on a concrete slab having a gross area of 4,568 square feet. The total cost of the project would be \$112,400 of which \$2,000 has already been expended for preliminary plans, leaving \$110,400 to be funded by this item. This breaks down to a cost of \$17.95 per square foot for the building and \$24.63 per square foot at total project level.

The building will provide a large classroom, an assembly room, a shower and locker area and an office for two people. It will be located outside the main gate adjacent to the existing employees community facility.

The in-service training activity is presently carried on in space provided in the administration building on the second floor. The gross area used is approximately 2,900 square feet. This space is now required for other office purposes for the classification and treatment activities which have to be expanded to meet population growth at this institution. The need for the additional office space appears justified and it is appropriate that it be developed on the second floor of the administration building where the in-service training now takes place. Consequently, it also appears appropriate to provide the replacement in-service training space in a less costly facility outside the main gate since the existing building is type 1, security construction.

Generally speaking, the size of the new project appears justified in line with the volume of activities which will take place, however, we have expressed certain ideas to the Department of Finance and the Division of Architecture concerning some of the details which appear to be unnecessarily excessive in cost. *Consequently we cannot recommend this amount.*

Department of Corrections
INSTITUTION FOR MEN

ITEM 348 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 719

FOR MAJOR EQUIPMENT, INSTITUTION FOR MEN, FROM THE STATE
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted -----	\$105,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation -----	No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for a single equipment project for a previously funded building as follows:

a. *Equip hospital addition*----- \$105,000

The Budget Act of 1958 provided \$1,679,700 for the construction of a major addition to the existing hospital at this institution. The purpose of this addition was to provide facilities for the additional population

Department of Corrections—Continued

occasioned by the expansion of the reception-guidance center and by the construction of the youth training facility immediately adjacent to this institution. In the latter case, a working agreement was reached between the Youth Authority and the Adult Authority whereby youth inmates actually requiring hospitalization would be accommodated at the men's institution, thereby obviating the necessity of providing a hospital facility at the youth training school.

It is now proposed to provide various kinds of movable equipment for this addition. While we have not seen the detailed list of items, it would appear that the amount requested is in reasonable relationship with the size of the project. However, we question whether the list might contain items which are normally considered expendable or as having a short life and, therefore, not properly financed from bond funds. This is in line with our statements concerning this subject preceding the Capital Outlay Analysis section. We suggest that these lists be reviewed and divided into two categories, one to be financed from bond funds and the other from the General Fund. *In any case we would recommend approval of the amount only subject to a more intensive review by the Department of Finance before the actual expenditures are made.*

**Department of Corrections
SAN QUENTIN PRISON**

ITEM 349 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 723

**FOR MAJOR EQUIPMENT, SAN QUENTIN PRISON, FROM THE STATE
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$8,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for a single equipment project for a previously funded building as follows:

a. Equip chapel, second phase..... \$8,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$229,000 for the construction of the second and final phase of the new chapels at this institution. This was to provide facilities for Protestant, Jewish and other minority religious groups. At this time it is proposed to fund the equipment for this construction. While we have not seen a list of items involved, it would appear that the sum requested is reasonably in line with the size of the project. However, we question whether the list might contain items which are normally considered expendable or as having a short life and, therefore, not properly financed from bond funds. This is in line with our statements concerning this subject preceding the Capital Outlay Analysis section. We suggest that these lists be reviewed and divided into two categories, one to be financed from bond funds and the other from the General Fund.

**Department of Corrections
INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN**

ITEM 350 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 725

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$1,236,800
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	75,000
Reduction	\$1,161,800

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for a single construction project which will probably consist of two units which together will be called a reception guidance center to be constructed on the grounds of the present Institution for Women at Corona. The total unit would provide additional capacity for 120 women. Basically, it would consist of a standard 120-bed cottage plus a receiving and diagnostic unit. As of this writing we have received neither preliminary plans nor specifications and we have no Division of Architecture estimate to back up the proposed amount.

We would call attention to the fact that the program for this project was submitted to the Division of Architecture under date of September 22, 1960, and that no scope hearings or discussions were held to determine the adequacy and propriety of the program. Consequently, we do not feel that there is any justification for providing more than funds for working drawings in this budget. On the basis of the present population of this institution versus its capacity, which would indicate an undesirable overcrowding, it would appear that additional capacity is justified. *Therefore, in order to keep the project moving ahead we would recommend working drawings at \$75,000 with construction to be funded in the 1962 budget.*

Department of Youth Authority

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA RECEPTION CENTER AND CLINIC

ITEM 351 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 730

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, NORTHERN CALIFORNIA RECEPTION CENTER AND CLINIC, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$129,550
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	11,950
Reduction	\$117,600

ANALYSIS

This item provides for one construction project and one equipment project for a previously funded building as follows:

a. Equip living unit..... \$11,950

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$357,300 for the construction of a living unit with a capacity for 49 boys in individual rooms. It is now proposed to provide for the nonfixed equipment of this building. The

Department of Youth Authority—Continued

list provided by the Youth Authority, while reasonably similar to lists for similar prior buildings, repeats certain inventory quantities that appear excessive in view of the fact that a group of similar buildings should be able to function with group inventory reserves that would be less than the aggregate total that would result if each building were a separate entity having no relationship to the others. Consequently, we believe that the list is overstated in some items. However, this difference would not account for more than approximately \$1,000 to \$1,500. We question whether the list contains items which are normally considered expendable or as having a short life and, therefore, not properly financed from bond funds. This is in line with our statements concerning this subject preceding the Capital Outlay Analysis section. We suggest that these lists be reviewed and divided into two categories, one to be financed from bond funds and the other from the General Fund.

b. Construct storm drain system----- \$117,600

This project involves the construction of approximately 950 lineal feet of 21-inch reinforced concrete pipe and 1,195 feet of 24-inch pipe as an offsite storm drain to carry drainage from the collection system now in existence at this institution which now discharges into an open drainage sump, in order to connect the system with a storm drain line expected to be constructed by a local drainage assessment district. The actual cost of the underground line is estimated at \$58,500. In addition, the utility district requires a payment of \$60,000 to size its line so that it will carry the drainage of this institution.

The need for the project is based on the fact that the existing sump loses its percolation capacity very rapidly as the result of silting. This involves costly annual reworking and replacement of the gravel in the sump. Despite this, there have been two occasions when the sump failed to hold all of the discharge and the area was partly flooded resulting in strained public relations with neighboring properties. The total runoff will be further increased by virtue of the fact that there will be some additional construction at this institution which will eliminate open ground area thereby creating additional runoff.

In view of the above, there appears to be reasonable justification for a project of this type. However, insofar as the construction portion is concerned we believe that there are several details in the design which are excessive in cost and we have submitted our criticisms to the Department of Finance and the Division of Architecture. As of this writing, these have not yet been resolved. *Consequently, we cannot recommend this amount.*

**Department of Youth Authority
FRED C. NELLES SCHOOL FOR BOYS**

ITEM 352 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 734

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, FRED C. NELLES SCHOOL FOR BOYS, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$856,050
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	521,900
Reduction	\$334,150

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for five construction projects, equipment projects for three of them, two equipment projects for previously funded buildings and one working drawings project for a conversion of an existing building in the future as follows:

a. Equip two 50-boy dormitories..... \$26,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$573,000 for the construction of two new living units of 50 capacity each. It is now proposed to provide the necessary equipment for the buildings. The list of items appears to be in line with conventional practice in Youth Authority institutions. However, we question whether the list might contain items which are normally considered expendable or as having a short life and, therefore, not properly financed from bond funds. This is in line with our statements concerning this subject preceding the Capital Outlay Analysis section. We suggest that these lists be reviewed and divided into two categories, one to be financed from bond funds and the other from the General Fund. *In any case we would recommend approval of the amount only subject to a more intensive review by the Department of Finance before the actual expenditures are made.*

b. Equip food-service building..... \$41,150

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$674,000 for a new food-service building containing a kitchen, messhalls and storage areas. At this time it is proposed to provide for the movable types of equipment necessary for such a building. In view of the fact that the project replaces an existing one, it would appear that there should be a substantial amount of movable equipment that can be transferred to the new building. Consequently, we question the sum proposed for this project. As of this time, we have not yet seen a satisfactory equipment list which can be evaluated against existing equipment. *Consequently, we cannot recommend this project.*

c. Construct classroom building..... \$253,200

This project will provide for the construction of a one-story brick-walled, wood roofed building containing eight classrooms, and having a gross area of 6,870 square feet. This unit is identical with the one that was provided as part of Item 293d of the Budget Act of 1960. It will provide for the final increment of academic space to allow for the ultimate expansion of this institution. The basic building will cost

Department of Youth Authority—Continued

approximately \$21.43 per square foot and the total project will cost approximately \$37.22 per square foot. The rather substantial difference between the two unit costs is primarily the result of extensive site development which involves demolition of existing buildings and clearance of the site generally and rather extensive utility services that need to be brought into the area to supply the new building.

While we make no criticisms of the over-all plan and the cost of construction, we would point out that the estimate includes the sum of \$14,895 for plans, work drawings and specifications which represents 7 percent of the total construction cost including utilities and site development. In view of the fact that the project is an identical reproduction of the one funded in the Budget Act of 1960, we believe that the Division of Architecture has failed to take into account the re-use of the basic drawings, at least from the ground up. *Consequently, we believe that there should be an adjustment in the total amount proposed for the project to reflect the re-use of the working drawings and specifications, therefore we cannot recommend this project.*

d. Equip classroom building ----- \$17,300

This will provide the basic classroom equipment needed for the project immediately preceding. It parallels the amount that was provided in the current budget act for a like unit. However, we question whether the list might contain items which are normally considered expendable or as having a short life and, therefore, not properly financed from bond funds. This is in line with our statements concerning this subject preceding the Capital Outlay Analysis section. We suggest that these lists be reviewed and divided into two categories, one to be financed from bond funds and the other from the General Fund. *In any case we would recommend approval of the amount only subject to a more intensive review by the Department of Finance before the actual expenditures are made.*

e. Construct commissary ----- \$218,400

As of this writing we have received neither preliminary plans nor specifications for this project. However, we do have some program material which indicates that there is reasonable justification for additional commissary storage.

The present commissary provides slightly less than 4,000 square feet of area for the storage of many kinds of supplies including foodstuffs and clothing. This area was based on an institutional population capacity of less than 350. Already constructed or funded projects will increase this capacity to 600, nearly double. Adequate commissary storage is essential to permit bulk purchases and quarterly and annual shipments which result in substantial savings to the State. Consequently, it would appear that additional space is justified. *However, in the absence of material and data on which to base an opinion, we cannot recommend this project.*

f. Equip commissary ----- \$16,000

This equipment project is related to the construction project immediately preceding. Program materials furnished us included an equipment

Department of Youth Authority—Continued

list which indicates that most of the amount involved covers portable steel shelving and one electric lift truck, with the balance being for small items. It would appear that everything contained in the list would be properly financed from bond funds. *Consequently, we would recommend approval subject to any action taken on the construction project preceding.*

g. Working drawings—convert food-service building to chapels \$11,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$674,000 for the construction of a new food-service building, containing kitchen and dining rooms to accommodate the expanding population at this institution. Upon completion of the new building and the vacating of the old, it is proposed to convert the existing building into two chapels which will include some classroom space and chaplains' offices. The existing building lends itself rather admirably to this purpose because of its original gothic-type construction. Since the new food-service building is not scheduled for completion and occupancy until July of 1962, no work can commence on the existing building until some time after that date. Consequently, it is necessary only to provide for working drawings for the project at this time. The sketchy preliminary plans submitted indicate that the general redesign of the building is aimed at an economical conversion. Ultimately, the total conversion cost may run in the neighborhood of \$170,000 including the cost of the working drawings. *We recommend approval.*

h. Storm drain system----- \$103,800

This project is the first phase of two which will ultimately total approximately \$150,000. The purpose is to provide for underground storm drainage which will be connected to a proposed county storm drain system. The need for this is brought about by the fact that the expanding population at this institution is using up area that was previously agricultural which acted as a storm drain buffer area. With the conversion of this area to buildings, playfields and roads, the surface run-off is considerably enhanced and its magnitude would threaten surrounding developed property. Consequently, as a result of a rather extensive study, it appears to be necessary to provide the storm drain system at this time.

Part of the project involves the construction of a main discharge line outside of the State's institutional property which will connect to the county system. The major portion of the cost involves the construction of drain lines throughout the main reservation. In view of the magnitude of the project, the cost appears to be in line. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

i. Enlarge gymnasium, shower and dressing room facilities--- \$92,000

This project is a combination of alterations to the existing gymnasium and a new area to be added to the building which together with the alterations will provide for a new shower and drying area, a dressing area with locker space, an issue and supply area, out-of-season equipment storeroom, toilet facilities and a small office. The remodeled

Department of Youth Authority—Continued

area totals approximately 1,771 gross square feet and the new area totals approximately 1,793 square feet. The total cost of the project is \$93,700 of which \$1,700 has already been expended for preliminary plans, leaving \$92,000 to be funded by this item. The cost breaks down to \$13.50 per square foot for the remodeled area and \$26.70 per square foot for the new area for the building construction alone, exclusive of utilities and fees.

This project appears to be essential to the expansion of the capacity of this institution. The shower and toilet facilities in the present gym are extremely limited and with the additional boys being housed at this institution it is almost impossible to properly process the boys through the shower and issue room facilities. The project appears to be justified and the design and cost appear reasonable. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

j. *Equip enlarged gymnasium and shower room*----- \$2,600

This will provide for minor items of equipment, particularly in the issue room, for the project immediately preceding. The amount appears to be in line for the purpose. However, we question whether the list might contain items which are normally considered expendable or as having a short life and, therefore, not properly financed from bond funds. This is in line with our statements concerning this subject preceding the Capital Outlay Analysis section. We suggest that these lists be reviewed and divided into two categories, one to be financed from bond funds and the other from the General Fund.

k. *Athletic field lighting*----- \$74,600

This project involves the installation of 15 60-foot steel poles, each of which will support from one to four one-thousand watt mercury vapor lights, depending on its location, and a few of the poles will carry incandescent lights for security purposes in the event of power failures to the mercury lights.

The purpose of the project is to compensate for the lack of an adequately sized gymnasium to properly handle the greatly increased population at this institution. The development of an outdoor athletic field with a fieldhouse containing showers and lockers, plus the field lighting will obviate the necessity to build a conventional large gymnasium. The cost of the total project would be substantially less than that of a gymnasium and will permit large numbers of boys to participate in athletics at one time. The favorable weather in this area makes such planning possible. The athletic field and fieldhouse have already been funded.

The design of the project is not intended to provide a light level adequate for interscholastic athletic competition. The level which will be provided is approximately equivalent to that of the average secondary school. The cost of the project in consideration of the facilities involved appears to be reasonable. *However, we have questioned the need to provide the secondary incandescent light mentioned above. Until this question is resolved we cannot recommend this project.*

**Department of Youth Authority
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA YOUTH CENTER**

ITEM 353 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 736

**FOR WORKING DRAWINGS, NORTHERN CALIFORNIA YOUTH CENTER,
FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$150,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for a single project of augmentation of working drawings for future construction as follows:

a. Working drawings additional _____ \$150,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$700,000 for the acquisition of a site for a new Youth Center in Northern California. In addition, it provided \$200,000 for working drawings for a central services unit and for a 400-bed initial institution. The total cost for such a facility will probably be in the neighborhood of \$6 million which would indicate a working drawings cost of approximately \$350,000. This item proposes to provide an additional \$150,000 for this purpose, bringing the total available to \$350,000. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Youth Authority
YOUTH TRAINING SCHOOL**

ITEM 354 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 739

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
YOUTH TRAINING SCHOOL, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$98,235
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for one construction project and equipment for it as follows:

a. Construct visiting room addition _____ \$91,700

This project would provide 4,246 square feet of gross building area addition for visitor use. Construction would be identical with existing institution which involves reinforced brick masonry walls and concrete roof.

The existing visitors room provides approximately 2,076 square feet and was designed for the original population of 400, giving an average of 5.15 square feet of visitor space per capita. Subsequently, the second phase of this institution added facilities for an additional 800 boys, making a total of 1,200. This would reduce the existing visiting area to an average of 1.7 square feet per capita. For purposes of comparison, the Preston School of Industry provides approximately 5.5 square feet per capita. The addition proposed in this project would

Department of Youth Authority—Continued

roughly maintain the 5.15 square feet per capita with which the institution started. We believe that there is justification for the project in view of the fact that a visiting program is an extremely important part of the treatment of the age group involved in this institution. The cost of the project will be \$15.80 per square foot for the basic building and \$21.73 per square foot for the total project. *We recommend approval.*

b. Equip visiting room addition----- \$6,535

This request will provide the additional chairs, settees, picnic tables, etc., that will be required for the enlarged facility. We believe that the list of items appears to be in line with the size of the project. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Youth Authority
VENTURA SCHOOL FOR GIRLS**

ITEM 355 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 741

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, VENTURA SCHOOL FOR GIRLS, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted -----	\$1,546,970
Legislative Analyst's recommendation -----	1,318,370
Reduction -----	\$228,600

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for two construction projects and one large equipment project for partial equipment for previously funded buildings as follows:

a. Equip new institution----- \$574,370

This project represents the equipment necessary to make operable all of the units of the new institution which has previously been funded by the Legislature as well as the two living units mentioned above. The Budget Acts of 1959 and 1960, together, provide \$70,000 for equipment. The lists that have been made available appear to contain a number of questionable items and quantities and we are not entirely certain that full advantage is being taken of equipment already available at the old institution. We question whether the list might contain items which are normally considered expendable or as having a short life and, therefore, not properly financed from bond funds. This is in line with our statements concerning this subject preceding the Capital Outlay Analysis section. We suggest that these lists be reviewed and divided into two categories, one to be financed from bond funds and the other from the General Fund. *In any case we would recommend approval of the amount only subject to a more intensive review by the Department of Finance before the actual expenditures are made.*

Department of Youth Authority—Continued

b. *Construct two living units*----- \$744,000

This project will provide two residence units of 50 girls each which will bring the total capacity of the institution, including previously funded construction, to 500 girls. The two being requested are identical with those designed and constructed under the original major appropriation for the new site and identical with the two units which were funded in the Budget Act of 1960. Each unit has an area of 11,788 gross square feet. It is interesting to note that the two units being proposed are at a cost which is substantially lower than the amount that was budgeted for the two units in the 1960 Budget Act, although they are identical in every respect. Primarily the reduction occurs in the basic building cost, in site development and in utilities. The reduction is based on the actual experience resulting from the first units constructed.

The units are entirely of type 1 construction with brick masonry walls, concrete roofs and security windows. The cost for the basic building comes to approximately \$23.65 per square foot as compared to over \$26 per gross square foot for the two units that were funded in the 1960 Budget Act. At total project level the cost will be \$31.70 per square foot. The relatively high cost of these facilities stems almost entirely from the fact that the buildings contain single rooms each with toilet and lavatory facilities.

Since the need for this additional capacity exists, as evidenced by the population at the existing institution, and since the cost appears to be in line with the nature of the facilities, we recommend approval.

c. *Shop and classroom addition*----- \$228,600

This project continues the phasing of the construction of the new plant for this institution. The project essentially will be additions to three buildings already funded and under construction. It will provide two additional academic classrooms, one vocational shop and a home economics unit consisting of a food laboratory, clothing laboratory, classroom and a dining-living room for practice purposes. Construction will be identical with the funded buildings consisting of brick masonry walls with steel-beamed roof framing and steel roof decking. The gross area of the three units will be 9,378 square feet and the cost will be \$19.40 per square foot for the basic buildings and \$24.78 per square foot for the total project.

It has been calculated that from a total population of 500 approximately 326 will be available for regular daily attendance in school facilities. The balance would be absorbed in work details, treatment or otherwise absent from the school program. On the basis of 15 students per classroom there would be a requirement for 22 rooms in total of which 17 rooms have already been funded. Consequently, the additional five rooms appear to be justified on this basis.

The cost of the project appears to be in line with the character of the facilities to be provided. However, we have raised several questions concerning some details which appear slightly excessive in cost. Furthermore, we note that the estimate contains a full 7 percent for plans,

Department of Youth Authority—Continued

working drawings and specifications which apparently takes no cognizance of the fact that most of the space is a repetition of what has been previously designed. For example, in the project for the two living units the repetition has been taken into account and only 5 percent has been budgeted for architectural services. *Consequently, we cannot recommend this project.*

Department of Education

SCHOOL FOR CEREBRAL PALSID CHILDREN, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

ITEM 356 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 745

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
SCHOOL FOR CEREBRAL PALSID CHILDREN, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$1,639,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	None
Reduction	\$1,639,000

ANALYSIS

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$110,000 for the acquisition of a new permanent site for the School for Cerebral Palsied Children in Southern California. The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$60,000 for the preparation of working drawings for the building to be constructed on the site. Initially it was hoped to be able to procure a comparatively flat site less than one half mile to the north of the Los Angeles State College campus. For various reasons this proved impossible. The decision has now been reached to acquire a site on the steep hillside immediately to the west of and overlooking the campus of Los Angeles State College. The property has not yet been entirely acquired and entry for proper surveys has not been possible. Consequently, any attempts at preliminary planning have been handicapped by the lack of exact data on the site.

As of this writing we have received only a tentative outline specification and a so-called progress print of the preliminary plans. These were so recently received as to make it impossible to resolve all the questions that were raised even at first glance at these materials.

In any case the progress plan indicates a part one story and part two story concrete structure which would contain on the first floor eight four-bed sleeping rooms for children that are domiciled here full-time, two living rooms, four classrooms, a physical therapy room, an occupational therapy room, a kitchen and dining room, sundry facilities such as laundry, storage rooms, specialized training rooms for speech and psychology testing, a nurses station and examining room, a staff lounge and the usual complement of restrooms, mechanical rooms and some offices. The second floor which will be smaller in area, about one half the size of the first floor, will contain offices, examining rooms, medical consultation rooms, a large conference room, a large lecture room divisible in two so that two separate classes may be

Department of Education—Continued

conducted at the same time and four single bedrooms with connecting baths for parents of newly arrived children who may have to spend a night or two until the children become accommodated to the school. As mentioned above the site is a difficult one which will require a substantial amount of earth movement, terracing, retaining walls and road and landscaping work. The amount proposed in this item is not at this time backed up by a firm estimate. *Consequently, in view of the foregoing, we cannot recommend the amount budgeted.*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ITEM 357 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 748

FOR MAJOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$46,268,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	17,855,500
Reduction	\$28,412,500

ANALYSIS

The capital outlay requests of the University of California are reflected in the following 31 items, totaling \$46,268,000. We recommend approval of all of the projects, as such, with the exception of projects "M", "bb", "ff", "rr", which total \$5,812,400. However, we cannot recommend the costs proposed for a number of the projects, the total cost of which amounts to \$22,600,100.

Excessive costs are illustrated by, for example, project "d" for the construction of a photosynthesis laboratory at Berkeley at \$1,470,000 with an estimated cost for heating, ventilating and some localized cooling which breaks down to \$6.32 per gross square foot of building area. Our experience at state colleges would ordinarily indicate that a complex laboratory building having fairly complex ventilating ducts, fume hood ducts and air conditioning would be considered fairly high at \$5 a square foot. Even the electrical work on this building comes to almost \$4 per square foot which is higher than our usual experience.

Another example would be project "j" for which only the working drawings are being requested for the design of a physical sciences lecture hall which will ultimately cost more than \$685,000, or in excess of \$53 a square foot for the gross area at total project level. Some of the factors contributing to this excessive cost, in our opinion, are such things as the fact that the entire exterior wall of the building is to be covered with special terra cotta tile; the roof is designed to have a garden on it around the perimeter area; the estimate includes \$5.83 per square foot for heating and ventilating alone, without air conditioning and a number of other comparatively minor details such as motorized chalkboards.

Another example would be project "k" for the construction of a biochemistry building at Berkeley having a total cost of approximately

University of California—Continued

\$3,574,000, which results in a square foot cost of \$43.22 for the gross area at project level. Some of the factors leading to this excessive cost involve such things as a tile roof and a heating and ventilating system including a limited amount of cooling for specialized areas which breaks down to \$6.36 per square foot, even more excessive than the example mentioned above.

Another example would be project "q" for the construction of an office building wing on the Davis Campus for a total cost of \$1,250,000 which breaks down to approximately \$26 per square foot for the gross area at total project level. For a simple office building without air conditioning, although provision is made for adding it in the future, this is from 20 to 25 percent higher than office buildings ordinarily built by the State. Among contributing factors are such things as a poor space utilization factor since the indications are that only 50 percent of the gross area will be net assignable space. In part this may be due to the fact that the building actually starts with its second floor rather than a ground floor, as the ground floor area is open with the building being on "stilts." We have had no explanation as to the necessity for this approach since the space under the building does not appear to be used for anything more than pedestrian walkway. Other factors are shown in specifications which include such things as the furring and plastering of the interior faces of the exterior concrete walls, a form of treatment which the State has abandoned for many years as being unnecessary. Among minor items are such things as built-in, rolldown projection screens in conference rooms. The state standard at college facilities provides that with rare exceptions, projection screens will be merely hung from the ceiling or wall and will be an agency-furnished item. An interesting comparison would be the recently completed state office building in Fresno which was constructed for a cost of \$17.53 per square foot of gross area including air conditioning. While the building is approximately three times the size of the project at Davis, this difference in size is not enough to account for the large difference in cost per square foot.

Another example would be project "r" for the construction of an addition to the library on the Davis Campus at a cost of \$1,820,000 which includes some remodeling of the existing building. Nevertheless, the new building is estimated to cost \$28.60 per square foot of gross area at total project level. The estimate appears to indicate a cost of \$5.37 per square foot for heating, ventilating and air conditioning which is extremely high for a simple open library area. The specifications call for furring and plastering the interior faces of the exterior concrete walls and for such things as floor covering in the stack areas when uncovered hardened concrete or even steel floors are customary in conventional stack areas.

Another example, would be project "aa" for the construction of a new library unit on the north campus at Los Angeles at a cost of almost over \$5 million which results in a square foot cost of \$28.26 for the gross area at total project level. It is interesting to note that this project has air conditioning also and that its cost is estimated at \$2.91 per gross

University of California—Continued

square foot for heating, ventilating and air conditioning. This should be compared with some of the figures in previous examples. While it is lower we have raised some questions as to discrepancies in the estimate which would indicate that the amount for heating and ventilating is apparently \$40,000 higher than it should be. The gross cost per square foot is, we believe, excessive for this type of space. Factors contributing to this, in our opinion, are such things as quarter-inch plate glass used in all windows throughout the building, which is most unusual; the plan includes what appears to be an elaborate and expensive second floor reading garden without indication as to whether it is counted as normal reader station space; a large elaborate brick panel wall on the first floor which occludes entirely the plate glass mentioned above in this particular area and which appears to serve no reasonable purpose. Additionally there are such minor details as an emergency generator which is normally not supplied in state buildings of this type, a cot room for men and other details.

Another example would be project "bb" for the construction of physics unit 2 on the Los Angeles Campus at a cost in excess of \$5,600,000 which breaks down to \$39.20 per square foot for the gross area at total project level. The high cost per square foot in this building involves such things as extensive brick veneer and veneer made of exposed aggregate panels which are applied to the surface of the basic concrete structure. Additionally, there are such items as an emergency generator for an undisclosed reason, adjustable sun louvers which are substantially more costly than the fixed type (the State generally uses the fixed type) and several other minor details.

Another project is "cc" which is for working drawings only for art unit No. 2 on the Los Angeles Campus. This is a structure the cost of which will probably exceed \$3,670,000, which will result in a square foot cost of \$30.20 for the gross area at total project level. The excessive cost for a building of this type appears to be involved in very elaborate courtyard treatments involving thousands of square feet of brick paving, an elaborate bridge system to permit access from the outside to certain upper levels and a number of other design features which in our opinion add to the cost without giving clear indication that an equally attractive building could not be designed at a lesser cost. We would call attention to the fact that elsewhere in the budget there is a project for the new Alameda County State College near Hayward which is an art building only slightly smaller than the one proposed for U.C.L.A. which involves the adaptation of a building constructed on the San Fernando Campus, and for which the cost is estimated at only \$22 per square foot of gross area. While the two buildings are probably not directly comparable, there is sufficient comparability to indicate that the cost differential is unjustifiable.

Another example would be project "gg" which is for working drawings only for an addition to the administration building on the Los Angeles Campus which would ultimately cost approximately \$32.40 per square foot of gross area at total project level for what is essentially an office building. A substantial portion of the excessive cost

University of California—Continued

probably lies in the fact that the building will be almost wholly covered with brick veneer to make it match the existing administration building. Other factors of excessive costs also enter into the problem. We would again make comparison with the Fresno State Office Building which was recently completed at a gross cost of less than \$18 a square foot, including air conditioning.

Another example is project "ii" for the construction of a humanities building on the Riverside Campus at a total cost of almost \$3½ million which results in a square foot cost of almost \$35 for the gross area at project level. For a comparatively simple and conventional classroom building, this is a very high cost. We have not received preliminary plans for this project but based on the program material that was furnished last year when working drawings were requested, we have been able to find no rationale that would account for this cost. The heating and ventilating and plumbing figures appear to be in line, but we would point out that the electrical estimate indicates over \$3 a square foot which is comparatively high for a conventional classroom building. Another point that should be called to attention on this project, is the fact that of the 101,020 gross square feet in the building, the program appears to indicate that only 55,500 square feet will be assignable. This is roughly a 55 percent utilization factor, which is quite low.

Another example would be project "jj" for the construction of an addition to the library building at Riverside for a cost of \$34.61 per square foot for the gross area at total project level, including air conditioning. It will be noted that this is substantially higher than the cost for the new library at Los Angeles and the library addition at Davis. Among the factors which we believe are responsible for this excessive cost are the elaborate design of the exterior which involves a reflecting pool, an elaborate entrance arcade, considerable brick paving, brick veneer and other details. The specifications furnished are wholly inadequate to give a clear picture of all that is intended, at least they are not up to the scope and detail of the preliminary specifications we usually receive from the Division of Architecture.

Another example would be project "qq" for the construction of a classroom wing on office classroom unit 2 for an indicated cost of \$29.10 per square foot for the gross area at project level. The building is essentially a simple classroom building with only one small area being highly specialized to house computer equipment. The building continues the policy of only two-story buildings on this campus with continued use of tile roofs and the special concrete block walls that have become the hallmark of this campus. There are numerous details in the specifications and the plan that in our opinion add to its cost, such as specifying select birch doors rather than unselected as is the usual state standard, specifying select walnut interior paneling instead of unselected, including built-in projection screens rather than simply mounted agency-furnished screens, ceramic tile wainscots, six feet high in restrooms when the state standard is four feet six inches and numerous other details that do not add to the function, longevity or low

University of California—Continued

maintenance cost of the building. In addition, the estimate indicates \$39,000 for the air conditioning of the single computer room which appears to us to be nearly twice what it should be. The cost of floor covering and acoustic tile shown in the estimate appear to be substantially higher than we would expect in the ordinary state building of this type. A description of all the projects follows.

We have requested information from the university on an extensive list of doubtful items and the information when received, will be used in fuller discussion of the issues before the committees.

Berkeley Campus

a. *Equip education-psychology building*----- \$57,400

The Budget Act of 1958 provided \$6,182,200 for the construction of a multistory building to house the education-psychology departments on this campus. Present indications are that the project will be ready for occupancy by December of 1961. Hence it is necessary at this time to provide funds for equipping the building. This proposal represents a first increment with probably a second increment in the following budget for about a like sum.

While we have not had an opportunity to examine the equipment list, the amount requested is substantially less than would normally be anticipated for a project of this size. However, the list may very possibly contain items which are expendable or which have a comparatively short life and, therefore, should not be financed from bond funds. Consequently, we would recommend that the list be reviewed before approval by the Legislature, in line with the observations we made in our statement preceding the capital outlay analysis. This review may lead to dividing the list into two parts, one to be funded from bond sources and the other from the General Fund.

b. *Equip agricultural greenhouses*----- \$49,500

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$755,500 for the construction of a new series of greenhouses on the Oxford Tract, largely to take the place of greenhouses that were being lost as the result of other construction.

The amount proposed appears to be reasonably commensurate with the size and type of project. However, in line with our comments preceding the capital outlay analysis concerning the propriety of financing, from bond funds, equipment items that might be expendable or have a very short life, we would recommend that the list be reviewed and divided into two parts, if necessary.

c. *Construct environmental design building*----- \$6,018,700

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$217,300 for working drawings for an architecture building which has now been renamed the "environmental design" building. The design as now developed provides a reinforced concrete structure with a basic three-story "U" shaped building, but having a total of nine stories on the north wing. The design is very simple and straightforward which is reflected in the fact that the cost for the basic building, having 210,000 gross square feet of area

University of California—Continued

and including rather extensive relocation of utilities, is \$24.05 per square foot. The gross project cost will be approximately \$29.87 per square foot. In a subsequent budget, equipment will be requested totaling in excess of \$725,000.

The present departments constituting the College of Environmental Design include architecture, landscape architecture and city and regional planning, all of which are now housed in temporary structures which are planned to be removed for other permanent construction. In our statement preliminary to the capital outlay analysis we made certain observations concerning the possibilities of more intensive utilization of existing space both at the state colleges and the university. However, we do not believe that this applies to the project in question because of the fact that it contains some highly specialized space and because it is replacing very inadequate temporary, wooden structures which need to be removed for other permanent construction. *Consequently, we recommend approval of this project.* The student capacity of this building is estimated at 1,296 F.T.E.

d. Construct photosynthesis laboratory----- \$415,200

This project involves the construction of a specialized laboratory building primarily for research in the fields of photosynthesis and chemical biodynamics. The total cost of the project is estimated at \$1,470,000 of which \$1,035,000 is presumed to be available from nonstate sources and \$19,800 has already been devoted to the project for preliminary plans, leaving the balance being requested. While we have received some data on the project, we have not as yet seen a preliminary plan. The data on hand indicate that the gross area of the building will be 34,000 square feet and the construction cost of the basic building will be \$36.03 per square foot and the total project will be \$43.21 per square foot. The estimate includes factors which we consider excessive and requiring explanation. For example, the heating and ventilating alone are estimated at \$215,000 or about \$6.32 per square foot of gross building area. From experience that we have had with the most elaborate laboratory buildings that have been built at state colleges, we believe that \$5 per square foot for heating and ventilating and air conditioning is ordinarily a high figure. In view of the foregoing, *we cannot recommend approval of this project until these apparent high costs are reconciled.*

e. Construct and equip sanitary engineering building----- \$235,000

This project involves the construction of what is basically a laboratory building on the Richmond Field Station. The total cost of the project including \$50,000 for equipment is \$453,000 of which \$218,000 is apparently forthcoming from non-state sources, leaving a balance of \$235,000 proposed to be financed by the State. While we have received no plan for this project, we have received some data indicating that the structure would be a one-story building of wood and concrete construction with a gross area of 13,400 square feet. The cost of the basic building would be \$24.40 per square foot and the gross project exclusive of Group 2 and 3 equipment would be \$30.07 per square foot.

University of California—Continued

In the instance of this project also, we find that there are some factors requiring explanation. Again, in the case of heating and ventilating, the cost is \$4.48 per square foot for what should be a very simple system. This appears to be too high for the purpose. *In view of the foregoing, we do not feel that we can recommend this project, at this time.*

f. Construct and equip alterations to Haviland Hall----- \$348,100

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$21,000 for the preparation of working drawings for alteration of this 35-year old building. In addition, almost \$10,000 of preliminary plans funds were committed to the project. The gross area of the building is 40,000 square feet and on the basis of this area, the basic alteration work would average \$6.85 per square foot and the gross project, \$8.71 per square foot.

Upon completion of the education-psychology building in December of 1961, the School of Education which now occupies Haviland Hall will completely vacate the building. Upon renovation, the Schools of Social Welfare and Criminology will occupy the building. Since the building is to be vacated, it appears to be appropriate to make whatever renovations are necessary so that the new occupants can make sufficient use of the space. We have examined the plans in detail and we believe that the proposed work is justified and that the cost is commensurate. *We recommend approval.*

However, we should point out that included in the request is \$30,000 for agency furnished equipment. In line with our general comments concerning the problem of financing expendable or short lived equipment from bond funds, we would recommend that the list be carefully divided and financed on a dual basis.

g. Construct alterations to Hearst Mining Building----- \$611,400

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$21,500 for working drawings for alterations to this building, the age of which exceeds 45 years. In addition, almost \$25,000 was committed to the project from lump sum allocations for preliminary planning. The building has a gross area of 100,000 square feet and on this basis the basic alteration work will average \$4.75 per square foot and the gross project, \$6.58 per square foot. In a subsequent budget, equipment to the extent of approximately \$300,000 will be requested.

A portion of the building will be vacated by the Department of Paleontology when it moves in to the new earth sciences building which will soon be ready for occupancy. It is then proposed to devote the building entirely to teaching and research in the Department of Mineral Technology. This involves substantial physical interior alteration, improvement of the ventilation and addition of very substantial power supplies. Basically, the building because of its monumental design has a poor utilization factor and this project will in part correct or improve this factor. We have examined the project in considerable detail and we believe the work to be done is justified and the cost is commensurate. *We recommend approval.*

University of California—Continued

h. Construct alterations to life sciences building----- \$639,000

The project involves extensive alterations to a building which was originally constructed in 1928 under conditions of inadequate financing. As a result, the building has undergone a number of previous major maintenance projects as well as alterations. The gross area of the portion of the building to be altered is approximately 50,000 square feet and on this basis the basic alteration work is estimated at \$10.30 per square foot and the gross project cost at \$13.04 per square foot. Much of this cost results from the fact that the space will be more intensively used for graduate and research work involving extensive laboratory equipment, both replacement of existing obsolete equipment and additional.

The space is being vacated by the Department of Soils and Plant Nutrition which moves into Hilgaard Hall in the fall of 1961 and the Department of Psychology which moves into the new education-psychology building early in 1962. The remaining departments will then expand and occupy the modernized and altered space.

In consideration of the "checkerboard" moves that will take place and the fact of the buildings poor original design and quality, we believe the project is justified. We have examined the preliminary plans in detail and the work appears to be reasonable and the cost commensurate. *We recommend approval.*

i. Construct alterations to home economics building----- \$216,900

This project proposes alterations and conversions to approximately 14,000 gross square feet of area in the home economics building which was constructed in 1952. The bulk of the cost revolves around the installation of laboratory equipment, new plumbing runs to service the equipment and additional ventilating duct work for fume hoods, etc. This leads to the relatively high cost of \$12.14 per gross square foot for the basic work and \$15.90 per square foot for the overall project.

The area to be converted is being vacated by virtue of the fact that certain home economics courses such as clothing construction, house furnishing and decorating will no longer be offered on this campus. Basically, the aim is to dedicate the building almost exclusively to research laboratory and teaching facilities for the nutritional sciences. We have examined the preliminary plans and believe that the work is justified for the goals expressed. The cost also appears to be commensurate for the type of work to be done. Since the space involved is highly specialized we do not believe that the problems of more intensive utilization of existing space apply directly in this instance. *We recommend approval.*

j. Working drawings for physical sciences lecture hall----- \$23,500

This project involves the design and preparation of working drawings for a rather unusual facility. The only large lecture hall on the eastern side of the campus was the old chemistry auditorium which has been demolished to provide a site for the new Chemistry Unit 1, already funded. It is proposed therefore to substitute for this space by

University of California—Continued

providing a 550-seat lecture hall of unusual functional design. The demonstration facilities at the front of the hall will be in the form of a large turntable, set into the floor on which three separate and distinct demonstration complexes will be provided. This will make it possible for one class to be watching a demonstration while either or both of the other two complexes are behind the scenes being setup for a following class. This would make it possible, in theory, to use this large facility at every and any hour of the day that it was desired to do so. The only lag would occur in the period of time that it would take to clear out one group and permit another group to be seated. Another unique feature of the design is the placement of closed circuit television cameras and monitor units at various points in the seating area to permit almost everyone seated in the large area to have an equally close view of the demonstration taking place. The preliminary design indicates that the cost of the facility including the working drawings will probably exceed \$685,000 which with a gross area of approximately 12,700 square feet would result in a basic building cost in excess of \$43 a square foot and a total project cost in excess of \$53 a square foot. However, it should be pointed out that from the standpoint of the utilization of the area this relatively high cost may be misleading. The facilities placed in the building present an opportunity for unusually full utilization and if this is done, it may well prove to be reasonably economical construction.

However, this is not to say that we believe that the cost cannot be pared down and still provide the basic facilities and functions required. We have already raised questions concerning the preliminary design and specifications which have not as yet been resolved. However, since only working drawings are being requested and the project must come back to the Legislature for construction funds, reviews of the project for the purpose of reducing the cost will probably be considered. *Consequently, we would recommend approval of the request.*

k. Construct biochemistry building----- \$2,822,000

This project contemplates the construction of a laboratory building to be devoted to research facilities and teaching space for the biochemistry department. The actual cost of the total project exclusive of agency-furnished equipment will be approximately \$3,574,000. Towards this cost there has been provided \$37,000 from state funds for preliminary plans and \$15,000 from nonstate funds for preliminary plans making a total of \$52,000. This would result in a gross requirement of \$3,522,000. It is our understanding that federal funds to the extent of \$766,000 will be made available to share in this project. This would indicate that the State's share should only be \$2,756,000 instead of the amount requested.

In any case, the gross area of the building is estimated at 82,500 square feet, which would result in a square foot cost for the basic building of \$36.24 and \$43.22 for the complete project, excluding equipment. Subsequently, over \$500,000 in equipment will be required. Due to the highly specialized nature of the building, its total F.T.E.

University of California—Continued

capacity will be only 373. Presently, the biochemistry department is using space in the biochemistry-virus laboratory building which is badly needed by the virus laboratory itself. Ultimately, it is proposed to build a totally new virus laboratory near the proposed biochemistry building and the conversion of the existing one to use by the physical sciences. The highly specialized nature of these facilities would indicate that it might not be possible or practical to apply the idea of more intensive utilization of existing space. *On this basis, we would recommend the basic project.* However, we have raised questions concerning the excessive cost and construction details which we believe contribute to this excessive cost which have not yet been resolved. *Consequently, we cannot recommend the amount.*

l. Construct utilities ----- \$391,500

The continual growth of this campus by the addition of large multi-story structures, which in some cases replace older structures which are removed and in other cases constructed on newly acquired property, leads to serious distortions and unusual demands on existing water, sewer, storm drains and electrical lines.

The proposed project involves extension of electrical services, improvement and increase in electrical system and substation capacity, extension of steam main, storm drains and sewer lines and extension of a major water main and revisions to existing water distribution systems to improve fire flow capacities which in some areas are dangerously low. The various units of the project appear to be justifiable and the costs are in line with the work to be done. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

m. Working drawings for chemistry unit 2----- \$200,000

This project proposes the design and working drawings for a multi-story concrete laboratory structure with an estimated gross area of over 122,000 square feet. The project is a second step of three in a plan to replace substandard and obsolete facilities while also allowing for the expansion of teaching and research facilities for the departments of chemistry and chemical engineering. It will occupy a site on which there is now an old brick building from which present activities will be moved into chemistry unit 1 upon completion in 1962. The proposed structure will have an F.T.E. capacity of 559 and it will probably cost in excess of \$5,700,000 exclusive of agency-furnished equipment. This indicates a cost of \$39.17 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$46.50 per square foot for the total project. Subsequently, equipment probably in excess of \$1 million will be proposed.

With reference to our comments preceding the capital outlay analysis concerning the possibility of more intensive utilization of both state college and university space, there may be some question as to the justification for the expansion portion of this project. We do not question that portion of it which is intended to replace the existing old brick building which is distinctly substandard for a high quality teaching and research program in chemistry and chemical engineering. *Consequently, we would recommend that these working drawings be deferred*

University of California—Continued

until such time as the university can demonstrate that it is not possible to achieve a more intensive utilization of the existing laboratory and auxiliary spaces. In the event a more intensive utilization is possible, it will probably still be necessary to provide some additional space to take the place of the old existing brick building.

n. Land acquisition ----- \$680,000

This project involves a portion of the cost of acquiring certain property needed for future implementation of the five-year capital outlay program from 1961 to 1966. Of this amount, \$480,000 represents half of the estimated cost of 2.69 acres comprising the greatest part of a block on which residence hall unit 3 will be constructed at some future time. The balance of \$200,000 represents an allowance for purchases of necessity and opportunity which at this time totals over \$2 million and for which \$242,000 has already been appropriated. Included is .45 acre for administrative unit 2, .22 acre for a law school residence hall, .77 acre representing the second step in a site for parking structure E, 2.7 acres for residence hall unit 4 and 1.85 acres for parking structure J. All of the property involved lies to the south of the major campus boundary along Bancroft Way and is between Piedmont on the east and Dana on the west.

An intensified utilization of existing structural space on the campus, even if it can be achieved, would not obviate the necessity for additional parking space as the enrollment at this campus grows, nor would it obviate the need for additional residence hall space if the residence hall program is to continue on its present basis. Consequently, it would appear that the proposals are in line with established and accepted policies. *Therefore, we recommend approval.*

Davis Campus

o. Equip physical sciences unit 1 (first increment) ----- \$50,000

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$1,592,890 for the construction of unit 1 of a new physical sciences complex on this campus. Construction of the project is scheduled to be completed in March of 1962. Hence it becomes necessary to provide funds at this time to equip the building. The amount proposed represents only a first increment probably covering those things which take a considerable period for delivery or special fabrication. While we have not seen the list, the sum would appear to be substantially less than would be the normal full complement for a building of this size and type. On the assumption that the first increment contains no items that might be considered expendable or as having a comparatively short life, *we recommend approval of the request.*

p. Construct and equip addition to physical education building ----- \$678,500

This project has a rather long and complicated history. It involves the construction of an addition to the existing physical education facilities, particularly to provide facilities for women. In the 1956-57 fiscal year, funds for working drawings and construction in the amount of

University of California—Continued

\$600,000 were allocated from the Fair and Exposition Fund which at that time did not require legislative appropriation. Subsequently, bids were taken and rejected because they substantially exceeded available funds for the design as then planned. The plan was to provide for the physical education needs of 1,000 women.

It is now proposed to size the project for an enrollment of 2,500 women, the number expected by 1966.

The present total project cost is \$1,227,500 towards which there is still available \$549,000 from the original allocation. The project has a gross area of 40,578 square feet and the gross cost mentioned above figures out at a cost of approximately \$24.00 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$30.25 per square foot for the total project. We have examined the preliminary plan for the newly designed addition and have raised some questions concerning features and costs which have not as yet been resolved. Consequently, we cannot recommend the amount budgeted at this time.

g. Construct office section of classroom and office building
unit 2 ----- \$1,175,900

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$1,325,000 for the construction of classroom unit 2 and for the preparation of working drawings of the office wing portion of classroom unit 2. The project was divided in this way because the additional number of offices involved in the office wing were not justified at that time. It is now proposed to construct this multistory office wing at a gross project cost of \$1,250,000 which will produce a gross area of 48,700 square feet at a cost of approximately \$21.00 per square foot for the basic building and approximately \$26.00 for the total project. We would also like to point out that the design indicates approximately 24,000 square feet of net assignable area resulting in efficiency of less than 50 percent, an extremely low figure for what is essentially a simple office building. The design also contemplates that the building will be on stilts with a clear space underneath so that the first usable floor is actually the second story. We believe that the design is excessively costly, that the specifications include features that are unnecessary and uneconomical. Questions we have raised have not as yet been answered. *Consequently, we cannot recommend approval.*

r. Construct library addition and make alterations to li-
brary—administration building ----- \$1,820,000

This project proposes the design and construction of an addition to the existing main library building in order to provide stack space for 400,000 volumes and a total reading station of 1,024. The need for this space is based on an anticipated enrollment of 5,000 F.T.E. by 1966.

The project involves the construction of a reinforced concrete addition with a gross area of 55,350 square feet. In addition, there is substantial alteration work required in the existing building in order to make the two function together properly. The cost breakdowns indicate that the new work for the basic building will be \$23.80 per square foot and \$28.60 per square foot for the total cost of the new portion.

University of California—Continued

The alteration work will run \$8.07 per square foot and \$10.52 per square foot respectively. Since this is a library building, it will include air conditioning which is primarily for the purpose of maintaining uniform temperature and humidity conditions to preserve the book collections. It is not practical to air condition the book stack area alone therefore the air conditioning will serve the entire building and will provide comfort conditioning for the reader area as a byproduct. In a subsequent budget, there will be requests for equipment in excess of \$265,000.

We have examined the preliminary plans of this project and have raised certain questions concerning features which we believe add unnecessarily to its cost. As yet, these questions have not been answered. *Consequently, we cannot recommend the amount of money requested.*

s. Construct veterinary science laboratory, animal housing
unit 2 ----- \$151,700

This project involves the design and construction of a single story, two unit reinforced concrete, tilt-up structure for housing experimental animals. The gross area is estimated at 6,524 square feet which is estimated to cost approximately \$17.78 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$23.65 per gross square foot for the complete project. Subsequently, there will be requests for equipment which will probably exceed \$30,000.

A similar animal unit was completed in 1955. However, it has insufficient capacity for the total number of animals required. At present, valuable research space is being used for housing animals and this results in hazardous conditions in a building not planned for this purpose. Consequently, it appears that the project is justified on this basis.

We have examined the preliminary plans which indicate a relatively simple facility, but one having a relatively high proportion of utilities and special features required for keeping animals in a healthy condition. This results in the comparatively high cost per square foot. *Since we believe that the cost is commensurate with the size and type of the project, we recommend approval.*

t. Construct and equip poultry husbandry building for experimental birds ----- \$174,700

This project proposes the design, construction and equipment of a single story, reinforced concrete building containing facilities for housing poultry as well as some auxiliary spaces. The structure is estimated to have a gross area of 5,100 square feet which would cost approximately \$25.50 per square foot for the basic building and \$32 for gross square foot for the total project. In addition, the total request includes \$17,000 for agency-furnished equipment.

The need for the building is based on the fact that existing space is being eliminated or has already been eliminated as the result of new construction projects which require the demolition of some old poultry buildings. On the basis, the project appears justified.

University of California—Continued

However, the cost seems excessive and our review of the preliminary plan indicates some questionable features which may be responsible for some of the excess cost. Questions we have raised have not as yet been resolved. *Consequently, we cannot recommend the amount.*

La Jolla Campus

*u. Complete construction and equip partially, Building B,
School of Science and Engineering----- \$520,000*

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$3,836,940 for the construction of the first unit of the School of Science and Engineering on the La Jolla campus. This is a laboratory building which will be known as "building B." Actual design and construction cost will require all of the funds appropriated so that agency furnished equipment will need to be funded at a later date.

At the time the appropriation was made, air conditioning was deliberately eliminated from the estimate on the basis of Department of Finance policies, which do not allow for air conditioning in a laboratory or classroom building for purely comfort purposes alone. However, since that time calculations based on a large volume of highly specialized, high heat producing equipment which will be used in the building for teaching and research, indicate the necessity for refrigerated air conditioning to offset the excessive volume of process heat. The calculations which we have examined appear to indicate that there is justification for controlling this excessive heat both from the standpoint of efficient and accurate operation of the equipment as well as minimizing the unnatural heat burdens that would be imposed on the occupants of the building. The additional cost for this feature will be \$350,000. We question this amount since it appears to be excessive for the purpose. *Consequently, we cannot recommend the project.*

In addition, the project includes \$170,000 for the purchase of certain types of scientific and engineering equipment that require long periods of time between order and delivery. We assume that this would indicate that none of the items involved would likely be considered as expendable or as having an unusually short life. *Therefore, we would recommend approval of the equipment request.* Subsequently, additional equipment will be proposed in an amount probably exceeding \$1,500,000.

*v. Construct Building "C" for School of Science and Engi-
neering ----- \$2,465,000*

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$219,000 for working drawings for the second unit of the School of Science and Engineering. The second unit has been conceived as two separate and distinct buildings referred to as "C" and "D." Of the total amount appropriated for working drawings, \$160,000 has been committed for this purpose for Building C alone. The funding for the construction of Building D will probably be requested in the 1962 Budget Session.

Building C is essentially a laboratory building having a gross area of 68,474 square feet in three floors and a basement. The basic design involves a so-called utility core which makes the building extremely flexible so that radical changes in laboratory facilities can be made with

University of California—Continued

comparative ease. The estimated cost of the project indicates that the basic building will break down to \$30.42 per gross square foot and the total project to \$38.33 per gross square foot.

The design includes some rather elaborate exterior facilities based upon the fact that the location is a sharply sloping site. Included in these outdoor facilities is an eating facility which appears to us to be somewhat unusual for a building of this type. We would point out that this building has an estimated capacity of 140 F.T.E. graduate students, which including faculty would still indicate a very low occupation density. We have no indication whether this eating facility is intended as a central one for all of the buildings in this complex or whether it is intended for this building alone. *Until these questions can be resolved, we do not recommend this amount.*

w. Construct utilities and site development, step 2 for School of Science and Engineering----- \$250,000

This project appears to indicate that it is a second increment of basic utilities and site development such as grading, road paving, water mains, sewer mains, storm drainage, steam distribution mains and electrical distribution lines. However, the data that have been submitted appear to be confusing and contradictory. Particularly, since large additional refrigeration capacity is referred to in the preliminary description. *Consequently, until these discrepancies can be resolved and other questions cleared up, we cannot recommend this amount.*

Los Angeles Campus

x. Equip graduate school of business administration building \$257,300

The Budget Act of 1958 provided \$4,285,000 for the construction of a building for the graduate school of business administration. The Budget Act of 1957 provided \$202,000 for working drawings for the same project. It is now anticipated that the building will be completed by September of 1961 and, consequently, it is necessary to provide funds at this time for the equipment needed to make the building operable.

We have not examined the equipment list but the amount proposed appears to be commensurate with the size and character of the project. However, in line with our comments preceding the capital outlay analysis, concerning the possible impropriety of financing expendable or short-lived equipment from bond funds, we feel that this list should be scrutinized and divided into two categories, one to be financed from the bond funds and the other from the General Fund.

y. Equip engineering unit 3----- \$335,000

The Budget Act of 1958 provided \$5,418,000 for the construction of the third engineering unit at Los Angeles and in the same act, \$221,500 was provided for working drawings for the same building. In the Budget Act of 1960, \$722,219 was provided for a first increment of equipment for this building. Presumably, this is now the second and last increment for equipping the building.

University of California—Continued

While we have not examined the list, the two amounts together appear to be reasonably commensurate with the size and character of the project. However, it is possible that the second increment may include items of equipment that might be considered expendable or short lived. *Therefore, in line with our comments on this subject preceding the capital outlay analysis, we would recommend that the list be scrutinized and divided into two parts, if justified, for funding from two sources.*

z. Complete addition to chemistry-geology building, step 1--- \$182,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$4,215,800 for the construction of an addition to the chemistry-geology building and the Budget Act of 1959 provided \$212,660 for the working drawings for the same project. Construction funding specifically eliminated refrigerated air conditioning for the project on the basis of Department of Finance policies which prohibited air conditioning, for human comfort alone in classroom and laboratory buildings.

However, it has since developed that the heat load which will be produced in this building by high-capacity experimental and research equipment would impose an excessive burden on the occupants of the building as well as affecting the efficiency and accuracy of the equipment involved. We have examined detailed calculations which indicate the justification for providing refrigerated air conditioning primarily to offset the unnatural heat gain. *The cost appears to be in line with the size of the project and, consequently, we recommend approval.*

aa. Construct north campus library unit 1----- \$4,943,000

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$346,400 for the design and working drawings for a new library unit to be placed at the north end of the campus where it would eventually become the focal point for graduate study and research in the departments of the humanities and the social sciences. The existing library at the older campus would become primarily an undergraduate library. The foregoing was the principal reason for building a new and separate building. The second and probably equally as important a reason was the fact that the location of the existing library and its traditional monumental design made it prohibitively costly if not virtually impossible to build additions.

The project contemplates the construction of a five-story building, plus basement and sub-basement. The structure is basically of reinforced concrete frame and reinforced concrete flat floor slabs with exterior walls being primarily of the curtain type and made of various materials such as brick, glass and concrete. The gross area of the structure is estimated at 189,600 square feet which is estimated to cost \$22.04 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$28.26 per gross square foot for the overall project. Subsequently, equipment requests will probably exceed \$900,000. Air conditioning is included in this building primarily for the purpose of maintaining a uniform temperature and humidity condition for the preservation of valuable books and documents. Since the floors are of an open design, it is not practical to air condition the book areas alone. Consequently, the reading areas will be

University of California—Continued

air conditioned as a by-product. This first unit will have a capacity for 750,000 volumes and will have 1,500 reader stations in addition to the usual complement of auxiliary services and spaces.

We have raised certain questions concerning features which we believe add unnecessary costs to the project. We have also raised questions concerning apparent discrepancies in the estimates. *Consequently, we cannot recommend the amount requested for this project.*

University of California—Continued

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$203,200 for working drawings for this project. The design contemplates a reinforced concrete frame and floor building of six stories above grade and two below grade. Exterior walls are of reinforced concrete with a substantial use of brick veneer and precast exposed aggregate concrete panels sometimes referred to by the trade name of "Mosai" which are in effect a veneer. The gross area of the building is estimated at 145,000 square feet and the cost for the basic building will be \$32.20 per gross square foot and \$39.20 per gross square foot for the total project. Subsequently, there will be requests for equipment, probably exceeding \$1,100,000. The building will include air conditioning based on the fact that an unusually high volume of experimental and research equipment will release large amounts of electrical heat placing an unnatural and excessive burden on the occupants of the building. Furthermore, many items of equipment in physical research require accurately maintained temperatures and humidity to function properly. On this basis, the air conditioning appears to be justified.

However, we have raised certain questions concerning features, some of which have been mentioned above, which appear to us to add very substantial unnecessary costs to the project. These questions have not as yet been answered. Furthermore, in line with our statement preceding the capital outlay analysis concerning the possibility of a more intensive utilization of existing classroom and laboratory space for both the university and the state colleges, *we believe that the project should be deferred until the university can demonstrate that it is not possible to overcome all or part of the need for space in this building by more intensive utilization of existing space.*

cc. Working drawings for art unit 2..... \$132,000

This project proposes the design and working drawings for a reinforced concrete structure which will be mainly an eight-story tower with a three-story wing and a separate two-story unit containing a five-hundred seat auditorium and exhibition areas. The gross area will probably be 121,704 square feet and the ultimate total project cost, exclusive of agency-furnished equipment but including the cost of the working drawings, will probably exceed \$3,670,000. This will result in a cost of \$25.10 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$30.20 per gross square foot for the total project. In addition, there will ultimately be proposed equipment in excess of \$325,000. Preliminary specifications indicate that the design will include air conditioning. And the cost mentioned above would be inclusive of this. In the instance of such

University of California—Continued

a building, the air conditioning would be almost wholly for human comfort purposes and not for the abatement of process heat.

The proposed project will have an F.T.E. capacity of 542 and it is claimed that existing art facilities which are comprised principally of art unit 1 and other spaces scattered through the campus were overloaded in the fall of 1959 with a teaching load of 587 F.T.E. It is estimated by the fall of 1965 that the teaching load will exceed 1,000 F.T.E. in art and its related fields. In addition, it is planned to release a substantial portion of the existing art building to the new school of architecture to provide for its initial development. From the figures above it would appear unlikely that a more intensive utilization of existing space, most of it specialized for art purposes, could conceivably double its capacity, which would be required by 1965. *Consequently, we feel that working drawings for this project are justified at this time.*

However, we would like to point out that our examination of the preliminary plans submitted plus the outline specifications indicate a building which we consider to be excessively elaborate both as to design and treatment detail which consequently is more costly than it needs to be. Therefore, while we recommend approval of funds for working drawings, we cannot recommend the excessive level of appropriation indicated for the completed project, which is in our opinion several hundred thousand dollars more costly than reasonably equivalent college facilities.

dd. Construct life sciences graduate instruction and research unit 2----- \$1,297,000

This project proposes the design and construction of a reinforced concrete frame, six-story structure with exterior concrete walls and brick veneer. The building is estimated to have a gross area of 32,196 square feet and will be attached to life science unit 1 at each of the six floors. The cost of the project is estimated at \$34.21 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$40.90 per gross square foot for the total project. This includes air conditioning of the structure generally because at least 60 percent of the space requires air conditioning for process reasons in the various laboratories in order to maintain and control temperatures for experimental purposes and for the housing of live animals. Consequently, it appears just as economical to air condition the entire building. In a subsequent budget, there will be requests for equipment probably exceeding \$250,000.

The F.T.E. capacity of the project will be 142 with two-thirds of the space being for graduate student and faculty research laboratories and related service facilities and the other one-third being animal quarters. Part of the new space will be replacing space now being used in the vivarium which is to be demolished. Since this structure is exclusively for graduate and research purposes, it is questionable whether the same yardstick of space utilization can be applied to it as would be the case in ordinary undergraduate facilities. Generally speaking, multiple use of graduate research space is not possible since long time experimental setups are required which precludes the use of the space on a multiple

University of California—Continued

basis. In view of the fact that the university anticipates a 200 percent increase in F.T.E. in bacteriology from the fall of 1959 to the fall of 1965 it would appear that the space is justified for this specialized program.

We have reviewed the preliminary plans and specifications and have raised certain questions concerning details in the design which we consider to be excessive and unnecessarily costly. These questions have not as yet been resolved. *Consequently, we cannot recommend the project.*

ee. Construct utilities, roads and walks to north campus area \$195,000

This project proposes certain site and utility development and landscaping in the north area of the campus which is being developed as a social sciences and humanities center. Roughly, the project is divided into two major portions and one minor portion. One of the major portions is for landscaping, which includes the development of some major roads and walks which cannot properly be tied to any one building and the other involves the extension of water mains and the installation of storm drains and catch basins. The minor portion involves electrical work for lighting the area.

The graduate school of business administration is anticipated to be completed by October of 1961, the theater arts building, unit 1, by September of 1962 and the social science unit 1 by September of 1962. These are funded and under construction. Consequently, it appears essential that site development be provided for the general area not only to eliminate what might otherwise be unsightly conditions but to prevent maintenance problems and excessive wear and tear which would result from raw undeveloped areas causing the tracking of dirt and debris into the buildings. The project appears to be justified and the amount requested seems commensurate with the size and character of work to be done. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

ff. Working drawings for university activities, Memorial Center ----- \$163,000

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for a structure which in many respects would be similar to the recently completed Los Angeles Sports Arena adjacent to the Coliseum. It contemplates a building having a gross area of approximately 261,000 square feet with a gross cost, as of the current index, of \$5,800,000, plus \$200,000 for equipment. The structure would have 10,000 permanent seats and provision for 3,500 additional movable seats. Furthermore, in view of the concentrated occupancy potential, it will require air conditioning. From the data furnished, we cannot be certain whether air conditioning is included in the price quoted above or would be in addition thereto.

The present concept of the building is that of an oval shape with the location such that it can be entered from grade at different sides from several levels. In addition to the large playing floor which on occasions can be partly occupied by the movable seating mentioned before, there will be athletic activity rooms, locker, shower, training and office rooms, equipment storage areas and various other special purpose spaces. The

University of California—Continued

estimate of construction cost indicates \$18.50 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$22.20 per gross square foot for the complete project exclusive of agency-furnished equipment.

The justification for the project is based on the mass seating needs for student and public meetings, convocations, lectures, concerts and intercollegiate and intramural sports such as basketball, gymnastics, handball, volleyball and wrestling. The nonathletic activities will involve the use of a portable stage and the provision of adequate acoustical control to make the space suitable for such things as concerts or drama presentations.

The present indicated requests and demands by the university and the state colleges for academic space are such that the present revenue prospects of the State will fall short of meeting these demands. Even by the expedient of additional bond funding, the revenue potential will be overburdened to meet bond service payments. Consequently, it appears that a choice must be made by establishing priorities which extend beyond individual agency priorities, putting highest on the list those things that are essential and necessary to the basic high quality, state supported higher education program that has been established in California. With the facilities already available to the university this type of facility should, we believe, be lower in priority than other basic academic facilities. Furthermore, the substantial community service orientation of this type of project would indicate that it is appropriate to seek funds from the local metropolitan community for a memorial of this type rather than to expect scarce state funds to be devoted to it.

We would also point out that the several state college campuses are equally entitled to such cultural and community facilities beyond those that can be accommodated in the conventional gymnasiums, little theaters or music recital halls. The approval of this project, even for working drawings only, would establish a precedent which will inevitably lead to similar demands by all of the state college campuses. A conservative estimate of the cost potential implied would probably exceed \$40 million, assuming that no single state college campus would consider a facility larger than half the size of the one proposed here. *Consequently, we recommend that this project be disapproved.*

We might also point out that in the event local funds can be obtained for such a project, the State would still be contributory to it in the form of the land on which it would stand, the utilities and services that would need to be supplied and the increased maintenance burdens that would be imposed on parking and road facilities.

gg. Working drawings for addition to the administration building ----- \$72,500

This project proposes the design and preparation of working drawings for an addition to the existing administration building, having four floors with a gross area of approximately 61,956 square feet. Construction is contemplated generally as being reinforced concrete and since it will be a wing of a building that already has brick veneer surfacing, the addition is also specified to have brick veneer surface. The

University of California—Continued

cost is estimated at \$25.35 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$32.40 for gross square foot of the complete project exclusive of agency-furnished equipment. Subsequently, there will be requests for equipment probably exceeding \$127,000.

The continued enrollment growth on this campus requires a parallel growth in administrative services and positions which must be housed on the campus. Obviously, the problems of space utilization in academic facilities do not apply here. Consequently, the need for additional space appears to be justified. However, the specifications and other data which we have received and the plans appear to be unsatisfactory. The cost is excessive for what is essentially office space. We have raised questions concerning these factors which have not as yet been satisfactorily resolved. *Consequently, even though only working drawings are involved, we cannot recommend approval of the project.*

Los Angeles Medical Center

hh. Construct physical rehabilitation unit----- \$3,561,000

The Budget Act of 1957 provided \$196,000 for the preparation of working drawings for a physical rehabilitation unit for the Los Angeles Medical Center. The delay in the development of the west medical campus as well as other factors have delayed development of this project and request for construction funds. As now designed, the building is estimated to have 112,212 square feet of gross area in a reinforced concrete, five-story structure which includes refrigerated air conditioning. The cost estimates indicate a cost of \$25.80 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$34.20 per gross square foot for the complete project. In addition, there will be future budget requests for equipment which will probably exceed \$550,000.

The building will contain spaces for 64 hospital-type beds, out-patient clinics, clinical research laboratories and staff offices. The basic mission of this unit would be to train paramedical personnel involved principally in physical rehabilitation following surgery, accidents or crippling diseases. It will also provide for graduate work in specialized areas of medicine such as pediatrics, orthopedics, speech and hearing, etc. The need for such a building is basically a matter of policy since existing facilities do not provide the specialized spaces necessary to carry out such a program. We assume from the fact that the Legislature approved the preparation of working drawings, that the policy for establishing such a facility has been set.

We have raised a number of questions and criticisms concerning design features of the building which we consider to add unnecessarily to the cost. In addition, we find that the basic space utilization of the building is comparatively inefficient in that the assignable space represents only 59 percent of the gross area. *Since our questions have not as yet been resolved, we cannot recommend the amount.*

Riverside Campus

ii. Construct humanities building----- \$3,372,400

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$100,400 for working drawings for this project. It is now contemplated as a structure with a gross area

University of California—Continued

of 101,020 square feet with an estimated cost of \$29.27 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$34.94 per gross square foot for the complete project. Subsequently, there will be proposed equipment funding probably in excess of \$380,000. The project will have a capacity of 696 F.T.E. in the Division of Humanities and for general campus use. It will contain classrooms, language laboratories, faculty offices and facilities for instruction in art, music and drama. For these latter fields this campus has no facilities specifically designed for the purpose. There will also be a 500-seat lecture hall-theater facility in the building. We have seen neither preliminary specifications or plans for this project and the square foot cost mentioned above seemed excessive for what should be a fairly conventional classroom building. The so-called language laboratories mentioned would not have the sort of laboratory facilities generally contemplated in scientific laboratories. *Consequently, we cannot recommend the amount.*

jj. Construct addition to the library building----- \$1,795,000

This project involves the preparation of working drawings and the construction of an addition to the existing library comprising approximately 52,586 square feet of gross area in four stories and a basement. This is an interim increment. Ultimately there will be additional expansion as the enrollment on this campus grows. The cost of the project including air conditioning is estimated at \$28.71 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$34.61 per gross square foot for the total project. Ultimately, equipment will be proposed probably exceeding \$160,000.

The existing library has a stack capacity of something under 150,000 and a reader seating capacity of 317. This addition will provide space for an additional 150,000 volumes and 548 reader seats, which would make a total of 865 seats and almost 300,000 volumes. The projected enrollment for the fall of 1966 is 3,600 F.T.E. On the basis of the standard rule requiring seating for 25 percent of the F.T.E. enrollment, the total number of seats which would be made available by this addition would be adequate. The total volume capacity is also commensurate with the anticipated enrollment. This also contemplates the space required by the citrus experiment station for its library materials.

We have examined the plans and the preliminary specifications which we consider inadequate since they do not give a clear picture of what is intended. We have also raised certain questions concerning the design and details which we believe are partially responsible for what we consider an excessive cost for this type of building, as noted above. *As yet, these questions have not been resolved. Consequently, we cannot recommend this amount.*

kk. Land acquisition----- \$650,000

This project contemplates the purchase of 840 acres of land in the Moreno Valley about 15 miles directly east of the existing campus. The land is to be used both by the agricultural experiment station for its research projects and the new college of agriculture which has been established by the regents at this campus which will become the southern

University of California—Continued

counterpart of the Davis Campus. All agricultural work has now been eliminated from the Los Angeles Campus.

Academic expansion of the existing Riverside Campus has continually encroached upon existing useable agricultural land so that the remaining portions are inadequate for the experiment station's research work. It would appear that this is an appropriate expansion of this campus to provide facilities that will serve those agricultural needs that are peculiar to Southern California. The cost of less than \$800 an acre seems to be reasonable in an area where real property values will inevitably increase many fold. It would therefore be a sound investment to buy the property at this time. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

ll. Construct improvements to field 9----- \$60,300

The Riverside Campus owns a 34-acre piece of property which is now undeveloped, lying to the south of the campus and south of Pennsylvania Avenue. Expanding needs of the agricultural experiment station particularly with respect to the relatively new research programs in the vegetable and field crops requires that additional land be put under cultivation. This project contemplates mostly the cost of irrigation and drainage facilities and some land preparation. The work appears justified. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

mm. Construct protective filters and coolers for glass houses,
step I ----- \$246,500

A great deal of experimental agricultural work is carried on at this campus in numerous glass houses. Increasing air pollution in the area is causing injury to plants and distorting the experimental work. Most of the glass houses now have evaporative coolers for temperature control. However, these coolers are inadequate to permit the addition of activated carbon filters to assure uncontaminated air in the glass houses. Consequently, the proposed project consists of providing new evaporative coolers with the activated carbon filters or reworking the existing coolers where possible and adding filters. Thirteen glass houses have been selected for this work in order to give every department on the campus at least one glass house with contaminant-free atmosphere. The cost appears to be in line with the nature of the work to be done. *In view of the accepted mission of this station and the known fact of air pollution in the area, we would recommend approval.*

San Francisco Campus

nn. Construct primary electrical expansion----- \$295,500

The completion of the 15-story Health Sciences Instruction and Research Unit No. 1 on this campus will result in a facility or building which will have the highest single power demand of any building on this medical campus. At present, the capacity to satisfy this demand does not exist. The present primary system is 4,160 volts and the new demand will require that the primary service be raised to 12,000 volts in order to reduce system costs since the higher voltage uses lighter cable. This change-over requires complex new switch gear, special step-down transformers to reduce the 12,000 volts to 4,160 for some areas

University of California—Continued

and the replacement of obsolete interrupting equipment on the 4,160 volt system. The project also requires the construction of a small pent-house on top of the existing power plant to accommodate the new equipment. The scope of the project appears to be entirely reasonable for the apparent requirements. The cost of the work to be done appears commensurate with the size and nature of the project. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

oo. Working drawings for addition to and alterations to
clinics building ----- \$174,000

This project proposes the preparation of working drawings for a structure which will be 10 stories in height of steel frame design with window curtain wall exterior, largely similar to the health sciences instruction and research unit No. 1 which was funded in 1960. It is presently estimated that the building would have a gross area of 138,983 square feet which would cost \$30.54 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$35.75 per gross square foot for the complete project. Subsequently, equipment will be requested which will probably exceed \$475,000. Furthermore, the cost estimates are tentative and may undergo substantial revision. The building will be immediately behind the existing clinics building and will be interconnected with it from the second through the seventh floors. The clinics program is a basic and essential function in the medical teaching curriculum. The present clinic service capacity is adequate to handle a senior class of approximately 75. In 1961, it is proposed to increase the senior class to 100 which can be accomplished only by curtailing the clinics program available to each individual student. Ultimately, it is planned to increase the class to 125. The clinics addition will permit the restoration of the previous level of clinics teaching available to each student as well as provide for the additional 25. Other programs that depend upon the clinical facilities involve postgraduate interns, residents and fellows, student nurses in the masters degree program and students in the dental program. Assuming that the existing facilities provided an appropriate ratio for the current senior class, then the expansion in class size would appear to justify additional facilities.

However, we have examined the preliminary plans and specifications and have raised certain questions concerning design features which appear to us to be excessively costly. These questions have not as yet been resolved. *Consequently, even though only working drawings are involved, we cannot recommend this amount.*

Santa Barbara Campus

pp. Equip library unit 2----- \$191,000

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$1,415,400 for the construction of an addition to the library on this campus. The addition is now scheduled for completion by December of 1961. Hence it is necessary to provide funds at this time for equipping the building so that the new space may be put to use. While the amount proposed appears to be commensurate with the size and type of project, we have not seen the equipment list

University of California—Continued

and have no way of knowing whether any items contained therein might be considered expendable or as having a comparatively short life.

In line with our comments preceding the capital outlay analysis, concerning the propriety of financing expendable or short-lived equipment from bond funds, we would recommend that this list be scrutinized and divided into two classes as required, *the financing to come then from bond funds or General Fund as indicated.*

qq. Construct classroom wing of classroom and office unit 2 \$1,074,600

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$1,006,000 for the working drawings for a two-wing classroom and office building and for the construction of the office unit. The construction of the classroom wing was deferred because enrollment projections did not warrant the additional space. It is now proposed to build the classroom wing which is basically two structures, one being a two-story concrete frame with concrete block wall building having a tile roof and containing most of the space, the other being a one-story, concrete frame and concrete block building housing a large lecture room with 144 seating capacity. The gross area of the project is approximately 41,636 square feet which is estimated to cost \$24.93 for gross square foot for the basic building and \$29.10 per gross square foot for the total project. In a subsequent budget, equipment will be requested which will probably exceed \$105,000. Basically, the building is a conventional classroom building having no laboratory spaces requiring expensive equipment utilities. The only exception is a large computer laboratory having the characteristic special grid-type floor which permits a high degree of flexibility in running cable between portions of the equipment. This laboratory also requires refrigerated air conditioning because of the high heat output of the computer equipment. The capacity of the building will be 562 F.T.E. in teaching and research laboratories for the Departments of Anthropology, Sociology, Economics, Political Science and general assignment space.

For a comparatively simple building, we believe that the cost indicated is excessive. We have raised questions concerning some of the design features and construction details as indicated by the preliminary plans and specifications. These questions have not as yet been resolved. Furthermore, in view of our comments preceding the capital outlay analysis concerning the possibility of a more intensive utilization of existing classroom and laboratory space at the university and the state colleges, we would question the necessity for the building at this time. *Consequently, we cannot recommend the amount.*

rr. Construct utilities and site development----- \$208,800

This project represents a series of jobs intended to upgrade certain specific areas of the campus, particularly from the standpoint of improving lighting conditions at night. Some areas of roads and walks totaling over 10,000 feet are without adequate lighting making nighttime automobile and pedestrian traffic hazardous particular in foggy weather. Included also are the construction of certain walks and curbs and some planting, all intended to improve the general site conditions

University of California—Continued

and eliminate maintenance problems that arise from muddy conditions in rainy weather and drifting dirt in dry weather.

Finally, one involves the replacement of overhead electrical and telephone lines with underground ducts and vaults totaling about \$41,000 in cost. While we believe all the other portions of this project have sufficient merit to justify their financing at this time, we doubt that the replacement of the overhead lines can be justified at this time. *Consequently, we recommend that this project be reduced by \$41,000, leaving a total of \$167,800 to be financed.*

ss. *Construct central laboratory for radioactive material*----- \$666,000

This project proposes the design, working drawings and construction of a two-story, reinforced concrete frame and concrete block walled building of rather unusual and elaborate design, containing a gross area of 12,674 square feet. The cost is estimated at \$38.11 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$53.34 per gross square foot for the complete project, exclusive of agency-furnished equipment. Subsequently, equipment will be requested in amounts probably exceeding \$260,000. The capacity of the building will be 68 F.T.E. Basically, the building is almost completely laboratory space devoted to the handling of radioactive materials in connection with instruction and research in physics, chemistry and biology. The building includes air conditioning which is apparently necessary because of the delicate and critical nature of the experiments being performed which require controlled temperatures and humidities. We have examined the preliminary plans and specifications which we feel indicate an excessively elaborate building, further borne out by the high cost quoted above. We have raised certain questions which have not as yet been resolved. *Consequently, we cannot recommend the amount.*

tt. *Land acquisition* ----- \$596,700

This proposal represents part of the cost of a purchase of 111 acres contiguous to the campus to permit expansion to the west. The total cost is quoted as being \$1,560,000. We have received no details or other information on this project. The University's five-year capital outlay program for the years 1961 to 1966 published on July 1, 1960 includes no mention of additional land in Santa Barbara, except in the year 1964-65 when \$250,000 is proposed for acquisition of 60 acres adjacent to the campus and 20 acres for a biology growing area. The latter presumably is not immediately contiguous to the campus since the amount proposed for the 20 acres is \$150,000, whereas only \$100,000 is proposed for the 60 acres.

The general plan for this campus, thus far, has been to keep the buildings at the two-story level, thus making poor use of the existing property which is quite extensive. We would suggest that if the land already owned by the campus is proving to be inadequate for its ultimate growth, that consideration be given to multistory buildings in order to avoid the purchase of additional land at \$15,000 an acre. *In view of the lack of information on this subject, we cannot recommend approval.*

State College System
ALAMEDA STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 358 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 763

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT; ALA-
MEDA STATE COLLEGE FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PRO-
GRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$9,115,300
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	9,075,300
Reduction	\$40,000

ANALYSIS

This item will provide three major construction projects and one equipment project as follows:

a. *Construct fine arts building* \$2,356,500

This project involves the construction of a building which will have a total cost of \$2,393,000. Part of this gross cost has already been provided through an appropriation made in the Budget Act of 1960 for working drawings. However not enough credit has been taken for this and the figure should be adjusted downward. The gross area of the building will be 106,947 square feet and it is basically a reproduction of the fine arts building already constructed and in use on the campus of the San Fernando Valley State College, which was designed by a private architect. The original plan had a number of excessively expensive features, some of which will be eliminated in the working drawings for the new project. Others would be impractical to eliminate since a substantial redesign might be involved. Construction is generally of reinforced poured-in-place concrete with some brick exterior walls and some metal-panelled curtain wall particularly in the office wing portion of the building. The cost of the basic building is estimated at \$17.85 per gross square foot and the complete project will run approximately \$22.37 per square foot. Since this is a totally new site there are fairly substantial costs for utility runs as well as general site development to provide lawns, walks, planting, irrigation systems, etc.

While the project is labelled fine arts building, initially it will serve many purposes including home economics, art, business and executive and student personnel functions. Initially, its constructional capacity will be 1,018 F.T.E. As extraneous activities are phased out of the building and into other new construction the F.T.E. capacity will change. *Since this is part of the orderly development of this new campus, for which no other capacity exists, and since the cost appears to be commensurate with the size and character of the project, we recommend approval.*

b. *Construct science building* \$5,415,000

This project involves the construction of a building whose total cost is estimated to be \$5,497,900 part of which has already been provided by a working drawings appropriation in the 1960 Budget Act. However insufficient credit has been taken for this and the amount should be

State College System—Continued

adjusted downward. The building will have a gross area of 201,141 square feet and is an almost exact reproduction of the building designed and constructed by the Division of Architecture on the campus of the San Fernando Valley State College. However, certain changes will be required because of the fact that initially the building will house subjects other than sciences since the basic design has a capacity of 700 F.T.E. in science fields only. Initially, the building will house, in addition to science, music education, library and audio-visual functions. Therefore, the initial instructional capacity will be approximately 624 F.T.E. In order to accommodate the library, the building will have a basement which is in addition to the original plan as it was constructed at San Fernando Valley.

The basic building is estimated to cost \$18.65 per gross square foot and the total project including fixed laboratory equipment will cost \$27.33 per square foot. This also takes into account substantial site development and utility runs.

The design consists of two wings of three stories and basement each of poured-in-place reinforced concrete throughout. The project represents part of the orderly development of a new campus where no other capacity now exists. *In view of the foregoing and since the cost is commensurate with the size, location and character of the project, we recommend approval.*

c. Site development ----- \$943,800

The Budget Act of 1957 provided \$1,650,000 for the acquisition of a site for Alameda State College and for initial development to the extent possible from any surplus remaining after acquisition. The Budget Act of 1958 provided \$830,108 for initial development. In addition, the Public Works Board provided approximately \$400,000 from augmentation funds.

At this time it appears that the total acquisition cost including all services and charges will probably come to \$1,550,000. The remainder of all the moneys provided will be approximately \$1,300,000 which will be applied towards the basic development of the site. The property is rolling and sometimes precipitous hilltop land requiring very substantial earth movements which will serve both to provide reasonably level areas for construction and to fill in canyons and swales which will provide additional level areas for parking and other purposes. As of this writing, the project for the rough grading and other basic work is about to go to bid and it is estimated that the cost should be somewhat under \$1,300,000. In addition to the rough grading, there is a great deal of other site development work that must be performed such as bringing in water, sewerage, gas, power, roads, walks, campus lighting, etc.

The project now proposed is the first phase of two which basically will provide drainage facilities and structures, steam distribution services, plumbing services which include water lines, gas lines and sewerage lines, main electrical distribution services and a switch house including extensive electrical main switch gear.

State College System—Continued

it appears that the request is justified at this time. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

b. *Equip corporation yard*----- \$19,540

This request is part of the project immediately preceding and involves items of equipment which are not now available due to lack of space. However, there may be some items in the list which have a comparatively short life or may be expendable. *Consequently, we believe the list should be reviewed in the light of our statement on the subject preceding the capital outlay analysis.*

c. *Working drawings for remodeling library*----- \$20,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$1,035,100 for the construction of a new library on a more centrally located site, since the existing library is not readily expandable. It is now proposed to convert the existing library building to standard classroom use. Its size is such that it is anticipated that it will develop a capacity of 710 F.T.E. Working drawings only are needed at this time since the schedule of evacuation of this building and removal to the new library is such that construction need not be funded until the 1962 budget request. *We recommend approval.*

d. *Construct outdoor physical education facility*----- \$226,400

There is apparently a discrepancy in both the description of this project as contained in the printed budget and in the amount of money shown. To the best of our knowledge, there will be no parking spaces provided as part of the project. Secondly, the current estimate for the project involves \$202,700 rather than that shown in the printed budget. We believe that both of these are oversights and should be corrected.

The development involved in the project includes the construction of six tennis courts, four handball courts completely roofed and one comfort station near the main playfield. The handball courts will be backed up to one of the blank walls of the men's gymnasium. The comfort station is a very simple wood frame stucco building with one concrete wall and a wood roof and concrete floor. It will provide facilities for both men and women where none now exist and where the closest are a very substantial distance away from the field. The six tennis courts involve a substantial earth moving problem since the location is a rather difficult one. Consequently, their cost is comparatively high. Also, some adjacent slopes are so steep as to require Guniting to protect them.

The facilities proposed are part of the standard physical education plan of each state college and, consequently, they appear to be justified on the basis of uniformity of facilities. The cost appears to be in line with the nature of the project and the difficult location. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

e. *Working drawings for Marine Fisheries Laboratory*----- \$32,550

The Budget Act of 1960 provided funds for the purchase of a new site, removed from the campus, on which a marine fisheries laboratory could be constructed. A site is now under negotiation at Trinidad some 15 miles from Arcata. The property is on a bluff directly overlooking

State College System—Continued

the ocean and west of the highway. Site problems will be comparatively difficult and the peculiar problems of a laboratory requiring large volumes of salt water as well as fresh need to be thoroughly explored before any design can be finalized. Consequently, it is proposed to provide only working drawings at this time with construction to be requested in the 1962 Budget.

The ultimate building will probably contain between 6,500 and 7,000 gross square feet and with its highly specialized facilities will probably cost in excess of \$550,000 for the total project. This would indicate that the total project, including all of the site development and the salt water supplies, might run as high as \$80 per square foot of gross building area. It should also be pointed out that the F.T.E. capacity of this unit will be approximately 10. The wildlife and fisheries curriculum at Humboldt State College is comparatively unique as far as the state colleges go. Also it is doubtful that any other college, public or private in the State of California offers this type of curriculum which at Humboldt State College is considered to be among the best in the nation. In view of this we believe there is justification for proceeding with this project. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

f. Construct surface parking----- \$133,500

This project proposes the construction of a parking area on the north perimeter of the campus below the new dormitory buildings and down in the canyon of Jolly Giant Creek. The design is somewhat unique in that it involves replacing a portion of the creek with a 54-inch reinforced concrete pipe culvert and then filling the area over this to create parking area. The total area will provide facilities for 300 cars. Also involved will be stairways from the parking lot to the campus since there will be about a 70-foot differential in elevation. The actual total cost will be \$181,100, the difference being made up by a \$45,000 appropriation for parking that was made in the Budget Act of 1960 and \$2,600 that was allowed for preliminary plans. This will result in a cost of approximately \$603 per parking space. In view of the site difficulties, the cost estimate appears to be in line with the problem.

Since a considerable amount of existing parking on this campus has been obliterated by the construction of buildings, additional parking to compensate must be provided. A fee will be charged for the space and the project represents a continuing program of plowing back into new parking the fees collected from existing parking. *In view of the foregoing, we recommend approval.*

g. Equip education-psychology building----- \$115,200

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$663,500 for the construction of a new education-psychology classroom building. This project is estimated to be ready for occupancy by January of 1962. Consequently, it is necessary to provide funds at this time for the purchase of the conventional equipment for such a building. While we have not as yet seen the equipment list, the amount appears to be reasonably commensurate with the

State College System—Continued

size of the project. However, we would question whether all of the items contained therein are properly financed by bond funds. Consequently, in line with our statement preceding the capital outlay analysis, we believe the list should be reviewed to determine which portion should be bond funds and which portion should be general funds. *Furthermore, we would recommend approval subject to a more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance prior to expenditure of any funds.*

h. Equip library building----- \$122,100

The Budget Act of 1960 provided over \$1 million for the construction of a new library having a capacity of over 110,000 volumes and 665 reader stations. On a formula basis this would provide facilities for an F.T.E. enrollment of 2,700. The present enrollment projection for the fall of 1964 is 2,070 F.T.E. Consequently, it appears that the basic buildings will serve for some years beyond that.

It is now proposed to provide for the additional equipment including books which would be required by the larger facility as compared with the existing library. However, we would question whether the list, which we have not yet seen, contains items having a short life or being comparatively expendable which should therefore not be purchased by bond funds in accordance with our statement preceding the capital outlay analysis. *Furthermore, we recommend that the approval of the item be given subject to a more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before actual expenditures are made.*

i. Equip engineering curricula----- \$88,475

The State Board of Education recently approved an engineering curriculum for this campus. It is our understanding that temporarily this curriculum will be established in whatever space can be made available. Eventually it will move into the existing corporation building which is a reinforced concrete structure and would serve engineering quite well.

We have not seen the list of equipment as yet but the sum requested appears to be reasonably commensurate with such programs. However, the list may contain items which should not properly be financed from bond funds in accordance with our statement preceding the capital outlay analysis. *Furthermore, we suggest approval of the item subject to a more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before actual expenditures are made.*

State College System

LONG BEACH STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 362 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 772

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
LONG BEACH STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION
PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	-----	\$1,140,875
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	-----	No change

State College System—Continued

ANALYSIS

This item provides for one working drawings project for future construction and four equipment projects for facilities that have already been funded as follows:

a. Working drawings for health service building----- \$43,600

The present student health facilities at this campus are in temporary and makeshift areas. The campus is expected to have an enrollment in excess of 10,000 by the fall of 1964. Consequently, it would appear that in order to provide the same level of service on this campus as is being provided on other state college campuses, a regular student health building is justified. It is proposed at this time to provide only for working drawings with construction funds to be requested in the 1962 Budget. The ultimate cost of the project will probably be in the vicinity of \$700,000. It is anticipated that it will be designed along lines similar to buildings provided at other state colleges and using the same standards of 70 square feet for treatment rooms and 70 square feet for doctors' offices in suites of three as was established by the Legislature two years ago. *We recommend approval.*

b. Equip engineering building, second increment----- \$761,800

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$1,660,000 for the construction of an engineering building to house a newly approved curriculum in engineering. The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$150,000 as a first increment of equipment to be used in temporary facilities to start an engineering, teaching program before the availability of the permanent building. The current completion date is estimated as February of 1962. Many items of equipment required for an engineering curriculum either have to be specially fabricated or ordered many months in advance of delivery because of the highly specialized nature of the items. Consequently, it is proposed at this time to provide funds for the second increment for this building.

While we have not seen the equipment list, the amount proposed is fairly commensurate with the size and type of project involved and reflects the high cost of equipping an engineering program. It is possible that there are items in this list which are not properly financed out of bond funds because of their short life or expendability. In line with the statement we have made concerning this, just preceding the capital outlay analysis, we would recommend a review of the list for the purposes of segregating the items into two classes. *Furthermore, we would recommend approval contingent upon a more intensive review by the Department of Finance before expenditures actually occur.*

c. Equip administration addition----- \$17,750

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$523,700 for the construction of an addition to the administration building to take care of the increasing demands for administrative space on a growing campus. The present estimate of completion of the project is October of 1961. Consequently, it is necessary at this time to provide funds for the additional office equipment which would be required.

State College System—Continued

While we have not seen the list of items, the amount requested appears to be commensurate with the size of the project. Also, we are assuming that it probably contains no items which would not be properly financed by bond funds. *Consequently, we recommend approval, subject to a more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before actual expenditures are made.*

d. Equip fine arts wing No. 3----- \$260,945

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$1,559,500 for the construction of another wing of the fine arts complex. The project is now scheduled for completion in February of 1962. Consequently, it is necessary to provide funds at this time for the usual complement of equipment for a project of this type.

While we have not seen the equipment list as of this time, we make the *same recommendations with respect to it, involving the propriety of the use of bond funds and more intensive scrutiny before expenditures are made.*

e. Equip science wing No. 3, second increment----- \$56,780

The Budget Act of 1958 provided \$3,721,000 for the construction of the third unit of the science building complex which is now scheduled for completion by August of 1961. The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$880,200 for the first increment of equipment for this building, representing generally those items requiring either special fabrication or long delivery periods. It is now proposed to provide funds for the second and probably the final increment of equipment which can be purchased on fairly short notice.

While we have not seen the equipment list, we presume that it may very likely contain many items which are normally considered expendable or having a comparatively short life. Consequently, we make the same recommendation with respect to the use of bond funds as has been made elsewhere. *Furthermore, we recommend approval, only subject to a more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before actual expenditures are made.*

State College System

LOS ANGELES STATE COLLEGE OF APPLIED ARTS AND SCIENCES

ITEM 363 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 774

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, LOS ANGELES STATE COLLEGE OF APPLIED ARTS AND SCIENCES FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$2,388,500
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	2,088,500
Reduction	\$300,000

State College System—Continued
ANALYSIS

This item will provide for two working drawings projects, one construction project, one site acquisition project and an equipment project for previously funded construction as follows:

a. Working drawings for engineering addition (partial)----- \$100,000

Under existing utilization standards and with the current mix of curricula it is proposed to round out this campus to somewhere between 16,000 and 17,000 F.T.E. as being the maximum that can be accommodated on a comparatively cramped site. To accommodate the projected magnitude of the engineering curriculum it is proposed to take over the existing industrial arts building, add to it and convert the entire unit into additional engineering facilities. The present proposal involves working drawings for the addition to the existing industrial arts building. Subsequently, there will be other proposals to convert the existing building to straight engineering use.

Industrial arts is proposed to be moved into a new building to be designed and constructed and referred to as Classroom Building No. 2. The size of the latter building has not yet been determined since the entire question of capacity is unresolved. In our statement immediately preceding the capital outlay analysis section, we have made reference to problems of the adequacy of utilization of college classroom space and the possibilities of more effective utilization. While engineering facilities have a notoriously poor ratio of F.T.E. capacity to size and cost of the facilities, we believe there is still room for improvement in the intensity of use. Consequently, we would recommend that there be no further expansion at this time until attempts have been made to increase the utilization of existing facilities and then a new evaluation of needs be made. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval of this project.*

b. Working drawings for Classroom Building No. 2 (partial) \$200,000

This project would provide for a new classroom building which, as has been mentioned above, will house the industrial arts program as well as other classroom facilities. *We make the same recommendations with respect to this project as in the engineering addition above.*

c. Construct snack bar----- \$380,500

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$310,000 for working drawings and the Budget Act of 1960 provided \$5,304,000 for construction of Classroom Building No. 1 which was designed to have a capacity probably exceeding 5,100 F.T.E. The present gross cost of the building is estimated to exceed \$6 million and its completion date is scheduled for September of 1962.

In consideration of the fact that the building would have a total F.T.E. capacity, in one unit, which is as great as if not greater than many complete colleges, it was decided that it would be practical and economical to provide an eating facility somewhere within the building. Otherwise it would have been necessary to either expand the existing cafeteria or to build another cafeteria in order to take care of the additional population that would result. Since the building is designed to

State College System—Continued

have escalators it was believed that the ideal location for a branch cafeteria or feeding facility would be on the roof of the building and, consequently, the basic building includes the rough exterior shell and roof of such a feeding facility.

The project proposed here involves the finishing of this area which includes a set of escalators from the fifth floor to the roof, one up and one down, and the kitchen equipment. Also, all of the electrical, plumbing and heating and ventilating work is included since the basic building contract provided only a bare exterior shell. The seating capacity will be approximately 530 under cover with additional capacity on open roof areas. The operational plan for this unit is to provide what is essentially a snack bar including short orders. No major cooking work will be done in it and no major food preparation will occur. Many prepared items will be brought over from the main cafeteria. We believe that to have provided a conventional facility in a separate building having the same capacity and with the same operational plan would have cost 25 to 30 percent more than will be expended in this case including both the cost of the bare shell and the cost of the finishing. Furthermore, it would not have had the convenience and usefulness of this facility placed as it is at a point of ready access from any part of the entire building. The finishing details are kept simple and economical, although durable and easy to maintain. The cost appears to be in line with the size and character of the project. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

d. Site acquisition and construction—parking----- \$1,258,000

While the title of this project includes construction, the basic appropriation would be for acquisition of an area to the north of and at a lower elevation than the existing campus where there is now extensive but obsolescent, modest residential development. The area is essential to provide the additional parking space that will be required for an enrollment exceeding 16,000 F.T.E. The total cost of the acquisition may exceed the amount being requested. However, it is recognized that it will not be possible to acquire all the property within the budget year due to the fact that it is composed of many single family parcels. The construction of temporary parking on such parts as can be quickly acquired will be financed from the General Fund, by an item for working drawings for a multistoried parking structure provided in the 1960 Budget Act.

It would seem that there is little choice in this matter since any attempt to construct multistory parking would result in a cost per car space that would exceed the cost of acquiring this property and constructing simple, inexpensive surface parking. The existing large surface parking on the campus level is in a filled area and was never designed to take heavy structures. To provide multilevel parking in this area would result in a very costly structure having expensive pile foundations. *In view of the foregoing, we recommend approval of this project.*

State College System—Continued

e. Equip science building, phase 2----- \$450,000

The main science building at this campus was originally funded in 1956. The Budget Act of 1958 provided \$930,000 as the first increment for equipping this building on the premise that the entire building would not initially be devoted to science. Subsequently, as the science program grew and nonscience activities were phased out of the building, additional science activities would have to be equipped in subsequent budgets.

It is now proposed to provide the second and probably the final increment of equipment for this building. We have not seen the equipment list and although the amount seems to be commensurate with the size of the program, we would raise questions as to possible items included which are not properly funded from bond sources. *Furthermore, we would recommend approval only contingent upon a more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before actual expenditures are made.*

**State College System
ORANGE COUNTY STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 364 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 775

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
ORANGE COUNTY STATE COLLEGE FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$8,543,400
Legislative Analyst's recommendation ----- No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for one major construction project and one working drawings project for a future building as follows:

a. Construct science building and boiler plant----- \$8,293,400

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$550,000 for working drawings for a science building with boiler plant attached wherein initially the science building would in affect be a multipurpose classroom, administration and library building and the boiler plant portion would be physically sized to take all of the ultimate equipment required for the fully developed campus. The total gross cost of the project including all architectural fees is now estimated at approximately \$9,454,500 which will produce a six story and basement block-type building with an adjoining boiler house which would be the equivalent of approximately two stories. Construction would be poured-in-place, reinforced concrete throughout, with the exception of the boiler plant portion which would be of concrete and steel framing. The main building would have a gross area of 300,600 square feet and the boiler plant, 11,190 square feet. Initially, the building will house 1,990 F.T.E. plus administrative space, student personnel space, library and other noninstructional spaces. Ultimately, when it is fully utilized as a science building, it will have a capacity of 1,580 F.T.E. in science.

State College System—Continued

The overall cost mentioned above reflects the fact that the initial laboratory equipment is substantially less than that which will be required when the entire building is devoted to science. From time to time as nonscience activities are phased out of the building, additional amounts will be requested to convert space to science use. The amount being requested in this budget reflects credit for the working drawing money that was provided in the 1960 Budget Act and also reflects the fact that the boiler plant is being provided as a mere shell in this portion. Since the construction timing of the basic building is such that funding of the boilers, air conditioning refrigeration equipment and other auxiliary boiler equipment would not be required until the 1962 Budget Session, these items have been eliminated from the current request. This approach is a proper financing technique to avoid appropriating funds which would merely lie idle or to avoid the installation of equipment which would go unused for a year or more.

The cost estimates for the finished project are \$20.25 per gross square foot for the basic main building and \$28.52 per square foot for the main building total project. The cost of the boiler house would be approximately \$19.30 per square foot for the basic building and over \$78.00 when all equipment is installed. As has been pointed out, the boiler building is large enough to accommodate additional boilers as the campus expands and also additional refrigeration equipment.

It has been mentioned that air conditioning is involved in this project. This is based on the fact that the main building will be designed as a "block" type with a great deal of internal, windowless space. The economics of such a design are such that the gross cost including air conditioning is no more than the conventional design without air conditioning.

Since this is a new campus and no other space exists for anticipated enrollments with the exception of temporary buildings capable of accommodating between 500 and 700 F.T.E., we believe that the construction of this project is justified. *Furthermore, since the cost appears to be in line with the size and character of the project we recommend approval.*

b. *Working drawings for music-speech-drama building----- \$250,000*

The project mentioned immediately above will temporarily provide space for music, speech and drama facilities. However, these facilities are the most difficult to incorporate into a building not specially designed for them. Consequently, it is proposed that they be the first to be phased out of the building. Therefore, this proposal is for working drawings for a building which will exclusively house music, speech and drama. The ultimate plant resulting from these working drawings will probably cost in excess of \$3,500,000 and will provide capacity for approximately 531 F.T.E. *We recommend approval.*

**State College System
SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 365 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 776

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEGE FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$140,435
Legislative Analyst's recommendation ----- No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for one project of working drawings for a future building and one equipment project for a building already funded as follows:

a. Working drawings for music building addition ----- \$95,000

This project contemplates the design and working drawings for a new music building with a gross area probably exceeding 70,000 square feet and a gross ultimate cost probably exceeding \$2,500,000. The present music facilities are contained in a building which houses the little theater and speech-drama activities. There are an inadequate number of rehearsal rooms and no music recital hall. The highly specialized character of these facilities makes it difficult to evaluate them on the usual basis of space utilization. The growing enrollment at this campus, particularly in music, requires more of these specialized areas. Consequently, there appears to be justification for providing a separate complete facility for the music curriculum. The original plan was to attempt to add a wing to the existing speech-drama building, but tight and difficult site problems would result in a poor facility with little opportunity for future expansion. *In view of the foregoing, we recommend approval of this project.*

b. Equip women's gymnasium ----- \$45,435

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$1,031,800 for the construction of a new women's gymnasium in order to free the existing gymnasium for exclusive use by men. Present estimates of completion date indicate that the project will be ready for occupancy by December of 1961. Consequently, it is necessary at this time to provide funds for equipping the new building.

While we have not seen the equipment list, it would appear that the amount requested is reasonably commensurate with the size of the project. However, we question whether there are items in the list which would not be properly financed from bond funds. In any case, we would recommend approval only contingent upon a more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before the actual expenditures are made.

**State College System
SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 366 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 778

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, SAN
DIEGO STATE COLLEGE FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PRO-
GRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$1,056,500
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	876,500
Reduction	\$180,000

ANALYSIS

This item will provide two construction projects, two working drawings projects one equipment project for a previously funded building as follows:

a. Working drawings for classroom building..... \$180,000

This project proposes the design and working drawings for a multi-story classroom building which will have a capacity for 2,155 F.T.E. in business administration and mathematics. The ultimate cost of such a building will probably exceed \$2,500,000.

The existing and funded F.T.E. capacity at this campus based on existing utilization standards, is 8,945. The enrollment for the Fall of 1964 is projected at 11,220 F.T.E., leaving a gap of approximately 2,300 F.T.E. However, as we have noted in our statement preceding the capital outlay analysis, there is reason to believe that a more intensive utilization of existing space can be achieved. If this can be done, in all probability the capacity by 1964 would be adequate for the anticipated enrollment. Consequently, we believe that no additional capacity should be provided for on this campus, at this time, unless it can be demonstrated that it is impossible to increase the utilization of existing facilities. *Therefore, we recommend deferral of this project.*

b. Construct boiler addition..... \$123,500

The present boiler plant at this institution consists of two boilers, one of which was installed in 1954 and the other in 1958. The design capacity of both boilers is approximately 25,000 pounds of steam per hour. However, the older boiler is incapable of generating this maximum because of inadequately sized control valves and an inadequately sized draft fan. As a result, the total practical capacity of the two boilers is about 40,000 pounds. This is further reduced by the limiting effect of the capacity of the deaerating feedwater heater which prevents the plant from generating more than 38,500 pounds per hour. Apparently all other auxiliary equipment is adequately sized to permit generating as high as 75,000 pounds per hour. The calculated demand of existing and funded buildings is approximately 45,000 pounds per hour, indicating a deficiency as well as total lack of standby.

It is proposed, therefore, to install a third boiler of the package type having a capacity of approximately 52,500 pounds per hour in an existing space which is large enough for the purpose. In addition,

State College System—Continued

corrections will be made to the older boiler to permit its steaming to full capacity as well as replacement of the deaerator to permit maximum efficiency of all boilers.

The cost of the project appears to be commensurate with the size of the equipment involved and the alteration work to be performed on the older boiler. *We recommend approval.*

c. *Equip life science and psychology building—*

first increment ----- \$500,000

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$225,000 for working drawings and the Budget Act of 1960 provided \$3,817,000 for the construction of a life sciences—psychology addition to the existing complex. This was to provide capacity for approximately 1,020 F.T.E. in the subject fields involved. The current estimated date of completion is September of 1962 indicating the necessity to provide for certain items of basic equipment in this budget.

While we have not seen the equipment list, the amount proposed appears to be reasonably commensurate with the size of the project, as a first increment. Also, we would assume that the first increment would contain almost entirely items having a rather long life expectancy. However, we cannot be certain of this and, consequently, we feel that it should be reviewed for the purpose of determining whether any items in the list are more properly financed out of the General Fund rather than the bond funds. *Furthermore, we would recommend approval only contingent upon a more intensive review before actual expenditures are made.*

d. *Working drawings for little theater*----- \$80,000

This project proposes the design and working drawings for a little theater having 250 seats with an F.T.E. capacity rating of 114. To date, we have seen no program for this project, although we recognize that the existing facilities at this growing campus are becoming increasingly inadequate. We also recognize that this type of facility cannot be measured in the same utilization terms as regular classrooms and laboratories. Consequently, it does not appear that a more intensive utilization of existing space will solve the problem. *In view of the foregoing, we would recommend approval of this proposal contingent upon the submission of a satisfactory program and adequate justification for the facility generally.* Our recommendation is based on the fact that we believe that the project will be speeded up by this approach and time will be saved.

e. *Construct parking—phase 1*----- \$173,000

The continued enrollment expansion at this campus requires constant additions to the parking facilities for which, under present policies, the students are required to pay to use the space. The project actually involves a total of 700 car spaces, 500 of which are already existing, but are in an area which requires regrading in order to be able to add 200 more. The final result of this expenditure will be an area totaling 700 cars, an increase of 200, with an inexpensive oiled surface, plus

State College System—Continued

certain stairways, drainage facilities, aerial lighting, etc. Ultimately, regular surfacing will be requested for the site.

Since parking areas at this institution are at a premium, particularly because of very difficult topographic problems, the cost appears to be reasonable for the amount of work involved in producing the added spaces. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

State College System

SAN FERNANDO VALLEY STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 367 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 781

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, SAN
FERNANDO VALLEY STATE COLLEGE FROM THE STATE CON-
STRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$9,246,590
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	9,046,590
Reduction	\$200,000

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for one site acquisition project, three construction projects, two projects for working drawings for future buildings and one equipment project for an already funded building as follows:

a. *Site acquisition* \$1,300,000

This project proposes the purchase of 55 acres immediately adjacent to the existing campus boundary to be used for the development of parking in the near future. There is every indication that this land if not purchased by the State will shortly go into subdivision development which will increase its value substantially above the current estimate of \$25,000 an acre. Since the ultimate plan for this campus is for 20,000 F.T.E., it is apparent that a very large acreage will be required for parking purposes. The cost to buy this land and to develop it for parking, since it is flat, easy terrain, will probably not exceed \$300 to \$350 per car space. The cost of a multistory parking structure would average \$1,200 a car space. Furthermore, under present policies, the students and faculty using these state-provided parking spaces pay an annual charge. *Consequently, we believe that it would be good business and to the State's advantage to provide for the purchase of this property at this time.*

b. *Construct classroom building No. 1* \$7,108,040

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$358,960 for the design and working drawings development for a building which would become the largest single building on the campus and would be the first building devoted almost exclusively to typical classrooms as compared to most of the other buildings already constructed which are specialized, such as science, music, speech, art, etc. This building is contemplated as a three-wing structure in which the two classroom wings would be con-

State College System—Continued

nected by a faculty office wing to form a U shape. The classroom wings would be three stories of block-type construction design and the faculty wing would probably be about seven stories. Construction would be generally of reinforced concrete, poured in place with inexpensive interior partitions permitting easy changes in the future. The gross area would be approximately 317,209 square feet and at basic building level is estimated to cost \$18.78 per square foot and \$23.54 per square foot at total gross project cost. It should also be pointed out that since the design involves the so-called block type with a substantial portion of interior classroom space, air conditioning is automatically included. It should be reiterated that experience indicates that a block-type design including air conditioning is no more costly and sometimes less costly than a conventional design with all exterior space without air conditioning.

The present and funded capacity on this campus available by the fall of 1964 is 4,237 F.T.E. The enrollment projected for the same date is 7,450. It does not seem possible that this gap can be closed by a more intensive utilization of existing space in accordance with the statements we have made preceding our capital outlay analysis. This building would add almost 4,700 F.T.E. capacity, making a total of approximately 9,000 F.T.E. capacity which would be about 1,500 more than the projected enrollment for 1964. Despite this fact and in the hope that a more intensive utilization will actually increase the available capacity beyond the 9,000, we would still recommend constructing this project at the size designed. It is now an economical cohesive, integrated plan. Any attempt to rearrange it on a piecemeal basis would, we feel sure, result in much higher costs and possibly a less satisfactory building. *Consequently, we recommend approval of the project as submitted.*

c. Working drawings for engineering building----- \$250,000

This project involves the design and preparation of working drawings for a building to house engineering laboratories as well as some general classrooms. The size of the project is intended to provide space for 971 F.T.E. in engineering curricula as well as some faculty office space. As of this writing, the general shape of the building has not yet been determined although in conferences we have suggested that the building be as compact as possible in order to conserve highly valuable land. The ultimate cost would probably exceed \$4 million for the building at total project level with about \$1,500,000 in equipment to follow.

In view of the fact that engineering curricula are authorized for this campus and the fact that no satisfactory facilities for this field now exists, it would appear to be proper to provide such a building. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

d. Working drawings for administration-classroom building \$200,000

This project contemplates the design and preparation of working drawings for a building which will mainly house administrative offices which is, at present, being thought of as a part two-story and part

State College System—Continued

multistory building. It will contain classrooms which in time will be phased out of the building as the campus grows and other classroom buildings are provided so that ultimately the building will be exclusively for administrative purposes. The ultimate gross cost of the project will probably exceed \$3 million.

At present the administrative office's function is carried on in the top floor of the library building. This was done deliberately in order to provide a library building of a size large enough to justify its construction at one time and to be able to reuse the plans of the library from the Los Angeles campus. It has served admirably in this way and we believe that it can continue to serve in this way for at least one year longer than is contemplated. As we have pointed out in the large classroom project above, the capacity in 1964 will exceed the projected enrollment due to the fact that it is economical to build classroom building number 1 as a large single unit. *Consequently, we believe that consideration for this combination administration and classroom building should be deferred for at least one more year.*

e. Construct outdoor physical education facilities—
augmentation ----- \$148,000

The Budget Act of 1948 provided \$1,579,100 for the construction of a physical education building and outdoor physical education facility. This figure was based on an inadequately developed scope in consideration of the rate of growth of this campus and the ultimate enrollment. Consequently, in the 1960 Budget Act an additional \$1,314,900 was provided for the gymnasium. This left very little for outdoor physical education facilities. In view of the fact that the augmentation is predicated fundamentally on an increase in scope rather than an increase in cost, it was decided that it would be appropriate to ask for the augmentation in the budget rather than from the augmentation fund. We believe that the estimate for the facilities to be provided is reasonable and commensurate with the size of the project. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

f. Construct street improvements ----- \$75,000

The east boundary of the San Fernando Valley campus is Zelzah Avenue, in connection with which certain agreements were reached with the City of Los Angeles for the purposes of widening and straightening. One of these agreements involved paving part of the street immediately adjacent to the campus boundary. The actual work will be done by the city and the cost of this portion will be defrayed by the State. Hence, this request. *We recommend approval.*

g. Equip gymnasium, pool and outdoor physical education --- \$165,550

As mentioned previously the Budget Act of 1958 and 1960 provided funds for the construction of a gymnasium facility together with outdoor physical education features and the Budget Act of 1959 provided \$185,800 for the construction of a swimming pool or more correctly, two swimming pools, one for swimming and one for diving. The gymnasium, the outdoor facilities and the swimming pools are now esti-

State College System—Continued

mated to be ready for occupancy by February of 1962. Hence it is necessary at this time to provide funds for equipping these facilities.

While we have not seen the equipment list, the amount proposed appears to be reasonably commensurate with the size of the projects. However, in line with the statements we made preceding our capital outlay analysis, concerning items of equipment which are not properly financed from bond funds and in view of the fact that equipment for gymnasiums and outdoor facilities usually involves a substantial amount of expendable or short-lived equipment, we believe the list should be reviewed and financed on a split basis. *In any case, we would recommend approval only subject to a more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before actual expenditures are made.*

**State College System
SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 368 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 783

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, SAN
FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION
PROGRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$255,125
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	105,125
Reduction	\$150,000

ANALYSIS

This item will provide three projects for working drawings for future buildings and two equipment projects for buildings already funded as follows:

a. Working drawings for psychology and air science building \$60,000

The project proposed to be funded for working drawings is actually classroom building number 4 and is contemplated as a four-story classroom and office building generally of reinforced concrete construction having a gross area of approximately 52,300 square feet. Its ultimate cost will probably exceed \$1,300,000 including the working drawings and it is estimated to have a total instructional capacity of 162 F.T.E.

In line with our statements preceding the capital outlay analysis concerning space utilization standards at state college campuses and the possibilities for more intensive utilization, and in view of the fact that the existing and funded capacity by the fall of 1964 is 6,793 F.T.E. as compared with an estimated enrollment of 8,650 F.T.E., *we recommend that this project be deferred until it can be demonstrated that it is not possible to increase the intensity of utilization of existing space.*

b. Working drawings for music and speech addition..... \$90,000

This project proposes the design and working drawings for a part two-story and part one-story addition to the existing music-speech

State College System—Continued

building. Construction will generally be of reinforced concrete and will produce a gross building area of approximately 58,000 square feet plus more than 5,000 square feet of unfinished basement area. The gross ultimate cost including working drawings will probably exceed \$1,900,000. The total instructional capacity is estimated at 235 F.T.E.

The spaces involved in this addition are highly specialized, being primarily for music, drama and television productions, the utilization of which are difficult to establish on a strict formula basis. Nevertheless, in line with our statements preceding the capital outlay analysis, concerning the utilization of college space generally and the possibilities of intensification of such utilization, *we believe this project should be deferred until it can be demonstrated that it is not possible to achieve a greater utilization of existing space.*

c. Working drawings for addition to classroom building No. 2 \$20,000

This project proposes the design and working drawings for a lightweight addition to the top of existing classroom building number 2 which was originally designed by a private architect. The additional space would be used exclusively for faculty offices. The cost of construction will probably exceed \$450,000. Since the number of faculty is based on a student faculty ratio and not on the intensity of use of academic and teaching space, it appears that there is justification for the additional offices to house faculty needed for an expanding enrollment. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

d. Equip multistoried parking facility----- \$10,125

The Budget Act of 1959 provided a lump sum authorization to the Department of Finance for the financing of the parking facilities on various campuses in connection with the college dormitory program. Of this authorization \$2½ million was allocated to the construction of a multistory garage on this campus, having a capacity of 2,000 cars. The allocation was subsequently reduced by almost \$1 million and the capacity was reduced to 1,500 cars. This project is now expected to be ready for use by December of 1961.

The use of the parking spaces by students and faculty will be based on annual charges which will accrue to the General Fund. We have not as yet seen the list of equipment involved, but we would assume that some of it may have a short life or be practically of an expendable nature. Consequently, and particularly in view of the fact that earnings from the structure accrue to the General Fund, we would recommend that this equipment project be funded from the General Fund. *Furthermore, we would recommend approval subject to more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before actual expenditures are made.*

e. Equip engineering curricula—second increment----- \$75,000

This proposal apparently results from the expansion of the engineering curriculum at this campus as approved by the State Board of Education. We have not seen the equipment list nor do we have any basis for judging its validity. In addition, there may be items included

State College System—Continued

which are not properly financed from bond funds. However, since we may assume that some of this equipment is required for the expanded curriculum, *we would recommend approval only contingent upon a more intensive scrutiny of the equipment list before actual expenditures are made.*

**State College System
SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 369 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 785

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, SAN
JOSE STATE COLLEGE FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PRO-
GRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$2,700,290
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	2,200,290
Reduction	\$500,000

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for one project of working drawings for a future building and two projects of equipment for buildings already funded as follows:

a. Working drawings for science building No. 2..... \$500,000

This project involves the design and working drawings for a building which is contemplated as being of reinforced concrete construction, four stories and basement, and probably having a gross area in excess of 306,000 square feet. This area will support an F.T.E. capacity of 845 in the physical sciences. The ultimate gross cost of the project will probably exceed \$10,500,000.

In view of the statements we have made, just preceding the section of capital outlay analysis concerning classroom and laboratory space utilization and the possibility for intensification of such utilization, and in view of the fact that the presently funded and existing capacity of this institution is 12,240 F.T.E. as compared with a projected enrollment by the fall of 1964 of 12,240 F.T.E., it would appear that this proposal is premature and should be deferred until such time as it can be demonstrated that a more intensive utilization of existing space cannot be accomplished. *Consequently, we recommend deferral of the project.*

b. Equip engineering building—first increment..... \$2,000,000

The Budget Act of 1958 provided \$7,093,000 for the design and construction of an engineering building addition to the existing facilities. The current estimate for the completion date of this building is August of 1962. Consequently, it becomes necessary to provide funds at this time for the basic equipment of such a building.

While we have not as yet seen the equipment list, the amount requested appears to be reasonably commensurate with the size and type

State College System—Continued

of building and program involved. We assume also that the first increment will probably include only those items that will have a long life expectancy. However, we cannot be certain of this and some review should be given to determine if any portion of the list includes items which are more properly financed from the General Fund rather than from bond funds. *Furthermore, we would recommend approval only contingent upon a more intensive review before actual expenditures are made.*

c. Equip aeronautics building----- \$200,290

The Budget Act of 1958 provided \$917,900 for the design and construction of an aeronautics building on a leased site at the San Jose Municipal Airport. It should also be pointed out that the Budget Act of 1959 provided \$352,800 for the construction of and equipment for an aeronautical test cell at the same location. The present estimate indicates completion of the aeronautics building by August of 1962. Consequently, it is necessary at this time to provide funds for the specialized equipment required for such a building.

While we have not seen the equipment list, the amount appears to be commensurate with the size and character of the project. However, we understood previously that a considerable portion of the equipment would be donated or otherwise be made available by the aeronautics industry. *Consequently, we would recommend approval of the item only contingent upon an intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before actual expenditures are made.*

**State College System
STANISLAUS STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 370 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 788

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, WORKING DRAWINGS, STANISLAUS
STATE COLLEGE FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM
FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted -----	\$510,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation -----	No change
Reduction -----	None

ANALYSIS

This item provides for a single project which combines site development and working drawings as follows:

a. Site development and working drawings----- \$510,000

Chapter 1681 of the Statutes of 1957 provided \$500,000 for the acquisition of a site for a new state college in Stanislaus County. The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$200,000 which was for "site acquisition, construction, improvements and equipment."

In December of 1959 the State Public Works Board selected a 220-acre site near the City of Turlock. The cost of this site came to \$400,000

State College System—Continued

and the excess of \$100,000 from the original appropriation went into the bond augmentation fund controlled by Section 16354 of the Government Code. In the meantime, it was decided to start operations on this campus by renting facilities on the Stanislaus County Fair Grounds. These facilities required certain remodeling and alterations, to be done in such a way that the space would readily be put back into use for the fair during fair time. In addition, equipment was required in these rented facilities. The \$200,000 that was provided in the Budget Act of 1960 was used for this purpose. Consequently, no funds were available for any work on the new site.

It is now proposed to provide the sum requested to prepare a master plan of the site, working drawings for a classroom building, a library-cafeteria, outdoor physical education facilities, utilities and some actual development of the site. No preliminary plans are as yet available, but preliminary plans will have to be first approved by the Public Works Board before working drawings can be started. A master plan will also have to be approved by the board. *Consequently, we recommend approval of this item as a logical step in the development of the new campus.*

State College System**CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE**

ITEM 371 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 789

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE FROM THE STATE
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$2,239,400
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	2,010,620
Reduction	\$228,780

ANALYSIS

This item involves one remodeling project, one construction project and four equipment projects for buildings previously funded on the San Luis Obispo Campus and one remodeling project, three construction projects, two working drawings projects for future buildings and three equipment projects for buildings already funded on the Kellogg-Voorhis Campus, as follows:

San Luis Obispo Campus

a. Remodel administration building—phase I..... \$115,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$1,544,000 for the design and construction of a new administration-classroom building on this campus. Present estimates indicate completion of the building will be in September of 1963. Since no remodeling of the existing administration building could take place before all activities had been removed to the new building, it would seem premature to finance alterations in this budget. *Consequently, we recommend deferral to the 1962 Budget.*

State College System—Continued

b. *Equip remodeled administration building*----- \$113,780

Since the remodeling of the existing administration building would produce additional classrooms, additional equipment would be required to make these rooms usable. *In view of our recommendation concerning the preceding project, we would also recommend that this be deferred.*

c. *Site development*----- \$243,030

There has heretofore been provided in excess of \$4 million by legislative appropriation and by augmentation from the Public Works Board for the construction of a dam and water reservoir known as Whale Rock, near San Luis Obispo which was to provide a dependable water supply for the Men's Colony at San Luis Obispo, the California State Polytechnic College campus and the City of San Luis Obispo. The city contributed its commensurate share of the system. The construction included not only the dam and reservoir but a main distribution and pumping line. It is now proposed to provide an on-campus distribution system of the water to become available from this project, to be used for irrigation purposes. This would constitute a first phase of the on-campus distribution and storage and subsequent phases would follow in the future as required and justified. This accounts for the major portion of the request. The balance is for a sewer connection to the city's system. At present, the campus is already discharging into the city sewerage system, but the main line is inadequate and on occasion has caused flooding and backing up. The new line would alleviate the situation. The costs seem to be in line with the size of the project involved and the justification appears satisfactory. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

d. *Equip food processing building*----- \$256,900

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$1,412,600 for the construction of a food processing building. It is now estimated that the building will be ready for occupancy by January of 1962. Hence it is necessary to provide funds for equipping the building at this time.

While we have not seen the equipment list, the amount appears to be reasonably commensurate with the size of the project. However, due to the nature of the project, we believe there is a possibility that the list would contain many items that would be considered expendable or having a comparatively short life which should therefore not be financed from bond funds, in accordance with our statement preceding the capital outlay analysis. *In any case, we would recommend approval of the amount only subject to a more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before actual expenditure of funds.*

e. *Equip physical science building*----- \$137,600

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$611,800 for the construction of an addition to the physical science building. It is presently estimated that the project will be ready for occupancy by September of 1962. Hence it is necessary to provide funds for equipping the new space at this time.

While we have not reviewed the equipment list as of this writing, the amount proposed appears to be reasonably commensurate with the size

State College System—Continued

and type of project. However, it may be that the list contains items which are of an expendable nature or which have a comparatively short life and which therefore should not be financed from bond funds in accordance with our statements preceding the capital outlay analysis. *In any case, we would recommend approval of the amount only subject to a more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before actual expenditures are made.*

f. Equip engineering program, first increment----- \$260,100

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$2,928,300 for the construction of an additional engineering building on this campus. It is presently estimated that the project will be ready for occupancy by September of 1962. Hence it is necessary to provide funds at this time for equipping the new spaces. The amount proposed represents merely a first increment and will probably be those things that require the longest time to procure or fabricate. On this assumption, and the further assumption that the list would not contain items considered expendable or having a short life, *we would recommend approval subject to a more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before actual expenditures are made.*

Kellogg-Voorhis Campus

g. Working drawings for engineering building----- \$200,000

This project involves the design and working drawings development for a new engineering facility which will augment engineering facilities already available on the campus. The design has not as yet been firmed up although we have made suggestions that the building be as compact as possible in order to conserve valuable land. The ultimate gross cost of the project will probably exceed \$3 million.

The existing and funded capacity available on this campus in the fall of 1964 would be 4,075 F.T.E. which is an average figure and does not indicate shortages or overages in specialized space. On the same date it is projected that there will be 5,370 F.T.E. enrollment. While we have suggested the possibility of increasing the capacity of state college institutions by a more intensive utilization of the space, and engineering laboratories generally should lend themselves to a greater hourly utilization the facilities proposed represent kinds of laboratories that are not now available. Consequently, we believe that it would be appropriate to plan for this addition by providing the working drawings at this time. The ultimate project would have a capacity of approximately 919 F.T.E. *We recommend approval.*

h. Working drawings for men's gymnasium and pool----- \$100,000

This project involves the design and development of working drawings for a new gymnasium to permit the existing gymnasium to be used exclusively by women, and a complex of two swimming pools similar to those provided recently at the other state colleges. As of this time, the design for the new gymnasium has not been firmed up, but it may be assumed that the ultimate gross cost of the gymnasium and the pools will probably be in the vicinity of \$1,500,000.

State College System—Continued

Conventional utilization formulas do not apply to gymnasiums and pools which are generally predicated on a percentage of expected total enrollment. It is doubtful whether the existing gymnasium can be used more intensively for instructional purposes during regular class hours, than is now being experienced. Consequently, in line with the continued growth of this campus which is estimated to have an enrollment of 5,370 F.T.E. by the fall of 1964, it would appear that additional gym space is justifiable. The pools are justifiable on the basis that it would provide the same facilities that have been provided in all other state colleges. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

i. Remodel physics building----- \$42,500

This project involves the remodeling of two existing rooms in the physics building which were designed as physics laboratories but were not so used initially. The work involves the installation of laboratory furniture and wall cabinets and related mechanical and electrical work. About half of the cost is involved in fixed laboratory equipment alone.

Since the cost estimate appears to be in line with the nature of the work to be done, we recommend approval.

j. Equip physics building remodeling----- \$67,740

This project is part of the one immediately preceding and the amount requested appears to be commensurate with the normal high cost experienced in equipping complex scientific laboratories.

While we have not had the opportunity to examine the equipment list, it seems possible that some of the items may be considered expendable or as having a short life and, therefore, not properly financed from bond funds in accordance with our observations preceding the capital outlay analysis. *In any case, we would recommend the amount subject only to a more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before actual expenditure of funds.*

k. Water development—off campus----- \$164,000

Existing water supplies on this campus are wholly inadequate to carry out the complete agricultural irrigation program that is contemplated. Comparatively cheap water is available from the effluence of a nearby industrial plant which can be satisfactorily and economically treated and be used for irrigation. Bringing this water to the state property involves a four-way agreement between industrial plant, Pomona water district, the City of Pomona and the State with each sharing proportionately. The State's share of the main supply facilities is the amount requested. This will bring water only to the property line of the campus. It would appear that this method is by far the cheapest source of water supply that can possibly be acquired. *We have reviewed all of the data in this matter and we recommend approval of the project.*

l. Site development----- \$233,000

The major portion of this project involves the on-campus distribution of the water brought to the campus by the project immediately preceding. It represents a first phase of this distribution and subsequently,

State College System—Continued

there will be at least one more phase for which funding will be requested. This will enable the irrigation of a major portion of the east agricultural area as part of the regular agricultural curriculum. A small part of the total amount is involved in providing certain access roads and fencing made necessary by the construction of a new county highway through part of the campus severing some of the range land which must be fenced to prevent cattle from straying. Actually, the cost of the fencing and the access roads was allowed for in the payment made to the State by the county in acquiring the right-of-way. *In view of the foregoing, we recommend approval.*

m. Equip administration-classroom building----- \$93,500

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$2,090,900 for the construction of a combination administration-classroom building on this campus. It is now estimated that the project will be ready for occupancy by September of 1961. Consequently, it is necessary to provide funds at this time for equipping the new space.

While we have not examined the equipment list, the amount proposed appears to be reasonably commensurate with the size of the project. However, the list may contain items which are not properly financed from bond funds in accordance with our observations preceding the capital outlay analysis. *In any case, we would recommend approval of the amount subject only to a more intensive review by the Department of Finance before funds are actually expended.*

n. Equip agriculture classroom building----- \$186,150

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$1,181,000 for the construction of an agriculture classroom building. It is presently estimated that the project will be ready for occupancy by September of 1962. Therefore, it would be necessary to provide funds at this time to equip the new space.

While we have not examined the equipment list, the amount proposed appears to be reasonably commensurate with the size of the project. However, it may contain items which are not properly financed from bond funds in accordance with our observations preceding this capital outlay analysis. *In any case, we would recommend approval of the amount only subject to a more intensive scrutiny by the Department of Finance before funds are actually expended.*

o. Construct surface parking----- \$26,100

This project will provide additional parking space for 200 cars for the use of which students, employees and faculty would be charged a fee. The growing enrollment on this campus plus the loss of some existing parking space due to construction work make the additional space necessary. Basically, it will be financed from the charges collected by the college and deposited in the General Fund. *We recommend approval.*

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

ITEM 372 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 800

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$115,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	None
Reduction	\$115,000

ANALYSIS

This item involves one modernization project and one acquisition project as follows:

a. Elevator modernization, Los Angeles State Building..... \$100,000

The current estimate for modernizing all three elevators in the old Los Angeles State Office Building, made by the State Division of Architecture, is \$234,000 which we consider to be excessive since it includes entire replacement of the existing cabs and all of the doors of each floor with the exception of the lobby where existing bronze doors will be reworked and reused. This is in addition to the new control equipment and safety devices that would be provided. Theoretically, at least, this could have eliminated five existing elevator positions for a possible annual savings of approximately \$25,000.

However, it has apparently now been decided to modernize only one of the elevators merely for the purpose of making it available on a 24-hour basis so that authorized people entering the building after hours would not be dependent upon the state police to operate the elevator for them. The estimate of \$100,000 appears to be arbitrary and we have seen no data to support it. In any case, it would seem doubtful that this single modernized elevator would be permitted to run during the day without an operator, while the other two elevators use operators. Consequently, there would be no savings to the State and the project could then hardly be considered as "hard core."

While we recognize that the existing elevators were installed in 1931 or 1932 and that they are presently in need of some overhaul and repairs, we question the approach being used. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be deferred for further study.*

b. Acquisition of site for microwave radio vault..... \$15,000

In our analysis of the support budget of the Division of Forestry, we have discussed the problem of a microwave radio system and have recommended against any further expenditures until the Legislature has had the opportunity to review the entire proposal. *Consequently, in line with this recommendation we would recommend that this item be disapproved.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene
ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 373 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 824

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION
PROGRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$336,000
 Legislative Analyst's recommendation ----- No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for one major, conglomerate project which includes many separate and distinct portions all of which are aimed at increasing the security of this institution. The bulk of the cost is involved in such things as providing maximum security screening on the windows of all closed wards at an estimated cost of \$185,000, and hereculite glass in the windows of practically all the closed wards. This latter is a type of quarter-inch thick tempered plate glass highly resistant to fracturing and similar to the all-glass doors often seen as entryways to stores and office buildings. The cost for this would be about \$45,000; the removal of window vents in the day rooms and side rooms of all closed wards. This may involve the change of the entire steel window frame in some instances. The cost of this is estimated at \$27,000. The balance of the work is in a series of small but widely distributed projects such as riveting all beds, replacing hinges on doors with the solid tin type which cannot be removed, providing concrete benches instead of wood benches, etc.

The estimates were made by the agency and not by the Division of Architecture. Consequently, there may be some question as to its accuracy for practical purposes. The work to be done is largely based on recommendations made by personnel from the Department of Corrections who are widely experienced with security problems in the state prisons. The justification of need for this is based on recent events at this institution which were a matter of widespread public interest due to outbreaks of the inmates. We should also point out that approximately \$140,000 has already been committed to the correction of some of the most glaring security defects.

While the only detail we have seen on the project is one of simple program description of the requirements, it would appear from experience that many of these things need to be done in order to make this institution the secure plant that it was supposed to be from the beginning because of the nature of the inmates housed therein. Furthermore, we believe that the various pieces of the project should be placed in a very strict priority order so that in the event the amount proposed is insufficient, after the Division of Architecture has made its study and estimates, the available funds will at least take care of the most critical items at the top of the list.

Department of Mental Hygiene—Continued

We wish to point out again that the project is in reality a series of minor construction and improvement projects and as such should be financed from the General Fund rather than bond funds.

Consequently, we would recommend approval subject to appropriate funding and contingent upon a further review by the Department of Finance and upon approval of the State Public Works Board.

**Department of Mental Hygiene
CAMARILLO STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 374 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 825

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
CAMARILLO STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION
PROGRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$200,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for one construction project and equipment for it as follows:

a. Construct canteen building..... \$180,000

This project will provide a new canteen building at this institution which will contain a conventional counter service snack bar and a separate area for a store facility in which the inmates may buy various supplies and personal products. The construction is of the simplest and most functional type, being of concrete block walls with wood roof and the total project cost will be approximately \$22.87 per square foot for a gross area of 7,912 square feet. This will include forced air heating and ventilation and a modest kitchen area commensurate with the type of heating which is contemplated.

The existing canteen at this institution has been wholly inadequate for many years. The original building was a war surplus, light metal structure which is difficult to maintain in any reasonable repair and which is inadequate in size. This project has been requested by the department and been deferred for a number of years. We believe the price is reasonable and the job should now go forward. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

b. Equip canteen building..... \$20,000

This is tied to the project immediately preceding and primarily provides the snack bar counters and stools along with some items of other equipment necessary for this type of operation. It is our understanding that the list does not include items that might normally be considered expendable or which would have a comparatively short life. *We recommend approval.*

Department of Mental Hygiene
DeWITT STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 375 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 826

FOR MASTER PLANS, DeWITT STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$10,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for a single master planning project as follows:

a. *Master plan for new facility* _____ \$10,000

This institution was originally constructed during the war as an army general hospital. It was subsequently acquired by the State and converted to use as a general hospital for the mentally ill with some capacity for mentally retarded. Its construction was basically designed to have a comparatively short life and reflected a crash program needed to handle wartime casualties. The existing plant has an extremely high maintenance factor and is basically unsuited to a modern psychiatric treatment program. Ultimately, it will have to be replaced or its capacity absorbed elsewhere.

It is proposed to expend \$10,000 on the preparation of a master plan for a phased replacement of the existing facilities by adequate modern facilities. In any case, such a master plan is an absolute prerequisite to determine whether the site is suitable for a modern plant and what the financial implications will be over a period of years. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

Department of Mental Hygiene
MENDOCINO STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 376 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 828

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, MENDOCINO STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$206,800
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for a single construction and alteration project as follows:

a. *Replace boilers* _____ \$206,800

This project involves the removal of three out of four existing boilers and their replacement by two package-type boilers with a total steaming capacity considerably in excess of that of the three boilers. The two new boilers will have a capacity of 27,000 pounds per hour each, whereas the three being replaced have a maximum capacity of 18,200, 15,800 and 14,700 respectively. Of the three boilers, one was installed in 1938, one in 1928 and one in 1926.

Department of Mental Hygiene—Continued

The basic problem at this institution is not one of inadequate boiler capacity for the peak demands but the fact that the industrial safety division has recommended replacement of the boilers due to their condition and age as well as obsolete type of construction. In addition, the existing plant is seriously lacking in certain kinds of safeguard equipment which would greatly reduce the hazard of explosions and other accidents. The contemplated project, in addition to installing two new boilers, would provide the safety equipment for the remaining older boiler as well as for the new ones. We believe that the physical situation at this installation is such as to justify this replacement. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene
METROPOLITAN STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 377 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 829

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
METROPOLITAN STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$306,500
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for a single expansion and remodeling project as follows:

a. Replace boiler facilities \$306,500

This project involves the removal of two existing boilers out of a total of four and their replacement by a single large field erected unit, the capacity of which will considerably exceed that of the two it replaces. The two older boilers were installed in 1937 and 1924 respectively. Each has a maximum steaming capacity under ideal conditions of only 10,000 pounds per hour or 20,000 pounds together. The new boiler would have a capacity of 50,000 pounds per hour. Another major replacement involves the deaerating feed water heater which has a capacity that is inadequate for even the four boilers that are now installed. With the new boiler it will be hopelessly short rated and replacement is essential. In addition, certain auxiliary control and safety devices as well as piping changes will be involved.

The present plant consisting of four boilers has a total steaming capacity of 70,000 pounds per hour maximum on a continuous basis. This substantially exceeds the so-called 100 percent rating of the boilers. The maximum capacity is barely sufficient to handle the present peak load. An outage of any one boiler would seriously impair the ability of the plant to maintain steam supplies during peak demand periods at the institution. Furthermore, additional buildings which are already funded would bring the total demand to substantially above capacity. Future buildings which are contemplated would further aggravate this situation. Consequently, we believe that the project is necessary at this time. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene
MODESTO STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 378 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 830

**FOR MASTER PLANNING, MODESTO STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE
STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$10,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for a single master planning project as follows:

a. *Master plan for new facility* _____ \$10,000

This institution was originally constructed during the war as an army general hospital. It was subsequently acquired by the State and converted to use as a general hospital for the mentally ill with some capacity for mentally retarded. Its construction was basically designed to have a comparatively short life and reflected a crash program needed to handle wartime casualties. The existing plant has an extremely high maintenance factor and is basically unsuited to a modern psychiatric treatment program. Ultimately, it will have to be replaced or its capacity absorbed elsewhere.

It is proposed to expend \$10,000 on the preparation of a master plan for a phased replacement of the existing facilities by adequate modern facilities. In any case, such a master plan is an absolute prerequisite to determine whether the site is suitable for a modern plant and what the financial implications will be over a period of years. It should also be noted that this particular plant is considerably inferior to the one at DeWitt, indicating an even more urgent need for replacement. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene
NAPA STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 379 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 831

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,
NAPA STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PRO-
GRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted _____ \$149,070
Legislative Analyst's recommendation _____ No change

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for two major related projects as follows:

a. *Remodel serving areas, south ward group, phase II* _____ \$137,070

This project basically consists of some alterations and the installation of cafeteria-type serving equipment in each of three kitchen and dining units in the so-called T-Units, No. 2, 3 and 4. Number 1 unit was previously funded.

Capital Outlay

Item 382

Department of Mental Hygiene—Continued

having unusually short life. *Consequently, we would recommend approval as requested.*

MILITARY DEPARTMENT

ITEM 382 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 842

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, MILITARY DEPARTMENT, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$139,500
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	No change

ANALYSIS

This item provides for a single construction project as follows:

a. *Construct food service facility A.N.G. Base, Ontario*..... \$139,500

This project is the final one in the series which was started by the Budget Act of 1957 which provided for food service facilities at the Fresno, Hayward and Van Nuys Air National Guard bases. The Budget Act of 1960 provided a similar facility at McClellan Field in North Highlands. The financing of this program was based on the fact that certain property owned by the Air National Guard at Glendale was sold and the funds were to be used ultimately for establishing adequate food service facilities at specified Air National Guard bases where such facilities either were nonexistent or of such poor quality as to be a danger to health, as well as being inadequate for training purposes.

The project for Ontario follows the plans of the other bases almost identically except for size. Its seating capacity is less than the first three. It will have a gross building area of 7,168 square feet and will be of Type V construction with concrete block exterior walls on a concrete slab with a wood frame and wood covered roof. Basically, the building will provide a kitchen area, an open messhall area and toilet facilities. The basic building is estimated to cost \$12.55 per square foot and the total project, \$19.75 per square foot. The interior work is of the simplest kind consistent with good maintenance and hygienic conditions for food preparation. The cost appears to be in line with the nature of the project.

However, we would like to point out that the estimate includes \$8,242 for plans, working drawings and specifications which represents 7 percent of the construction cost. In view of the fact that the basic building from the ground up is an exact reproduction of previously designed buildings, it would appear that this allowance for architectural services is excessive. It would seem that 4 or 5 percent should be more than adequate which would result in a reduction of possibly \$2,000 in the amount to be budgeted. While we would otherwise recommend this project as proposed, we must direct attention to the fact that financing of the construction of military facilities was not included in the original \$200,000 bond issue. Therefore, we would seriously question the propriety of funding this project from the bond funds particularly since the proceeds of the sale mentioned above were deposited in the General Fund. *Therefore, we recommend that the project be financed from the General Fund.*

**Department of Natural Resources
DIVISION OF FORESTRY**

ITEM 383 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 868

**FOR ACQUISITION, MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND
EQUIPMENT, DIVISION OF FORESTRY, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$2,656,908
Legislative Analyst's recommendation	1,265,769
Reduction	\$1,391,139

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for three site acquisition projects, seven construction projects and equipment for six of them and one equipment project for previously funded buildings as follows:

a. Purchase of land for conservation camps..... \$55,000

This will provide for the purchase of a site at Iron Mine which is already in use under a lease arrangement, plus additional land to serve as a buffer between the conservation camp and encroaching developments. In addition, it provides for the purchase of two new sites for new conservation camps as part of the continuing program to provide two new conservation camps each year. Since these are part of a continuing program, they would appear to be justified and *we recommend approval.*

b. Purchase of land for county headquarters..... \$35,000

The present Placer County Ranger Headquarters is located about a mile east of Auburn in an area which is admittedly not the most desirable under the circumstances. However, despite handicaps the operation is proceeding fairly smoothly, particularly since other fire stations including the Iron Mine Conservation Camp are close by. *Consequently, in view of the acute shortage of capital outlay funds we would recommend this proposal be disapproved.*

c. Sites for lookouts and forest fire stations..... \$38,000

This is a continuation of an established program for the purchase of strategic mountain tops for lookout purposes and for the purchase of locations for new or displaced fire stations. The problem with the mountain tops involves encroachments by utilities and others which impairs the sightlines of a lookout tower unless the state owns a sufficient area around the mountain top to prevent such encroachments. *Consequently, we recommend approval of this proposal.*

d. Construct District V Headquarters—Monterey..... \$636,610

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$85,000, from bond funds, for the purchase of a site on which to construct a new headquarters building for District V of the Division of Forestry which would also be shared by the district headquarters of the Division of Beaches and Parks. The present headquarters operation is in leased space on which the lease can be renewed to July 31, 1965.

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

As of this writing we have received neither preliminary plans and specifications nor a formal estimate from the Division of Architecture. As a matter of fact we have not even received what we would consider adequate program information nor have there been conferences to determine the appropriate scope of the building. Since the present lease of the Division of Forestry in Monterey expires on July 31, 1962, renewable to 1965, it is obvious that a new building may not be ready in time for the first expiration date and an extension will be necessary in any case. While we recognize that the present office space is inadequate and that the specialized needs, particularly of the Division of Forestry, are such that it is probably not possible to lease adequate facilities in the general vicinity of Monterey and that therefore it is desirable to provide a state-owned facility for the two agencies, in the absence of adequate material on which to base any judgments or make any recommendations, we suggest that providing working drawings at this time would be the most appropriate thing to do. *Consequently, we recommend that this project be reduced to \$50,000 and that the title be changed to working drawings.*

e. Construct Oroville ranger office and warehouse----- \$137,064

This project involves the replacement of existing facilities which are comparatively cramped for the number of people assigned. However, the basic buildings are in a reasonably good state of repair. In view of the fact that there is a shortage of capital outlay funds, we believe that these buildings can be continued in use until such time as the State's financial position is improved. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be disapproved.*

f. Equip Oroville ranger office and warehouse----- \$7,700

This proposal is involved with the project immediately preceding and we make the same recommendation that it be disapproved.

g. Construct Orange County ranger messhall and barracks--- \$126,550

The present facility's function is both a state operation and as a schedule "A" contract operation. There are 11 direct state employees involved and approximately 30 schedule "A" employees. The existing facilities are adequate for the direct state employees, but the deficiencies are attributable almost entirely to the contract or schedule "A" employees. Consequently, we believe that any replacement at this station should be provided by county contract funds and not by the State. *We recommend, therefore, that this project be disapproved.*

h. Equip Orange County messhall and barracks----- \$6,304

This proposal is involved with the project immediately preceding. We make the same recommendation that it be disapproved.

i. Construct Santa Cruz ranger messhall and barracks----- \$96,625

The existing facilities at this station which is near Felton in Santa Cruz County, were originally constructed in 1935 using salvage materials from other buildings. The present buildings are in poor physical

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

condition and do not warrant any rehabilitation. Continued use would require substantial maintenance with unsatisfactory results.

The proposed project involves the construction of two separate buildings although usually in a project of this size the two would be combined into one. However, this is not possible because of site limitations. The gross area of the two buildings is 4,229 square feet. Construction is of conventional wood framing with redwood siding and wood roof with asphalt shingles. The design has been standardized over many years by the Division of Forestry. The cost for the basic buildings would be \$17.60 per square foot which includes a walk-in refrigerator and complete kitchen facilities. The total project would cost \$23.40 per square foot. *In view of the foregoing and since the cost appears to be in line for the facilities and the location, we recommend approval.*

j. Equip Santa Cruz ranger messhall and barracks----- \$3,420

This proposal involves furnishings for the project immediately preceding. The list is comparatively small. However, it contains items that we consider to be questionable in view of the fact that the project is a replacement of existing facilities. *Consequently, we would recommend deferral until the following budget.* In the interim it can be determined exactly what existing equipment can be transferred and what additional items might be justified.

k. Construct Sonoma Conservation Camp, first phase----- \$171,125

This project involves the construction of a new 80-man conservation facility in the vicinity of Fort Ross in Sonoma County. The ultimate facility would have a gross building area of 32,600 square feet and would cost in excess of \$606,000, exclusive of equipment.

The first phase of the proposal involves work to be done on the site by Division of Forestry employees and possibly some inmates. In addition, the Division of Architecture would develop during the same period the complete working drawings and specifications for the main buildings which would be constructed by regular contract processes.

Although the design of this facility follows that of previously constructed conservation camps, we have taken exception to certain features, elimination of which we believe will produce a better facility for somewhat less cost. In addition, we would like to point out that the basic estimate includes the standard percentage for Division of Architecture's services. In view of the fact that the facility is largely a reproduction of previously constructed buildings, at least from the ground up, it would appear that the division should budget a lower percentage for its services. However, since the request is only for a partial cost of the entire project and involves mostly the work of the Division of Forestry, we would take no exception at this time to the amount proposed. However, we believe that the Division of Architecture should take cognizance of the points we have made so that in the 1962 budget proposal the amounts requested will reflect savings. *Therefore, we recommend approval of the amount requested.*

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

l. *Equip Sonoma Conservation Camp, first phase*----- \$134,721

This proposal involves the heavy equipment and other tools that will be used by the Division of Forestry in preparing the site and will ultimately be used by inmates in performing various field tasks for the Division of Forestry, Department of Fish and Game, Division of Beaches and Parks, etc. While we have not seen the specific list involved in this proposal, the amount appears to be in line with prior approved proposals. However, we question whether the list might contain items which are normally considered expendable or as having a short life and, therefore, not properly financed from bond funds. This is in line with our statements concerning this subject preceding the Capital Outlay Analysis section. We suggest that these lists be reviewed and divided into two categories, one to be financed from bond funds and the other from the General Fund. *In any case we would recommend approval of the amount only subject to a more intensive review by the Department of Finance before the actual expenditures are made.*

m. *Construct Rainbow Conservation Camp*----- \$434,400

This project involves the almost complete replacement of an existing conservation camp in San Diego County.

While we recognize that the existing facilities are in a comparatively poor state of repair due to their age and to the fact that they were largely of used materials to start with, we feel that there is still some serviceability in the building and in view of the shortage of capital outlay funds, *we recommend that the existing facilities be continued in service until such time as the State's financial position is improved.*

In any case, we have raised some questions as to the design and the reasons for variations between this location and others since there should be uniformity, and hence economy in adhering to a single design for this purpose.

n. *Equip Rainbow Conservation Camp*----- \$54,091

This proposal is involved in the project immediately preceding and we make the *same recommendation with respect to it.* Furthermore, we would raise the question as to why any equipment is required since basically the project is a replacement of existing facilities and a going operation. If additional equipment is required, it should be included in the regular support budget where normally additional equipment for expanded programs is handled.

o. *Construct California Mens Colony Conservation Camp*---- \$30,000

This project involves the conversion of certain existing buildings in the barracks unit of the California Mens Colony near San Luis Obispo, to make them into a conventional 80-man conservation facility. We have seen no details of the remodeling and conversion work proposed. However, in view of the amount of area involved the sum requested appears to be reasonable. *Consequently, we would recommend approval.*

p. *Equip California Mens Colony Conservation Camp*----- \$195,127

This proposal presumably involves the heavy equipment and other working tools needed for inmate work crews to perform their various

Department of Natural Resources—Continued

field services. However, we have not seen the itemized list and since in the case of conservation camps, as distinguished from centers or branch centers, the facility is operated completely by the Division of Forestry and it may be assumed that this list will include certain items of furnishings such as mattresses, bedsheets, pillowcases, etc. Therefore, there is some question as to which portion of the total proposed would be considered comparatively expendable and should be payable from the General Fund rather than from the bond funds in accordance with the statements we have made preceding the capital outlay portion of this analysis.

q. Equip three conservation centers----- \$495,171

This proposal involves the furnishing of various kinds of heavy equipment and other tools to be used by each of the 100-man conservation work crews that will operate out of the Lassen Conservation Center near Susanville, and the two branch centers in Humboldt and Tuolumne Counties. This involves merely the equipment that will be used in the course of performing various field duties such as road building, trail building, fire breaks and other outdoor activities on behalf of various state and local agencies. The indoor type of furnishings for the center and the two branches are furnished in the capital outlay budget of the Department of Corrections.

Since a fairly large volume of hand tools will be involved in this proposal, the question might also be raised as to the propriety of providing such comparatively expendable and easily lost items out of bond funds. Therefore, we believe that this proposal should be reviewed in the same light as has been explained in our statements preceding the capital outlay portion of this analysis.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH

ITEM 384 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 877

FOR SITE ACQUISITION, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted -----	\$50,000
Legislative Analyst's recommendation -----	No change

ANALYSIS

This item proposes the acquisition of a small parcel of additional land contiguous and to the east of the existing building in Berkeley. This is probably the last land that it will be possible to buy in this particular location, adjacent to the building. The need for this land is predicated on the proposal to construct a major addition to the existing building.

The present plans for the addition indicate that the thinking involves two wings to be added to each end of the building. The gross area of these wings will probably exceed 220,000 square feet and will be at least as tall as the existing building, possibly taller in one wing to house animals on the roof.