

Secretary of State—Continued

ments, measures and the length of each. The methods used and conclusions reached in estimating requirements appear reasonable.

It is estimated that 8,144,000 copies will be printed.

The report to the Governor by the Director of Finance on the State Printing Office, dated December 18, 1961, cites the high cost of printing these pamphlets in the State Printing Office, based on a bid for printing made in 1960 by a private printing establishment. The reasons for the high cost are enumerated in the report as explained by the State Printing Office. In order to take advantage of the substantial savings which could be obtained by avoiding the present legal requirement that all printing be done in the State Printing Office, the language substantially as follows is proposed for enactment. The savings, based on the 1960 experience, should exceed \$50,000.

“Provided that if the estimate of cost of the State Printing Office for the printing and shipping of these pamphlets exceeds by more than 20 percent a bid for printing and shipping by a private printer, this difference in cost shall be deemed to constitute a practical inability of the State Printing Office to economically furnish the printing services required by this appropriation, and this appropriation shall be reduced to the amount determined by the Director of Finance to be sufficient for contracting for the private printing and shipping of the pamphlets and for other necessary expenses incidental to the preparation and distribution of the pamphlets.”

We recommend approval of the budget as submitted.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ITEM 38 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 39

FOR SUPPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested	\$9,200,633
State employees' retirement	531,856
State employees' health and welfare	59,592

Total	\$9,792,081
Estimated to be expended in 1961-62 fiscal year	9,779,501

Increase (0.1 percent)	\$12,580
------------------------------	----------

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	\$700
--	--------------

Summary of Recommended Reductions

	Amount	Budget Page	Line
Tape recorder and amplifier-speaker system	\$700	40	64

ANALYSIS

California continues to lead the nation in many phases of agricultural production, with the Department of Agriculture reporting 139 crops grown in commercially significant quantities. Total 1960 cash receipts from California agriculture were \$3,186,778,000, which was 9 percent of the cash receipts from farming for the entire United States, and

Department of Agriculture—Continued

the largest amount ever recorded by a single state. Preliminary 1961 statistics, currently available only for crop production, show the second largest total in the State's history—about equal to total crop value in 1960 and slightly below record 1959 crop production. California has about 2.6 percent of the nation's farms and approximately 3.3 percent of total farm acreage.

The Department of Agriculture is basically a protective, regulatory, and service agency, with varied responsibilities in such fields as the control of pests and diseases in plants and animals, the enforcement of standards of quality, quantity, and cleanliness in agricultural and certain other products, the dissemination of market news, production statistics, and forecasts, and the administration of marketing programs for agricultural products. Support of department activities is derived from the General Fund, industry contributions to the Department of Agriculture Fund, and the federal government. The General Fund supports those activities protecting the public welfare or which are of benefit to the agricultural industry as a whole, and the Department of Agriculture Fund supports those activities requested by the agricultural industry or which are of benefit to segments thereof. The federal government provides financial support on a matching basis to various co-operative research programs, and in addition, provides personnel or contributes to the salaries of various personnel engaged in programs of interstate or national significance.

The total proposed 1962-63 operating budget of the Department of Agriculture is \$17,592,603, which represents a \$46,630, or 0.3 percent increase over estimated expenditures for the current year. The amounts and sources of these funds are summarized as follows:

<i>Source</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Budget Item</i>	<i>Dollar increase from 1961-62</i>
General Fund -----	\$9,871,585	-----	\$15,244
Department of Agriculture Fund -----	7,641,514	-----	28,722
Federal government -----	79,504	-----	2,664
Totals -----	\$17,592,603		\$46,630

A comparison of proposed budget year expenditures with that for the current year shows a substantial increase in salary savings, from \$258,345 for 1961-62 to \$445,031 for 1962-63. Costs of authorized positions for fiscal year 1962-63 plus proposed new positions represents an increase of 2 percent in comparison with the funded increase of 0.7 percent after deducting salary savings. The fiscal year 1962-63 salary savings is the equivalent of 83.8 authorized and requested positions for 1962-63, in comparison to 48.1 for 1961-62. For fiscal year 1962-63 the salary savings were increased by \$330,000 to fund part of the 5 percent salary increase requested by the Governor.

The analysis of this item of the budget bill, although it appropriates only the General Fund portion of the department's budget, includes a discussion of all department activities. Item 40, which appropriates from the Department of Agriculture Fund, will need to be adjusted for any budget changes which are financed from the Department of Agriculture Fund.

Department of Agriculture—Continued

As noted in the following table, there has been a persistent annual increase in the percentage of General Fund support of department activities. In the last four years alone this percentage has increased from 54 percent to 58 percent of total expenditures.

Department of Agriculture Expenditures 1957-58 through 1960-61				
	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
I. ADMINISTRATION				
General Fund -----	\$319,184	\$296,820	\$370,445	\$525,432
Department of Agriculture Fund ----	176,000	196,506	184,247	205,663
Total -----	\$495,184	\$493,326	\$554,692	\$731,095
Percent General Fund-----	64.46%	60.17%	66.78%	71.87%
II. PREVENTION OF INTRODUCTION AND SPREAD OF CROP AND LIVESTOCK PESTS AND DISEASE				
General Fund -----	\$4,231,236	\$4,555,769	\$4,574,134	\$5,162,701
Department of Agriculture Fund ----	135,675	148,399	152,272	164,018
Total -----	\$4,366,911	\$4,704,168	\$4,726,406	\$5,326,719
Percent General Fund-----	96.89%	96.85%	96.77%	96.92%
III. PROTECTION TO THE PUBLIC AND MAINTENANCE OF QUALITY STANDARDS				
A. Administration of laws and regulations requiring compliance with standards of composition, grade, quality, sanitary condition, labeling, packing, etc.				
General Fund -----	\$1,710,498	\$1,799,260	\$1,905,657	\$2,087,745
Department of Agriculture Fund --	867,985	886,983	920,932	976,263
Total -----	\$2,578,483	\$2,686,243	\$2,826,589	\$3,064,008
Percent General Fund---	66.34%	66.98%	67.42%	68.14%
B. Regulation of use and application of injurious agricultural chemicals, and regulation of commercial pest control operators.				
General Fund -----	\$53,955	\$57,654	\$64,028	\$135,410
Department of Agriculture Fund --	25,348	25,386	27,131	25,525
Total -----	\$79,303	\$83,040	\$91,159	\$160,935
Percent General Fund---	68.04%	69.43%	70.24%	84.14%
C. Prevention of theft of livestock.				
Department of Agriculture Fund --	\$710,045	\$704,515	\$733,124	\$761,836
Total -----	\$710,045	\$704,515	\$733,124	\$761,836
D. Administration of weights and measures laws.				
General Fund -----	\$99,543	\$90,552	\$91,504	\$114,582
Department of Agriculture Fund --	80,976	75,257	82,400	82,514
Total -----	\$180,519	\$165,809	\$173,904	\$197,096
Percent General Fund---	55.14%	54.61%	52.62%	58.14%
Total—Protection				
General Fund -----	\$1,863,996	\$1,947,466	\$2,061,189	\$2,337,737
Department of Agriculture Fund --	1,684,354	1,692,141	1,763,587	1,846,138
Total -----	\$3,548,350	\$3,639,607	\$3,824,776	\$4,183,875
Percent General Fund---	52.53%	53.51%	53.89%	55.87%

Department of Agriculture—Continued

Department of Agriculture Expenditures
1957-58 through 1960-61—Continued

	1957-58	1958-59	1959-60	1960-61
IV. ASSISTANCE TO PRODUCERS AND HANDLERS IN MARKETING OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS				
General Fund -----	\$739,343	\$744,328	\$770,885	\$954,414
Department of Agriculture Fund ----	4,068,502	3,972,291	3,949,058	4,210,705
Total -----	\$4,807,845	\$4,716,619	\$4,719,943	\$5,165,119
Percent General Fund-----	15.38%	15.78%	16.33%	18.48%
GRAND TOTALS				
General Fund -----	\$7,153,759	\$7,544,383	\$7,776,653	\$8,980,284
Department of Agriculture Fund ----	6,064,531	6,009,337	6,049,164	6,426,524
Total -----	\$13,218,290	\$13,553,720	\$13,825,817	\$15,406,808
Percent General Fund-----	54.12%	55.66%	56.25%	58.29%

The department recently initiated the first comprehensive analysis of its organization and procedures in many years, and over the last year changes have been made in many phases of its operations. In addition to regrouping functions and bureaus within several new divisions and eliminating one level of supervision, the department is instituting new accounting procedures and converting several functions to data-processing equipment. Budgetary control and common clerical services will be centralized at division level, and within each division efforts are being made to redefine activities into functional programs. New positions resulting from reorganization are financed by the abolition of existing positions without requesting additional funds. Many of these changes are not reflected in the current year or in the proposed 1962-63 budget.

While the reorganization has resulted in some functional realignments, it has in effect been a reshuffling of functions at the top, and with few exceptions the bureaus have retained their original identities. Moreover, the reorganization has not progressed to the point of considering the fundamental and interrelated problems of field organization and maximum integration of departmental activities.

With the exception of headquarters staff, most departmental activity is carried out in the field, and at present the department has over twenty different organizational units each with its own independent field organization. Regardless of how these units are grouped together at headquarters, their field activities continue to be independently organized and administered, with the possibility of attendant excessive costs of operation. Closely related to field organization is the problem of achieving the most effective integration of departmental activities, as discussed in greater detail in a subsequent recommendation.

The reorganization plan contemplates that a Program and Planning Office be added to headquarters staff "for a continuing review of departmental programs and services in terms of their value to the agricultural economy." While the concept of a continuing review of all

Department of Agriculture—Continued

departmental programs is excellent, and indispensable to sound management, this is a basic responsibility of line supervisors which the reorganization has increased from four to seven. In addition to the seven line division chiefs, there are two Deputy Directors, an Assistant Director, an Assistant to the Director, an Administrative Service Officer, an Economic Adviser, and an Administrative Adviser in the Director's office, all of whom are concerned to varying degrees with the review of departmental programs. Several of the written position descriptions specifically include this responsibility. If a formalized program review procedure seems desirable, it would be a simple matter to institute using the available positions. No additional personnel have been requested for the Program and Planning Office in the budget year; however, *it is recommended that the department specifically justify these proposed positions and that they not be established during the interim without Legislative approval.*

One of the new divisions created in the reorganization is that of Dairy Industry, which was originally proposed to contain the Bureaus of Milk Stabilization and Dairy Service. However, because of a statutory requirement that a veterinarian administer the division in which Dairy Service is located, it has not been possible to transfer it from the Division of Animal Industry to the new Division of Dairy Industry. The Dairy Council, which is an advisory board and has no line responsibility, has been added as the second unit in the new division. It is difficult to see any real need for this additional division, particularly when one of its major components (Dairy Service) can function equally well in either division, and legislation may be required before it can be legally transferred from Animal Industry. Grouping the Dairy Council with the other advisory boards leaves only the Bureau of Milk Stabilization, which does not appear to justify an independent division. The Bureaus of Milk Stabilization and Dairy Service were in separate divisions prior to reorganization, and appeared to function satisfactorily. To be consistent with the organization of the rest of the department the work of this remaining bureau should be divided between the newly created Divisions of Agricultural Economics (economic and marketing functions) and Compliance (enforcement functions). *It is therefore recommended that the Division of Dairy Industry be abolished, with the functions of the Bureau of Milk Stabilization divided between the Divisions of Agricultural Economics and Compliance, and the Dairy Council regrouped with the other industry advisory boards. It is further recommended that the position of Chief, Division of Dairy Industry, be abolished for a savings of \$12,326.*

A total of 23 new positions are proposed in the budget year, most of which the department justifies on the basis of increased workload. The need for these proposed positions has been carefully reviewed, and while the supporting data appears to justify many of the new positions, in several cases the workload measures and/or field organization structure raise certain questions regarding the request for new positions. *It is recommended that the positions listed below be approved for one year only, and thoroughly rejustified in the 1963-64 budget request on*

Department of Agriculture—Continued

the basis of (1) reliable, objective workload measures, and (2) a review of the existing organization structure within which such positions will function. In addition, this justification should include a long-range analysis of the feasibility of integrating these and similar positions with those performing other, related functions. The objective should be to secure greater flexibility in assigning personnel to cover peak workloads and providing broader professional development and promotional opportunities for the field and central office personnel. The effect of such integration on field organization should also be considered.

Positions recommended for approval for one year

One senior weights and measures investigator (complaint investigation)

One district supervisor of seed inspection

Two rodent and weed control assistants

One junior marketing specialist

One electric meter technician

In connection with the preceding recommendation, and the broader reorganization problems previously discussed, this office anticipates devoting some time in the future to spot checks of departmental field activities, evaluation of the validity of workload measures, and related matters. It is apparent that both the General Fund and the Agriculture Fund will benefit from any efficiencies which might result from more effective combination and organization of departmental activities.

In the budget request for new equipment, the department is requesting a broadcast quality tape recorder and amplifier-speaker system. This equipment is justified on the basis of requests made by various radio stations that the department prepare tape recordings of its reports and activities for individual station use. The justification states "it is anticipated that when this service is established, the requests from other radio stations will increase, resulting in a greater outlet for passing on agricultural information of the state to the public." The department has for some time made agricultural information available to the various communications media by issuing news releases and reports of various kinds. This proposal to expand the public information program of the department to the extent of actually preparing broadcast quality tapes for direct use by private industry appears to be improper use of funds because the department would be preparing material which otherwise would be the program responsibility of the individual stations. This request for equipment is being recommended for deletion as a policy question since it would set a precedent for other agencies to institute similar programs. If this service should grow, as the department believes it will, presumably it will be necessary to expand the operation even further in the future. *It is therefore recommended that the request for tape recorder and amplifier-speaker system be denied, and that \$700 be removed from the budget.*

Department of Agriculture
FEDERAL CO-OPERATIVE MARKETING RESEARCH

ITEM 39 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 50

**FOR SUPPORT OF FEDERAL CO-OPERATIVE MARKETING
 RESEARCH FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested	\$75,000
State employees' retirement	4,047
State employees' health and welfare	457
 Total	 \$79,504
Estimated to be expended in 1961-62 fiscal year	76,840
 Increase (3.5 percent)	 \$2,664

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION None

ANALYSIS

Federal Co-operative Marketing Research is a program in which the federal government shares equally with the State in the cost of conducting research into various marketing problems. The federal government participates in this program under the terms of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 and Public Law 733 (79th Congress), and state participation is authorized by Section 1286 of the Agricultural Code. The general objectives of this research are to assist marketing agencies at all distributive levels to utilize the most recent and best marketing practices, to increase consumption of farm products, and to provide better and more timely marketing information.

Since the beginning of this program in 1947, California has conducted a number of matched fund research projects, with total state expenditures to June 30, 1961 of \$852,262. Research has been conducted in such areas as agricultural statistics, fruit and vegetable standardization, plant pathology, marketing, seed inspection, and market news. Projects proposed for the budget year basically continue research currently under way at the same level, as summarized in the following schedule:

<i>Research project</i>	<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Proposed 1962-63 Budget (state funds only)</i>
Collection of new basic information for fruits and nuts, bush berries, and raisins necessary for reliable production forecasts.	Enumeration of one-fourth of fruit producing counties for tree and vine numbers and acreages by year of planting and variety.	\$35,149
Improvement of quality and packaging of California agricultural products.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Determination of soluble solids and acid content of Thompson seedless grapes as season progresses. 2. Correlation of factors of maturity and maturity release dates for late varieties of apples in various districts of state. 3. Analysis of the minimum size for each count of deciduous fruit as marked on container to determine if any of many sizes should be eliminated or combined. 	4,309

Item 40

Agriculture

Federal Co-operative Marketing Research—Continued

<i>Research project</i>	<i>Objectives</i>	<i>Proposed 1962-63 Budget (state funds only)</i>
Development of methodology for certifying that fruit and nut tree and vine nursery stocks are virus free.	Continuation of research leading to registration and certification of virus-free stocks for peaches, apples, pears, quinces, almonds, apricots, plums, prunes, and grapevines.	\$21,745
Determination of problems and opportunities with respect to expansion of markets and improvement of marketing practices for agricultural products.	Determination of obstacles to effective marketing, utilization, and consumption of agricultural commodities, and development of recommendations for actions to be taken by government agencies and the industry.	13,797
Total-----		\$75,000

It is recommended that state funds for these co-operative research projects be approved. Total industry contributions to the co-operative research program to June 30, 1961, have been \$331,583. Federal contributions over this same period to these industry projects have totaled \$222,617.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

ITEM 40 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 39

FOR SUPPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FUND

Amount requested-----	\$7,308,016
State employees' retirement-----	299,661
State employees' health and welfare-----	33,837
Total-----	\$7,641,514
Estimated to be expended in 1961-62 fiscal year-----	7,612,792
Increase (0.4 percent)-----	\$28,722

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION----- \$12,326

Summary of Recommended Reductions

	<i>Amount</i>
Chief, Division of Dairy Industry-----	\$12,326

ANALYSIS

This item appropriates funds from the Department of Agriculture Fund for that portion of the department's budget supporting activities requested by the agricultural industry or which are of benefit to segments thereof. Revenues to this fund are derived from fees and assessments from a variety of industry sources.

The analysis of Item 38 of the budget bill, which appropriates the General Fund portion of the department's budget, includes a discussion of all department activities including the above recommendation concerning the Division of Dairy Industry.

With the exception of this recommendation, this item is recommended for approval as requested.

Department of Agriculture
POULTRY IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION

ITEM 41 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 53

FOR SUPPORT OF THE POULTRY IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION
FROM THE POULTRY TESTING PROJECT FUND

Amount requested	\$188,525
State employees' retirement	6,948
State employees' health and welfare	960
Total	\$196,433
Estimated to be expended in 1961-62 fiscal year	188,456
Increase (4.2 percent)	\$7,977

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION See Item 42

ANALYSIS

The Poultry Improvement Commission was established by Chapter 173, Statutes of 1947, to conduct annually a poultry-testing project in the vicinity of Modesto or other place determined by the commission as having similar qualifications. Commission membership consists of the Director of Agriculture, two representatives of the University of California, and seven gubernatorial appointees representing the seven major poultry districts of the State.

The commission states that it "provides California's poultry industry with accurate production data on the various types and strains of chickens and turkeys. The work of this commission is divided into two district areas, the chicken project located near Modesto and the turkey project located near Keyes. Specific tests, requested by the poultry industry, are conducted to provide a means whereby commercial poultrymen may judge the merits of available strains of chicks and poults."

The proposed 1962-63 budget of the commission shows a \$7,977, or 4.2 percent, increase over estimated expenditures for the current year, which is a further continuation of the steady rise in commission expenditures over the years. This budget item appropriates the entire support budget for the commission from the Poultry Testing Project Fund, which in turn receives the major portion of its revenue by transfer from the General Fund, Item 42. Although this General Fund contribution is actually less in the budget year than in the current year, and other estimated revenues remain approximately the same, by utilizing accumulated surplus the commission is able to increase its program. Further, because the General Fund transfers are commingled with other moneys in the Poultry Testing Project Fund, any unexpended balances are not reverted at the end of the fiscal year. The following table summarizes these transactions in the Poultry Testing Project Fund.

<i>Poultry Testing Project Fund</i>	<i>Estimated 1961-62</i>	<i>Proposed 1962-63</i>
Surplus, July 1	\$53,417	\$41,828
Miscellaneous revenue	66,015	66,783
Transfer from General Fund	110,852	102,822
Total resources	\$230,284	\$211,433
Less support, Poultry Improvement Commission	188,456	196,433
Surplus available for appropriation, June 30	\$41,828	\$15,000

Poultry Improvement Commission—Continued

This office has been increasingly critical of the practice of supporting the commission's activities from the General Fund, especially when Section 45 of the Agricultural Code gives the commission clear authority to make the poultry-testing projects self-supporting. In lieu of General Fund support, a relatively simple method of collecting equivalent funds would be to institute an additional tax on poultry feeds. It is well-established state policy to require industry reimbursement for state services of benefit to particular segments of industry. There appears to be no reason why this same policy should not be followed with respect to the operations of the Poultry Improvement Commission.

It is therefore recommended that the Poultry Improvement Commission be required to collect sufficient fees to make its operations entirely self-supporting and that the requested transfer of \$102,822 from the General Fund in Item 42 be denied.

As an alternative, it is recommended that Item 42 of the budget bill be amended to read "and provided further, that any surplus existing in the Poultry Testing Project Fund at the end of the fiscal year shall revert to the General Fund." Such an amendment in the budget year would have the effect of reducing the amount transferred from the General Fund by an estimated \$15,000, from \$102,822 to \$87,822. It is difficult to see why a \$15,000 contingency fund is necessary to the work of the commission, as there is a well-defined procedure for obtaining emergency funds. In the past the commission has underestimated miscellaneous revenue, and such underestimates increase the amount of surplus carried forward, surpluses which should be applied to reduce the General Fund contribution to commission support.

The commission indicates that during the budget year it is going to expand its poultry testing program to include three commercial ranches for "on-the-farm" testing and comparative evaluation with Modesto tests. It states further that anticipated income from the project is expected to exceed estimated revenues. *In addition to the recommendation in the above paragraph, it is also recommended that prior to submission of next year's budget request the commission prepare and submit to the Legislature a thorough analysis of its present program of independent testing at Modesto and Keyes, in contrast to a self-supporting program based on moving all such projects to commercial ranches, with the commission providing technical supervision only.*

**Department of Agriculture
POULTRY IMPROVEMENT COMMISSION**

ITEM 42 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 54

**FOR AUGMENTATION OF THE POULTRY TESTING PROJECT FUND
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested	\$102,822
Transferred from the General Fund in 1961-62 fiscal year	110,852
Decrease (7.2 percent)	\$8,030
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	\$102,822

Corrections

General Analysis

Poultry Improvement Commission—Continued

		Summary of Recommended Reductions		Budget	
		Amount	Page	Line	
Transfer from General Fund to Poultry Testing					
Project	Fund				
	-----	\$102,822	54	13	

ANALYSIS

This item transfers \$102,822 from the General Fund to provide the major support of the Poultry Improvement Commission. Although the amount requested for the budget year shows a decrease from the current year, proposed *total* expenditures of the commission show a 4.2 percent increase. The commission proposes to balance its budget by the increased use of surplus funds in the Poultry Testing Project Fund.

Full discussion of commission activities and the recommended reduction in this item is found in the analysis of Item 41.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

GENERAL SUMMARY

The total expenditure for this department for 1962-63 including special items of current expense is estimated in the Governor's Budget at \$55,151,964. This represents an increase of \$7,802,696 or 16.5 percent over the estimated 1961-62 expenditures of \$47,349,268 reflected in the 1962-63 Budget.

Department of Corrections—Consolidated per Capita Costs

Fiscal year	Total expenditures	Total average population	Consolidated per capita cost	Increase over prior year	
				Amount	Percent
1953-54	\$18,426,278	14,171	\$1,300	\$93	7.7
1954-55	20,414,691	15,337	1,331	31	2.4
1955-56	23,729,947	15,288	1,552	221	16.6
1956-57	26,085,865	15,677	1,664	112	7.2
1957-58	29,278,885	17,012	1,721	—57	—3.4
1958-59	31,928,106	18,964	1,684	—37	—2.2
1959-60	34,708,340	19,496	1,780	96	5.7
1960-61	40,682,198	21,750	1,870	90	5.1
1961-62*	46,949,268	24,491	1,917	47	2.5
1962-63†	54,751,964	26,515	2,065	148	7.7

* Estimated in the 1962-63 Budget.

† Budget request.

The above table reflects the continual increase in per capita costs for this agency. The per capita cost of \$2,065 for 1962-63 is \$145, or 7.7 percent, greater than 1961-62. It is also \$765 or 58.9 percent greater than the cost per inmate of \$1,300 experienced by this department in 1953-54. We recognize that part of the increase is due to the opening of new facilities, but also note the increase in levels of service especially in the nonfelon addict programs. The rate of recidivism remains relatively constant.

According to the 1962-63 Budget, the agency is authorized to employ 5,109.9 positions in 1961-62 and 5,028.8 positions in 1962-63. The dif-