

**Department of Public Works
DIVISION OF AERONAUTICS**

ITEMS 181, 182 and 183 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 453

**FOR SUPPORT OF DIVISION OF AERONAUTICS FROM THE
GENERAL, AIRPORT ASSISTANCE AND ARCHITECTURE
PUBLIC BUILDING FUNDS**

Amount requested -----	\$121,936
Estimated to be expended in 1962-63 fiscal year -----	140,069
Decrease (12.9 percent) -----	\$18,138

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

Summary of Recommended Reductions

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Budget Lines</i>
Reduce General Fund—Increase Airport Assistance Fund	\$9,022	455	8 and 28
Increase General Fund—Reduce Architectural Public Building Fund -----	\$13,575	455	8 and 41

GENERAL SUMMARY

This agency was originally established as the Aeronautics Commission by Chapter 1379, Statutes of 1947, with a major mission to aid local jurisdictions in solving local airport and aviation problems and to promote civil aviation generally. Subsequently, by Chapter 2071, Statutes of 1961, the staff of the commission was incorporated in the Department of Public Works as the Division of Aeronautics and the commission was altered to the State Board of Aeronautics which consists of five members appointed by the Governor for four-year terms.

The duties of the Division of Aeronautics are set forth in a number of statutes largely along the lines mentioned above. However, the 1961 Legislature, by several statutes, placed additional responsibilities on the division by requiring it to regulate parachute jumping, broadened its responsibilities with respect to the inspection of potential elementary and secondary school sites where adjacent airfields or airports posed possible hazards and created the Airport Assistance Fund with \$350,000 annually for distribution among cities, counties and airport districts on the basis of their needs. Of this total \$15,000 is made available to the division for administrative purposes. The bulk of the support of the division comes from the General Fund and a relatively small portion comes from the Airport Assistance Fund which does not require annual appropriation.

ANALYSIS

The budget for the 1963-64 fiscal year proposes the expenditure of \$121,936 which is \$18,138 of 12.9 percent less than the \$140,069 estimated to be expended during the current fiscal year. This reduction is wholly the result of the fact that in the current fiscal year there was \$20,000 budgeted for the purchase of a new plane, a one-time expenditure which will probably not occur again for many years. Therefore, it may properly be said that the regular support budget for personnel and operating expenses has changed very little although such change has been upward with about a 9-percent increase in operating expenses proposed and a somewhat less than 1-percent increase in salaries, wages and related expenses for retirement, health and welfare.

Division of Aeronautics—Continued

When the budget for the current fiscal year was proposed it included two new positions, one a field representative and the other an intermediate typist-clerk. These positions were proposed largely on the basis of increased workloads due to added responsibilities placed upon the division by the 1961 session of the Legislature. We agreed with the necessity for the field representative but disagreed with the intermediate typist-clerk and our position was sustained by the Legislature. Subsequently, the position of intermediate typist-clerk was established by administrative order and the cost of the position was defrayed from the Airport Assistance Fund which annually provides \$15,000 for administrative purposes but which heretofore had not been used by the division for this purpose.

We also recommended during the 1962 session that the division make use of this \$15,000 since it represented part of an allocation from the Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax Fund based on unrefunded gasoline taxes for gasoline used by airplanes.

It now appears that the workload occasioned particularly by the enactment of the airport assistance program has materialized to the point where a clerical position is justified. However, we should point out that the basis for our prior recommendation for the additional field representative was also this same workload. Consequently, we feel that both these positions should be supported from the administrative funds available from the Airport Assistance Fund. Since the proposal for the new budget year involves using \$5,978 from that fund, there remains a balance of \$9,022 which, if not used for administrative purposes, would be merged with the main fund and allocated to various airports around the State. Consequently, *we recommend that the appropriation proposed from the General Fund be reduced by \$9,022 and the same amount be made available from the Airport Assistance Fund.*

The budget also proposes for the first time that a small portion of the support of this division come from the Architectural Public Building Fund on the premise that the work of the division in making inspections of potential school sites in accordance with Section 15005.5 of the Education Code is a proper charge against this special fund. The Architecture Public Building Fund receives its revenues in the form of fees, representing percentages of the construction value of public schools for which plans are submitted to the Division of Architecture for checking as to adequacy of design for structural, seismic and other stresses to assure that every public school building constructed in California will meet minimum requirements for the safety of its occupants. This is a distinct statutory, regulatory activity which is the responsibility of the Division of Architecture. The respective school districts have no choice but to submit their plans and make whatever changes or improvements in design are dictated by the Division of Architecture. It should also be pointed out that fees already on deposit in the fund cover on-going projects for which sites are already established. In the case of the Division of Aeronautics its service is purely an advisory one. The individual school district need not follow the advice of the Division of Aeronautics with respect to whether or not

Industrial Relations**Items 184-185****Division of Aeronautics—Continued**

a particular site is properly or improperly located in relation to a nearby airport. The question is usually one of interference and noise rather than safety, as such. It appears to us that this diversion of the Architecture Public Building Fund is unjustifiable. On the other hand the advisory service of the Division of Aeronautics appears to be a proper charge against the General Fund as part of the overall service rendered by the Division of Aeronautics for the good of the State at large. *Consequently, we recommend that item 183 for \$13,575 from the Architecture Public Building Fund be eliminated and the General Fund support item be increased by a like amount.*

Department of Public Works**DIVISION OF ARCHITECTURE****ITEM 184 of the Budget Bill****Budget page 456****FOR SUPPORT OF DIVISION OF ARCHITECTURE
FROM THE ARCHITECTURE PUBLIC BUILDING FUND**

Amount requested	\$1,339,877
Estimated to be expended in 1962-63 fiscal year	1,346,585
Decrease (0.5 percent)	\$6,708

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION **None****ANALYSIS**

The budget proposed for this section of the Division of Architecture is based on providing about the same level of service as in the current fiscal year with the same number of authorized positions. The slight reduction anticipated occurs entirely in the area of materials and methods structural research which is being adjusted downward slightly. It is anticipated that the workload occasioned by the construction of new public schools will continue at about the same level as in the past few years. A new schedule of fees provided by the Statutes of 1961 will gradually eliminate the relatively small deficit that the Architecture Public Building Fund has developed. At the beginning of the budget year it is anticipated that this deficit will be approximately \$116,000 and at the end of the budget year it will have dropped to \$86,000. At this rate the deficit should be wiped out in a couple of years. *We recommend approval.*

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS**ITEM 185 of the Budget Bill****Budget page 464****FOR SUPPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested	\$14,979,022
Estimated to be expended in 1962-63 fiscal year	13,824,317
Increase (8.4 percent)	\$1,154,705

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION **\$136,949**