

## Capital Outlay

### Capital Outlay

#### General Program

The capital expenditure program as budgeted for the 1963-64 fiscal year contemplates an expenditure in excess of \$635 million which covers all of the major phases of the State's activities including highways and the water program. However, this summary will confine itself to the program that is directly reflected in the Budget Bill, since both the highways construction program and construction of the State Water Facilities do not require Budget Bill action.

The Budget Bill includes a total of \$15,138,361 of appropriations from the General Fund. The most significant of these are Department of Corrections and Youth Authority, \$1,420,000; University of California, \$1,953,000; State Colleges, \$1,101,000; Department of Finance, \$1,707,000; Department of Mental Hygiene, \$1,076,000; Department of Conservation, \$735,000; Department of Parks and Recreation, \$5,614,000 and the Department of Water Resources, \$708,000. These appropriations generally cover so-called "minor" construction and equipment projects with the exception of the amount for the Department of Parks and Recreation which covers both major and minor development and acquisition projects and the Department of Water Resources which is for the Davis-Dolwig (recreation) part of their major construction program. The balance covers relatively small amounts for agencies such as the Department of Agriculture, Military Department, etc. The figures for each agency have been rounded for simplicity. The total mentioned above compares with \$13,296,581 which was appropriated for relatively similar purposes by the Budget Act of 1962.

The major construction and equipment program for the agencies previously mentioned is covered entirely by bond funds. The total contained in the Budget Bill is \$147,675,139 of which the most significant parts are Department of Corrections and Youth Authority, \$12,280,000; University of California, \$67,506,000; the state college system, \$57,609,000; Department of Mental Hygiene, \$6,989,000 and Department of Conservation, \$2,791,000. These figures have also been rounded for simplicity. Actually the only remaining coverage is \$500,000 for project planning referred to, in the Budget Bill, as "unallocated." This covers the preliminary planning and programing for the subsequent budget. It is interesting to note that higher education, the university and the state colleges collectively, accounts for approximately 85 percent of the total of bond fund appropriations. It is also interesting to note that the total of bond fund appropriations is ordinarily not carried as part of the grand total of the budget, but the amounts included in the expenditure program for bond interest and redemption of principal are carried as part of the total annual cost.

Since higher education is responsible for what is by far the most significant portion of the bond fund financing proposal, some further detail of the program is in order. The total bond fund proposal for both the university and the state colleges is, in round figures, \$125 million, of which approximately \$13,800,000 represents equipment for

### General Program—Continued

buildings already funded and under construction or about to start construction. Acquisition of additional land or payment for land already acquired totals approximately \$3,100,000, and proposals for working drawings, with construction funding being provided at some future date, total approximately \$1,601,000. The latter would contemplate construction costs of over \$25 million in future budgets. The total of these figures, plus funds for preliminary planning and programing, is approximately \$20 million, leaving a construction program of approximately \$105 million as the cost of actual construction projects. A significant difference between the proposal for the budget year and that which provided for the current fiscal year is in the area of working drawings. The funds for working drawings that were included in the 1962 Budget Act had an ultimate construction value of \$70 million as compared to only \$25 million in the present proposal as noted above. We believe that the amount of actual construction proposed in this budget is overambitious in the sense that it will not be possible to commit to contract this volume of construction within the budget year.

A further significant fact with respect to higher education is contained in a comparison between the printed budget presented at the 1960 session of the Legislature and the present printed budget presented at the 1963 session. On page 735 of the 1960 document there is an estimate that the full-time equivalent enrollment of regular students for the year 1962-63 at all of the state colleges would total 88,200. On page 771 of the 1963 document there is an estimate that for the 1962-63 year there will be a total of 76,440 which represents a reduction of almost 12,000 FTE or over 13 percent. In other words, in 1960 the anticipated enrollment was overstated by more than 13 percent. The 1963 document also estimates that by the 1966-67 year the enrollment will total 112,065 FTE. It is for this potential that the present proposals are geared. If there was a 13 percent overstatement in a recent three-year period, to what extent is it possible that the 1966-67 estimate is overstated? Furthermore, it should also be considered that the existing and already funded capacity is calculated on the basis of current intensities of space utilization. We have mentioned before the possibility of increasing this utilization, by various means which would tend to dilute the annual needs for additional space and thus make possible a smaller program for the budget year and possibly a number of years thereafter.

### Bond Fund Situation

The 1963 budget document, on page 714, indicates that on July 1, 1963, there will be available in the State Construction Program Fund, unappropriated and uncommitted balances to the extent of \$187,849,443. From this must be deducted the \$20 million which is held in reserve for junior colleges in accordance with the program which was voted by the people in November of 1962. This leaves a balance for the State Construction Program of \$167,849,443. Total estimated expenditures from new appropriations, a relatively minor carryover and costs incidental to the printing and preparing of bonds will be \$148,466,050. This would leave a balance of \$19,383,393 which would be available

## Capital Outlay

### General Program—Continued

towards the capital outlay program that would be presented to the 1964 Legislature. The implication of this situation is that at the 1964 session, unless other major fund sources are found to cover the State's construction program, the Legislature will again be acting on a Budget Bill in which the major portion of the capital outlay program would be contingent upon the passage of another bond issue, by the electorate. By way of comparison it will be recalled that at the 1962 session there was still available approximately \$52 million in unappropriated bond funds toward the capital outlay program for the 1962-63 fiscal year.

It will be of interest also to note the provisions, in the budget, for the annual debt service incidental to the three State Construction Program Bond issues of 1955, 1958 and 1962. On page 706 of the 1963 budget document there is indicated a total provision of \$25,534,933 consisting of \$14,234,933 in interest payments and \$11,200,000 in redemption payments. These provisions are payable from the General Fund and the amount will probably increase each year until a peak period is reached after which the amounts will begin to decline, providing no additional bond issues occur.

### Architectural Services

There are a number of significant developments in the area of the State's architectural services which are worthy of comment at this time. The University of California continues its long-established policies and procedures whereby all of its major construction projects are awarded to various private architects for design and working drawings with the university maintaining a substantial staff of architects, engineers and programers who perform the initial functions, provide the necessary information to the architects, prepare contracts and bidding documents, generally oversee the construction work and provide for intimate inspection of the actual construction as it progresses on a day-to-day basis. The major change that has occurred in the last few years has been to provide each campus with a far greater degree of autonomy with respect to the handling of the projects on the individual campuses but still maintaining a statewide overhead group to co-ordinate the work.

In the case of the state college system, it will be recalled that the Trustees of the California State Colleges were, by statute, granted autonomy with respect to the handling of their construction program so that they could choose either private architects or the State Division of Architecture, at will. The trustees actually started in formal operation, in this area, in July of 1961. To date the trustees' actions with respect to state college projects has resulted in about 40 percent of them being given to various private architects all over the State and about 60 percent being assigned to the State Division of Architecture on the same basis as though it were a private architect. As of this writing, although numerous projects have been assigned to private architects for designs and working drawings, not a single one of these projects has yet been completed by these architects to the point where they have gone to bid. A number of the projects are very close to completion

### General Program—Continued

of working drawings and some bidding will probably take place in the very near future. With respect to this latter problem there is a very significant situation that exists at the moment for which no final solution has yet been arrived at by the trustees.

The preparation of bidding documents, contracts, awards to contractors, subsequent change orders, progress payments, inspection of the work in progress on a day-to-day basis and final acceptance of the construction project is a far more complex, drawn-out and tedious process than the design and preparation of working drawings. For these services the trustees have basically three avenues open to them. First they may choose to augment their contracts with the individual architects and require that they undertake all of the work necessary to put a project under contract and under construction and to follow it through to completion. It would then be up to the private architects to provide inspection service, legal service and financial control service. This approach would probably result in as many different methods as there would be architects involved. Secondly, the trustees could undertake the development of their own staff to provide all of these services in much the same way as is now being done by the University of California. This approach has the merits of being relatively uniform with respect to all architects and all projects and being under the close and direct control of the trustees' staff. However, it has, at the moment, the drawback of requiring a great deal of time to put together such a staff with the necessary competencies. The resultant delays in the construction of the various projects would be considerable. Finally the trustees could contract with the State Division of Architecture to supply these services for all projects, those which are being designed and prepared by the division as well as those being designed and prepared by private architects. This method has a number of immediate advantages as well as long-range advantages. The Division of Architecture has a long, well-established organization to cover all the bases and in so doing it has established standard procedures and standards of acceptable performance by contractors. This would make it possible for projects being designed and prepared by private architects to go into the construction phase with practically no delay. From the long-range standpoint it would assure that all projects, irrespective of the designer, would be constructed along the same procedural lines and to the same quality standards. We believe that the last alternative is the best one and we suggest that the Trustees of the California State Colleges give it the most serious consideration. It is our understanding that the Division of Architecture has been negotiating with the staff of the trustees for over a year and a half, along these lines, but to date without success or final developments. It should be pointed out that even the Division of Architecture requires some time to recruit some additional staff that would be needed to carry the burden, of which they had otherwise been relieved by the statutory changes and which resulted in the reduction of its staff.

Another significant area in dealing with architectural services involves the State Division of Architecture and the Division of Beaches

**General Program—Continued**

and Parks. The development program of the latter agency has been lagging despite the availability of funds which have been appropriated for development. The budget under consideration includes a substantial shifting of the design, working drawing and construction execution from the Division of Beaches and Parks to the Division of Architecture. Greater emphasis has been placed on the preparation of preliminary plans in order to provide the Legislature with clearer and more accurate data on the proposals contained in the budget. This is a procedure which we have long recommended and hoped for. For the first time since our office has been analyzing the capital outlay programs of the Division of Beaches and Parks, we have had adequate advance information in the form of preliminary plans, specifications and estimates on almost every project proposed in the budget. This procedure, we feel certain, will materially accelerate the funded development program of the Division of Beaches and Parks as well as that being proposed in the new budget.

**Minor Construction**

With respect to the minor construction program of the many agencies contained in the budget, we have had the privilege of continuing long-established procedures whereby we have checked each proposal, in the field, at the individual campuses, hospital reservations or correctional installations. We have reviewed each project in detail as to need, propriety of solution and cost estimate. We have, in fact, reviewed a great many more projects than are contained in the budget. Subsequent to this field review we have been privileged to confer with the Department of Finance and the several agencies which resulted in the reduction of the total number of projects to that contained presently in the budget. With very few exceptions, where we could not reach agreement, we have recommended approval of the minor construction proposals.

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

ITEM 298 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 715

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$129,785
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**ANALYSIS**

Two major projects and three minor projects are requested by the Department of Agriculture. The major projects and two of the minor projects all serve to improve the Fresno livestock and poultry pathology laboratory. The third minor project relates to improvement of the Sacramento 1220 N Street building. Recommendations are as follows:

- |                                                                                          |          |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| a. Construct virology section at Fresno Livestock and Poultry Pathology Laboratory ..... | \$62,000 |
| b. Equip virology section at Fresno Livestock and Poultry Pathology Laboratory .....     | 8,185    |

## Department of Agriculture—Continued

The Department of Agriculture will enter into a new field of service made possible by the construction of a virology laboratory addition to the Fresno livestock and poultry pathology laboratory. The support budget reflects additional staff for this program. This addition will be constructed in the central court of the existing structure. There are 1,460 square feet in the addition and it includes an animal room, laboratory with attached walk-in incubator, an inoculation room, a wash-room for specimens, a darkroom, and men's and women's locker rooms. The \$27-per-square-foot building cost is reasonable for an addition of this nature and the \$8,185 equipment cost will provide the basic complement necessary. *We recommend approval.*

## c. Minor projects ----- \$59,600

A virus isolation control unit will be constructed to house animals necessary to provide specimens for the virology laboratory. Estimated cost of this unit is \$21,000. The control unit consists simply of five open-top swine pens and six individual pens equipped with a spray cooling system. The single system evaporative cooling in the pathology laboratory will be replaced by a new air-conditioning system that will be zoned to properly handle the varied activities of the building. Cost of the air-conditioning is \$32,600. The final project will cost \$6,000 and provides for the construction of a walk-in germinator facility for the seed laboratory in the 1220 N Street building in Sacramento. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Corrections  
SOUTHERN CONSERVATION BRANCH**

ITEM 299 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 720

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$49,000  
Recommended for approval ----- no change

**ANALYSIS**

The Southern Conservation Branch was constructed adjacent to the Institute for Men at Chino and completed in 1962. It has been used since then, temporarily, for the inmates scheduled to occupy the California Rehabilitation Center at Corona. When those inmates are transferred to Corona this branch will function as a training base and central supply for the Southern California conservation camp program. It is therefore necessary to construct a warehouse to house bulk supplies that will be distributed to the camps. A stock metal prefabricated building containing 7,000 square feet will be erected to satisfy this need. This is the most economical type structure for the purpose. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Corrections**  
**CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION AT TEHACHAPI**

ITEM 300 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 722

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
 CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION AT TEHACHAPI,  
 FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$52,180  
 Recommended for approval ----- no change

**ANALYSIS**

A major portion of the institution's electrical system does not have adequate capacity. It is therefore necessary to renovate the system and \$25,000 is budgeted for that purpose. The recently completed inmate activity building must be equipped with a sprinkler system to comply with recommendations of the State Fire Marshal. The cost of this installation is \$7,350. An addition to the industries warehouse will be constructed for \$6,130 to satisfy the need for additional space. The final increment of construction of the corporation yard will be completed for \$13,700. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Corrections**  
**CORRECTIONAL TRAINING FACILITY**

ITEM 301 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 723

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
 CORRECTIONAL TRAINING FACILITY (SOLEDAD),  
 FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$47,490  
 Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

The south barracks will be reconditioned for \$19,830. This reconditioning includes renovation of the heating system, construction of fire escapes, repairs to the showers, repainting, resurfacing walks and roadways and other miscellaneous items. An automatic shirt unit will be replaced in the laundry because it is worn beyond repair, at a cost of \$15,685. The vocational agricultural greenhouse will be relocated to a more functional area for \$11,975. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Corrections**  
**DEUEL VOCATIONAL INSTITUTION**

ITEM 302 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 724

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$47,300  
 Recommended for approval ----- no change

Deuel Vocational Institution—Continued  
ANALYSIS

The inservice training area in the administration building will be remodeled to be used as office space for \$22,000. The training function will be moved to the newly constructed inservice training building. The dairy operation will be improved as the result of constructing a \$6,000 concrete road in the farm area and a \$6,000 improvement to the dairy corrals. The paint spray area will be moved for \$7,000 in order to free industries warehouse space and to alleviate a security problem. Three projects totaling \$6,300 will improve the recreation area adjacent to the adjustment center and will provide an office for industries personnel. *We recommend approval.*

Department of Corrections  
STATE PRISON AT FOLSOM

ITEM 303 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 725

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted .....	\$557,300
Recommended for approval .....	27,300
Amount unresolved .....	530,000

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION .....

None

ANALYSIS

One major and one minor project are proposed by this item as follows:

a. *Construction of industries warehouse* .....

\$530,000

This item proposes to fund the construction of an industries warehouse at a location outside the fence and just opposite the cannery. The correctional industries operation normally pays rent for the facilities owned by the State. A precedent will be established with this project as it is intended that upon completion of construction that the industries revolving fund will transfer \$530,000 to the General Fund as reimbursement. The warehouse will replace space being used in various structures on the prison grounds. It appears to be a highly desirable project.

We have not received a complete budget package although we understand that the preliminary estimate indicates a greater cost than is budgeted. The Department of Finance has indicated that it intends to scale the project down so that it can be constructed within the funds budgeted. We expect to review this activity prior to budget review by the legislative committees. *Consequently, we cannot recommend the item at this time.*

b. *Reroof building No. 2* .....

\$27,300

Building No. 2 will be reroofed in compliance with a Division of Architecture report. The estimated cost is \$27,300. *We recommend approval.*



**Department of Corrections  
INSTITUTION FOR MEN**

ITEM 304 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 726

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
INSTITUTION FOR MEN (CHINO),  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$70,800  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

An industries warehouse, funded in the 1960 Budget Act, was later deferred because the money had to be used for an emergency electrical repair. The Institution for Men has two major industries operations, a cannery and a furniture shop. Both of these activities require extensive storage and the cannery has recently added a second production line which has made the storage shortage especially acute. The cost of the warehouse is \$35,000. Construction of dayrooms is proposed for four living units that do not have such areas at present. The inmates now watch television in the hallways which is contrary to Fire Marshal recommendations. The cost of dayroom additions is \$28,800. The final project provides for the completion of an inmate activities building that was funded in a prior year. Showers, offices and storage areas will be installed for \$7,000 to make the structure completely operable. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Corrections  
MEDICAL FACILITY**

ITEM 305 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 728

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$3,000  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

This project will provide for the extension of the irrigation system. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Corrections  
MEN'S COLONY EAST FACILITY**

ITEM 306 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 729

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$16,700  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

**Men's Colony East Facility—Continued  
ANALYSIS**

A minimum landscape project for \$9,000 is included to clean up the front of the institution. The industry knitting mill will be partitioned for \$7,700 so that functions causing high humidity can be isolated from those in which this humidity cannot be tolerated. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Corrections  
MEN'S COLONY WEST FACILITY**

ITEM 307 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 730

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
MENS COLONY WEST FACILITY,  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted \_\_\_\_\_ \$24,325  
Recommended for approval \_\_\_\_\_ No change

**ANALYSIS**

The visitor's room will be enlarged and altered so that one officer will have clear visibility of the entire room. The estimated cost is \$6,825. A temporary building will be relocated and the medical section will be expanded to remedy extreme deficiencies in this area. The cost of this project will be \$17,500. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Corrections  
STATE PRISON AT SAN QUENTIN**

ITEM 308 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 731

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted \_\_\_\_\_ \$138,326  
Recommended for approval \_\_\_\_\_ No change

**ANALYSIS**

An initial complement of equipment for the Black Mountain Conservation Camp will cost \$11,006 and include such items as movie equipment, a station wagon, a pickup, miscellaneous office equipment and miscellaneous custody equipment. Two shirt units, two tumblers and a pants finishing unit will be replaced in the institution laundry for \$35,000. An industries maintenance shops building will be constructed for \$36,000. A chemical storage unit will be constructed adjacent to the detergent plant for \$9,000. This will enable the purchase of large quantities of bulk chemicals that should save approximately \$3,000 per year. The navy cleaning plant vacated due to the loss of that business will be renovated so that the clothing industries can be moved in. The cost of this renovation is \$47,320. *We recommend approval.*

## Department of the Youth Authority

## NORTHERN CALIFORNIA RECEPTION CENTER AND CLINIC

ITEM 309 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 737

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$22,300  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

## ANALYSIS

The first phase of an automatic lawn sprinkling system installation is scheduled and requires \$22,300. It is anticipated that this system will reduce water costs and maintenance. *We recommend approval.*

## Department of the Youth Authority

## YOUTH CONSERVATION CAMPS FOR BOYS

ITEM 310 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 739

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT  
YOUTH CONSERVATION CAMPS FOR BOYS  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$18,300  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

## ANALYSIS

Three projects are included in this item, all at the Washington Ridge camp. The first is to construct a covered passage between the dormitory and dining room-recreation hall as protection during inclement weather. The second involves installation of recreation area floodlights and the third includes improved ventilation for the food storage room and office areas. *We recommend approval.*

## Department of the Youth Authority

## FRICOT RANCH SCHOOL FOR BOYS

ITEM 311 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 739

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$94,300  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

## ANALYSIS

There are nine essential projects for the Fricot minor budget. Five of these are related to the improvement of the grounds and utilities, two involve needed storage and the remaining two are for athletic field light augmentation and a bedroom addition to a budgeted new duplex. The grounds improvement and utility projects include improvements

**Fricot Ranch School for Boys—Continued**

to the sewage plant for \$6,600, rehabilitation of the fire protection system for \$31,500, a survey of the school property to determine possible excess land for \$12,000, the second phase of grounds improvement for \$20,000, and augmentation of \$5,000 for the road to the butane storage tanks, funded in 1962-63. The storage additions involve remodeling an unused boy's restroom in the kitchen area to dry storage and construction of gardening and recreation storage buildings. *We recommend approval.*

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

ITEM 312 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 740

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
FRED C NELLES SCHOOL FOR BOYS  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	_____	\$25,000
Recommended for approval	_____	No change

**ANALYSIS**

This item covers a series of grounds improvement and extension of road projects and will be completed in compliance with the Nelles master plan. *We recommend approval.*

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

ITEM 313 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 743

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted	_____	\$125,830
Recommended for approval	_____	No change

**ANALYSIS**

Seven of the nine minor projects scheduled for funding at Paso Robles are related to extended or improved utility service. There is a \$24,600 sewage disposal plant alteration, a \$9,860 water main replacement, a \$20,900 sprinkler system replacement, a \$7,600 water softener brine tank replacement, a \$6,700 boiler control equipment relocation, a \$7,300 steam and condensate line replacement and a \$2,100 fire protection system extension. The third and final phase of a project to enlarge cottage day rooms required by present standards will be complete for \$43,770. The final project involves alterations to the dishwashing room for \$3,000. *We recommend approval.*

Department of the Youth Authority  
PRESTON SCHOOL OF INDUSTRY

ITEM 314 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 744

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$101,210  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

## ANALYSIS

Three of the minor projects budgeted are related to the security system. The first involves increasing the height of the security fence from 12 to 16 feet and covering the upper portion with hardware cloth in a low brushy area that has been the most accessible escape route. Cost of this alteration is \$31,400. A second project involves construction of an observation tower adjacent to the old administration building that controls a full view of the entire institution and will not only serve as a deterrent to possible escapes but will provide an opportunity to observe the direction of flight of the boy who makes it over the fence. The third security project requires construction of a patrol road around the psychiatric treatment unit for \$2,600. A sprinkler system needed to reduce the fire hazard in the carpenter shop and lumber storage building will be installed for \$6,500. The "A" company dayroom will be altered for \$14,100 to provide better supervision and more free space. Roads that have served their useful life will be resurfaced and curbs and gutters installed for \$10,710 and the administration parking area will be increased for \$4,900. *We recommend approval.*

Department of the Youth Authority  
YOUTH TRAINING SCHOOL

ITEM 315 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 745

FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
YOUTH TRAINING SCHOOL  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$4,500  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

## ANALYSIS

It is proposed that the swimming pool water be heated in order to extend the season in which it can be used. *We recommend approval.*

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

ITEM 316 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 748

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$22,750  
 Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

The Ventura School for Girls has a capacity of 400 in eight 50-girl living units. Each girl occupies a single room. Each room is equipped with a water closet and lavatory and a common expression of rebellion involves tampering with the water supply by plugging the water closets with sheets or blankets. It is therefore necessary to provide a convenient method for the ward supervisor to shut off the water before extensive damage is done. This project proposes water shutoff valves in all the living units for \$22,750. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Education  
SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND, BERKELEY**

ITEM 317 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 750

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$7,000  
 Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

A project to install underground telephone conduit to replace conduit deteriorated beyond economical maintenance repair will be continued for \$7,000. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Education  
SCHOOL FOR CEREBRAL PALSID, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA**

ITEM 318 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 751

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$42,902  
 Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

A new school funded by item 356a of Chapter 888, Statutes of 1961, is under construction to replace the present leased facility. The \$42,902 is proposed for equipment and will be used to replace that worn beyond repair and to purchase new equipment necessary to raise the standard of service to that of the Northern California school. *We recommend approval.*

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

ITEM 319 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 752

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$1,275  
 Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

A vinyl tile floor that has deteriorated to the point that loose edges have become hazardous will be replaced in the day room of the girls dormitory. A gardeners tool and athletic equipment storeroom will be constructed adjacent to the athletic field.

*We recommend approval.*

**Department of Education  
SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF, RIVERSIDE**

ITEM 320 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 753

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$6,050  
 Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

Four minor projects will be completed. A playground will be developed for the kindergarten children with an inexpensive enclosure to prevent their running into a nearby residential street. "Kool" shades will be purchased for \$450 for the infirmary's west exposure. A health problem will be eliminated by refinishing the porous swimming pool walls for \$3,500. A service road will be repaired for \$600.

*We recommend approval.*

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

ITEM 321 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 754

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$1,953,600  
 Recommended for approval ----- 1,927,900

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ----- \$25,700

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide funds for a total of 65 minor projects on all campuses at a cost of \$1,953,600. This is \$46,100 less than the amount appropriated for this purpose in the 1962 Budget Act. There are two

## University of California—Continued

major types of projects that are required on most of the campuses. One stems from the continual need to remodel classroom facilities to keep pace with the changing curricula and the second is the installation of television control rooms and television distribution systems to provide for the increased interest in teaching through that medium. The projects are discussed by campus as follows. Statewide:

Five projects requiring a total of \$166,300 are requested for four university facilities. The Imperial Valley field station will be provided with a 30,000-gallon domestic water storage tank and a cattle barn for \$7,000 and \$49,500 respectively. Irrigation, drainage, frost protection systems and a weather station will be constructed for \$49,500 at the Lindcove field station. A farm machinery equipment storage building will be constructed for \$14,300 at the Hopland field station and an addition to the laboratory-measuring building will be constructed for \$46,000 at Mt. Hamilton. *We recommend approval.*

## Berkeley:

Twelve projects requiring \$398,200 are requested for the Berkeley campus. The first two on the campus priority list provide for a television studio control room and for extension of the television distribution system. Two of the projects provide for improvements to the old Ford plant in Richmond that the University now owns, in which one section will be enclosed to house the UC press and another will be modified to provide an increased lighting level for library storage. The Richmond field station that is being used extensively for engineering laboratory work will be expanded to include a 2,000-square-foot building which will house civil engineering projects in the cement manufacturing and fire-testing fields. An agreement with the City of Berkeley to widen certain streets and sidewalks as compensation for streets that the city has closed requires \$48,000. The six remaining projects provide improvements to the ventilation in the optometry building and gymnasium, renovation of a storage area for use as a museum collection area, modernization of unfinished areas in the Greek theater, alteration of a laboratory for graduate botany study and extension of irrigation in the botanical gardens for biology and botany studies. *We recommend approval.*

## Davis:

The Davis campus will be improved in six areas as a result of the expenditure of the proposed \$260,500. An instructional television studio control room will be provided by a \$49,500 alteration to a storage area in Herring Hall. Space will be converted to new uses in Hunt Hall, Walker Hall, the biological sciences building and in the "Aggie Villa" apartments. Finally, it is necessary to correct hazardous wiring systems in older buildings to comply with the electrical wiring code. *We recommend approval.*

## Los Angeles:

Six of the eleven projects accounting for \$110,400 of the \$240,900 requested for the UCLA campus are related to conversions and expansions required by changing curriculum needs. Two of the projects relate



University of California—Continued

to improvements of the utility service; one of which requires provision of a new six-inch water main to serve the men's gymnasium and the other provides for improved street lighting on University Drive. A \$27,500 project is necessary to modify 23 elevator door openings in the chemistry-geology building to bring them up to current safety standards. The Mira Hershy Hall girl's dormitory which has been settling and cracking will be underpinned for \$32,000 and an environmental temperature control system will be constructed for the Department of Botany for \$40,000. *We recommend approval.*

Los Angeles Medical Center:

The \$90,000 requested for the Los Angeles Medical Center will provide for four projects. Two of these are related to instructional television. A microwave link will be provided between the campus and the Harbor General Hospital so that students at either area may benefit from activities at the other. The TV distribution system on the campus will be extended to eight additional classrooms for \$20,000. Outpatient clinic areas on various floors will be modified to alleviate crowded conditions and to provide more functional work space for \$15,000. An unfinished basement area will be modified for \$35,000 to provide for the instruction of 100 students in the Department of Pediatrics. *We recommend approval.*

Riverside:

There are six projects requested for the Riverside campus. The total cost is \$178,700. Unfinished space in the basement of the physical science building will be modified for \$44,700 to provide additional storage area. An aluminum lath house and mist chamber for the citrus experimental station departments will be constructed for \$45,000. Facilities of this type have been a continual problem to the University as the humidity and temperature control required is extremely difficult to design and maintain. The functional arrangements in the administration building will be improved as the result of minor alterations requiring the expenditure of \$19,000. A psychology laboratory that has been vacated due to the completion of a new facility for that function will be modified for \$10,000 and used by the Department of Sociology. Alterations to various laboratories in the life sciences building will be made to increase student capacity from 64 to 92. The final request is for \$50,000 to enable further development of the recently purchased Moreno Ranch so that the expanding experimental agricultural work can be performed in that area. *We recommend approval.*

San Diego:

The final phase of a project to remodel the Scripps library will be completed for \$35,000. The experimental aquarium building was designed so that a second floor could be added and \$50,000 is requested for that addition. The structure is 31 feet wide by 70 feet long and will house controlled environment seawater rooms and holding tanks, and other environmental controls. An equipment compound and warehouse building will be constructed for \$50,000. This compound will be located

**University of California—Continued**

in a remote area of the campus and will be used as a catchall for much of the equipment scattered throughout the campus. This equipment creates an eyesore and an invitation to vandalism. The total cost of San Diego minor capital projects is \$135,000. *We recommend approval.*

**San Francisco:**

There are six projects ranging in cost from \$8,400 to \$45,000 and totaling \$135,800 that must be completed to serve the needs of the San Francisco campus. Two laboratories that are occupied by 75 dental students each will be provided with adequate ventilation necessary to reduce the heat created by use of Bunsen burners. This will cost \$8,400. A third transformer will be installed at the substation of the medical science building for \$25,200 to meet the needs of the increased electrical load. A trend from men to women employees on the third and ninth floors of the medical building has created a problem in the restroom provisions which will be corrected for \$17,000. An overcrowded stenographic pool area will be expanded by inclosing a basement areaway for \$14,500. The San Francisco campus will remodel a portion of the old Ford plant in Richmond to store equipment and clinical records for \$45,000. A 500-square-foot storage addition to the refuse burning structure is proposed to permit night burning without hiring an additional driver. The \$25,700 cost broken down to a unit cost of over \$50 per square foot is partially due to the rugged terrain of this site. This is a marginal project and it is our opinion that a better, less costly solution might be available. *We recommend approval of all projects with the exception of the last, which would reduce the total by \$25,700.*

**Santa Barbara:**

There are six projects requested to fulfill the needs for minor capital improvement of the Santa Barbara campus requiring a total expenditure of \$208,200. Three of these projects relate to utilities services. The first is a \$35,000 modification required by the high pressure of the water system. Pressure reduction valves for 51 buildings will be installed and 28 new fire hydrants will be provided. Seventy new electrical power poles will be installed for \$49,000 and 1,500 feet of four-inch transite telephone ducts to service the southwest campus area will be installed for \$18,000. The remaining three projects fall in the alteration category. The first provides for the initiation of the engineering program in the industrial arts building that will be vacated because of termination of that curriculum. The second and third alterations will provide for chemistry classrooms in a relocated temporary building and education classrooms in a second temporary building. *We recommend approval.*

**Santa Cruz:**

Four of the six Santa Cruz projects provide for rehabilitation of buildings A, B, C and D, the former countinghouse, granary, cookhouse and coach house. These buildings will be used for the security and control office, a receiving storage office, a planning office and an adminis-

## Capital Outlay

Items 322-323

### University of California—Continued

tration and storage building. The remaining two projects relate to fire prevention and poison oak eradication. Total cost of the six projects is \$140,000. *We recommend approval.*

### California State Colleges CHICO STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 322 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 776

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

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted .....	\$43,180
Recommended for approval .....	No change

#### ANALYSIS

Seven projects are included in this minor capital item. Two are related to the new corporation yard site. The first provides for \$22,000 to equip the new corporation yard and the second provides \$10,000 to move buildings from the old corporation yard to the new one. Miscellaneous projects necessary to improve various offices and classrooms on the campus will be accomplished for \$5,500. Four projects for less than \$5,000 each and totalling \$5,680 provide for identification of classroom buildings, improved storage facilities in the life science department, equipment for the child development playground laboratory, and for the relocation of a college owned residence to the farm to provide better supervision. *We recommend approval.*

### California State Colleges FRESNO STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 323 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 779

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

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted .....	\$53,400
Recommended for approval .....	No change

#### ANALYSIS

Five of the seven minor projects are related to the Fresno State College farm operation. One of these projects, requiring \$7,500, will provide new farm wells and pumps and a second project requiring \$16,600 will enable the college to lower existing wells to compensate for the dropping water table and to install new equipment for the water supply. A third water supply project will be the installation of concrete pipe distribution lines for \$1,800. Farm fencing will be extended for \$10,000 and the farm drainage system will be improved for \$15,000. A DC supply will be provided in the mechanical engineering laboratory and panic hardware will be installed in the engineering classroom building for \$1,800 and \$700 respectively. *We recommend approval.*

**California State Colleges  
HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 324 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 781

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$77,480
Recommended for approval .....	75,150

<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION .....</b>	<b>\$2,330</b>
------------------------------------------	----------------

**ANALYSIS**

An auto mechanics laboratory that was originally presented for consideration as a major project has been scaled down so that it may be constructed for \$50,000. Continuation of the site development on the campus will be provided by \$6,775 for sidewalks and retaining walls and \$1,000 for a bank slippage study. Lighting levels that are substandard will be corrected in Jenkins Hall and the science building for \$12,000. A loading platform will be constructed adjacent to the physical science building and the vacuum pump in the college elementary school will be replaced for \$1800 and \$3,575 respectively.

The final project provides for the second phase of remodeling the college laboratory school for \$2,330. In the 1962-63 budget year this project was scaled down in conference to \$5,500 to include all necessary changes in the college laboratory school. The remodeling requested by this \$2,330 represents that portion that was considered unnecessary in the last budget year. *We therefore recommend reduction in the amount of \$2,330.*

**California State Colleges  
LONG BEACH STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 325 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 783

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$66,600
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**ANALYSIS**

There are five projects budgeted for the Long Beach campus. The first is to provide a standby boiler for the cafeterias so that service may be maintained when normal maintenance operations are being performed. The cost of the standby boiler is \$10,000. New sidewalks will be provided to enhance the safety of the students and faculty and further the site development of the college for \$20,000. The duplicating center in the business service area will be equipped for \$25,000. An outdoor dining area will be constructed for \$10,000 to reduce the crowded situation of the regular dining area on fair weather days. The final project provides for \$1,600 to establish an area for an outdoor sculpture studio. *We recommend approval.*

## California State Colleges

## LOS ANGELES STATE COLLEGE OF APPLIED ARTS AND SCIENCES

ITEM 326 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 785

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$127,500  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

## ANALYSIS

Ten projects are proposed on this campus, five of which range in estimated cost from \$2,000 to \$3,000 and total \$13,000. These five projects include the provision of a block wall adjacent to the pool, the conversion of a storage room to an instruction room, the alteration of chemistry laboratory tables, removal of chalkboards in the science labs, and remodeling of the welding shop. The second phase of a project to increase electrical capacity in the science building to an adequate level will be completed for \$45,000. Relocation of fume hoods in the science building necessary as a result of the increased graduate enrollment will be continued for \$25,000. An adequate volatile chemical storage room will be completed for \$10,000. A general storage building will be constructed in the corporation yard area for \$28,000. The final project provides \$6,500 to partition functional areas in the library. *We recommend approval.*

## California State Colleges

## ORANGE STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 327 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 787

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$198,000  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

## ANALYSIS

The temporary buildings that have been serving for general campus use which will be vacated upon completion of the new science structure will be remodeled to provide an adequate art curriculum facility. The estimated cost of this project is \$50,000. An additional \$148,000 will be required to provide equipment for the art students in this area. We have not had an opportunity to review this equipment list but expect to do so prior to the budget hearings. This is not an unusual expenditure for what is essentially a new curriculum on the campus. *We recommend approval.*

**California State Colleges  
SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 328 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 788

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$45,000
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**ANALYSIS**

There are seven projects included in this request. Five of them range from \$1,000 to \$5,000 and total \$15,500 and include the provision for sand removal from well No. 3, ventilation of steam tunnels, modification of smoke dampers in the music speech building, alterations to the library and additional lighting in the gymnastics room. A \$7,500 project is necessary as a safety measure in the area of the pistol range. A safety backstop and shelter shed will be provided. The largest project will be construction of a \$22,000 storage building for general use in the corporation yard area. *We recommend approval.*

**California State Colleges  
SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 329 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 790

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$121,300
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**ANALYSIS**

The first two projects are related to the utilities serving the campus. The San Diego campus is one of the oldest in the system and it has been apparent recently that extensive work is necessary in the utility area. A \$10,000 utility engineering study therefore is proposed for the next year. The second \$10,000 project is necessary to replace sewer lines that are undercapacity because of the additional load added by completion of the new life science building. Occupancy of the new engineering building at San Diego State resulted in moving the old materials testing laboratory out of the industrial arts building. It is proposed that a photography laboratory be constructed in this area for a cost of \$40,000. Two adjacent rooms of the chemistry-geology building will be remodeled for \$9,000 and \$15,000 each to accommodate laboratory needs of geology graduate students. The southwest exposure of the industrial arts building will be sheltered by sun control louvers for \$16,000 to reduce excessive heat buildup. Chemistry equipment required by the expanding program will be purchased and installed for \$15,000. Three additional small improvement projects for a total of \$6,300 will be completed. *We recommend approval.*

**Capital Outlay****Items 330-332****California State Colleges  
SAN FERNANDO STATE COLLEGE****ITEM 330 of the Budget Bill****Budget page 793****FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
SAN FERNANDO VALLEY STATE COLLEGE,  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$7,000  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

One of the homes acquired by the college in the course of land acquisition will be remodeled to serve as a child development center for \$5,000. The remaining \$2,000 will be used to replace sidewalk curb and paving that was damaged when utility work was done by local government. *We recommend approval.*

**California State Colleges  
SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE****ITEM 331 of the Budget Bill****Budget page 795****FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND  
EQUIPMENT, SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE,  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$70,600  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

Equipment for the language laboratory will be provided for \$5,500. Alterations in the biochemistry laboratory will be completed for \$9,100. Unfinished space in the basement of the arts and industries building will be given a minimum treatment to provide for needed storage area for \$24,300. The handball courts at San Francisco State are the three wall type and will be converted to the standard four wall with chain link roof for \$22,000. Three additional small improvement projects ranging from \$1,500 to \$5,000 and totaling \$9,700 are proposed. *We recommend approval.*

**California State Colleges  
SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE****ITEM 332 of the Budget Bill****Budget page 797****FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND  
EQUIPMENT, SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE,  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND****RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$91,200  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

San Jose State College—Continued  
ANALYSIS

A dangerous situation will be corrected with the construction of a volatile chemicals storage area for \$9,000. Steam service will be extended for \$10,000. Substandard lighting in the library reading rooms will be improved for \$24,000. The program clock system will be extended for \$40,200. Two additional projects of \$4,000 each will provide improved laboratory vacuum service in the science building and solar control on the old engineering building. *We recommend approval.*

California State Colleges  
SONOMA STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 333 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 799

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted .....	\$53,840
Recommended for approval .....	No change

ANALYSIS

The first phase of the corporation yard for the new site will be constructed for \$30,000 and equipped for \$20,000. We have not seen the proposed design of this structure but we are satisfied that this cost indicates an economical solution. A classroom in the temporary campus will be altered to provide a language laboratory for \$3,840. *We recommend approval.*

California State Colleges  
CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE

ITEM 334 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 803

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted .....	\$146,114
Recommended for approval .....	No change

ANALYSIS

The minor project funds budgeted for the 1963-64 year are divided into \$77,914 for the San Luis Obispo campus and \$68,200 for the Kellogg-Voorhis campus.

Four of the projects for the San Luis Obispo campus are related to the engineering program. The mechanical engineering laboratory will be remodeled, additional electrical capacity and additional metal working equipment will be provided for \$7,100, \$7,800 and \$10,300 respectively. The air-conditioning building power supply will be replaced for \$9,650. In the science area the science building will be provided with sun control awnings for \$16,000 and a storage building will be con-



## California State Polytechnic College—Continued

structed in an alcove of the science building for \$6,000. The final project estimated to cost in excess of \$5,000 is a restroom for the agricultural area. There are five additional projects that will cost less than \$5,000 each and total \$15,308 which are related to the agricultural program and building lighting improvement.

Two of the Kellogg-Voorhis projects that are estimated to cost more than \$5,000 are related to the farm program. The first is the construction of a horse weaning barn for \$12,000 and the second is the construction of a lambing barn for \$5,300. A storm drain will be constructed to divert water channeled onto the college property from the freeway and a corporation yard warehouse will be provided for \$8,250 and \$30,000 respectively. There are four projects estimated to cost less than \$5,000 each and totaling \$6,650 relating to the engineering agriculture and physical education program. *We recommend approval.*

## MARITIME ACADEMY

ITEM 335 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 807

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted .....	\$148,375
Recommended for approval .....	None
Unresolved .....	53,375

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION .....	\$95,000
-----------------------------------	----------

## ANALYSIS

This item will provide for one major equipment project for a prior construction project and one major construction project as follows.

## a. Equip engineering building .....

\$53,375

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$548,500 for the construction of an engineering building and \$145,300 for the equipment of that building at the California Maritime Academy. It is now proposed to add to the equipment, items which were overlooked in the initial appropriation. We have raised some questions concerning the propriety of several very high cost items in this list but these questions have, not yet been resolved. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

## b. Construct corporation yard .....

\$95,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$49,000 from the General Fund as a minor item to construct a modest building to improve the corporation yard situation on this campus. It was subsequently decided that this would not be adequate. It was with reluctance in the first instance that we had agreed to recommend the \$49,000 item in view of the fact that this campus is a static one as far as enrollment is concerned and that while the corporation yard and maintenance facilities are not of as high caliber as would be desired, we believe they can serve for some time, particularly since the ship is used to some extent as a maintenance

**Item 336****Capital Outlay****Maritime Academy—Continued**

shop area since it contains many shops both for instructional purposes and for maintaining the ship. We recently re-examined the situation at the site and have come to the conclusion that it is not justifiable to spend more than the amount that was originally appropriated.

The budget proposes to revert the \$49,000 and to provide a new amount of \$95,000 from the bond funds. We believe this is an unnecessary and unwarranted expenditure at this time and *consequently we recommend disapproval.*

**DEPARTMENT OF EMPLOYMENT**

ITEM 336 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 809

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$633,380  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide financing for two major construction projects, one major alteration project, preliminary plans for major projects in the following fiscal year and two minor projects, as follows.

*a. Construct building addition, Stockton----- \$280,560*

The present Stockton premises were occupied by the State in 1952, at which time it was projected that the building would be adequate for a 10-year period through 1962. The structure had a gross area of almost 20,000 square feet. Within this 10-year period the growth of the staff has now reached a point where overcrowding is beginning to take place and it is proposed to increase the available space by an amount sufficient to care for the agency for the 10-year period from 1964 through 1974. 1964 would be the earliest in which the addition could be occupied. The project will provide over 9,700 square feet of gross additional area with a net usable area of approximately 7,830 square feet. The design will of necessity require the continuation of the existing style in order to make the addition compatible with the existing building. Also there will be a considerable amount of alteration in the existing building to accommodate the reshuffling of offices which will be necessitated by the addition.

The cost is estimated at approximately \$27.50 per gross square foot at total project level which appears to be reasonable in view of the fact that a substantial amount of alteration is involved. *We recommend approval.*

*b. Construct building addition, Bakersfield----- \$192,720*

The Bakersfield facilities of this department were also occupied in 1952 and were planned to provide for growth during the 10-year period until 1962. The growth has occurred and overcrowding is being experienced. This proposal would add approximately 7,100 gross square

## Department of Employment—Continued

feet to the existing almost 14,000 feet. As in the project above the additional area will carry the agency through 1974.

The cost of the project is approximately \$27.50 per gross square foot at total project level which appears to be reasonable in view of the extensive alterations required in the existing building. *We recommend approval.*

c. *Alter employment building, Sacramento*----- \$100,000

The Department of Fish and Game, which occupies space in the Sacramento Employment Building, is scheduled to move to the new Retirement Building in May of 1964. The Department of Social Welfare which also occupies space in the building is scheduled to move to the Motor Vehicle Building upon its completion, which will occur very shortly. The removal of these two agencies will free a substantial amount of space which must be altered to meet the needs of the Department of Employment. The two agencies collectively occupy somewhat over 76,000 square feet of net usable area. Also the Department of Employment, in making use of this area, will have to alter some of its own area since it will shift segments of its own agency. Together this appears to be an adequate justification for the amount of \$100,000 for the project. *We recommend approval.*

d. *Preliminary plans* ----- \$20,000

The practice of providing funds for preliminary plans to be prepared for the succeeding budget has been well established by the Legislature. However, in this instance the amount appears to be somewhat too great for the purpose. The average cost of preliminary plans has been three-quarters of 1 percent. On this basis the amount being proposed would provide for over \$2½ million worth of construction projects. This does not seem to be indicated in the fiscal year following. In view of the fact that the actual funds are allocated for preliminary plans purposes only by action of the Department of Finance it would appear that there will be adequate control on the expenditure of the funds and to the extent that funds are not expended they will revert to their source. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

e. *Minor projects* ----- \$40,100

The local operating office of employment will be altered to better handle the increasing workload for \$20,000. Congestion caused in the cafeteria of the main Employment Building will be relieved by the installation of a conveyer belt and rearrangement of the dishwashing area for \$20,100. *We recommend approval.*

## DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE—GENERAL ACTIVITIES

ITEM 337 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 811

FOR MAJOR AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION, EQUIPMENT AND  
REPAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE,  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted -----	\$1,645,260
Recommended for approval -----	915,000
Amount unresolved -----	319,760
Recommended reduction -----	\$410,500

## ANALYSIS

This item proposes to provide funding for two major working drawing projects on a reimbursable basis, one augmentation of previously funded construction, two site acquisition projects, three major alteration projects, one major equipment project and one minor project as follows.

## a. Working drawings, office building, Sacramento ----- \$350,000

The Capitol Master Plan calls for the construction of an office building, designated as number 8 on the plan, at the corner of Eighth and N Streets in Sacramento, on part of what is now the Department of Employment parking lot, which was originally purchased by the Disability Fund. This office building is intended ultimately to house the health and welfare agencies such as the State Department of Health, the State Department of Mental Hygiene, State Department of Social Welfare, etc. As of this writing there has not yet been developed a clear program of the size, shape and type of the building. On the basis that the total architectural and engineering service costs of such a building would approximate 6 percent of the total project cost we might assume that the building will ultimately cost between \$5,750,000 and \$6 million. Furthermore, at a cost of \$6 million for a general office type of building we may assume a project cost of \$25 a square foot which at \$6 million would mean a gross area of approximately 240,000 square feet. Since it has long been contemplated that the Department of Public Health should move to Sacramento it would appear to be an appropriate move in this direction by providing for such working drawings. Initially these drawings will be funded from the General Fund but ultimately this amount will be returned to the General Fund when the Legislature approves construction money from the Public Building Construction Fund which means money provided by certificate borrowing from state trust funds. *We recommend approval.*

## b. Working drawings, Supreme Court, Sacramento ----- \$200,000

The Capitol Master Plan contemplates the location of a Supreme Court building complex on the square block bounded by 9th and 10th Streets and O and P Streets in Sacramento, which is now under active acquisition. The Capitol Plan also contemplates that by 1980 there would be required 77,000 square feet of net useable area for the Su-

## Department of Finance—General Activities—Continued

preme Court and other courts as well as some offices. On the assumption that this would be a monumental type building with probably not over 55 percent efficiency of space utilization we might assume that this would result in a gross building area of about 140,000 square feet which, at a cost of \$35 to \$40 per square foot, would mean approximately \$5 million for this building. Since it has long been contemplated that the Supreme Court should be moved to Sacramento, and existing law so provides, it would be appropriate to provide for working drawings as a first step. Initially the drawings will come from the General Fund but ultimately this will be replaced when the Legislature authorizes construction funds from the Public Building Construction Fund which receives its money by certificate borrowing from state trust funds. *We recommend approval.*

*c. Acquisition of site, planning, construction and equipment,  
Governor's Mansion ----- \$400,000*

This project, as described, is somewhat of a misnomer since no acquisition of site, as such, is involved. The State already owns the site upon which this structure is to be erected. Basically the proposal of an additional \$400,000 merely represents an augmentation needed to make the total construction project solvent over and above the \$475,000 which is already available.

The available funds consist of \$150,000 which was appropriated for the acquisition of a site for the Governor's Mansion, which acquisition was later abandoned in favor of using the site already owned by the State at 15th and N Streets, and \$325,000 in an additional appropriation which was intended to be used with the \$150,000 for the actual total construction cost of a Governor's Mansion. When the latter appropriation was made the total cost was based on a contemplated mansion of approximately 10,000 gross square feet. The present Governor's Mansion measures approximately 9,000 gross square feet in a basement and three stories. The original proposal was based on a study made by the Division of Architecture in 1959 which contemplated a modern well-laid-out building having approximately 10,000 gross square feet of area. The cost in this study was less than \$300,000. This was later updated to over \$400,000. This 10,000 square feet in a modern well-designed building would provide a great deal more usable area than is provided in the existing mansion with its hodgepodge of badly laid-out rooms.

Subsequent to the last appropriation, mentioned above, the Capitol Building and Planning Commission in co-operation with the Department of Finance established a program for a Governor's Mansion and offered this as a basis for a design competition which was ultimately won by the San Francisco architectural firm of Campbell and Wong. This program went far beyond an ordinary residential mansion. It provided that less than one-half of the total structure would be devoted to actual residence facilities for the Governor and his immediate family. The balance of the structure would provide facilities for large state functions and for temporary housing of guests of the State. The

## Department of Finance—General Activities—Continued

program thus resulted in a plan having a gross area in excess of 25,000 square feet. To the best of our knowledge such a program was not represented to the Legislature at the time it was asked to appropriate the additional \$325,000.

We suggest that the existing funds are adequate for the construction of a very high-quality residential mansion. Within a gross area of not to exceed 12,000 square feet it would be possible to provide a large master bedroom with two separate dressing-room facilities and two separate bathroom facilities for the Governor and his lady, four additional family bedrooms with baths, a maid's room with bath, an ample study for the Governor, a large living room having the capacity to entertain as many as 50 guests at one time and a large dining room with a capacity to seat at least 40 people together with kitchen, pantry and other appurtenant facilities. For a high-quality fully air-conditioned facility we would estimate a cost of between \$40 and \$45 per gross square foot including all necessary landscaping and a swimming pool. This would result in a total cost of possibly \$500,000 or slightly over which could be justified on the basis of ordinary cost index rise since the original appropriation was made.

The large formal state function areas being provided in the present plan represent spaces that will remain idle for relatively large portions of the time. We believe the functions contemplated in these facilities can be served equally well by the use of hotels or other established facilities which are completely suitable for large formal social events of this nature. Such facilities are available within a few blocks of the contemplated site for the Governor's Mansion. *In view of the foregoing we would recommend deletion of the proposal to augment the existing appropriation.*

*d. Acquisition of site, Sacramento*----- \$150,000

This acquisition will provide the site for the ultimate construction of Building No. 8 in the Capitol Master Plan as mentioned above. It represents the northeast quarter of the block between Seventh and Eighth and N and O Streets which is now occupied by the employment parking lot. Originally this block was purchased by an appropriation from the Employment Disability Fund at a cost of approximately \$600,000. Therefore this proposal represents one-fourth of the historic cost. *We recommend approval.*

*e. Acquisition of land, Stockton*----- \$125,000

This project proposes an augmentation to a previous appropriation for purchase of land for a state office building in Stockton. The purchase was originally initiated by appropriation in the 1956 Budget Act and to date approximately \$245,000 has been expended for acqui-

## Department of Finance—General Activities—Continued

sition of three-fourths of a square block. The present proposal will permit the acquisition of the balance of the property, thereby providing a complete square block for the ultimate construction of the state office building. *We recommend approval.*

*f. Alterations, Los Angeles State Office Building*----- \$100,000

There is an area on the west side of the first floor of the new office building in Los Angeles which has never been finished for office use, it having been used for storage purposes. Basically while it is part of the first floor with reference to Broadway it is a windowless area because it backs up to the hillside of the building on Hill Street and is therefore in effect a sort of basement. It has an area of something over 16,000 feet which is proposed to be remodeled and improved for regular office use as well as some storage purposes. We have not seen a complete program on the project and he have no basis for evaluating the amount requested. *Consequently, can make no recommendation at this time.*

*g. Alterations, Franchise Tax Board, Office Building No. 2  
and Archives Building, Sacramento*----- \$135,700

As of this writing we have received no program for these alterations other than the information that there is involved the installation of data processing equipment and the development of some office space. *Consequently we can make no evaluation of the amount proposed and therefore can make no recommendation at this time.*

*h. Alterations, Library and Courts Building, Sacramento*----- \$84,060

This project proposes to expand the power facilities coming into this building which have been marginal for a number of years due to additional equipment having been installed without increasing the power source. The bulk of this cost is for this purpose. In addition we are informed that there is to be some additional office and library space created. However, we have received no program to cover the project and consequently we cannot evaluate the estimate. *Therefore, we can make no recommendations at this time.*

*i. Equip Retirement Building*----- \$90,000

The Retirement Building in Sacramento is scheduled to open in March of 1964. A building of this size requires a great many items of equipment to maintain, operate and clean the structure. This equipment list does not include office furnishings which are provided by the individual agencies occupying the building. The list does include such things as floor polishing and floor washing machinery, all types of janitorial equipment, ladders, etc., as well as some building maintenance machine tools and related equipment. *We recommend approval.*

*j. Minor projects*----- \$10,500

This involves a single project for the painting of the exterior of the State Garage at 10th and O Streets in Sacramento. This structure was basically designed as a rugged unfinished concrete building. We would point to the fact that there are many famous and noted modern struc-

## Department of Finance—General Activities—Continued

tures designed by outstanding architects which are finished in raw architectural concrete without paint and are intended to remain so. We believe that this structure is a relatively handsome one along the same lines and that painting the structure, which means that ultimately it will have to be repainted regularly, is an unnecessary expenditure since it has no relationship to the safety or preservation of the structure. *Consequently, we recommend this project be disapproved.*

## Department of Finance

## CALIFORNIA MUSEUM OF SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY

ITEM 338 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 815

## FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, CALIFORNIA MUSEUM OF SCIENCE AND INDUSTRY, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted .....	\$62,400
Recommended for approval .....	None
Recommended reduction .....	\$62,400

## ANALYSIS

This item will provide for a single major construction project involving the installation of a new roof on the old national guard armory adjacent to the California Museum of Science and Industry, which is to be used as a space age museum building. The remodeling of the interior that was previously funded was completed in 1962.

The roof complex is structurally adequate and safe. The problem is entirely one of weather integrity. The roofing has been patched from time to time and this has managed to keep the roof reasonably weather-tight. It is our understanding that there now appears no likelihood of permanent exhibits in this building before the end of 1964 although there will be temporary exhibits in it from time to time. In view of the acute shortage in the General Fund and in view of the relatively marginal aspects of this project we would recommend that it be deferred and that maintenance on it be continued until such time as there is more adequate justification for replacing the roof. *Therefore we recommend disapproval of the project at a savings of \$62,400.*

## Department of Mental Hygiene

## LANGLEY PORTER NEUROPSYCHIATRIC INSTITUTE

ITEM 339 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 832

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted .....	\$18,000
Recommended for approval .....	No change



## Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute—Continued

## ANALYSIS

The department is attempting to reduce to a minimum, capital expenditure at Langley-Porter because of the plans to move to a new structure that is considered in the major capital program. There are two projects, however, that could not be ignored. The first project involves remodeling a children's recreation and therapy area so that effective supervision will be possible with minimum staff. The second project entails a minimum amount of partition movement necessary to enable deployment of the administrative staff into a streamlined operation. At present the switchboard operator doubles as a receptionist but is located in an area that is not conducive to the dual role. There is also an administrative secretary located in a screened area of the main lobby. *We recommend approval as requested.*

## Department of Mental Hygiene

## NEUROPSYCHIATRIC INSTITUTE AT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

ITEM 340 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 833

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted \_\_\_\_\_ \$12,700  
Recommended for approval \_\_\_\_\_ No change

## ANALYSIS

Four small projects will be completed with the proposed funding. A portion of the day hospital area will be altered so that it may serve as an emergency service unit for a cost of \$6,200. A one-way observation window necessary to facilitate training, will be installed. The mail duplicating room will be enlarged, and an unfinished area will be developed with the remaining funds. *We recommend approval as requested.*

## Department of Mental Hygiene

## AGNEWS STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 341 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 834

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted \_\_\_\_\_ \$83,040  
Recommended for approval \_\_\_\_\_ No change

## ANALYSIS

The most important minor project requires the replacement of unsafe main electrical breaker switches and extension of the electrical distribution system to provide an alternate source of power for important loads.

**Agnews State Hospital—Continued**

The cost of this project is \$21,300. A sewer line that does not drain due to its outlet being higher than its inlet will be altered for \$6,400. Obsolete shirt-pressing units will be replaced for \$11,340. Bedpan-cleaning facilities will be installed in wards that house predominantly bedridden patients at a cost of \$12,500. The \$7,300 project to provide convenience outlets and plumbing necessary for domestic clothes washers will enable those patients that so desire to clean their own personal garments. Ironer hoods will be installed in the laundry to remove the heat generated with the hope of bringing the heat level down to a tolerable range. The cost of this project is \$15,000. Three additional small improvement projects estimated at a total of \$9,200 are included. *We recommend approval as requested.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
ATASCADERO STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 342 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 835

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$19,000
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**ANALYSIS**

A new laundry lint filter with increased capacity will be installed for \$7,000 to reduce the high cost of recurring maintenance. Three additional projects for under \$5,000 totaling \$12,000 and pertaining to fire and safety recommendations, improvements to the sewage plant, and refurbishing of the main corridor will be completed. *We recommend approval as requested.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
CAMARILLO STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 343 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 836

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$89,300
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**ANALYSIS**

Wards 8 and 8a will be reconditioned including the installation of improved heating and lighting, the refurbishment of the electrical and plumbing systems, and painting and cleaning for \$18,000. A second project for \$18,500 is necessary to replace deteriorated telephone conduit with new conduit sized for the expanded needs. A domestic water tank must be reconditioned for \$14,000. Repairs to the children's unit ward

## Capital Outlay

Items 344-345

### Camarillo State Hospital—Continued

require an expenditure of \$7,900 because of damage inflicted by uncontrollable children. Refrigerated water coolers will be installed at various places for \$6,000, a new transformer capable of handling the increased load of the dairy will be installed for \$5,550 and the dirt road access to the reservoir tank will be surfaced for \$5,300. There are five additional projects for under \$5,000 each and totaling \$14,050 that are necessary for the safety and welfare of the patients. *We recommend approval.*

### Department of Mental Hygiene

#### DeWITT STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 344 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 838

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

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted .....	\$94,500
Recommended for approval .....	No change

#### ANALYSIS

The major project at DeWitt is the replacement of laundry equipment that has worn beyond repair at a cost of \$43,000. A second increment of the boiler rebricking job will be completed for \$11,600. Visitors' toilets will be constructed for \$5,300. The incremental construction of wheelchair ramps, patient ward toilets, and improved ward screened porches will be completed for \$7,500, \$7,300 and \$9,600 respectively. Three additional projects requiring \$10,200 include the installation of refrigerated water coolers and toilet partitions for the patients and the enlargement of laundry and trash receptacle areas for improved maintenance. *We recommend approval.*

### Department of Mental Hygiene

#### MENDOCINO STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 345 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 839

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

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted .....	\$53,700
Recommended for approval .....	No change

#### ANALYSIS

The main kitchen roast oven must be replaced as it is in a condition beyond repair. A new oven may be purchased and installed for \$24,000. Squirrel cage fans will be purchased and installed in ward units G, H, I, J and K for \$8,000 to correct the lack of air movement which is a deterrent to sleep on hot summer evenings. There are eight projects each requiring less than \$5,000 and totaling \$21,700 that are necessary to eliminate hazards, facilitate maintenance, and improve water supply for additional irrigation. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
METROPOLITAN STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 346 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 840

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$78,350  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

A sprinkler system and baffle partitions suspended from the ceiling will be installed in the laundry as a measure to reduce the fire hazard. Most of the Mental Hygiene laundries are not sprinkled as it is not a code requirement. In this case however, conditions in the laundry exceed the code allowances and the correction must be made. Sun louvers are proposed to reduce the heat buildup in the receiving and treatment building on the west exposure, for \$13,000. The utility steam tunnel must be vented so that temperatures will be lowered to enable the maintenance people to perform their normal duties. Cost of this project is \$10,000. An automatic sprinkler system will be installed in a portion of the grounds to eliminate the need for manual irrigation. It has been found that automatic sprinkler systems reduce both personnel and water needs. There are eight additional projects each estimated at less than \$5,000 and totaling \$20,400 that are necessary to reduce hazards, improve sanitation and provide for improved service to the patients. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
MODESTO STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 347 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 841

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$76,650  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

The main kitchen roasting oven must be replaced for \$15,000. The pot-washing section and scullery is in need of extensive repair which will cost \$12,000. Patient toilet and shower improvements will be made for \$10,000. A ceiling mounted track and curtains will be provided for four medical surgical wards to partially isolate terminal cases, for \$8,700. A dining room floor will be refurbished for \$5,500. There are eight projects estimated for less than \$5,000 each and totaling \$25,450 that should be completed to reduce fire hazards, improve patient conditions and reduce maintenance costs. *We recommend approval.*

## Department of Mental Hygiene

## NAPA STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 348 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 842

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$103,400  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

## ANALYSIS

The most important project at Napa is to replace X-ray equipment that has served its useful life and is now not only a hazard but continually breaks down and is the cause of lost professional time. Cost of the replacement is \$49,900. The shower arrangement in the children's unit will be altered so that the boys and girls do not have to share the same shower area and a storage room will be converted to a doctor's treatment room for \$8,000. Two roasting ovens will be replaced in the main kitchen because the existing units have outlived their economic usefulness. Cost for the two is \$36,500. A swampy area will be recovered by installation of a drain system for \$5,000, and large dormitories will be subdivided for \$4,000. *We recommend approval.*

## Department of Mental Hygiene

## PATTON STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 349 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 844

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$100,650  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

## ANALYSIS

A major remodeling project on Ward 14 has been scaled down so that a substantial improvement will be made for \$40,000. Included in this estimate are funds necessary to provide a fire sprinkler system to comply with Fire Marshal recommendations. Automatic industrial type dishwashers will be installed as an increment of a continuing project on the wards for \$14,300. The intense heat in the laundry will be reduced to a tolerable level with the installation of exhaust fans and an evaporative cooler in the press room. The cost of this project is \$14,900. The employee parking lot at the corner of the administration building will be surfaced for \$5,500 to reduce the dust problem. The electrical distribution system in the residential area will be altered to handle the increased load. Cost of this project is \$6,850. There are five projects estimated at \$5,000 or less each and totaling \$19,500 that are designed to reduce safety hazards and to provide better services for the patients. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
STOCKTON STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 350 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 845

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$63,200  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

The old brick, main male building which has been vacated because it is a safety hazard will be demolished for \$20,000. The cottage X kitchen facilities will be remodeled for \$14,000. Three Bradley sinks will be removed and 24 washbasins installed and additional modifications completed in the 156-patient ward D. The estimated cost is \$8,100. A sand trap will be installed on well No. 7, air filters will be installed in the receiving and treatment and administration buildings, refrigerated water coolers will be installed, the maintenance yard will be surfaced, the shoeshop will be relocated in the clothing area and garbage disposals will be installed in ward kitchens. The cost of these six projects will total \$21,100. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
FAIRVIEW STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 351 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 846

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budget ----- \$70,000  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

A very unsuitable working condition created by lack of handwashing facilities in acute infirm wards will be corrected by the addition of four wash basins each in the 65-bed dormitories of six wards, at a cost of \$7,200. Vinyl floor covering will be installed as a continuation of a phase project to cover concrete floors in numerous ward buildings. The \$10,000 budgeted for this project this year will make a total of \$40,000 to date. An additional \$9,000 is necessary to replace laundry chutes that were not properly constructed for the kind of use they receive. Several hot water tanks must be relined for \$8,000. Sun control awnings are necessary to reduce the heat build up in Buildings D, E and F, the cost of which is estimated to be \$10,000. The school recreation field that should have been completed as part of a major project will now be completed at a cost of \$8,000. Seven projects ranging in cost from \$1,000 to \$5,000 and totaling \$17,800 are required to facilitate services and eliminate safety hazards. *We recommend approval.*

## Capital Outlay

Items 352-353

### Department of Mental Hygiene PACIFIC STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 352 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 848

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

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$107,400  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

#### ANALYSIS

The bathing and hand washing facilities improvements that have been phased since a 1955 epidemic emphasized the need will be continued for \$15,000. A washer and an extractor will be replaced in the laundry for \$13,400. Clothes rooms will be enlarged and remodeled for \$6,000. A cathodic protection system is necessary to correct a ground condition that has accelerated corrosion and caused leaks in the underground piping. The cost of the project is \$10,000. The second phase of installation of window protection screens requires \$6,300. Vinyl tile will be used to cover concrete floors in Wards 13A, B and 20 for \$5,400. The ground irrigation system will be extended for \$5,800. Fire sprinklers and ceiling hung baffles will be installed in the laundry to protect against fires and to offset certain code deficiencies. Estimated cost is \$28,500. There are six additional projects that range in price from \$1,400 to \$4,000 and total \$17,000 that are necessary for improved maintenance and better service to the patients. *We recommend approval.*

### Department of Mental Hygiene PORTERVILLE STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 353 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 849

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

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$70,040  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

#### ANALYSIS

It has been determined that it is necessary to convert from gas to electric service in a number of the wards at Porterville State Hospital. The hospital has been plagued with gas leaks, a cathodic protection system did not solve the problem and reinstallation of gas services is an alternative that is too expensive. Conversion to electricity will be completed for \$18,500. The main kitchen will be modified to facilitate proper cleaning in the scullery area and to provide a proper food cart storage area. Additional hand washing facilities must be constructed in the wards as part of a continuing effort to reduce contamination. There are five projects ranging in cost from \$2,240 to \$4,600 that provide for improved services and adequate employee work space. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
SONOMA STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 354 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 850

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$36,450
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**ANALYSIS**

An additional water heater is needed to provide water at the recommended minimum temperature and will be installed in the laundry building for \$6,400. Walker and Slater cottages will be improved by the addition of industrial type dishwashers complete with the rinsing necessary to insure disease control. Cost of this modification is \$5,350. There are eight projects ranging in cost from \$1,200 to \$5,000 and ranging in type from the installation of bathing slabs to the installation of fly fans that are required to provide a minimum hygienic level necessary for this type hospital. Included is \$2,500 for additional hand washing facilities on the wards. It will be noted that each of the four mentally retarded hospitals is requesting money from the minor capital budget for hand washing facilities on the wards to alleviate the health hazard in that area. *We recommend approval.*

**CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL**

ITEM 355 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 854

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$2,420,850
Recommended for approval .....	196,775
Amount unresolved .....	2,224,075
Reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide for two site acquisition projects, three major construction projects and a group of minor projects as follows:

*a. Site acquisition, Bishop* ..... \$50,000

The Highway Patrol operations in Bishop are conducted in a leased facility which has now become too small for the purpose. Furthermore, it is desired that in providing a new state owned building for the Highway Patrol that it also be sized to provide space for the Department of Motor Vehicles which will be an ideal relationship and an economical use of the space. The ultimate building will probably exceed 5,000 gross square feet in area together with 20,000 square feet of paved parking area, carports and vehicle inspection areas. *We recommend approval.*



## California Highway Patrol—Continued

*b. Site acquisition, Truckee*----- \$15,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$10,000 for the acquisition of a site in Truckee on which to erect an office building to house the activities of both the California Highway Patrol and the Department of Motor Vehicles in this area. At that time it was assumed that there would be a piece of state highway-owned property that would be available for the purpose. This has not materialized and it is therefore necessary to augment the original appropriation to buy a piece of privately owned property which is now under negotiations. *We recommend approval.*

*c. Construct annex and alterations to Sacramento headquarters office building*----- \$1,990,000

The program for the proposal of a new, enlarged headquarters facility for the Department of California Highway Patrol has gone through a number of phases. Several years ago the Legislature appropriated funds to provide for a joint venture office building between the Highway Patrol and the Military Department. This idea has now been abandoned. It is now proposed to build an annex which would occupy the parking lot area now embraced by the existing headquarters building. However, it is our understanding that this too is open to some further question with the thought in mind that the building should be built on adjacent property originally intended to be used for Motor Vehicle Department parking and possibly to convert the existing Highway Patrol headquarters building into a license counter office for the Department of Motor Vehicles. In any case the total program at this writing is still so uncertain that it is impossible for us to make an evaluation either as to the adequacy of the project or the propriety of the estimate. *Consequently, we must defer any recommendation to a later time during the legislative session.*

*d. Construct area office building, Merced, phase II*----- \$52,910

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$8,000 for the preparation of working drawings and the Budget Act of 1961 provided \$148,000 for construction, making a total of \$156,000 for a new state-owned Highway Patrol facility at Merced to take the place of the present leased facility. Subsequently, it was discovered that the program for the building had been inadequate and that it needed to be enlarged to do a proper job in its area. This has led to a new estimate totalling over \$210,000 and indicating a deficit of over \$52,000.

The proposed building will have 7,550 square feet of gross area and will be designed along fairly standard lines and with standardized utilization of spaces on the interior in accordance with previous experience in the Highway Patrol. This will result in a building costing \$15.55 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$27.84 per gross square foot for the entire project. The large discrepancy between the two figures is occasioned by the fact that the buildings of this type require extensive site development, particularly parking, and their generally isolated location requires costly utility development. In view of these

**California Highway Patrol—Continued**

factors and since we have reviewed the plans in considerable detail we believe that the cost is reasonable for the purpose and *consequently we recommend approval.*

*e. Construct area office building, Truckee----- \$234,075*

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$8,000 for the preparation of working drawings for a new office building in Truckee which would house both the California Highway Patrol and the Department of Motor Vehicles. A site for the new building is under negotiation as mentioned in the acquisition project above.

It is proposed to construct a building having in excess of 5,000 gross square feet which will probably result in a cost similar to the Merced building. However, as of this writing we have received no final plan package, principally because of the delay in acquiring the site. *Consequently until we receive such a package we are in no position to make recommendations. However, we anticipate that the package will be forthcoming while the committees are still in session and at that time we will make a recommendation.*

*f. Minor projects ----- \$78,865*

There are nine minor projects contained in this proposal. Six of them require a total of \$12,440 and consist of small alterations to improve the Highway Patrol operation in various offices of the State ranging in scope from a sun control to the addition of a lawn sprinkling system. The motorcycle accident investigation training area at the academy will be completed for \$36,500. This project was approved in a prior year but limited funds required a reduction in scope. The service roadway at the academy will be widened to permit more ready access of auto transport vehicles and a curb will be added to prevent these vehicles from driving on the academy lawns. This expenditure (\$17,425) is the first of a continuing project to provide adequate roads at the academy. A final project is to provide storm drainage from the academy to the major new storm drain system constructed in co-operation with the City of Sacramento. *We recommend approval of all California Highway Patrol minor construction projects.*

## DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES

ITEM 356 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 856

FOR MAJOR AND MINOR CONSTRUCTION, ACQUISITION,  
IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, DEPARTMENT  
OF MOTOR VEHICLES, FROM THE  
MOTOR VEHICLE FUND

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$1,508,652  
 Recommended for approval ----- No change

## ANALYSIS

This item proposes the financing of three major property acquisition projects, three major construction projects, one major working drawings project and several minor projects as follows.

a. *Purchase of site for office building and parking facilities,  
 Berkeley or vicinity* ----- \$275,000

The department is presently leasing approximately 2,350 square feet of building space with less than 8,000 square feet of offstreet parking area. Both these areas have become much too small for the average load placed on the facilities. The present lease expires in February of 1966.

Searches have been made in the area for more adequate lease space but this has not been fruitful since either adequate space is not available or the cost is excessive. Consequently, it is proposed to purchase a site on which will ultimately be erected a building providing over 5,800 square feet of net usable space with adequate parking area probably exceeding 50,000 square feet. The ultimate structure will probably cost over \$240,000 including all of the parking developments. *We recommend approval of the acquisition.*

b. *Purchase of site for office building and parking facilities,  
 Montebello or vicinity* ----- \$300,000

The Department of Motor Vehicles is presently leasing space for this office at two separate locations because of the growth of the traffic and the inability to expand the main office. Attempts have been made to locate more suitable leased space in the general area of the present office, which is considered ideally situated for the workload in the area. No suitable leased space has been found and it is proposed therefore to buy a site which will provide space on which to ultimately build a structure having approximately 10,755 square feet of net usable area together with a parking area exceeding 100,000 square feet. The ultimate structure together with development of parking facilities will

## Department of Motor Vehicles—Continued

probably exceed \$475,000 in total cost. *We recommend approval of the acquisition.*

*c. Purchase of site for office building and parking area, Palo Alto or vicinity*----- \$250,000

The Department of Motor Vehicles is presently leasing facilities in Palo Alto which contain approximately 2,200 square feet of net usable area and somewhat less than 13,000 square feet of offstreet parking area. This is substantially less than is required by the department to handle the average traffic load. Attempts have been made to locate adequate leased facilities but these are very difficult to find in this area and in most cases the costs for leased spaces in this area are very high. Consequently, it is proposed to acquire a site which will have sufficient area to provide for a building having approximately 5,665 square feet of net usable area together with parking area exceeding 55,000 square feet. The building which would ultimately be constructed will probably cost in excess of \$255,000 including the parking and site development. *We recommend approval of the acquisition.*

*d. Construct office building, San Rafael or vicinity*----- \$251,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$110,000 for the purchase of a site for state-owned building in the vicinity of San Rafael in order to provide adequate office and parking space in lieu of space being leased. As of this writing a final determination of a site in this area has not been made. However, it is anticipated that this determination will be concluded within the next several months and that it will be possible to start construction within the budget year. It is therefore proposed to construct a building having approximately 5,740 square feet of net usable area and a gross area of almost 7,200 square feet together with about 62,000 square feet of parking area. The gross project cost is estimated at approximately \$34 per square foot, which includes all of the extensive exterior development such as parking, serial number checking area, fencing, lighting, etc. Structures for the Department of Motor Vehicles have been fairly well standardized in their general design and in utilization of space. Based on prior experience the cost mentioned above is about average and consequently even though we do not at this time have a planned package and outline specifications, we believe that we are justified in recommending approval. When the plans package becomes available it will be reviewed and if the project deviates from previous standards, the Legislature will be informed. *We recommend approval.*

*e. Construct office building, Bakersfield or vicinity*----- \$347,500

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$250,000 for the acquisition of a permanent site in Bakersfield for a state-owned facility in lieu of the space being leased which has grown quite inadequate in office area and parking space. As of this writing a determination has been made on a site which will be slightly less than three acres and will thus be more than adequate to provide for the new project. It is proposed to construct a building having approximately 8,425 square feet of net usable

## Department of Motor Vehicles—Continued

area and over 10,500 square feet of gross area together with parking area of something over 81,000 square feet including a covered engine inspection area. While we have not yet received a plans and specifications package for the project we know from considerable experience with this agency that the designs generally follow a fairly standard pattern as to space utilization and general building quality. As in the project immediately preceding we believe that this experience justified proceeding with the project at this time. The cost is estimated at approximately \$33 per gross square foot which would include all of the site development, parking, lighting, etc. This about equals the average of similar projects that have been constructed in the last few years. *We recommend approval.*

f. *Blacktop parking area for new Sacramento headquarters building* ----- \$55,300

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$460,000 for the purchase of land adjacent to the new headquarters building for parking purposes. The area consists of approximately 144,000 square feet or 3.2 acres. This would provide for between 375 and 450 cars. If we assume that the space will average about 400 cars the cost for development would then be about \$138 per car space which is reasonable for surface parking area. *Consequently we recommend approval.*

g. *Working drawings for new building, Palo Alto or vicinity* -- \$15,000

This will provide for the construction project to follow the acquisition mentioned in project (b) above. The amount represents approximately 6 percent of the estimated cost of the building. Since it is entirely possible that the acquisition will be consummated before the end of the budget year it would seem appropriate to move the project ahead as quickly as possible by providing for working drawings to follow as soon as a site is decided upon. Construction funds would be requested in the 1964-65 fiscal year. *We recommend approval.*

h. *Minor projects* ----- \$14,852

There are two minor projects proposed, both relating to the Hope Street building in Los Angeles. The first is for \$13,852 to replace a sidewalk that is deteriorating because of the use of a faulty aggregate in the original construction. The second project is for \$1,000 to patch and paint damage caused by the yearly late surge of automobile registrants. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Public Works  
HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH**

**ITEM 357 of the Budget Bill**

**FOR SUPPORT OF HIGHWAY SAFETY RESEARCH  
FROM THE STATE HIGHWAY FUND**

Amount requested -----	\$150,000
Estimated to be expended in 1962-63 fiscal year -----	90,925
Increase (65.0 percent) -----	\$59,075
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b> -----	<b>None</b>

### Highway Safety Research—Continued ANALYSIS

Chapter 2110, Statutes of 1961, by appropriating \$100,000 from the State Highway Fund inaugurated an integrated program of highway safety research and directed that it be conducted under the general authority of the Department of Public Works with the co-operation and assistance of the Departments of the Highway Patrol, and Motor Vehicles, the Division of Highways and the Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering of the University of California. As of October 8, 1962, this \$100,000 appropriation has been allocated among these agencies as follows: Highways, \$23,500, Motor Vehicles, \$18,500, Highway Patrol, \$40,000, UCLA, \$16,000, and reserve, \$2,000.

There has been set up a series of studies aimed at various pressing highway safety problems such as control and characteristics of negligent drivers, study of single car accidents, effectiveness of traffic law enforcement, driver guidance on freeways and several other similar studies.

With the growing total number of traffic fatalities in California, the growing number of registrations and the increasing per capita mileage traveled it becomes imperative that a co-ordinated program of research be undertaken within the State geared particularly to the State's peculiarities but taking advantage of studies carried on in other parts of the country which might be pertinent. This means that a co-ordinating function must be carried out which will take cognizance of all research in this field and avoid duplications wherever possible. Since the total annual expenditure for highway construction, highway maintenance and highway law enforcement exceeds \$800 million it would appear that a relatively modest sum for continuous research would be well justified.

This item proposes an appropriation of \$150,000 for the continuation of this program. Only a few thousand dollars of this will be used to complete current projects. The bulk of the money will be used in initiating new studies all aimed at the large and complex body of physical and psychological factors which enter into the art and skill of highway driving and the concurrent accident frequencies. Some of these new studies are "the effects of fatigue on driving skills and related judgments," "the roadway characteristics and manpower deployment," "driver performance of persons involved in fatal accidents," etc. The same agencies previously mentioned will continue to share in the total effort. *We recommend approval of the request.*

### MILITARY DEPARTMENT

ITEM 358 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 916

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

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted .....	\$177,715
Recommended for approval .....	No change

Military Department—Continued  
ANALYSIS

This item will provide for one major project and a series of minors as follows:

a. *Preparation of plans and supervision of construction of federally financed projects*----- \$50,000

Federal funds are available for the entire cost of construction of buildings or facilities used for the storage, care and maintenance of federal equipment issued to the State. This total cost, however, does not include the cost of the preparation of plans or working drawings and of inspecting the project during construction. The State is required to finance these activities. The amount being proposed is based on the anticipated availability of federal funds for the fiscal year. *We recommend approval.*

It should be noted that the program of construction of basic armories under Public Law 783 of the 81st Congress by which the federal government provides up to 75 percent of the cost of the basic building with the State providing the balance, has now been discontinued in its entirety. The last major appropriation which was made by the State for this program was in Item 397 of the Budget Act of 1957 which appropriated \$639,795 for a list of armories and at the same time reappropriated the unexpended balance of prior appropriations and extended their availability until 1960. Subsequently unexpended balances were again extended by budgetary action of the Legislature. The intent was that as long as any funds remained the program would continue to construct armories in which the State's share averaged about 45 percent of the total gross project cost. As of June 30 of the current fiscal year it is anticipated that approximately \$929,000 will still have remained unexpended and unallocated. This is being reverted as savings to Section 16409 of the Government Code. The net effect of this action is to relieve the General Fund by this amount.

b. *Minor projects*----- \$127,715

Roof repair to various armories to comply with a Division of Architecture report will continue at \$37,215. Grading and paving of the Torrence Armory will be accomplished for \$15,000. The Long Beach Armory boiler and heating system will be overhauled for \$5,000. Vehicle storage and offstreet parking areas will be paved at various armories for \$54,000. The Stockton Armory will be rehabilitated for \$16,500. *We recommend approval.*

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

ITEM 359 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 918

FOR SITE ACQUISITION, ENGINEERING SERVICES, MINOR  
CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION, FROM  
THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$735,628  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

Department of Conservation—Continued  
ANALYSIS

This item will provide for five specific site acquisition projects, one general acquisition project for opportunity purchases, engineering, planning and inspection services and a larger group of minor projects as follows:

*a. Site acquisition, Tulare County ranger unit headquarters— \$25,000*

The present ranger unit headquarters is located in the town of Visalia and has become completely surrounded by general urban development. It is proposed to purchase a seven acre site outside of town on which ultimately to relocate this headquarters. A new headquarters complex will probably cost in excess of \$150,000 for buildings and general site development. In view of the difficulties of operating this type of emergency service in an urban environment we believe that there is justification for taking this step. *We recommend approval.*

*b. Site acquisition, Tuolumne County ranger unit headquarters \$5,000*

It is proposed to expand the existing headquarters land holding by approximately four acres to provide a buffer strip adjacent to the site to prevent possible encroachment by subdivision interests and to allow for future expansion. This headquarters is located in the town of Sonora.

We do not believe that there is adequate justification for the purchase of land for this type of activity merely as a buffer against housing encroachment. However, it would appear that as more of the total fire plan is put into effect and surrounding fire stations are enlarged or their personnel increased, this headquarters station will have to provide additional warehousing and storage facilities. Consequently, we believe there is justification for the purchase on this basis only. *We recommend approval.*

*c. Site acquisition for Pilot Peak lookout----- \$6,000*

The present site is under lease for an area of about two acres. The lookout is a key location in the Folsom Lake drainage area and since the present tower is in great need of repair or rebuilding it is felt that the site should be acquired before substantial sums are spent on a new structure. *We recommend approval.*

*d. Copperopolis forest fire station, additional acquisition----- \$2,500*

This involves the purchase of one or possibly two acres to provide an adequate leach field in order to alleviate the present condition which permits sewage effluent to run across the highway. *We recommend approval.*

*e. Smartsville forest fire station, additional acquisition----- \$8,000*

This installation is actually a combination forest fire station and spike conservation camp for the Youth Authority and is relatively crowded under these conditions at something less than two acres. Also they are experiencing difficulty with sewage disposal and an adequate



## Department of Conservation—Continued

leach field is required. Consequently, it is proposed to add approximately four acres. *We recommend approval.*

f. *Miscellaneous site acquisitions statewide*----- \$5,000

This will provide for opportunity purchases of lookout sites, radio repeater sites and possibly fire station sites. *We recommend approval.*

g. *Engineering, planning and inspection services*----- \$113,151

This activity proposes the continuation of a long established service whereby positions are carried under capital outlay funds for the purpose of engineering, survey and construction inspection services of the large volume of work that is performed directly by the Division of Forestry. For example, in the development of every conservation camp the division carries out the initial site development projects such as rough grading, rough road building, water and power lines, etc. We believe that this is an appropriate charge against capital outlay funds rather than general support costs since it does represent a recognized part of the cost of any project. The service covers eight general technical positions of whom six are construction inspectors, one clerical position and a surveying team of four positions. The amount proposed is somewhat less than the \$127,000 that was provided in the current fiscal year. *We recommend approval.*

h. *Minor construction projects*----- \$570,977

The physical plant of the Division of Forestry is so expensive with numerous small facilities dotting the State that it would be impractical, in this analysis, to set forth all of the minor projects that are required to either keep this extensive plant in good operating condition or to expand it in minor ways. We have examined the list of projects and from our general familiarity with the various sites we believe there is reasonable justification to provide for them. The total amount is only a few thousand dollars greater than that provided in the current fiscal year, which should be anticipated since the fixed installations of the division are growing in number, size and complexity. It should also be pointed out that approximately \$200,000 of the total amount represents inmate labor projects to be performed by the inmates of the various conservation camps. This will include such things as road and bridge repairs, construction and improvements to sewer, water and utility lines, construction and improvement to telephone and power lines, and general rough types of work which would otherwise be considerably more costly. *We recommend approval.*

## DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

ITEM 360 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 926

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted -----	\$81,600
Recommended for approval -----	No change

Department of Fish and Game—Continued  
ANALYSIS

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

*a. Kern River hatchery water supply system*----- \$65,000

The water supply system at this well-established fish hatchery has for many years been relatively unsatisfactory. Its source is a rock rubble diversion dam on the Kern River directly in the path of the discharge from an upstream power dam. This rubble dam and its appurtenant facilities have been a constant source of trouble and dissatisfaction. Flood problems have from time to time been the greatest source of trouble because of the loose nature of the diversion structure. The replacement consists of a 36-inch wood stave pipeline, almost 2,000 feet long which will pick up water by means of a new diversion structure immediately adjacent to the turbine discharge at the power dam where the water temperature is fairly constant and of proper level for trout propagation. The cost has been estimated by both the Department of Fish and Game and the Division of Architecture and it appears to be highly satisfactory for the purpose. It is anticipated that the actual work will be performed by the Department of Fish and Game using some contract assistance.

*b. Minor projects* ----- \$16,600

There are two minor projects both of which are virtually mandatory. One is the relocation and replacement of the domestic water system at the Mojave River hatchery which is based on a well and pump which were on the property when purchased by the State and which have now begun to fail seriously. The proposal is to tap into the main water supply system which supplies the ponds. The other involves a payment to the federal government for the purchase of the research vessel "Alaska." This vessel has been in the State's hands for four or five years on a no-charge, lease basis. During this period the State has invested upwards of \$150,000 in equipment and modernization. A bill was proposed in Congress to transfer title entirely to the State and in the process the bill was amended to require that the State pay half the surplus value of the vessel. This amounts to \$13,000 and appears to be entirely justified in view of the value of the vessel. *We recommend approval of both minor items.*

Department of Parks and Recreation  
DIVISION OF BEACHES AND PARKS

ITEM 361 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 930

FOR REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION, MAJOR AND MINOR  
CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	-----	\$5,614,416
Recommended for approval	-----	4,489,604
Unresolved	-----	1,124,812

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

Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued  
ANALYSIS

This item will provide for a major statewide acquisition program, 19 major construction projects at various state beaches and parks, one major planning project and a group of minor projects as follows. It represents largely an expansion of existing parks and emphasizes additional camping and picnicking units.

*a. Opportunity purchases of state park lands*..... \$500,000

This project proposes to continue the precedent established by the 1962 Budget Act in which a like amount was provided for the first time to be used by the Division of Beaches and Parks for the acquisition of suitable lands as unusually favorable opportunities arose. Such opportunities sometimes result from estate settlements, changes in long-range planning of existing owners or sometimes from the availability of lands due to highway acquisition programs and the resultant severance problems.

These purchases might be additions to existing and operating state parks for beaches, or they might serve as the key nucleus to a future new state park or state beach. In any case the expenditure of the funds would be subject to review by the State Public Works Board both as to cost and propriety of purpose. *We recommend approval.*

*b. Anza-Borrego Desert State Park development*..... \$213,100

This project proposes a new campground development in Culp Valley which will consist of 100 camp units, two trailer ramadas or shelters and one picnic ramada, three comfort station buildings, two combination buildings having both comfort stations and showers, a fenced employees trailer area to accommodate two house trailers, a metal utility and shop building, a small power generating plant, a water system including a pump and distribution lines to strategic points in the camping area, a network of roads and parking spaces at the campsites and a ticket-vending system which the Division of Beaches and Parks is planning to try at this location in order to save manpower. This will result in a cost of somewhat over \$2,100 per camp unit. As an initial development this appears to be a reasonable amount and any future additions in this immediate area should reduce the cost per camp unit. *We recommend approval.*

*c. Benbow Lake State Park*..... \$84,105

The dam on the Eel River at this state park was originally built in 1931 and apparently under relatively poor inspection and control conditions. The Division of Beaches and Parks has already spent about \$196,000 in making major repairs to the dam proper. It is now necessary to replace the fishway which is also of concrete construction and in danger of failing due to its age and original design. The work will be done by the Department of Water Resources and the estimate has been prepared by that agency. From our familiarity with this dam we believe that the estimate is in line with the nature and scope of the project. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

## Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

*d. Bolsa Chica Beach State Park*----- \$154,000

The beaches in Southern California, particularly in the area of Newport and Huntington Beach have suffered considerably from erosion which has been aggravated by the lack of substantial runoffs from the local rivers which normally would deposit large volumes of replacement material along the shores. The erosion control project proposed actually involves almost \$1 $\frac{3}{4}$  million of which the largest portion will be provided by the federal government. The total project will involve sharing of costs by the State Department of Water Resources, Orange County, the federal government and the Division of Beaches and Parks. The Beaches and Parks share will be used initially to provide and place three million cubic yards of sand along the beach in the Surfside-Sunset Beach area. The cost has been estimated by the Department of Water Resources and the federal government. *We recommend approval.*

*e. Clear Lake State Park development*----- \$144,400

This project proposes the development of 65 campsites as well as 25 picnic units in a reclaimed beach front area immediately to the east of the mouth of Cole Creek and between the lake and Old Kelsey Creek channel. This will provide a fairly self-contained area in which it is proposed to construct two combination buildings having comfort stations and showers, a comfort station building, 10 shelter ramadas in the picnic area, a substantial water system extension and extension of other utilities as well as roads, parking spaces, walks and landscaping. These facilities will provide much needed additional capacity for summertime use of this area. The cost appears to be in line with the size and nature of the project. *We recommend approval.*

*f. Columbia Historic State Park restoration*----- \$121,500

The original master plan for the restoration of buildings at this historic state park involved approximately 29 or 30 buildings. Of this total 12 have been completely restored or restored as far as it was desirable to do so. Four are actively in process of being restored and 13 remain to be restored or reconstructed with some work having been partially completed.

The present proposal would simply provide funds for a continuation of this restoration, to some extent on a catch-as-catch-can basis as special situations reveal themselves due to the continuing ravages of time and weather. Basically the work consists of strengthening or replacing foundations, strengthening walls, roofs, floors, etc. It is difficult to make actual estimates of the cost of such work and the proposal in effect provides \$100,000 for actual work with the balance being for planning and supervising service. This sum will be used as far as it will go and as the situation requires. *We recommend approval.*

*g. Del Norte Coast Redwood State Park initial development*\_\_ \$416,200

This state park approximately eight miles south of Crescent City and comprising about 6,000 acres straddling State Highway 101 has

## Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

not heretofore been developed for camping or formal picnicking. Consequently, basic initial developments are required before any camping facilities can be installed. This project proposes the establishment of such facilities which include roads, powerline, an auxiliary diesel power generator, service areas, a major water supply and distribution system, one standard park residence, one utility building and one flammable material storage building. The water and electrical utilities alone represent almost \$115,000 and the roads and parking areas another \$240,000. This is a rugged and steep area where road and parking areas are costly to develop and construct. The Division of Architecture will do practically all of the work excluding the roads and parking which will be handled by the Division of Beaches and Parks probably with the assistance of the State Division of Highways. The costs appear to be in line and it should be pointed out that this will not provide any camping or picnicking spaces as such. These will be proposed in a succeeding budget. *We recommend approval.*

*h. El Capitan Beach State Park development*..... \$52,400

This is a relatively small unit in the state park system comprising about 17 acres and about 20 miles west of Santa Barbara on Highway 101. The project proposes the further expansion of the facilities by constructing 20 additional campsites, 25 picnic sites, one comfort station and the necessary extension of roads and parking, electrical lines, planting, etc. A certain amount of channel erosion and bank protection is also included. The cost appears to be in line with the size and character of the project. *We recommend approval.*

*i. Fort Ross Historical Monument development*..... \$54,700

Land has recently been acquired adjacent to the original monument property which was relatively small, comprising only three acres. It is now proposed to develop this additional land by providing parking areas and a comfort station. In addition it is proposed to improve the water supply system and make several other minor utility improvements. Parking at this monument has heretofore been a relatively unsatisfactory situation because most of it occurred along the side of the highway. This project will materially improve the situation. *We recommend approval.*

*j. Henry Cowell State Park development*..... \$107,300

This park is located in Santa Cruz County just south of the Town of Felton. The project proposes the continuation of the development of the so-called Graham Hill portion of the park which is in the northeast corner of the property. The project will provide an additional 50 overnight campsites, a comfort station building, a combination building, together with the necessary roads, walks, parking areas and water, power and sewage connections. Most of the work will be done by the Division of Architecture but a few relatively minor projects will be accomplished by the Division of Beaches and Parks, such as providing nature trails, signs, area cleanup, etc. The cost appears to be commensurate with the size and type of project. *We recommend approval.*

## Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

*k. Henry W. Coe State Park initial development*----- \$174,700

This park is a relatively undeveloped site of over 12,000 acres located in Santa Clara County near Morgan Hill. It is accessible from Highway 101 by a recently improved county road. No previous camping or picnicking facilities have been provided. This project would provide the first of such facilities in 50 camp units, one combination building, one comfort station building, a complete water storage and distribution system, an electric utilities system and roads, walks and parking. This represents a relatively high cost, for each of the camp units is well over \$3,000 apiece. However, ultimately additional developments will bring the unit cost down. This is the only camping facility available directly from Highway 101 for many miles in either direction. In view of the site difficulties we believe the cost appears to be in line with the problems. *We recommend approval.*

*l. Humboldt Redwoods State Park site restoration and protection*----- \$139,350

This project is part of a long range, probably 10-year, program for restoring, improving and correcting the Bull Creek area of Humboldt Redwoods State Park. This area has been subject to serious erosion by high water runoffs which has caused damage to large and important stands of redwood trees. If this program is not started, continuing damage may eventually destroy all of one of the best redwood stands in the area. The work consists principally of regrading and reshaping Bull Creek channel, placing bank protection and cleaning up previous damage. The work will be done largely by contract with some assistance from Beaches and Parks personnel. *We recommend approval.*

*m. Joshua Trees State Park initial development*----- \$255,800

This park comprises almost 3,000 acres of desert scenic area about 16 miles from Lancaster in Los Angeles County. No development has taken place in this area to date. The proposed project would provide not only basic initial development but also 50 overnight camp sites, 25 picnic units, a comfort station building and a combination building, together with a major water distribution system, some electrical distribution, a park ranger's residence and garage, a utility and shop building and the installation of ticket-vending devices which will be tried in this area for the first time. Over \$95,000 of the total is required to provide roads and parking in the area. While the cost per unit is relatively high it is anticipated that future additional developments will bring the unit cost down. *We recommend approval.*

*n. La Costa Beach State Park general development*----- \$730,100

This is a relatively small park comprising about 45 acres mostly of beach frontage a few miles south of Carlsbad. The Budget Act of 1962 provided over \$370,000 for the initial development of this area and this project proposes the final phase of the development. When completed, the development will have about 300 campsites for overnight beach camping. However, the park is very heavily used on a daytime basis so that the cost per campsite cannot be used as a criterion for com-

## Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

parison purposes. The beach will get far more use as a day facility than it will for overnight purposes although the 300 campsites will provide a much-needed boost for the southern coast area.

The final phase involves the construction of an office and lifeguard control tower, a utility and shop building, five lifeguard towers, office and contact station, six comfort station buildings and five combination buildings together with roads and parking, landscaping, walks, etc. which comprise over \$250,000 alone. Also extensive utility development of gas, water, sewer and electrical services amounting to \$140,000 will be included. In view of the acute need for more facilities of this type in the southern part of the State we believe the project is justified and that the cost is commensurate with the anticipated use. *We recommend approval.*

*o. Millerton Lake State Park development..... \$232,200*

As of this writing the information which has been submitted to us in the form of plans and estimates does not appear to coincide with the description contained in the budget of the type of project that is involved. Furthermore, the estimate which we have indicates a cost of over \$314,000 as compared with the amount proposed in the budget. *Until we can examine and evaluate the details of the project as actually contemplated by the amount included in the budget we can make no recommendation.*

*p. Picacho recreation area development..... \$71,800*

This area is a recently acquired one about 20 miles north of Yuma adjacent to the Colorado River. No facilities or development exist at this time. The project proposes the construction of 15 campsites each with its own ramada or shelter, 12 prefab chemical toilets, a relatively small water system, roads and other site development and the development of a boat basin by excavating two boat channels from the river into a low area which will provide a basin where boats may be launched. Almost one-half of the total project most will be to provide roads and parking area. This is a very popular area used by both fishermen and hunters as well as recreationalists and represents the first such development in many miles of the California side of the Colorado River. The cost seems commensurate with the size and character of the project. *We recommend approval.*

*q. Salton Sea State Park water system developments..... \$749,512*

As of this writing we have received no information on this project to support the proposal or explain what is intended. We anticipate however that we will have received such information before the committees have completed their review of the budget. *When we have received the information and have had an opportunity to evaluate it we will make appropriate recommendations.*

*r. San Buenaventura Beach State Park erosion control..... \$143,100*

Information we have received on this project, as of this writing, indicates a substantially larger cost as the State's share in contribut-

## Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

ing to the development of a beach erosion control system in this area. We are aware of the fact that there is a considerable irregularity in the shoreline occasioned by the unpredictable supply of sand from the Ventura and Santa Clara Rivers and we are aware that the project involves the placing of groins and sand fills. It is anticipated that we will have adequate information on the project before the committees have completed their review of the budget. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

s. *San Mateo Beaches State Park development*----- \$102,500

This state park is really a series of disconnected parks stretching along the coast from the southern extremity of South San Francisco to about 23 miles south of Half Moon Bay. It is made up of about 10 separate and distinct areas. The development proposal involves the construction of two combination comfort stations and dressing room buildings at Francis Beach which is almost at the Town of Half Moon Bay together with 50 additional picnic units, extensions of the water and sewer system, grading, landscaping and roads and walks. In addition it is proposed to correct and restrain against further erosion an area at San Gregorio Beach which is about 11 miles south of Half Moon Bay.

The beaches in this area are very heavily used, particularly by people from San Francisco, and additional facilities are definitely needed. The cost appears to be commensurate with the size and nature of the work. *We recommend approval.*

t. *Sonoma Coast State Park development*----- \$345,900

This park is also one which consists of a series of separated pieces of coastal scenic properties stretching between Bodega Bay and Jenner along the route of State Highway 1. The project proposes to add facilities in an area at the head of Bodega Harbor and in an adjacent area fronting the Pacific Ocean. Involved are two combination comfort station-dressing room buildings, two combination buildings with showers, two regular comfort station buildings, an entrance kiosk, 100 overnight camp units, 50 daytime picnic units, water distribution system, extensive road and parking development and some fencing and landscaping.

This park is very heavily used in the summertime because of the prevailing cool climate which brings people from the very hot Central Valley areas. It would appear that while the cost per unit is relatively high, the location is one that has numerous difficulties which increase unit costs. In consideration of the size and type of project and the site problems we believe the cost is justified. *We recommend approval.*

u. *Squaw Valley State Park planning*----- \$10,000

This project proposes the preparation of a long-range plan for the general development of this park as a fully functioning unit in the state park system. It is contemplated that there will be changes in the present arrangement of buildings, movement and conversion of some of



Division of Beaches and Parks—Continued

the buildings to other uses, the establishment of picnicking and camping areas, ultimate alterations to Blythe Arena for more adequate utilization of the building, etc. It would appear that if any extensive changes are to take place in this park and if substantial additional sums of money are to be expended, an adequate master plan is needed to permit the Legislature to thoroughly review and understand, the proposal. We recommend approval.

v. Minor construction ----- \$811,749

There are over 50 separate and distinct minor projects included in this total which are far too numerous to delineate and explain in this analysis. They represent mainly projects of further development or improvement or repairs in existing and functioning state parks or state beaches. There are such things, for example, as an additional parking area at Natural Bridges State Park at \$49,600; a utility and shop building at Mitchell Caverns State Park for \$18,900; additional development of day use and picnic area at Folsom Lake State Park at \$46,700; fire truck trail construction in Big Basin Redwood State Park at \$13,500; replacement of a water line at Angel Island State Park at \$4,810; construction of trails and telephone lines at Mt. Jacinto State Park at \$19,760; additional camp ground development at Emerald Bay State Park at \$21,250; etc.

While we have not examined all of these projects in detail we have spotchecked a number of them and from previous experience we are familiar with the fairly standard approaches used by the Division of Beaches and Parks and as a consequence we feel that we can recommend this list of minor items.

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

ITEM 362 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 955

FOR CAPITAL OUTLAY, DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES  
FOR TRANSFER TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND  
RECREATION, FROM THE GENERAL FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted -----	\$686,000
Recommended for approval -----	541,000

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION -----	\$145,000
-----------------------------------	-----------

ANALYSIS

This item provides funds to implement the provisions of the Davis-Dolwig Act which authorizes appropriation of General Fund money to construct recreation and fish and wildlife facilities at state constructed water projects. Last year this analysis questioned the form of the Budget Bill of 1962 in which money for this purpose was taken from the General Fund while simultaneously California Water Fund money was appropriated by the continuing appropriation provisions of the Burns-Porter Act for the same purposes but was not included in the Budget Bill. This practice had the effect of permitting the Department

## Department of Water Resources—Continued

of Water Resources to construct dams and reservoirs for recreation purposes without legislative review by using California Water Fund money, and then subsequently asking the Legislature to use General Fund money to complete the undertaking. This problem still remains, but is partly resolved by the decision made in the preparation of the Governor's Budget that most of the funds appropriated for the Davis-Dolwig Act would be included in the ceiling of \$6,000,000 allocated to beaches and park construction for fiscal year 1963-64. The difficulty may be further resolved by the participation of the Department of Parks and Recreation in the planning of expenditures.

The money in this item is to be transferred to the Department of Parks and Recreation for expenditure. The work funded is as follows:

Frenchman Dam access roads -----	\$191,000
Antelope Valley recreation development -----	300,000
Del Valle Dam recreation development -----	50,000
Airpoint Dam recreation development -----	100,000
San Luis Dam tree planting -----	45,000

Last year the Legislature appropriated \$231,000 for access roads at the Frenchman Project. This was in addition to some access road construction contained in the project construction contract. Last year \$258,000 was expended to grade and improve a road around the reservoir itself. No work was done on the road into the project which has always been in poor condition. This year a request is being made for an additional \$191,000 to rebuild the road into the project. Thus, a total of \$449,000 will be expended for roads at the project.

The \$300,000 for Antelope Valley recreation development does not include any access road construction, since approximately 20 miles of road construction and road relocation was included in the original construction contract for the project. This is one reason why the construction contract for Antelope Valley Dam amounted to \$2,905,000.

The latest information on the Airpoint Dam indicated that the Department is reconsidering the construction of this terminal reservoir because of adverse geologic conditions at the dam site. The department already has a problem in land acquisition here because it acquired at an early date considerable land in excess of the subsequent needs for the project. Included in this excess land is a golf course which the department purchased several years ago. The County of Alameda is requesting the Department to turn the golf course over to it for operation. If the course is not needed for project construction purposes, it should be sold to the highest bidder unless the county wishes to pay the Department the original purchase price for the land. The State's water program should not inadvertently or otherwise become a vehicle for non-water-oriented purposes. *It is recommended, in the event the Airpoint Golf Course is not needed for actual project purposes, that it be sold to the county or the highest bidder and that until a decision on the future of the construction of the Airpoint Reservoir is made, the \$100,000 for recreation development not be appropriated.*

The sum of \$45,000 is being requested to plant 13,000 young trees at the San Luis site in anticipation of their growth to provide shade

## Department of Water Resources—Continued

when recreation use begins. The Division of Forestry has selected trees which are suitable for the area but these trees will require watering during the first three years of growth. It has not been possible to secure any factual data that these trees will survive without artificial watering after the three-year period of initial growth. *Until it is clearly demonstrated that these trees will not require continued watering, it is recommended that they not be planted and that \$45,000 for this purpose be removed from the budget.*

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

ITEM 363 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 958

**FOR MINOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
VETERANS HOME OF CALIFORNIA,  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$82,750
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**ANALYSIS**

It is estimated that \$32,600 will be required to convert the west hospital elevator from manual to semiautomatic operation. This is the only elevator that serves the B and C wings and is not operative for 12 hours per day. The amount of vertical traffic justifies continual operation. Lincoln barracks will be rewired for \$20,000 so that it can handle the present capacity and to conform with recommendations of the State Fire Marshal. "Kool" shades will be purchased and installed on the west wing of the hospital to reduce the heat build-up. Cost of the shades will be \$16,000. The lighting of the hospital dining room will be brought to a more adequate level for \$5,500. Other projects under \$5,000 each and totaling \$8,650 include replacing outlet plugs in the hospital with explosion-proof plugs, installation of a conductive floor in the recovery room, and modernization of the electrical service in the McKinley barracks. *We recommend approval.*

**UNALLOCATED**

ITEM 364 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 960

**FOR PROJECT PLANNING TO BE ALLOCATED BY THE  
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$125,000
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**ANALYSIS**

In keeping with the well-established policy of the Legislature this item will provide for the cost of preparing preliminary plans and programs for some classes of major projects and all General Fund supported minor projects in order that adequate financial data may be

**Unallocated—Continued**

presented to the Legislature at each session when actual construction appropriations are requested.

It is proposed, for example, to provide \$75,000 of this amount to permit a program of preliminary planning in the Division of Beaches and Parks on the basis of \$6½ million of construction value and 1.2 percent of project cost as the cost for the preliminary planning and programming. Similarly, \$15,000 of this is provided for the Trustees of the California State Colleges, \$12,000 for the Department of Water Resources, \$11,000 for the Department of Mental Hygiene and smaller amounts for the other General Fund state agencies.

*We recommend approval.*

**UNALLOCATED**

ITEM 365 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 960

**FOR MISCELLANEOUS REPAIRS, IMPROVEMENTS AND  
EQUIPMENT TO BE ALLOCATED BY THE DIRECTOR  
OF FINANCE, FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$100,000
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**ANALYSIS**

The Legislature has for many years provided annual lump sums under control of the Director of Finance to be used for emergencies and unforeseen situations requiring repairs, improvements and equipment which might arise in the course of the fiscal year and for which the agency budget had inadequate funds. For the past several years this amount has been stabilized at \$100,000 annually. In 1960-61 less than \$20,000 was expended and the balance reverted as savings. In the 1961-62 fiscal year something over \$83,000 was expended and the balance was reverted. In the current fiscal year to date about \$5,500 has been expended but the balance remains available to the end of the current fiscal year. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Corrections**

**CONSERVATION PROGRAM**

ITEM 366 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 720

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
CONSERVATION PROGRAM, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$700,000
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**ANALYSIS**

This item proposes \$700,000 to equip the Southern Conservation Center Branch, the 640 man institution located adjacent to the California Institution for Men at Chino. The detailed list of this equipment

**Conservation Program—Continued**

is still being prepared and therefore has not been reviewed. Past experience has proven this to be a reasonable expenditure to equip such a facility.

The Southern Conservation Center Branch is now operating and houses those inmates scheduled to occupy the rehabilitation center at Corona when that facility is complete. Funds budgeted in 1961, Item 349.5b, to equip the rehabilitation center, were used to equip the conservation center branch for the interim use. The \$700,000 budgeted by this item, therefore, will be used to replace equipment that will be moved to the rehabilitation center and to purchase equipment for the rehabilitation center in lieu of equipment which is common to the needs of both institutions and which will not be moved from the conservation center branch to the rehabilitation center. *We recommend approval of this item.*

**Department of Corrections****CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION AT TEHACHAPI**

ITEM 367 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 722

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION AT TEHACHAPI, FROM THE  
STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$500,000
Amount unresolved -----	500,000

**ANALYSIS**

Working drawing money was provided for a new 1,200-man institution at Tehachapi by Item 348b in the budget act of 1961. Preliminary investigation indicated that there might not be adequate water available to support an institution of this size. Design consideration was therefore delayed until this matter could be resolved. It has been determined that adequate water supply is available.

This budget item proposes that \$500,000 be made available so that site work may be completed by July 1964, thereby enabling general construction to commence immediately thereafter should the entire construction project be funded in the 1964-65 fiscal year. There are a number of important considerations that have not been resolved and as a result a complete preliminary package is still not available. We cannot make a definite recommendation in view of this lack of information.

The preliminary design that is being considered for this institution contemplates six 200-man living units. The recent Department of Corrections institution constructed at Los Padres houses the inmates in 300-man units. In the absence of information that would prove otherwise, we assume that 200-man units would require a higher staffing pattern than 300-man units. It is our opinion therefore that consideration should be given to the larger living units prior to approval of the proposed plan.

*We can make no recommendation at this time other than to question the reduced living unit size.*

**Department of Corrections  
MEDICAL FACILITY, VACAVILLE**

ITEM 368 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 728

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
MEDICAL FACILITY, VACAVILLE, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$69,200  
 Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

Funds requested by this item are required to pay the State's share in constructing a 21-inch-diameter sewage line from the institution to the City of Vacaville sewage plant. New construction in the vicinity of the institution will require that the city extend their sewage system to that area in the near future. Although the State operates its own plant and will not have to abandon this plant immediately, it is necessary that the State participate at this time so that the line will be sized large enough to handle the State's need when it does join the city system. It is also anticipated that when the State does join the city system that it will contribute a pro rata share of any required enlargement of the city treatment plant.

A budget package has not been prepared for this project. The engineering and construction will be performed by the City of Vacaville. Although we do not have the drawings and specifications to review, as we normally do for State construction projects, *this project is reasonable and is recommended for approval.*

**Department of Corrections  
REHABILITATION CENTER**

ITEM 369 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 730

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
REHABILITATION CENTER, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$130,000  
 Amount unresolved ----- 130,000

**ANALYSIS**

Funds provided by this item will be used to construct a firehouse for the United States Navy which was agreed to as part of the transfer arrangement that enabled the State to acquire the rehabilitation center from the federal government without cost. The original Navy firehouse was located so that it had to be included as part of the facility transferred to the State, therefore the State agreed to construct a replacement firehouse on the portion of the grounds retained by the Navy.

A budget package has not been submitted to the State and therefore *we cannot make a recommendation at this time.*

**Department of Corrections  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN**

ITEM 370 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 732

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$565,000
Recommended for approval .....	65,000
Amount unresolved .....	500,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ..... None

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide for two major projects, one for construction and the second for equipment of a previously funded construction project as follows:

*a. Construct feeding facilities* ..... \$500,000

The California Institution for Women was funded for construction by item 372.1b of the 1949 Budget Act. The design provided living units that accommodated 100 women each divided by a kitchen and dining room area into operating units of 50. It was considered desirable at that time that the inmates participate in food service and preparation. It has been discovered since that due to overcrowding and other problems this feeding solution is expensive and does not achieve the desired results. It is therefore proposed that \$500,000 be funded to correct the situation and provide adequate facilities. We have not received a program of the planned solution or a preliminary budget package. *We cannot, therefore, make a recommendation at this time.*

*b. Equip adjustment center* ..... \$65,000

The adjustment center designed to house 100 inmates was funded by Item 355a of the 1962 Budget Act. The facility is scheduled to be complete and ready for occupancy in May of 1964 which will require that the necessary equipment be funded in the 1963-64 budget. The proposed equipment list has not been prepared to date, therefore a review has not been made. The \$65,000, however, is reasonable for a facility of this nature and we expect to review the list before the expenditure is made. *We recommend approval.*

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

ITEM 371 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 739

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
FRICOT RANCH SCHOOL FOR BOYS  
FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$4,000
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**Fricot Ranch School for Boys—Continued**  
**ANALYSIS**

The 1962-63 Budget Bill appropriated \$147,700 for the construction of a new male employees dormitory. This item provides for the equipment necessary for the normal operation of this unit. *We recommend approval.*

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

ITEM 372 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 740

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$546,100
Recommended for approval .....	26,100
Amount unresolved .....	520,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION**..... None

**ANALYSIS**

The equipment for a construction project funded in the 1962-63 budget year and construction of a new unit are provided by this item as follows.

a. *Equip two 50-boy living units*..... \$26,100

There have been a series of units constructed and equipped at Nelles School for Boys and experience has shown that approximately \$13,000 per unit is adequate for equipment. This same level is required for these units. The equipment list has not been submitted to us but we expect to receive it prior to budget review by the legislative committees. *We recommend approval.*

b. *Construct two 50-boy living units*..... \$520,000

The two 50-boy units proposed by this item are to serve the same function as those funded in the 1962-63 Budget. The 1962-63 units were presented to the Public Works Board on January 28, 1963 and at that time the estimate was \$529,300. The current estimated cost of the two living units proposed herewith is \$598,000 which is \$78,000 higher than the amount in the budget bill and \$69,000 higher than those funded in 1962-63. There are a number of items included in the design that we feel are excessive and we hope that the cost can be reduced. We expect to have these problems resolved prior to the legislative hearings. *We cannot make a recommendation at this time.*



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

ITEM 373 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 742

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT  
NORTHERN CALIFORNIA YOUTH CENTER  
FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$9,642,700
Recommended for approval -----	3,742,700
Amount unresolved -----	5,800,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ----- \$100,000

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide for three major construction projects as follows.

- a. Construct first 400 capacity institution—phase II* ----- \$680,100
- b. Construct central administrative and service facilities—  
phase II* ----- \$3,162,600

The Budget Acts of 1960 and 1961 together provided \$350,000 for working drawings for a central services unit and an initial 400-bed satellite unit. These were based on a master plan which called for 12 such satellites, providing a total capacity of 4,800, grouped around a central services core which would provide common services to all satellites such as laundry, commissary warehousing, hospital, etc.

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$1,602,000 for the construction of the first phase of the central administrative and service core facilities and \$5,048,000 for the first major phase of the construction of the first 400-bed satellite. The present budget proposes the second and final phase of construction for the first satellite unit and the second interim phase in the development of the central services core.

The basic functional plan of this complex with respect to feeding, contemplates that there will be a central pre-preparation kitchen in the core complex together with four final preparation kitchens each of which would serve three satellites by trucking or carting the finished food from the central core area to the individual dining rooms attached to each 100 capacity domiciliary unit. We have been informed by the State Division of Architecture, which made an estimate of an alternative method, that \$100,000 could be saved in the construction cost of each satellite unit if the feeding plan were altered in the following manner. The basic pre-preparation kitchen would remain in the central core area, there would be a separate final preparation kitchen in each satellite, thus making 12 such kitchens instead of 4, to which would be attached the dining facilities for the satellite with no dining facilities as part of the individual domiciliary unit. In other words in the first plan food is brought directly to the domiciliary units and thus to the boys and in the second plan the boys come to the dining room and thus to the food. This second alternative would eliminate the cost of trucking prepared food from the central finishing kitchens to the

**Northern California Youth Center—Continued**

various satellites. Instead only the semiprepared food would be trucked in large volume to the individual satellite kitchens and there finished and served immediately into the attached dining rooms.

With respect to the second alternative, the staff of the Department of Youth Authority has determined that 12.9 positions for each group of three satellites, relating to the feeding program, could be deleted if this alternative were used. This would mean a total of 51 positions in the final development. However, the Youth Authority has rejected this alternative, despite the evidence of substantial Capital Outlay savings as well as annual operating savings, because they consider this method of feeding incompatible with their rehabilitation program. The Youth Authority has provided no substantial evidence that the first proposal would materially improve the rehabilitation program or that the second alternative would materially downgrade their program. Consequently we do not feel that the additional cost inherent in the present proposal can be justified. *Therefore, we recommend that the more economical alternative be selected and that projects A and B above be reduced by a total of \$100,000.* It is not possible to indicate the exact distribution of this reduction as this would be up to the Division of Architecture to determine.

*c. Construct 400 capacity institution, unit II----- \$5,800,000*

The second 400-boy unit will be basically the same as the first. The Department of Youth Authority has, however, proposed some changes. The most significant modification is the division of the 100-boy living units into 25-boy groups. We have not received a budget package and therefore cannot visualize the effect that this might have on the construction. We do understand, however, that they are requesting that the staffing formula for these units provide a higher ratio of personnel per inmate. This requested additional staff for the proposed second unit should be justified and approved prior to establishing 25-boy functional units. *We cannot make recommendations until submission of a budget package.*

**Department of the Youth Authority  
YOUTH TRAINING SCHOOL**

ITEM 374 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 745

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$68,308  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

Two structures to provide vocational and academic facilities were funded by the 1962-63 budget bill. The construction will be completed in the 1963-64 fiscal year. The \$68,308 requested is necessary to equip these facilities. Included within the classroom and vocational buildings

## Youth Training School—Continued

are four general classrooms, a remedial reading room, a mechanical drawing room, two paint shops, a clerk training room, an audiovisual training room, an upholstering shop, an auto service shop, a carpentry shop, a plastering shop and a masonry shop. This amount for necessary basic equipment appears reasonable. *We recommend approval.*

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

ITEM 375 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 748

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$54,230
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**ANALYSIS**

Two projects to equip construction projects authorized by the 1962-63 budget bill are included as follows:

*a. Equip 50-girl living unit* ..... \$39,230

This cost is approximately three times that necessary to equip a 50-boy living unit at Nelles School for Boys. It reflects the dining unit needs and the personal grooming room and laundry room needs that do not exist in the boy's unit. It also reflects provision for such furnishings as drapes, wardrobes and dressers that are not provided in the boys' unit. The purpose of these "frills" is to generate a feeling of pride in these girls so that they will help maintain the facilities rather than contribute to accelerated destruction. We cannot measure the effect of this effort but have accepted the theory to the extent of the extra cost of equipment required. *We recommend approval.*

*b. Equip academic classroom and office addition* ..... \$13,000

This equipment will provide the basic needs of the three additional classrooms that will be completed in the 1963-64 fiscal year. *We recommend approval.*

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

ITEM 376 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 754

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

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$87,506,300
Recommended for approval .....	31,593,800
Amount unresolved .....	\$29,247,600

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION .....	\$6,664,900
-----------------------------------	-------------

University of California—Continued  
ANALYSIS

This item proposes an extensive program on nine campuses and a series of field stations, comprising five land acquisition proposals, 24 equipment projects for previously funded construction, 45 construction projects, eight projects for working drawings for future construction and one proposal for funding for preliminary plans and studies as follows.

Statewide:

*a. General planning studies, preliminary plans and programming*----- \$789,200

This proposal continues the established procedure whereby funds are provided in advance to permit adequate planning and development of information of projects to be included in the fiscal year following the budget year. It represents a spread of between 1 and 1½ percent of from \$70 to \$75 million worth of projects which would probably be proposed in the 1964-65 fiscal year. *We recommend approval.*

*b. Equip intercampus library facility at Richmond*----- \$149,500

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$375,000 for alterations and some equipment of a centralized storage facility in Richmond which was to be based in the old Ford plant recently acquired by the university. It is proposed to expand the intercampus library capacity in this facility by the purchase of additional steel shelving. This approach permits the storage of large quantities of books, which are not used frequently, at a storage cost that is considerably below that which would be experienced if additional regular library space were created on the several campuses. *We recommend approval.*

*c. Acquisition of books for new campuses, step II*----- \$600,000

Within the next few years three completely new campuses will be in operation, one at Irvine, another at Santa Cruz and the third at San Diego. It is proposed to provide an initial complement of 75,000 volumes for each of these campuses upon opening. Thus far funds have been appropriated or otherwise allocated to the extent that 80,000 volumes will have been purchased. The amount proposed now will provide another 75,000 volumes and the following year will probably propose funding of the remaining 70,000 volumes to make the total. *We recommend approval.*

*d. Acquisition of land for Sierra foothill range agricultural field station*----- \$100,000

The budget states that this field station consists of two parcels, one of 800 acres and the other of 1625 acres which are separated by private property and are therefore not accessible to each other. Our understanding is to the contrary, that there is in fact an owned connection but that it is not as convenient to traverse as would be across the private property. We seriously question the justification for the expenditure of \$100,000 simply to make access between the two parcels a little more convenient. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval of this acquisition.*

## University of California—Continued

*e. Construct and equip Kearney horticulture field station----- \$357,800*

The land, consisting of 195 acres, has recently been acquired (1961) from funds provided by the university and the agricultural industry. It is now proposed to develop this property, which is located at Reedley in Fresno County, by construction of wells and a water supply system, fencing and field roads, a combined office-laboratory building with approximately 3,000 square feet of usable area, a 3500 square foot structure to serve as a warehouse, shop and machinery storage building and two single family dwellings of 1,200 square feet each. The plans for the facilities appear to be simple and straightforward and the cost appears to be in line with what is proposed for the property. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

*f. Construct south coast agricultural field station, step II----- \$176,100*

This field station in Orange County was acquired in 1955 and to date approximately \$240,000 of fair and expositions funds and donated funds has been expended on developing the site including the construction of lath houses, glass houses, supervisors cottages, etc. It is now proposed to expand the facility further by the construction of an office and laboratory building having almost 3,000 square feet of assignable space, a glass house addition and a potting shed. The costs appear to be in line with the size and nature of the facilities to be developed. *We recommend approval.*

*g. Acquisition of television equipment----- \$200,700*

This proposal was originally contained in the support budget of the university but was subsequently shifted into the capital outlay proposal. It is divided into \$33,155 for the Berkeley campus, \$43,400 for the Los Angeles campus, \$46,775 for the San Francisco campus, \$69,899 for the Santa Barbara campus and \$7,500 for the Riverside campus. It involves such things as a portable microwave unit on the Berkeley campus which will permit "beaming" material between buildings instead of providing a fixed network of underground cables. This should materially reduce the cost of the ultimate television distribution system within the campus. Also there are color cameras, TV tape recorders and numerous items of accessories to make the television systems as flexible and as efficient as possible. *We recommend approval.*

*h. Land acquisition—engineering field stations—south----- \$750,000*

The Berkeley campus has for more than 10 years had an off-campus engineering field station in Richmond which has enabled it to carry on training and experimentation of types requiring large ground spaces and removal from built-up areas because of the occurrence of obnoxious noises, hazardous fumes, etc. It is now proposed to provide a similar off-campus engineering field station for the Los Angeles campus. A site, about 35 miles north of the Los Angeles campus at Oak Spring Canyon, has been located which is within one hour's driving time over existing or to be completed freeways. The site will be from 550 to 1,000 acres depending on price negotiations. It would appear that this type of facil-

## University of California—Continued

ity is quite essential to the proper operation of a university engineering department and since land values are rising constantly it would seem prudent to purchase the necessary site at this time. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

## Berkeley Campus

## i. Equip Stephens Union, alteration, step I----- \$93,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$566,500 for alterations to the old Stephens Union building which was acquired from the student association by the university. The space was to be altered for graduate library use in the social sciences and for some social science graduate student research offices. It is now proposed to provide the equipment necessary to make the altered space operable. Most of the cost is involved in library shelving and some office equipment. *We recommend approval.*

## j. Equip physical science lecture hall----- \$47,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$647,500 for the construction of a 500-seat physical sciences lecture hall, independent of, but immediately adjacent to the new physical sciences building. This structure is scheduled to have the highest intensity of use of any space on the campus since it is designed with a revolving demonstration area which permits one class and demonstration to take place while other demonstrations are being set up behind the scenes. It is now proposed to provide equipment to make this facility operable. The amount appears to be in line with the size and type of project. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

## k. Equip La Conte annex----- \$457,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$3,383,470 for the construction of an annex for the physics department which would have approximately 95,000 gross square feet with 55,000 square feet of usable space. The Budget Act of 1959 provided almost \$100,000 for working drawings. It is now proposed to fund the relatively costly and complex scientific equipment needed to make the building operable when it is completed in December of 1963. While we have not examined the equipment list in complete detail, the amount appears to be reasonable for this type of building. *We recommend approval.*

## l. Equip Barrows Hall----- \$300,000

The Budget Act of 1958 provided \$4,704,000 for working drawings and construction of a project designated as the business administration-social science building which has since been named Barrows Hall. The structure probably exceeds 150,000 square feet of gross area and has about 104,000 square feet of assignable area. It is expected to be completed by February of 1964. It is proposed to equip the building in order to make it operable and since this is basically a classroom type of building, not containing expensive scientific equipment the amount appears to be in line with the project. *We recommend approval.*

## University of California—Continued

*m. Equip Etcheverry Hall*----- \$900,000

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$178,000 for working drawings and the Budget Act of 1960 provided \$5 million for construction of a project then designated as engineering unit I which has subsequently been named Etcheverry Hall. The building which is scheduled for completion by February of 1964 will have approximately 109,000 square feet of assignable area within a gross building of over 180,000 square feet. It will house relatively new engineering departments and consequently the amount requested for equipment appears to be somewhat less than might be anticipated in an engineering building of this size and cost. While we have not examined the equipment list in complete detail it appears to be reasonable for the purpose. *We recommend approval.*

*n. Equip environmental design building*----- \$300,000

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$217,300 for working drawings and the Budget Act of 1961 provided \$5,612,900 for the construction of an environmental design building having a gross area of approximately 210,000 square feet and approximately 138,000 net assignable square feet. The building will house facilities for architecture, city and regional planning, landscape architecture, decorative art, etc. While we have not examined the equipment list in detail the amount proposed seems to be reasonable for the size and cost of the building. *We recommend approval.*

*o. Land acquisition, Anna Head school property*----- \$75,000

The purchase of this piece of property measuring 1.9 acres was negotiated in 1959 at a cost of \$675,000. An initial payment came from the lump sum appropriation for opportunity purchases made to the university by the Budget Act of 1959. An additional payment was made from funds provided in 1961 and the amount now requested will complete the purchase. The property will ultimately be used as part of a site for the construction of a parking structure but in the meantime the existing buildings will be used for research activities. *We recommend approval.*

*p. Construct chemistry unit II*----- \$5,397,000

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$186,500 for working drawings and the Budget Act of 1962 provided \$40,000 for site clearance for the construction of chemistry unit II. It is contemplated that the building will have over 131,000 gross square feet with 79,000 square feet of assignable area, most of it in laboratories but with some offices, shops and a branch library. This facility will provide the necessary space for an increased emphasis at the graduate and postdoctoral levels in chemistry and chemical engineering. We have not yet received the outline specification or estimate for this project nor the final preliminary plans. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

## University of California—Continued

q. Construct and equip alterations to Stephens Union,  
 step II ----- \$233,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$566,500 for the first step in altering this building which was acquired from the student association. This involved remodeling the west portion of the building. The second step involves remodeling the east portion of the building. In both cases a substantial part of the remodeling consists in bringing the building up to modern standards of electrical and mechanical safety. In addition there are partition changes and improvements in the heating and ventilating system. The second step also involves the addition of an elevator to serve six floors where there is no elevator service at all. The gross area in the second step is approximately 16,000 square feet which would mean that at total project level, exclusive of equipment, the remodeling would cost approximately \$14.38 per square foot. This represents between one-half and two-thirds the cost of building comparable space brand new. In view of the otherwise substantial nature of the building this appears to be a reasonable investment. *We recommend approval.*

r. Construct law building addition ----- \$980,700

This project is physically part of a much larger one involving the Earl Warren legal center and the law students' residence facility, both of which will be financed by nonstate funds. While we have received preliminary plans for this project we have not received an outline specification and a detailed estimate, as of this writing. Since the plans also show the scope of the nonstate financed portions it is difficult to separate the two without the outline specifications and the detailed estimate. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

s. Working drawings for alterations to South Hall, step I ----- \$19,000

South Hall which was built in 1873 has a gross area of approximately 29,000 square feet. It is proposed to remodel and modernize it for ultimate occupancy by the Institute of International Studies. A good deal of the proposed work is involved in bringing the building up to modern safety and structural codes. Ultimately the total cost of the project is estimated at \$395,000 for which construction funds will be requested in a subsequent budget. Since this building is something of a landmark on this campus and since the remodeling will produce usable space which will serve for many years, at a cost of about \$13 per gross square foot it would appear to be a reasonable proposal. *We recommend approval.*

t. Construct and equip alterations to the main library  
 project A ----- \$325,400

This project involves a series of alterations in a number of areas in the main library and its annex in order to consolidate collections by department and facilitate the efficient operation of the library. Most of the work consists of partition changes and lighting and ventilation improvement as well as a new reference service area on the second



## University of California—Continued

floor. While we have received a set of schematic plans indicating the work to be done these have not been accompanied by an outline specification or a detailed estimate. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

*u. Construct and equip large testing machine facility at  
Richmond field station*----- \$379,700

The four-million-pound testing machine and other smaller testing machines are now located on the main campus on a very valuable site which could accommodate much more useful buildings with a great deal more floor area. The experimental and instructional work carried on with these testing machines is usually of long duration and involves large pieces to be tested. This kind of work can be better done at the Richmond field station on much less valuable land and with less disturbance to other surrounding activities. Also more ground space will be available to make the operation considerably more efficient. This proposal involves the construction of a factory type building having approximately 14,500 square feet of gross area. The nature of the equipment to be installed requires unusually heavy foundations and heavy utility supplies which bring the cost of the project to \$24.57 per gross square foot even though the building itself is otherwise relatively simple. We believe that this is a well-justified move in order to make use of the much more valuable space on the main campus. *We recommend approval.*

*v. Working drawings for addition to engineering materials  
laboratory*----- \$129,000

The removal of the facility mentioned in the project immediately preceding will provide ground space for a much-needed addition to the engineering materials laboratory building. The proposal would provide space for research and instructional facilities of types which would not require the large spaces and heavy machinery being moved to the Richmond site. The ultimate building will probably cost in excess of \$4,700,000 and will provide an additional approximately 128,000 gross square feet. We have not as yet seen preliminary plans for this proposal but since it is for working drawings only we anticipate that we will have an opportunity to see such plans before actual working drawings are started. *We recommend approval.*

*w. Construct and equip facilities at the Richmond  
field station*----- \$305,100

This project is actually a complex of a fairly large number of separate projects which include such things as the construction of a food service and conference facility, an addition to the Institute of Transportation and Traffic Engineering, a warehouse, renovation of a number of existing buildings, the construction of a weatherproof shelter over the existing model basin, the further reclamation of some tidelands area, additions to the water and fire protection systems, etc. The new construction will have a gross area of about 6,000 square

## University of California—Continued

feet and will be of relatively simple design costing \$15 per square foot for just the buildings. The balance of the work does not lend itself to a breakdown of cost per square foot. However, the total project cost appears to be reasonable for the changes and improvements to be accomplished. *We recommend approval.*

*x. Land acquisition—general* ----- \$200,000

This proposes a continuation of a long standing policy to provide funds each year for the university, at Berkeley, to make opportunity purchases of parcels of land lying within the master plan, long range, development boundaries. *We recommend approval.*

*y. Construct general campus improvements* ----- \$81,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$74,000 to finance part of a plan of general campus improvements which at the time was estimated to cost about \$150,000. Certain portions of these improvements were deferred for various timing reasons in order for them to coincide with other major construction projects. The total project is a complex of many pieces involving site improvements in three campus areas, a new footbridge across Strawberry Creek and restoration of the creek-bed and embankments and general area cleanup and relandscaping. The deferred portions are now proposed for financing in this project.

We still consider many of the phases of this project as being merely desirable rather than essential. In the interest of conserving scarce funds we believe that this project can be deferred indefinitely. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval.*

## Davis Campus

*z. Equip library expansion* ----- \$181,800

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$1,678,600 for the construction of a substantial addition to the existing library-administration building and for certain alterations in the existing building to accommodate the addition. Construction completion is scheduled for August of 1963 and it is now proposed to provide the funds necessary to equip the new addition. While we have not examined the list in detail the amount appears to be commensurate with the size of the project which involves over 55,000 square feet of gross area. *We recommend approval.*

*aa. Equip classroom and office, unit II* ----- \$282,000

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$1,096,600 for the construction of a multistory office and classroom building having a gross area of approximately 49,000 square feet. Actually this appropriation represented basically the office portion of the complex since the classroom portion was funded in a prior year. The equipment is proposed for both portions which are scheduled for completion in September of 1963. While we have not examined the equipment list in detail the amount appears to be commensurate with the size of the total project. *We recommend approval.*

## University of California—Continued

## bb. Equip vegetable crops controlled temperature storage facility ----- \$30,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$559,700 for the construction of a project having a gross area of approximately 15,500 square feet. This building is highly specialized with areas devoted to controlled temperature research in physiological and biochemical fields related to fresh and processed vegetables. The building is scheduled for completion early in 1964, consequently, it is necessary to provide equipment for it at this time. While we have not examined the equipment list, the amount appears to be reasonable for the size and type of facility involved. *We recommend approval.*

## cc. Equip residence hall, unit 6 ----- \$222,600

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$627,400 as the State's subsidy share of the construction of a residence hall unit for 400 students which would have a total cost, exclusive of equipment, of \$2,242,100, the balance of the funds being made available from loan sources and repayable from student occupancy fees. The equipment for the building also represents a state subsidy and covers such things as the beds and furnishings in each room, the general furnishings of the recreational areas, etc. The cost of equipment averages approximately \$556 per student. The building is scheduled for occupancy by July of 1964. *Since the cost appears to be commensurate with the size and type of project we recommend approval.*

## dd. Construct utilities ----- \$392,200

As this campus expands with the addition of new buildings and with the movement of some existing buildings to the perimeter of the main campus, changes and expansions in the total utility system must take place. The buildings already under construction or funded will require additional capacities of steam, power, water and sewage lines. This project proposes the installation of an additional 50,000 pounds per hour package boiler in the steam plant, which was recently enlarged, extension of 14-inch and 6-inch steam supply and condensate lines, the construction of a new electric substation to provide additional overall capacity and extensions of the domestic water system. The various segments of the project all appear to be justified in the light of campus growth and the cost appears to be commensurate with what is proposed. *We recommend approval.*

## ee. Construct agricultural toxicology and residue research laboratory ----- \$150,000

The existing pesticide residue research facilities are in an old building which now stands in the way of the construction of the new humanities building. Consequently, it is proposed to provide a replacement facility at another location, well removed from the central core of the campus, in order to continue to accommodate the extremely important research in problems of pesticide residues. It is hoped that the existing building may be salvageable and movable to the new loca-

## University of California—Continued

tion. However, the funding is proposed on the basis of constructing a new facility, which incidentally will be at least 50 percent funded by nonstate funds, having a gross area of approximately 22,000 square feet with 13,300 assignable square feet. While we have received a preliminary sketch of the facility we have not as yet received an outline specification or detailed estimate. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

## ff. Construct humanities building----- \$2,965,800

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$98,200 for working drawings and design of a humanities building to house the departments of art, drama, speech and music and having a gross area of approximately 105,000 square feet with about 59,000 square feet of assignable area. The project is now estimated to cost \$24.38 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$29.57 per square foot for the total project which appear to be reasonably in line in consideration of the fact that the project includes a little theater and music practice rooms all of which represent relatively costly space because of sophisticated design to control sound. Since Davis has become a general campus of the university and since it had no facilities heretofore to house the fine arts, it appears appropriate that such facilities be provided now. *We recommend approval.*

## gg. Construct physical science unit II----- \$3,910,300

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$124,100 for working drawings and design for a second unit of physical sciences facilities with a gross area of approximately 116,000 square feet. Present cost estimates indicate a total project cost, exclusive of movable equipment and furnishings, of \$4,094,000 which results in a cost of \$30.40 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$35.30 per square foot for the total project. This is a complex science building heavily loaded with utilities of all kinds, air-conditioned and otherwise designed as a relatively sophisticated structure for the physical sciences. In view of the continued growth in demand for science instruction it would appear that the additional space is justified. *We have examined the plans and the specifications and we recommend approval.*

## hh. Working drawings and site clearance for engineering building----- \$228,000

Since Davis has become a general campus of the university, the engineering curriculum has been growing rapidly both in general engineering as well as agricultural engineering. Facilities have been very limited on the campus in the past and this project contemplates the first full-scale facility specially designed for the purpose. It is being considered as a two-unit structure, one containing offices, classrooms and certain teaching laboratories and being three stories in height and the other being a single story, high ceiling, heavy equipment, laboratory-type building. Current estimates indicate an ultimate total project cost, exclusive of movable furnishings and equipment, of \$4 million for a combined structure having 185,300 gross square feet of area which

## University of California—Continued

would result in a cost of \$17.80 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$21.60 per square foot for the total project. Beyond this there would probably be in excess of \$750,000 for equipment required in a future budget. The placement of the building in the master plan requires the removal of existing swine and sheep barns to a new location on the perimeter of the campus in an area more compatible with their purpose. In order to expedite the entire project it was deemed prudent to provide funds in this budget to permit these buildings to be moved so that when the working drawings for the engineering building are complete and ready to go to bid the site will be ready. We have examined the plans and outline specifications and we believe that the cost is quite reasonable for the proposed facilities. *We recommend approval.*

ii. *Construct and equip plant growth research laboratory,*  
*step I ----- \$333,000*

This project is essentially a series of aluminum and glass greenhouses plus two headhouses. Present total greenhouse space on this campus is approximately 65,000 square feet and various departmental demands would indicate the necessity for an additional 62,000 square feet. This project proposes about 20,000 square feet of greenhouses and 10,000 square feet in the two headhouses. These buildings are relatively more complex than ordinary nursery greenhouses would be in that they include many types of controls and utilities for research and experimental purposes that would not be found in the ordinary greenhouse. Consequently, the total project cost is relatively high at \$20 per square foot. There appear to be some discrepancies in the data supplied which have not as yet been clarified. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

jj. *Construct and equip ecological research laboratory----- \$117,700*

This building will house specialized facilities for research work in ecology and population dynamics in wild animals. The building will contain spaces for animal colonies, laboratories, coldroom and offices. The gross area is approximately 10,000 square feet and construction is relatively simple with a cost of \$15.85 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$20.40 per square foot for the total project. *We recommend approval.*

kk. *Construct campus entrance road development----- \$310,500*

This project involves two separate and distinct phases one of which is considerably more costly than the other. The first involves the construction of a totally new entrance road from the vicinity of the administration building south to a new interchange with U.S. Highway 40. This interchange will not be constructed for some time and to the best of our knowledge an exact date for this has not been set. Consequently, we do not believe that this phase of the project is justifiable at this time.

The second phase involves improvements at the east entrance to the campus where most of the traffic now enters. This portion is relatively

## University of California—Continued

less costly than the first phase. We would recommend it for funding at this time. *Consequently, our recommendation on this project is that it be reduced by the amount involved in phase I.*

## Irvine

## ll. Construct library unit I----- \$2,081,600

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$494,500 for working drawings for academic buildings on the new campus at Irvine in Orange County. A portion of this was allocated to the library unit which initially will also house administrative offices. As presently contemplated the building would have approximately 80,300 square feet of gross area contained in a basement and five floors and designed ultimately to be expanded by the addition of another wing. Construction would be of reinforced concrete structural frame and floor slabs with precast concrete panels for the exterior walls. The cost would be \$21.50 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$27.50 per square foot for the total project exclusive of movable furnishings and equipment which will be required in a later budget. Basically this will be a loft-type structure in order to provide maximum flexibility in present and future use. *The cost appears to be somewhat higher for library space than we have been experiencing in state college construction and until this discrepancy can be satisfactorily explained we cannot make a recommendation.*

## mm. Construct social sciences and humanities unit I----- \$2,680,000

This project also received a share of the working drawing funds mentioned above and is now conceived as basically two nearly independent buildings, one a classroom building having a basement and three floors and the other a faculty office building having five floors. Construction would be of reinforced concrete frame and floor slabs with precast concrete exterior panels. Gross area of both buildings is now contemplated to be approximately 97,000 square feet at a cost of \$23.30 per foot for the basic building and \$29.40 for the total project. We have raised some significant questions with respect to the design of this building which we believe are reflected in the cost which seems to be somewhat higher than necessary for what is basically a very simple classroom and office-type of structure. These questions have not yet been satisfactorily resolved. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

## nn. Construct natural science unit I----- \$3,964,800

This project also received its share of the lump sum appropriation for working drawings. It is now conceived as relatively two buildings one being a basic science building having a basement and five floors and the other being a two-story lecture hall building with one 350-seat lecture hall and a specialized branch library. The main building will be primarily laboratories for instructional and graduate work in the biological sciences, chemistry, physics, geology and engineering. Ultimately, it is contemplated that the building will be totally devoted to either the biological or physical sciences with the other occupants being phased out into other new buildings.

## University of California—Continued

The gross area of the building complex is 116,570 square feet which is anticipated to cost \$29.20 per gross square foot for the basic buildings and \$35.90 per square foot for the total project exclusive of movable equipment and furnishings. Aside from the lecture hall portion the main building is a relatively complex and sophisticated science building heavily loaded with many kinds of utilities and air handling equipment and generally air-conditioned because of excess heat generated by processes and experiments taking place in the structure. We have raised several important questions concerning the design which have not yet been resolved. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

## oo. Construct cafeteria ----- \$787,600

This project also received a share of the lump sum appropriation for working drawings. The building is presently conceived as a two-story structure of reinforced concrete frame and floor slabs with precast exterior panels, to some extent. It will have capacity for 450 in the main dining room and 150 in the snackbar which temporarily will be used as a bookstore. Additional seating will be provided outdoors on the terraces and the plaza. The structure is designed to be nearly doubled in size in the future. The gross area of the building is 24,364 square feet which is estimated to cost \$27.00 per square foot for the basic building and \$34.30 for the total project which includes all of the fixed kitchen equipment but no movable equipment or furnishings. We have raised certain questions concerning some of the monumental aspects of the building which we believe are reflected in what appears to be a somewhat excessive cost. These questions have not yet been satisfactorily answered. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

## pp. Construct utilities and site development ----- \$1,400,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$1,008,000 for the construction of utilities and site development on this new campus. Basically this was to perform rough grading, construct some roads, water distribution system, electrical distribution system, bridge construction, etc. However, in order to provide central heating and cooling and the distribution of these two utilities it is now necessary to construct a central heating plant and certain utility tunnels. As of this writing we have not yet received a detailed plan nor specifications and cost estimate to support the amount being proposed. *While we recognize the need for these utilities to make the first buildings operable, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

## Los Angeles

## qq. Equip social science, unit I ----- \$407,000

The Budget Act of 1958 provided \$5,456,700 for working drawings and construction of social science units I and II. The building is now scheduled for completion in June of 1963. It should be pointed out that the original designation of units I and II no longer applies since both units were built as a single 11-story building and the equipment being

## University of California—Continued

proposed herewith is to take care of that entire structure. The building exceeds 225,000 square feet of gross area and while we have not examined the equipment list in detail the amount appears to be reasonable for the size and type of structure involved. *We recommend approval.*

*rr. Equip chemistry-geology building addition*----- \$500,000

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$212,660 for working drawings and the Budget Act of 1960 provided \$4,215,800 for the construction of an addition to the chemistry geology building. This contemplated a structure having about 160,000 gross square feet containing mostly laboratories for instruction and research. The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$400,000 for a first increment of equipment for this building which together with the amount proposed in this budget would make a total of \$900,000. While we have not examined the equipment list in detail in view of the fact that this is a science building where costs of equipment often run as high as 50 percent of the cost of the building, the amount proposed appears reasonable. *We recommend approval.*

*ss. Equip physics, unit II*----- \$650,000

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$5,043,800 for construction and the Budget Act of 1960 provided \$203,200 for working drawings for this project. The building is estimated to have a gross area of approximately 145,000 square feet and is scheduled for completion by July, 1963. The amount proposed for equipment seems relatively low for a building of this type and size and we note that the original equipment list totaled over \$1 million and the amount shown in the five-year plan was \$900,000. This would seem to indicate that the proposal herewith may well be only a first increment although the language in the printed budget does not indicate this. *Nevertheless, the amount is reasonable and even though we have not examined the equipment list in detail we recommend approval.*

*tt. Equip north campus library, unit I*----- \$387,200

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$346,400 for the design and working drawings and the Budget Act of 1961 provided \$4,609,700 for construction of a new library on the north part of the campus. The building was designed to have approximately 190,000 square feet of gross area and was intended to be expanded in the future. While the printed budget indicated that a first increment of equipment was also funded in the Budget Act of 1961 we can find no such evidence in the act although the financial statement contained in the university's five-year plan would indicate the availability of almost \$500,000 of additional funds over and above the construction and working drawings money mentioned above. We bring this point up simply to keep the record clear as to how much actual equipment funds have been provided. Without an accurate figure as to the total we would have no basis for making an evaluation as to the adequacy of the amount proposed in this budget. *Until this point can be clarified we can make no recommendation with respect to this equipment item.*



## University of California—Continued

uu. *Equip life sciences graduate instruction and research, unit II* ----- \$231,500

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$1,209,600 for the design, working drawings and construction of a six-story building to be attached directly to the existing life sciences I. The new addition was to have approximately 33,000 square feet of gross area consisting largely of graduate and research laboratories and offices. The addition is scheduled for completion in March of 1964 and equipment for it must be funded at this time. While we have not examined the list in detail the amount proposed appears reasonable for the size and type of building which is relatively complex and sophisticated. *We recommend approval.*

vv. *Construct central campus utilities and site development* \$106,000

This project is described as the construction of utility tunnels and utilities in the central campus area. It is at considerable variance with the project as it was originally submitted. For example, we understand that \$60,000 of this is to be used in connection with site development for the memorial center which will permit excavated material from the center to be placed elsewhere as required for the future master plan and thereby avoid the necessity of disposing of the excess material and then buying it back at a future date. *In any case we do not have an up-to-date package on this project and consequently we can make no recommendation at this time.*

ww. *Construct main library alterations, step I* ----- \$788,000

The new library on the north campus is scheduled for completion in November of 1963 at which time a number of activities will be moved to it from the existing library. The existing library will then become largely devoted to undergraduate service and to accommodate this, alterations in three steps will be required, of which this is the first. This first step will provide 540 additional reader stations, in the existing building, will convert most of the closed book stack areas to open stack areas, improve lighting, ventilation and add air-conditioning. The total project is generally in line with the justification which was used to establish the new library on the north campus. However, while we are in agreement with the cost proposed, in view of the complex nature of the alteration, *we would suggest that there should be prepared a total estimate of all three phases so that the Legislature may have advance knowledge of what is financially involved in the conversion of the old main library to an undergraduate library. We recommend approval.*

xx. *Construct administration building addition* ----- \$2,085,700

This campus has not had an expansion of its central administrative building for many years, which has resulted in a number of the administrative functions being forced into other buildings, usurping space intended for other purposes. There has been considerable delay in expanding the existing building because of site difficulties and the high cost of reproducing the original architecture. Previous proposals have all been considerably more costly than the one presently proposed. The

## University of California—Continued

project involves an addition having a gross area of somewhat over 74,000 square feet and costing \$22.60 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$28.70 per gross square foot for the total project exclusive of movable equipment and furnishings. The exterior of the addition will match as nearly as possible the existing building. In view of the site problems and the desirability of matching the addition to the existing building the cost appears to be reasonable for the purpose.

*We recommend approval.*

## Los Angeles Medical Center

yy. Construct school of dentistry, unit I----- \$4,924,100

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$237,600 for working drawings for the school of dentistry unit and for expansion of the student health service facilities. The latter was a relatively small project, which follows next in this analysis, and required only a small part of the working drawing funds. Basically the project is a physical extension of the existing medical school and hospital and therefore much of its exterior design characteristics will match the existing building. The structure will have approximately 147,000 gross square feet of area and more if the university is able to obtain federal funds for graduate and post doctoral research facilities. This unit together with expanded facilities in the basic sciences unit 2A will accommodate a total enrollment of 452 in the new school of dentistry which will consist of four classes of 96 students, 20 post doctoral students and 48 parodontal students. The plant will provide clinical capacity for 212 patients at one time.

As mentioned before the structure will conform to the existing building and will cost \$29.84 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$35.50 per square foot for the total project exclusive of movable equipment and furnishings which will require a future appropriation of over \$1,250,000. These facilities are highly complex and sophisticated requiring unusually heavy installations of utilities, air handling equipment, air conditioning and other specialized features. Consequently, the cost appears to be in line with the character of the project. *We recommend approval.*

zz. Construct student health service expansion----- \$838,300

As mentioned above, working drawings for this project were provided in the 1962 Budget Act. Actually the facilities will be integrated into the dental and medical units and will involve a rather complex shuffling of existing spaces wherein present student health facilities will have to move in favor of the expanding medical clinical laboratories of the hospital which are needed to increase the medical class size. The total project will comprise approximately 25,000 gross square feet of area at a cost similar to that of the dental school above, \$29.30 per square foot for the basic building and \$35.85 per square foot for the total project. When completed the student health facilities will be housed in approximately 17,300 square feet of assignable area which it is expected will provide for minimum student health services. *We recommend approval.*

## University of California—Continued

aaa. Working drawings for hospital and clinics, unit 2B,  
step II ----- \$196,200

Previous funding of over \$12 million provided the first step, known as basic sciences unit 2A, in a total expansion required to bring the medical school and hospital to a capacity for medical school classes of 128 each plus several thousand additional students in the paramedical fields which are essential to and closely allied to the basic medical program.

The second step would provide for the expansion of the hospital facilities which are essential to a basic medical program. The project would provide a net gain of 320 teaching beds making a total of 600 general hospital beds, 40 student health beds, 40 house staff beds and 188 beds in the Neuropsychiatric Institute. In addition there would be offices, laboratories and other essential supporting areas as well as outpatient clinics. It is anticipated that it may be possible to finance the addition entirely from federal funds, on the basis of pending congressional legislation. This would be done by using the previous appropriations for the basic sciences unit 2A as matching value. If these federal funds are not forthcoming then the project will be scaled down somewhat for financing entirely by the State. At present the cost of the project is estimated at almost \$13 million. If federal aid is not forthcoming the cost would be scaled down to approximately \$9,500,000 for full state financing.

In view of the fact that the medical school is already committed to increasing the class size to 128 and of the necessity to provide the expanded hospital facilities to meet qualifying standards for medical schools it would appear that this project should go forward. *We recommend approval.*

bbb. Construct ophthalmology clinic ----- \$800,000

The university hopes to obtain substantial nonstate funds to develop an eye institute in which would be included space for the expansion of the ophthalmology division of the medical school which would otherwise have been included in the hospital and clinics unit 2B mentioned above. The \$800,000 represents the State's cost of this particular space which would be constructed in a separate building adjacent to and south of the existing medical school and would have a total cost in excess of \$3,700,000. While we have received some fairly sketchy preliminary plans of the entire project, together with an outline specification and cost estimate, certain changes have taken place which have not yet been fully explained. *Consequently we can make no recommendation at this time.*

## Riverside

ccc. Equip library addition, step I ----- \$177,700

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$1,582,200 for working drawings and construction of an addition to the library which would add approximately 53,000 square feet of gross area to the existing building. At the time of the appropriation this addition was not referred to as step I. However, it actually does represent the first addition of two or

## University of California—Continued

possibly more. The equipment proposed will fully care for this first addition. While we have not examined the equipment list in detail the amount appears reasonable for the library stacks, tables, chairs, etc., that are required for a building of this size. *We recommend approval.*

## ddd. Equip agrichemicals and produce quality laboratory --- \$142,300

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$323,000 for working drawings and construction of a laboratory facility known as the "agrichemicals, produce quality and environmental pollution laboratory." The latter portion is expected to be financed by a grant from the national institutes of health. The equipment proposed will provide only for the state funded portion of the building. The nonstate funded portion of the building will be equipped from nonstate funds. While we have not examined the equipment list in detail it appears to be commensurate with the size and type of complex laboratory building involved. *We recommend approval.*

## eee. Construct utilities and site development in glasshouse area ----- \$189,000

This project is intended to provide basic utilities such as domestic water, irrigation water, steam and condensate lines, sewers, gaslines and electric utilities to an area which heretofore has been devoted to agriculture but which is now to be built up with glasshouses, headhouses, the agrichemicals laboratory mentioned above and several other buildings. The project also involves moving certain small agriculture buildings which now occupy the site and the construction of roads and walks. *We have received relatively inadequate information on this project to date and consequently we can make no recommendations at this time.*

## fff. Construct site development ----- \$183,600

This project proposes a series of separate projects which involve erosion control, construction of walks in essential areas where none now exist, construction of site drainage facilities, construction of noise control and the movement of a building to a new site in order to make way for the construction of the physical sciences No. 3 project. *We recommend approval.*

## ggg. Working drawings for agricultural sciences building --- \$99,000

Long range policies of the regents requires the removal of all agricultural activities from the Los Angeles campus and their transfer to the Riverside campus. In order to house these activities on the Riverside campus it is proposed to build a four-story reinforced concrete structure consisting mainly of laboratories and offices, having a gross area of almost 78,000 square feet. As presently contemplated the structure would ultimately cost, exclusive of movable equipment and furnishings, \$2,986,000 or \$29.13 per square foot for the basic building and \$38.47 per square foot for the total project. Even for a building as sophisticated and complex as this science building would be, it appears to us that the cost is too high. However, since only working

## University of California—Continued

drawings are being proposed at this time, it may well be that in the further development of the project before construction funds are requested in the next budget, the cost may be somewhat reduced. *Consequently, we recommend approval of the working drawings.*

*hhh. Construct physical sciences, unit IV----- \$3,119,500*

This project contemplates the construction of a complex physical sciences building containing mostly laboratories with some offices. The building would have almost 79,000 square feet of gross area and would cost \$31.16 per square foot for the basic building and \$40.09 per square foot for the total project exclusive of movable equipment and furnishings which would be funded in a later budget. The building would house, for the most part, the chemistry department in which there is a growing need for additional space. However, while we agree that the additional space is probably required, the complexities of a building of this type are such that it is most unlikely that the working drawings would be completed and the project put to bid in the budget year. Consequently, because of the high unit cost we believe that only working drawings funds should be provided at this time in order to have an opportunity to explore the possibilities for greater economies. *We recommend therefore that the project be reduced to \$150,000 for working drawings only.*

*iii. Construct central cafeteria----- \$749,300*

With the exception of the dining hall which is part of the residence building complex, this campus has only a relatively makeshift eating facility constructed in what was a horse barn. While this facility has been functionally quite satisfactory, the total growth of the campus has made it inadequate in capacity. It is proposed to construct a permanent central cafeteria building of which 20,315 square feet would represent the gross area attributable to the cafeteria but additional space will be constructed from nonstate funds so that it will become a total complex of cafeteria and student center including a book store. This joint construction results in economies for both the state portion and the student-financed portion since certain facilities can be jointly used. The state portion cost would be \$28.40 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$37.56 per square foot for the total project which includes a substantial amount for fixed kitchen equipment. *We recommend approval.*

*jjj. Construct and equip agricultural extension facility----- \$317,400*

This project proposes the construction of a three-story wood frame building on the citrus experiment site near the station administration building. It will provide office spaces, a lecture room, public meeting area and audiovisual area to accommodate functions of the agriculture extension service department which now are occupying a few thousand square feet on the main campus. The construction of this building will free these spaces for regular academic instruction. The building will have approximately 9,800 gross square feet and will provide three times as much space as is being vacated on the main campus. It will

## University of California—Continued

cost \$20 per square foot for the basic building and \$30.79 per square foot for the total project. The large spread between the two figures is occasioned by the fact that the site is very hilly and requires considerable site development. Nevertheless, we believe the cost is excessive and we question the actual necessity for the building. *Consequently we recommend disapproval.*

## San Diego

*kkk. Equip Building B—School of Science and Engineering \$500,000*

The first buildings for the school of science and engineering at San Diego were funded in the Budget Act of 1959 for preliminary and working drawings. Subsequently, the Budget Act of 1960 provided construction funds and the Budget Act of 1961 provided additional construction funds plus funds for some equipment and the Budget Act of 1962 provided \$475,300 for more equipment. The total financial picture of this project has been relatively difficult to trace because of the fact that funds have been merged from several appropriations. However, it appears that the planning and construction of this project has totaled about \$4,800,000 with about \$300,000 already provided for equipment. The additional amount proposed would make a reasonable total for a complex science and engineering building. *While we have not examined the list in detail, we recommend approval.*

*lll. Equip Building C—School of Science and Engineering— \$270,000*

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$219,000 for working drawings for building C and the Budget Act of 1961 provided \$2,298,800 for construction of a three-story-and-basement laboratory building having over 68,000 square feet of gross area. The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$500,000 for the initial equipment of this building. The amount proposed in this budget when added to the previous appropriation appears to make a reasonable total for a complex and sophisticated science building housing instructional and research facilities. *While we have not examined the equipment list in detail, we recommend approval.*

*mmm. Construct Building E—School of Science and*

*Engineering----- \$2,969,800*

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$98,200 for the design and preparation of working drawings for a three-story reinforced concrete general classroom and library building which was anticipated to have a gross area of approximately 107,500 square feet. This building would contain general classrooms, offices and library space but no laboratory or highly specialized and complex areas. In its present form the cost of the project will be \$23.18 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$28.97 per square foot for the total project. We believe this cost is relatively excessive for what should be a simple building. In the state colleges buildings of this character have been averaging \$20 per square foot for the basic building and about \$24 to \$25 for the total project. The basic building cost is the most significant since it enables direct comparison of two buildings. The total cost can be distorted by special problems in different areas. At the present proposed cost we do not feel we can

## University of California—Continued

recommend the project. *Until the cost can be satisfactorily resolved we can make no recommendation.*

*nnn. Working drawings for Building F—School of Science and engineering* ----- \$106,000

This project proposes the construction of a predominately laboratory type building having a gross area of almost 100,000 square feet which is presently estimated to cost \$29 per square foot for the basic building and over \$40.50 per square foot for the total project. The latter figure appears to be an error since it seems to include the cost of movable equipment and furnishings which alone come to \$650,000 and are normally not included in the total project costs. We have reviewed the diagrammatic preliminary plans which indicate the construction of a U-shaped four-story building with two large lecture halls filling the open area. The plan appears to be elaborate and costly, at least from the standpoint of overall site arrangement. *Until the elaborate plan can be resolved we can make no recommendation.*

*ooo. Construct cafeteria and student health facility* ----- \$804,700

This project proposes the construction of a joint facility which will house both cafeteria and student health services at state cost and student activities areas which will be provided from loan or other non-state funds. The information we have received on this project has been inadequate although we know that it is intended to provide, among other things, a 400-seat dining room together with a kitchen and apartment facilities and the student health suite. We have received no preliminary plans, outline specifications or cost estimates. *Consequently, we can make no recommendations at this time.*

## San Diego Medical Center

*ppp. Acquisition of books* ----- \$150,000

It is anticipated that medical school activities will commence in the fall of 1965 using the San Diego County Hospital as a base of operations. A library collection for a medical school is an essential part of the operation. The amount proposed will provide an adequate initial collection. *We recommend approval.*

## San Francisco

*qqq. Construct additional teaching facilities* ----- \$1,597,500

The previously funded health sciences instruction and research building was designed as a twin tower building each of 16 stories. However, the east tower was constructed with only eight total stories but with the foundations designed for the additional stories as funding made them possible. It is now proposed to add six stories bringing the east wing to a total of 14 and leaving two more stories to be added in the future. The additional six stories are needed to provide the total facilities required to accommodate an increase in class size from 100 medical students to 128. The addition will provide over 74,000 square feet of gross area at a cost of \$3,250,000 of which \$55,000 has already been made available previously for preliminary plans leaving a net

## University of California—Continued

requirement of \$3,195,000. Of this amount it is anticipated that one-half will be made available from nonstate sources, most probably the federal government. This leaves a net requirement of \$1,579,500 for state funds. The total cost results in a cost of \$39.28 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$43.72 per square foot for the total project. The extremely complex and sophisticated nature of this building plus the very difficult working conditions wherein the structure is sandwiched between the existing medical sciences building on the north and the steep hillside on the south are a substantial factor in the very high cost of this project. Since a very large sum of money has already been provided by the State and expended by the university for the purpose of increasing the class size to 128 it appears essential to complete the facilities to make this possible. *We recommend approval of the project.*

rrr. Construct and equip alterations to laundry-storehouse building ----- \$147,000

This project proposes to make certain alterations in the storehouse area of the combination laundry-storehouse building to accommodate the pharmacy processing laboratory which is presently located in a building scheduled for demolition. We recognize the necessity to provide this replacement space but as of this writing we have received no preliminary plans, outline specifications or estimates to support the figure in the budget. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

sss. Construct and equip Surge research unit I ----- \$140,000

The university proposes the construction of a relatively economical type two-story building on the hillside behind the hospital which will be devoted exclusively to research facilities to accommodate the increasing faculty until such time as more permanent space is provided. The structure is proposed to have approximately 10,000 square feet of gross area and it is anticipated that since it will house research exclusively that probably the federal government will provide 50 percent of the cost. The amount proposed represents the State half of the cost. While we have received a very sketchy preliminary plan of the project we have not received an outline specification or a cost estimate to support the figure. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

ttt. Construct and equip clinics building addition for school of dentistry postgraduate program ----- \$116,000

This project proposes the addition of a two-story structure on the roof at the west end of the clinics building which will form the sixth and seventh floors adjacent to the dental clinics. The cost of the addition will be divided between state funds and nonstate funds. It will have approximately 58,000 gross square feet of area and will provide postgraduate training facilities for the school of dentistry, one of the most important spaces being a 100-station lecture room. While we have received a preliminary sketch of the project we have received no outline specifications or cost estimate to support the figure shown in the budget. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*



## University of California—Continued

uuu. *Land acquisition* ----- \$200,000

The long-range plan for the expansion of the medical campus in San Francisco contemplates six major additions consisting of maintenance shops expansion, a parking structure for 1,500 cars, the institute of human disabilities, cancer research institute expansion, cardiovascular research institute expansion and postgraduate extension center for health sciences. It is estimated that the cost of all land required will probably exceed \$2,800,000. The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$250,000 towards this total project and it is now proposed to continue this acquisition program to the extent of \$200,000 for the budget year. With the constant expansion of the medical sciences and the already very heavy commitments made by the State on this site, it would appear that there is little choice but to continue to expand this campus until some ultimate goal is established. *We recommend approval of this acquisition proposal.*

## Santa Barbara

vuv. *Equip speech and drama building* ----- \$198,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$1,944,200 for working drawings and construction of a speech and drama building having a gross area of almost 55,000 square feet and containing among other things a 400-seat little theater and a 120-seat laboratory theater. The project is scheduled for completion in July of 1964. The amount proposed appears reasonable for the size and type of building. *While we have not examined the equipment list in detail we would recommend approval.*

www. *Equip psychology building* ----- \$330,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$1,641,400 for working drawings and construction of a three-story reinforced concrete building having a gross area of approximately 50,000 square feet to be used as a general psychology classroom facility. Some of the spaces in a psychology curriculum qualify as laboratory in a sense in that they require some fairly elaborate and expensive equipment. While we have not examined this equipment list in detail, the amount appears to be reasonable for the size and character of the building. *We recommend approval.*

xxx. *Land acquisition* ----- \$476,000

The Budget Act of 1961 and 1962 provided two payments towards the purchase price of 111 acres adjoining the present campus immediately on the west border. It is now proposed to provide for the third and last payment which will make a total purchase price of \$1,588,800 or a little over \$14,000 an acre which appears to be reasonable for this area since the site is almost entirely usable with very little of it in a bluff which might require some terracing to be used. The master plan calls for residence halls to be constructed on this property, the student health center, the campus corporation yard and parking for about 5,000 cars as well as some small athletic fields to be used by the residence halls. *We recommend approval.*

## University of California—Continued

yyy. *Acquisition of engineering laboratory equipment*----- \$100,000

When this campus was moved from its original site in Santa Barbara it carried with it an obligation to provide some industrial arts facilities. These were provided on the new site with the understanding that they would be gradually phased out since it is not considered appropriate for a university curriculum. The space to be vacated by industrial arts will be taken over by engineering and used until such time as an engineering complex is constructed. This equipment will enable the engineering laboratories to get started in this vacated space. While we have not examined the equipment list the amount proposed appears to be relatively modest for an engineering program. In any case it would ultimately be moved into the permanent building. *We recommend approval.*

zzz. *Construct and equip marine biology laboratory*----- \$480,400

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$21,300 for working drawings for a relatively small isolated building to be installed on the perimeter of the campus immediately adjacent to the lagoon to serve as a marine biology laboratory. The size of the building was estimated to be about 11,468 square feet of gross area and the cost is now estimated at \$35.15 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$51.48 per square foot for the total project exclusive of movable furnishings and equipment. While we recognize that a relatively small laboratory building tends to cost more per square foot than a larger building and that particularly a marine biology building having the corrosion problems attendant upon the use of large volumes of salt water also adds to the cost, we feel that in this instance the cost is excessive even beyond these considerations. In our analysis of the working drawings item in the 1962-63 Budget Analysis we pointed out that a somewhat similar building was being designed for Humboldt State College, on an isolated site, independent of the campus, at a basic building cost which was about 12 percent less than the projected cost for the Santa Barbara project. *It is still our contention that the cost is excessive and until this difference of opinion can be resolved we do not feel that we can recommend the project at this time.*

aaaa. *Construct utilities and site development*----- \$99,100

This will provide for a series of utility extensions and developments to accommodate new buildings either already under construction or to be constructed in the very near future. The project has been scaled down to only absolutely essential utility needs. *We recommend approval.*

bbbb. *Construct chemistry building*----- \$2,618,000

This project proposes the construction of a two-building complex to provide additional space for chemistry laboratories and related facilities. One building will be four story, reinforced concrete construction which will provide primarily research laboratories and offices and the other building will be a one story reinforced concrete structure which will contain two large lecture halls and related spaces. The total project

## University of California—Continued

is estimated to have over 75,000 square feet of gross area and will cost about \$28.67 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$35.21 per square foot for the total project exclusive of movable furnishings and equipment. The latter will be required in a subsequent budget year and will probably exceed \$550,000. While it is anticipated that laboratory buildings generally carry a high cost because of the sophisticated utility and air-handling systems, this particular project has a rather high proportion of office and lecture space which should tend to dilute the high cost. We have raised a number of questions with respect to the cost of this project and its design which have not as yet been resolved. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

## cccc. Working drawings for engineering building----- \$100,000

As mentioned previously this campus is developing a full scale engineering program which will start initially in space to be vacated by industrial arts. It is proposed to construct an initial permanent engineering building consisting of five stories in reinforced concrete construction together with the special concrete block which is a distinctive feature of this campus. The building is presently contemplated as having in excess of 102,000 square feet of gross area which will provide laboratories, classrooms and offices as well as supporting facilities such as specialized shops. At present the cost is estimated to be approximately \$24.70 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$30.74 per square foot for the total project exclusive of movable equipment and furnishings which would be required in the subsequent year and would probably exceed \$700,000.

We have raised a number of questions with respect to the design which puts relatively heavy engineering type laboratories in a "stacked" situation. Heretofore it has been the contention of most engineering faculty that the stacking of heavy engineering laboratories was unsatisfactory. The questions we have raised have not as yet been resolved, however, we anticipate that during the development of more complete preliminary plans the question will be satisfactorily answered. *Consequently, since only working drawings are being requested we recommend approval.*

## Santa Cruz

## dddd. Construct academic areas and dining facilities at residential college No. 1----- \$1,005,000

This project represents the first increment in a basic design that is a radical departure from any of the facilities that have been provided on university campuses to date. It is a relatively autonomous college unit for 400 students plus faculty consisting of eight residence hall buildings, a faculty residence building, a dean's residence building which is actually a single family dwelling, a dining and student activities building and an academic building which is attached to the dining, student activities building. The dining building is sized to provide facilities for a future college of similar capacity so that eventually the one central dining facility will serve 800 students in residence

## University of California—Continued

and two to four hundred additional students who would be commuting to the college. All of the buildings would be of concrete exterior wall construction with wood and steel roof, covered with flat tile. The total area of the buildings collectively will be approximately 142,000 gross square feet. The cost of the project exclusive of movable furnishings and equipment is estimated at \$3,710,000. Towards this the State has already contributed \$12,300 for preliminary plans. The \$1,005,000 proposal represents the State's share of the construction cost with the balance coming from loan or donation sources. Ultimately the furnishings and equipment will also be partly covered by nonstate funds.

This complex, which consists entirely of low rise buildings, the highest being three stories, will, according to the master plan, be repeated many more times, possibly as many as 48 since the ultimate capacity is supposed to be 27,500 FTE students. Obviously, this means that the entire ultimate plan occupies a great deal of ground space which in turn requires greatly stretched out utilities, roads, walks, general landscaping and site development and all the other amenities and necessities of a university campus. It would appear, on first perusal, that the ultimate cost of such a master plan must be greater per student than the hitherto conventional approaches. However, the Regents of the University of California in adopting this plan did so with the proviso that it should not cost more per student than could be expected under conventional situations. It is difficult at this point to make comparisons of per capita cost because this plan merges academic facilities with residential facilities whereas on the conventional campuses these are clearcut and separate.

*Subject to the limitation imposed by the regents as to comparable costs, we recommend approval.*

*eeee. Construct and equip corporation yard buildings----- \$659,900*

This project proposes the construction of initial corporation yard facilities with a gross area of approximately 34,000 square feet of which a substantial portion, possibly as much as half will be used initially for general administrative offices for the entire campus. The balance of the space will provide shop areas, storage areas, security and maintenance office areas and other appurtenant spaces incident to a corporation yard operation. The cost of the project exclusive of movable equipment and furnishings is estimated at \$570,000. To this is added the cost of the movable equipment at \$100,000 making a total of \$670,000. Towards this amount the State has previously furnished preliminary plans funds to the extent of \$10,100 making a net requirement, at this time, of the \$650,000 proposed. The cost of the basic structure will come to about \$13.50 per gross square foot and \$16.75 per square foot for the total project exclusive of movable equipment. While these costs are generally reasonable for this type of facility, particularly since much of it will be divided into offices initially, we have not received, as of this writing, preliminary plans or outline specifications to cover the project. The estimate that we have received is relatively sketchy and inadequate in itself as a basis for making a

## University of California—Continued

recommendation. Also there is contemplated, in minor construction funds, the rehabilitation and remodeling of some existing buildings for this purpose which makes this cost seem excessive. Furthermore, we would like to point out that we consider it poor budgeting to lump the construction of a project with the movable equipment and furnishings as is being done here. We believe they should be stated as two separate entities in the schedule. This is the procedure that has been used for all other agencies, as can be judged by other items in the budget bill. *In view of the foregoing we can make no recommendations at this time.*

ffff. Construct physical sciences unit I----- \$3,347,000

This project proposes the funding for working drawings and construction of a building having a gross area of over 82,000 square feet which would cost \$34.57 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$41.36 per square foot for the total project exclusive of movable equipment and furnishings which would add in excess of \$600,000 at a future date. The building is presently visualized as a six-story tower with a one-story portion in which would be contained two large lecture halls. The tower would provide laboratories, offices and some classrooms. Ultimately the building would be devoted exclusively to the physical sciences and it is designed to have a second tower added in the future which would bracket the one-story portion. To date we have received only the sketchiest preliminary plan which includes no information as to the location of the building with respect to the 400-unit college mentioned above and very inadequate outline specifications. We would suggest that due to the complexities and sophistication of a physical sciences building of this size that the funding of working drawings only should be adequate to permit the project to stay on course and on schedule. *For this purpose we recommend that the project be reduced to \$150,000 for working drawings only.*

gggg. Working drawings for library unit I----- \$92,500

To date we have received no information of any consequence on this project. We do not know its intended size, type or future total cost. No preliminary sketches have been provided. While we recognize that the library is an essential central unit for a beginning campus and that in order to keep the development of this campus on schedule it would be important to provide funds for working drawings in this budget, *we do not feel we can make a recommendation without some basis, however sketchy, of preliminary sketches and estimates.*

hhhh. Construct and equip utilities and site development---- \$724,500

Other than an incomplete estimate which covers what is a larger scope at a higher cost, we have received no detailed information on this project. While we recognize that utilities, roads and walks developments are essential to a new campus, we feel that the possibilities for excessive initial developments are too great to accept this project without detailed preliminary plans. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

ITEM 376.5 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 754

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

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted -----	\$9,209,100
Recommended for approval -----	None

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION-----	\$9,209,100
----------------------------------	-------------

## ANALYSIS

The Budget Act of 1962 contained, for the university capital outlay, for the first time an item which said in effect that if federal grants for medical school construction were received and applied against the projects in the regular capital outlay item for the University, to the extent that these grants reduced the State's outlay a like amount could then be used by the University for a schedule of projects which were a continuation of the listing in the five-year plan. These were, of course, medical school projects.

This item proposes to do the same thing with respect to Item 376, immediately preceding. The item contains a schedule of 11 projects, labeled (a) through (k) totaling the amount shown above but in effect being financed by the savings made from Item 376 and therefore requiring no appropriation of additional state funds. This is why the budget bill does not show in the extreme right-hand column an appropriated amount.

It should first be pointed out that the schedule contained in this item is in error in that it repeats projects that are in Item 376 rather than a list of new projects not contained in Item 376. This schedule therefore makes the item meaningless. As of this writing we have not been able to ascertain what the correct schedule should be.

The next thing we wish to point out is that without this Item 376.5 the University is free to accept any federal grants that are offered and this item does not alter that in any way. By approving this item, and assuming that federal grants to the extent anticipated are actually forthcoming, the total program of the University would be increased by the amount of the correct schedule that should be part of 376.5. We have already maintained that the total program proposed in Item 376 is relatively over-ambitious and not all of it could be committed during the budget year. Consequently, the additional projects in the schedule attached to 376.5 would further aggravate this situation and we seriously doubt that any of these projects could be committed during the budget year. Furthermore, we should also point out that whatever is the correct schedule for this item, it will include projects which we have not reviewed and which therefore the Legislature would be approving in somewhat that form of a "blank check." We suggest that there would be no delay in the total program if this item were rejected and the projects contained in the schedule, included in the program for the 1964-65 fiscal year. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval of this item.*

## TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

ITEM 377 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 774

FOR PROJECT PLANNING TO BE ALLOCATED BY THE TRUSTEES  
OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$810,000  
 Recommended for approval ----- No change

## ANALYSIS

The Legislature has for many years established and followed the policy of providing advance or preliminary planning funds which would permit the various agencies to prepare information and data on each project to be requested from the Legislature, of sufficient quality and exactitude to enable the Legislature to make a determination on the projects. Heretofore funds for this purpose have always been appropriated to the Director of Finance who then allocated them as required to the several agencies concurrently with approval to proceed into preliminary planning for each specific project. This technique has made it possible, generally, to provide the Legislature at each session with fairly dependable and understandable information on the projects contained in the budget.

It is now proposed, however, that since the Trustees of the California State Colleges have been granted the power of determining the architects to do the work of the trustees, that they be also allocated the funds for reallocation to private architects or the Division of Architecture at their discretion. It is assumed that the program for the 1964-65 fiscal year might be as much as \$60 million of major construction other than equipment or acquisition. On the further assumption that 60 percent of this volume or \$36 million will be delegated to the Division of Architecture,  $1\frac{1}{4}$  percent of this amount is considered appropriate for the services of the division. This amounts to \$450,000. The balance of \$24 million would be assigned to private architects where  $1\frac{1}{2}$  percent or \$360,000 is required. These two figures make the total being requested. We believe that it is imperative that the established procedure of providing adequate preliminary plans, specifications and estimates for legislative consideration when projects are being proposed, be continued in the interest of an orderly and predictable construction program. *We recommend approval.*

## California State Colleges

## STATE COLLEGE FOR ALAMEDA COUNTY

ITEM 378 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 775

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
STATE COLLEGE FOR ALAMEDA COUNTY, FROM THE  
STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$7,009,400
Recommended for approval	3,405,000
Unresolved	60,000

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	\$3,544,400
-----------------------------	-------------

## ANALYSIS

This item will provide for four major equipment projects to equip previously funded buildings, two construction projects and one working drawings project for future construction as follows:

a. Equip science building phase I \$550,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$550,000 for working drawings for initial permanent buildings, of which the science building was one and the Budget Act of 1961 provided \$5,310,000 for the construction of a science building which was basically, with some modifications, a reproduction of the science building at San Fernando State College. The resultant building when completed will have over 201,000 square feet of gross area and will have a capacity of 700 FTE in science facilities. It is proposed now to provide for the first increment of equipment for this large building which is needed to house some of the science programs. Initially part of the building will be devoted to uses other than sciences and as the enrollment grows these will be phased out and additional science equipment will be required. While we have not examined the list in detail it appears to be commensurate with the scope of the science program contemplated upon opening of the building. Consequently, we recommend approval.

b. Equip fine arts building phase I \$300,000

As mentioned above, the Budget Act of 1960 provided working drawing funds for initial permanent buildings on this campus, of which this building was one, and the Budget Act of 1961 provided \$2,310,000 for the construction of a building having almost 107,000 square feet of gross area which was a reasonable reproduction, with some modifications, of the fine arts building on the San Fernando campus. Initially the building will have an FTE capacity of over 1,000 since it will be used for general classroom purposes to a substantial degree. However, as the total enrollment of the college grows some of the extraneous subjects will be phased out of the building and more of it will be devoted directly to fine arts which will have the effect of reducing its total FTE capacity.

At this time it is proposed to provide for the first phase of equipping the building which will consist partly of equipment for fine arts purposes and partly of equipment for general classroom purposes. Ul-



## State College for Alameda County—Continued

timately, additional equipment will be required as internal changes take place. While we have not examined the lists in complete detail we believe it to be commensurate with the size of the project. *We recommend approval.*

*c. Equip fieldhouse and outdoor physical education facilities—\$45,000*

The Budget Act of 1960 provided working drawing funds and the Budget Act of 1962 provided \$380,000 for construction of outdoor physical education facilities and \$190,000 for the construction of a physical education fieldhouse. It is now proposed to provide the general movable athletic equipment required both for outdoor and indoor use. While we have not examined the list in detail the amount appears to be reasonable as a first increment for initial physical education facilities development. *We recommend approval.*

*d. Equip corporation yard and boiler plant----- \$75,000*

The Budget Act of 1960 provided working drawing funds and the Budget Act of 1962 provided \$250,100 for the construction of the central boiler plant and \$150,000 for the construction of the first phase of the corporation yard. It is anticipated that there will be a dual function in the boiler plant, on a temporary basis, in that its excess space will be used for corporation yard purposes while the corporation yard proper will be removed at some distance from the campus. The Budget Act of 1962 also provided \$12,000 for initial equipment for both the corporation yard and the boiler plant. It is now proposed to finance the main bulk of the equipment necessary to make the corporation yard function as well as the movable equipment needed in the boiler plant. The equipment consists of items such as machine tools for maintenance and repair work, hand tools of many kinds, janitorial and maintenance equipment of many kinds, etc. While we have not examined the list in complete detail we believe the amount is not excessive for the purpose. *Consequently we recommend approval.*

*e. Construct music classroom building----- \$2,335,000*

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$68,000 for design and working drawings of a music classroom building which is presently estimated to have about 82,500 square feet of gross area in two stories with a separate central mechanical building immediately adjacent. The two appropriations together would provide a total of \$2,403,000 which divided by the gross area would mean a cost of \$29.13 per square foot at total project level including all architectural fees. We have reviewed the plans in considerable detail and have raised questions which have by now been resolved. However, we still believe the cost to be somewhat high for a music building but this may be resolved when the project actually goes to bid.

The design is somewhat unusual in that the building is completely circular with an open inner court. This tends to lend itself to the played or angled walls that are usually desirable in buildings having serious acoustical problems which is the case in a music building. Since this campus is scheduled to have almost 3,200 FTE enrollment in the

## State College for Alameda County—Continued

fall of 1966 and since the currently existing or funded capacity is slightly more than half that, it is essential that the 458 FTE capacity represented by this building be added in order to make the campus fully self-sustaining as soon as possible without the use of outside rented facilities. *We recommend approval.*

## f. Construct gymnasium ----- \$3,644,400

We recognize that it is necessary to provide a basic gymnasium facility on every campus as long as there is a requirement for compulsory physical education in the state college system. However, we would point out that this campus will have a fieldhouse which makes possible a more extensive use of its outdoor physical education facilities than is the case where no fieldhouse and no gymnasium are provided. In view of the size of the gymnasium project and based on experience with the length of time that it takes for working drawings to be developed in a project of this size, we believe that only a working drawing appropriation is necessary at this time. In any case, as of this writing, the preliminary plan for this gymnasium has not been completely settled and consequently we have no basis for making a recommendation on the size and cost of the project. *Therefore, we recommend that only \$100,000 be provided for working drawings for the project which would result in a reduction of \$3,544,400 in this proposal.*

## g. Working drawings for cafeteria ----- \$60,000

It is recognized that cafeteria or other feeding facilities would be necessary on this campus due to its isolated location. However, some question has been raised as to whether it is appropriate to provide a central facility at this time rather than to provide decentralized facilities in the larger classroom buildings. To the best of our knowledge this question has not yet been resolved. In any case we have not yet seen any preliminary plans for this project or any outline specifications. However, it is anticipated that this information will be forthcoming before the legislative committees have completed their review of the budget at which time we will make an appropriate recommendation. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

California State Colleges  
CHICO STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 379 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 776

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
CHICO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION  
PROGRAM FUND

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted -----	\$4,969,400
Recommended for approval -----	87,400
Unresolved -----	1,681,000

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION -----	\$3,210,000
-----------------------------------	-------------

Chico State College—Continued  
ANALYSIS

This item proposes to provide for one equipment project for a previously funded construction project, and two construction projects as follows:

*a. Equip education-psychology building*-----\$87,400

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$1,052,000 for the design and construction of a building having approximately 38,000 square feet of gross area to house education-psychology departments particularly, with an FTE capacity of over 900. This project makes possible a total funded capacity for the fall of 1966 of 3,281 FTE against an anticipated enrollment of 3,250 indicating that there will actually be a slight overage. The building is scheduled for completion in September of 1963. Consequently, it is necessary at this time to provide for the equipment required to make the building operable. While we have not examined the equipment list in complete detail the total amount proposed appears to be commensurate with the size and type of the building. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

*b. Construct engineering building*-----\$1,681,000

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$65,000 for the preparation of working drawings for a structure which at that time was contemplated as having approximately 44,000 square feet of gross area. The preliminary plans have been revised a number of times and as of this moment we do not have plans, specifications or estimates to coincide with the amount proposed in the budget. We recognize that while this campus has apparently an adequate overall space in relation to its anticipated enrollment, it is deficient in facilities for engineering instruction. Therefore, we recognize the need for the project. However, in view of our lack of information we have no way of making an evaluation of what is proposed. It is anticipated that the information will be forthcoming before the legislative committees have completed their review of the budget. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

*c. Construct music drama building*-----\$3,201,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$75,000 for working drawings for a music building. Numerous delays in preparing and finalizing preliminary plans have occurred so that as of this writing we still have not seen adequate preliminary plans, outline specifications or estimates to support the amount in the budget. Consequently, we have no basis for making evaluations at this time.

Beyond this situation we would point out that the project proposes to include, among other things, a 500-seat little theater. The campus presently has an existing little theater although not quite so large. In view of the fact that in the overall the facilities capacities at this campus are slightly over anticipated enrollments for the fall of 1966 and in view of the fact that enrollments anticipated in 1960, when working drawings were funded, have fallen short by 14%, we believe that this project would be premature and an unwarranted expenditure of limited funds. *Consequently, we recommend that the project be disapproved at this time.*

**California State Colleges  
FRESNO STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 380 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 779

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
FRESNO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$1,359,000
Recommended for approval .....	1,319,000

<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION .....</b>	<b>\$40,000</b>
------------------------------------------	-----------------

**ANALYSIS**

This item would provide for one major construction project and one equipment project for a previously funded construction project as follows.

*a. Equip biology classroom phase II .....* *\$40,000*

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$126,100 for remodeling of two existing classrooms into biology laboratories and \$45,700 for equipping them. At that time no mention was made of the possibility that the equipment represented only a first phase and that a second phase would follow. It was our understanding that the sum was adequate to equip two laboratory rooms. Consequently we do not understand, at this time, the reason for a second increment of equipment for this particular project. If this equipment represents generalized equipment for the science program it properly belongs in the support program where normal yearly additions to the equipment of an institution are usually provided for. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval of this project at this time.*

*b. Construct library addition .....* *\$1,319,000*

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$60,000 for the preparation of working drawings for an addition to the existing library which would provide 825 reader stations and stack space for 190,000 volumes in a gross area of approximately 57,000 square feet. The cost, which includes over \$82,000 for alterations to the existing library to make it compatible with the addition, results in \$18 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and \$22.75 per gross square foot for the total project, exclusive of the alterations. This is a reasonable cost for a building of this type which is largely open, loft-type space. While the general classroom and laboratory capacity of the campus as existing or funded in the fall of 1966 exceeds anticipated enrollment for that date by almost 25 percent, the capacity of the existing library is less than is required for the enrollment and consequently we believe that it is appropriate that the library be expanded. *We recommend approval of the project.*

**California State Colleges  
HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 381 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 781

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, ACQUISITION, IMPROVEMENTS AND  
EQUIPMENT, HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE  
STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$378,500
Recommended for approval -----	129,500

<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION -----</b>	<b>\$249,000</b>
------------------------------------------	------------------

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide for one major equipment project for a previously funded construction project, one working drawing project for future construction and one land acquisition project as follows:

*a. Equip marine fisheries facility ----- \$49,500*

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$32,550 for preparation of working drawings and the Budget Act of 1962 provided \$512,000 for the construction of a marine fisheries facility or laboratory in a separate and independent location immediately adjacent to the ocean some 15 miles north of the regular campus. This is a highly specialized facility which is essential to the natural resources oriented curriculum at this college. It is now proposed to provide for the equipment necessary to make the building operable. While we have not examined an equipment list in complete detail, the amount appears to commensurate with the size and type of building. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

*b. Remodel for biological science facility ----- \$249,000*

This project proposes the remodeling of the existing corporation yard building, which is two-story reinforced concrete building, into a science annex since it is adjacent to the existing science building although physically removed from it. A new corporation yard has been funded although construction on it has not been started. It is anticipated that when the new corporation yard is complete the old one may be vacated and converted to other uses. We would like to point out that the present funded capacity for this campus is 2,155 FTE as against an anticipated enrollment at the same time in the fall of 1966 of 2,175, a minimal difference. We do not believe that there is justification for the piecemeal development characterized by this proposal. We suggest that it is possible for the campus to continue without expansion in this area for some time until it can justify a reasonably sized increment of additional science space. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval.*

*c. Land acquisition ----- \$80,000*

This campus has relatively little usable area available to it. Most of the property it now owns is steep, heavily wooded and very difficult to build on. The campus is surrounded on the south and the west by privately owned property, mostly well-depreciated housing which would provide much more suitable areas for construction than attempting to

**Humboldt State College—Continued**

use the steep hilly portion owned by the campus. Since this campus is ultimately expected to go to 12,000, in accordance with the trustees current establishments, it would appear to be prudent to acquire as much of this property as is practical and hold it for future development.

The amount proposed is based on an estimate prepared by the Division of Property Acquisition of the Department of Finance and relates to seven specific areas delineated on the master plan of the campus. We recommend approval.

**California State Colleges  
LONG BEACH STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 382 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 783

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
LONG BEACH STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE  
PROGRAM CONSTRUCTION FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$3,401,700
Recommended for approval .....	91,700

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION .....	\$3,310,000
-----------------------------------	-------------

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide for one major equipment project for previously funded construction, one major construction project and one project of working drawings for future construction as follows.

*a. Equip health service building .....* \$64,700

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$43,600 for working drawings and the Budget Act of 1962 provided \$593,400 for the construction of a health services building on this campus. Completion of the project is estimated in January, 1964. The building involves a series of doctors offices and treatment rooms, X-ray facilities, laboratory facilities, infirmary rooms, administrative spaces, etc. It is necessary at this time to provide for equipping the building in order to make it operable. While we have not examined the equipment list in detail the amount appears to be commensurate, based on past experience, with the size and type of building. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

*b. Construct gymnasium addition .....* \$3,310,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$74,000 for the preparation of working drawings for an addition to the existing gym which would provide, as proposed at that time, an additional approximately 120,000 square feet of gross area. Since that time the plans have gone through several phases and have been changed. As to the various changes that have taken place we have as yet received no final set of preliminary plans and specifications nor an estimate of cost, to support the figure included in this budget. It should also be pointed out that this project was assigned to a private architect by the trustees. It is hoped that before the legislative committees have completed their review of the

Long Beach State College—Continued

budget that the necessary information and data will be available on which to make an evaluation and a recommendation.

In any case we would recommend that the project be deferred in view of the fact that there is an existing gymnasium facility which by careful scheduling can be made to serve for several more years. We would point out that the projected enrollment for the fall of 1966 is 10,800 FTE as against the existing and funded capacity which totals 10,530 FTE for the same date. This would indicate a plant which is relatively even with the demands to be made on it at that time. In view of our statement preceding the capital outlay analysis to the effect that it is desirable to try to stretch the available bond funds to cover a two-year period until additional funds can be obtained, *we believe the project should be deferred.*

c. Working drawings for industrial arts building.....\$27,000

This project is proposed for future construction at probably 30,000 square feet of gross area in a building containing specialized laboratories, general classrooms and faculty offices with an ultimate capacity of 294 FTE. The cost of such a building will probably exceed \$1,800,000 plus relatively high expenditures for movable equipment and supplies. The demand for this type of training in the state colleges continues relatively high and facilities should be provided. *Consequently, we recommend approval of the working drawings.*

California State Colleges

LOS ANGELES STATE COLLEGE OF APPLIED ARTS AND SCIENCES

ITEM 383 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 785

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted .....	\$5,342,100
Recommended for approval .....	746,500
Unresolved .....	4,595,600

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION.....None

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for two major equipment projects for previously funded construction, one major construction project, one major project for working drawings for future construction and a substantial land acquisition and construction program as follows.

a. Equip classroom building No. 1, phase II.....\$354,500

The Budget Act of 1959 provided \$310,000 for working drawings and the Budget Act of 1960 provided \$5,304,000 for construction of a classroom building on this campus which has since been completed and represents probably the largest single classroom building on any state college campus with a capacity in excess of 5,000 FTE. The

## Los Angeles State College of Applied Arts and Sciences—Continued

Budget Act of 1962 provided \$650,000 as the first phase, of two, to provide the basic initial complement of equipment for the building. While we have not examined the equipment list in detail the total amount proposed, in both phases, appears to be commensurate with the size, type and capacity of the building. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

*b. Equip science building, phase III* ----- \$332,000

The permanent science building on this campus was originally financed for construction in 1956. In 1958 the Legislature provided \$930,000 as the first increment of equipping the building with the complex scientific equipment required. In 1961 the Legislature provided \$450,000 as the second increment for equipping the building as the enrollment grew. The present proposal is the third and last phase of equipping the building to house its full capacity of students in the sciences. While we have not examined the list in complete detail the total amount of all three phases appears to be commensurate with the size and character of the building. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

*c. Construct engineering building addition* ----- \$3,595,600

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$100,000 for the partial cost of working drawings for an addition to the engineering building. To date we have seen no final preliminary plans for this project nor do we have any data or information in the way of outline specifications or estimate of cost to support the figure contained in the budget. We assume however that this information will be forthcoming before the legislative committees have completed their review of the budget. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

*d. Working drawings for administration building addition (partial)* ----- \$60,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$53,300 for working drawings for an addition to the administration building at this campus. At the time the amount was included in the budget of 1962 there was not a clear-cut program for the size and scope of the building. This has since been resolved to indicate that a substantially larger building than had first been thought of would be necessary. Therefore, it is now being proposed to augment the existing funds to provide for working drawings for a larger building. The larger building will also, initially provide classrooms for 297 FTE which in time will be phased out so that ultimately the total building will then become administrative offices. As of this writing we have still seen no final program or preliminary plans for this project. However, in view of the acute need for additional administrative space at this campus and in view of the fact that only working drawing funds are being requested so that there will be an opportunity to review the preliminary before working plans are started, *we would recommend approval.*



Los Angeles State College of Applied Arts and Sciences—Continued

e. *Land acquisition and construction—parking (partial)*-----\$1,000,000

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$1,258,000 for the acquisition of a site and development for parking purposes. It is now proposed to augment this original appropriation by this substantial sum to provide for still more parking by the purchase of additional land. As of this writing we have seen no program to support the amount requested although the budget indicates that it will provide space for an additional 800 cars. If the latter figure is accurate this would mean that each parking space would cost \$1,250. We would point out that at this cost it is possible to provide multistory parking which would use up much less valuable land and hence would take less land off the tax rolls. *In view of our lack of information on the project, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

California State Colleges  
ORANGE STATE COLLEGE

ITEM 384 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 787

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
ORANGE STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted -----	\$4,172,300
Recommended for approval -----	782,300
Unresolved -----	3,390,000

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION ----- None

ANALYSIS

This item will provide for two major equipment projects for previously funded construction, one major construction project and two working drawings projects for future construction as follows.

a. *Equip science building, phase II*-----\$750,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$550,000 for working drawings and the Budget Act of 1961 provided \$8,293,400 for the construction of a science building and boiler plant. The building was to function initially as a multi-purpose structure housing all of the campus permanent facilities. These would gradually be phased out so that ultimately the building would be wholly engaged in science and would provide science capacity for a total college enrollment of 10,000 FTE. The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$1 million for the first phase of equipping this building which would require both laboratory scientific equipment as well as regular classroom and administrative equipment. It is now proposed to finance a second phase at \$750,000. This will not be the final phase since each major change in the building as nonscience activities are moved out, will require new equipment for the science program. While we have not examined this list in detail we believe that the amount of the two phases is in keeping with the size and character of the building. *Consequently we recommend approval.*

## Orange State College—Continued

b. *Equip outdoor physical education facilities*-----\$20,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$205,100 for the construction of outdoor physical education facilities involving turfed areas, running track, baseball area, etc. It is now necessary to fund the equipment to make the outdoor area operable. *We recommend approval.*

c. *Construct gymnasium*-----\$3,220,000

This project was assigned by the Trustees of the California State Colleges to a private architect. We have seen some interim preliminary plans but as of this writing we have received no final preliminary plan and outline specifications, nor have we received a cost estimate to support the figure contained in the budget. We anticipate that this data will be forthcoming before the legislative committees have completed their review of the budget. *Consequently we can make no recommendation at this time.*

d. *Working drawings for library building*-----\$170,000

This project proposes a structure which will house the library with audiovisual facilities, and initially will provide classroom space for 3,000 FTE students. Ultimately it would become completely library and audiovisual when the campus has reached a total enrollment of 10,000 FTE. While we have reviewed the program we have as yet seen no preliminary plans, outline specifications or cost estimate to support the proposal. On the assumption that the \$170,000 requested represents 6 percent of the total cost of the project we may assume that the total cost will be something approaching \$3 million and at approximately \$22 per gross square foot this should provide a building in excess of 135,000 square feet. *Consequently we can make no recommendation at this time.*

e. *Working drawings for site development, phase II*-----\$12,300

The construction of a music-speech-drama building has already been funded in the 1962 Budget Act and working drawings for a gymnasium were funded at the same time with construction for the gymnasium being proposed in the present budget. These buildings will require extensions of utilities, roads, walks, etc., in order to make them operable. Only working drawings are being proposed at this time since construction would not be required until the next budget. *We recommend approval.*

**California State Colleges  
SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 385 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 788

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$7,885,000
Recommended for approval .....	None
Unresolved .....	7,885,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ..... None

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide for two major construction projects as follows.

*a. Construct science building* ..... **\$4,750,000**

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$230,000 for working drawings for a science building addition. It was subsequently decided that the building should be a completely separate structure to house practically all the sciences with some of the existing science space being converted to other uses. The project contemplates a five-story-and-basement, reinforced concrete structure with a gross area of approximately 194,000 square feet. The basic building is estimated to cost \$20.07 per gross square foot and \$25.74 per square foot for the total project as presented. However, it should be pointed out that this does not include some of the features that are normally included in a building of this type. For example, the estimate does not include almost \$700,000 for fixed laboratory equipment such as laboratory tables which require a complete range of utilities permanently connected, fume hoods and other fixed laboratory devices. Nor does it include area lighting, landscaping and sprinklers as is usually the case. When these are added the total cost comes to \$29.60 per square foot. For a science building this is a reasonable cost in considering the complex nature of the structure. The trustees proposed to ask for these other items in a future budget. We have raised certain questions concerning the design and some of the features which have not yet been resolved. However, we anticipate a solution will be reached before the legislative committees have completed their review of the budget. It should be pointed out that the projected enrollment for the fall of 1966 is 5,350 FTE as compared with 4,300 capacity for the same date with the shortage being particularly in the area of laboratories for some classes. *In view of the foregoing we can make no recommendation at this time.*

*b. Construct music building* ..... **\$3,135,000**

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$95,000 for working drawings for a music building addition. It is now proposed to build a completely separate music building and to convert the original to other purposes. The project contemplates a structure which will have several separate and distinct parts. One part will house a fairly elaborate recital hall together with two large rehearsal rooms for band and choral rehearsal.

**Sacramento State College—Continued**

Another part will consist of an eight story tower with one story wings, the tower housing almost exclusively practice rooms and one of the one story wings housing offices and the other music classrooms and other appurtenant spaces. We have not as yet received a set of final preliminaries, outline specifications, or cost estimate on which to make an evaluation. Our initial reaction is that the cost of this particular design will be relatively high, even more costly than the science building preceding this. However, we anticipate that the necessary information will be forthcoming before the legislative committees have completed their review of the budget. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

**California State Colleges****SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 386 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 790

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
SAN BERNARDINO-RIVERSIDE STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE  
STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted ----- \$250,000

**TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION** ----- No change

**ANALYSIS**

This item would provide for two projects as follows.

a. *Master plans and site development phase I* ----- \$100,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$1 million for the acquisition of a site for a new campus in the San Bernardino-Riverside general area in accordance with legislative authorization in the Statutes of 1960. Present plans call for the college to be opened in the fall of 1965 in temporary facilities on the permanent site in much the same way as was done at Los Angeles State College, San Fernando State College and several others. While an actual site has not yet been procured the search has been fairly well narrowed down and a decision will probably be made within the budget year making it necessary to proceed with master plans immediately thereafter. *Consequently we recommend approval of the project.*

b. *Initial complement of library books first increment* ----- \$150,000

Normally this sum of money would buy about 25,000 books. However, it is our understanding that the purchases are to be made through a private firm which will handle all the details and it is entirely possible that the total number of books may be somewhat larger as a result since the purchase will be handled in conjunction with a similar purchase for the South Bay State College which should result in some economies. The books will be stored until required for the fall of 1965 opening. It is also our understanding that the goal is 50,000 books at the time that the campus is opened. It would appear therefore that as a first increment this proposal is acceptable. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

**California State Colleges  
SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 387 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 790

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$524,000
Recommended for approval -----	No change

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide for two major equipment projects for previously funded construction as follows.

*a. Equip life science building, phase III ----- \$324,000*

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 an addition to the life sciences and psychology building. Subsequently, the Budget Act of 1961 provided \$500,000 as a first increment of equipment for this building and the Budget Act of 1962 provided \$650,000 for a second increment. These two together with this proposal would make a grand total of \$1,474,000 to equip this building. As science curricula in the state college have become more complex and sophisticated the cost of providing equipment for these curricula has steadily risen until now they have been averaging between 40 and 50 percent of the cost of the building itself. While we have not examined this equipment list in detail the total cost appears to be in line with recent experience. *We recommend approval.*

*b. Equip business-administration and mathematics building,  
phase I ----- \$200,000*

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$180,000 for working drawings and the Budget Act of 1962 provided \$3,292,275 for construction of a multi-story classroom building with a capacity of 2,155 FTE. It is now proposed to provide a first increment of equipment for the building, particularly those items that take relatively long lead times to procure. While we have not examined the equipment list in detail it appears to be quite low for the purpose and should be adequate for a first phase. *We recommend approval.*

**California State Colleges  
SAN FERNANDO VALLEY STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 388 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 793

**FOR MAJOR ACQUISITION, CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND  
EQUIPMENT, SAN FERNANDO VALLEY STATE COLLEGE  
FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$742,200
Recommended for approval -----	546,500
Unresolved -----	195,700

<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION -----</b>	<b>None</b>
------------------------------------------	-------------

San Fernando Valley State College—Continued  
ANALYSIS

This item will provide for two major equipment projects and one land acquisition project as follows.

a. Equip classroom building No. 1, phase I-----\$434,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$358,960 for design and working drawings and the Budget Act of 1961 provided \$7,093,040 for the construction of a multistory building which would be devoted almost exclusively to conventional classrooms and which would have a capacity of over 4,500 FTE. The building is scheduled for completion the latter part of 1963. It is now proposed to provide the first phase of equipping the building which, since it consists largely of ordinary classroom furniture, is much less costly than would be the case in science buildings. Ultimately there will be at least two more phases to complete equipping the building. While we have not seen the list we believe that the amount being requested is reasonable for the purpose. *Consequently we would recommend approval.*

b. Initial complement of equipment, engineering phase III---\$112,500

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$46,950 as a minor construction item for initial equipment for an engineering curriculum on this campus. The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$200,000 as a second phase of this equipment which together with the present proposal will make a total of over \$358,000 for this purpose. The engineering curriculum is being temporarily housed in the science building. Ultimately when the new engineering building is completed and ready for occupancy all of this equipment will be moved to it and additional space will then be freed in the science building for expansion of that program. Engineering curricula have an extremely high cost of equipment necessary to implement them. The total amount involved including this phase is relatively minor and represents only a fraction of that which will ultimately be necessary when the engineering building is complete. While we have not seen the equipment list it appears to be reasonable for the purpose. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

c. Land acquisition (partial) -----\$195,700

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$1,300,000 for the acquisition of an additional 55 acres to meet the needs for the ultimate master plan on this campus. It is our understanding that the cost of this acreage has gone up substantially from that which was anticipated at the time the previous appropriation was made. Originally it was our understanding that the amount necessary would be almost double the original appropriation. Consequently, we do not understand the amount being requested herewith. We have received no information covering the proposal and *we can make no recommendation at this time.*

**California State Colleges  
SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 389 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 795

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$1,839,200
Recommended for approval .....	1,639,200
Unresolved .....	200,000

<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION .....</b>	<b>None</b>
------------------------------------------	-------------

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide for one major equipment project for previously funded construction and two construction projects as follows.

*a. Equip psychology, air science building .....* **\$212,200**

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$60,000 for the preparation of working drawings and the Budget Act of 1962 provided \$1,235,400 for the construction of a building which would provide space for the psychology and air science programs. The building is presently scheduled for completion by February 1964. While we have not seen an equipment list the amount proposed appears to be commensurate with the size and type of building involved. *We recommend approval.*

*b. Construct classroom building No. 3 addition .....* **\$1,427,000**

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$65,000 for design and working drawings for an addition to Classroom Building No. 3 which would contain a gross area of 61,111 square feet of general classroom space with a total capacity of 1,069 FTE students. It should be pointed out that the enrollment projection for this campus for the fall of 1966 is 11,500 for which they will have an existing funded capacity at that time of 7,462 FTE.

As an addition the building will conform in outward appearance as well as inside layout to the existing building which requires that it be a three-story structure with partial basement. The cost is estimated at \$18.50 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$23.50 per square foot for the total project which includes site development and substantial utility development. *In view of the need for additional capacity at this campus we recommend approval.*

*c. Construct music facility .....* **\$200,000**

This project contemplates the construction of a large music recital hall and some appurtenant facilities for 600 students FTE as expressed by the budget. It is proposed that it be constructed in an interior court of the existing music building. As the budget description reads the sum is supposed to be for working drawings alone which would indicate that the ultimate construction project would cost in excess of three and a half million dollars. However, this is probably an error and the \$200,000 is intended to provide the facility itself. As of this writing we have received no data, outline specifications or estimates to support the project as shown in the budget. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

**California State Colleges  
SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 390 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 797

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$5,990,000
Recommended for approval -----	750,000
Unresolved -----	5,240,000

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

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide for one major equipment project for a previously funded construction and one major construction project as follows.

*a. Equip engineering building, phase III----- \$750,000*

The Budget Act of 1958 provided \$7,093,000 for working drawings and construction of an engineering building which would expand the engineering facilities on this campus. The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$2,000,000 for the first increment of equipment for this building and this project proposes to provide a second increment which would make a total of \$2,750,000. Incidentally, the labeling in the budget as phase III is in error as this is actually phase II. Past experience has indicated that engineering complexes generally require equipment to the value of between 35 and 50 percent of the cost of the structure. Consequently, the two phases together fall short of this and we may anticipate additional increments in the future as the enrollment grows. While we have not examined the equipment list in this instance the amount appears to be commensurate with the project. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

*b. Construct science building No. 2----- \$5,240,000*

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$500,000 for design and working drawings for science building No. 2. At that time it was contemplated as a building having over 306,000 square feet of gross area with a potential cost in excess of \$10,500,000. Subsequently, it was somewhat downgraded to 290,000 square feet at a potential cost of slightly over \$10,000,000. Since that time it has been further reduced in size but at this time we have not as yet received final preliminary plans, outline specifications or estimates to support the amount shown in the budget. We have no way to judge the size of the building other than the fact it is stated that it will house a total of 410 students FTE. We anticipate that the necessary information will be forthcoming before the legislative committees have completed their review of the budget. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*



**California State Colleges  
SONOMA STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 391 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 799

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
SONOMA STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$7,658,500
Recommended for approval -----	362,500
Unresolved -----	7,296,000

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

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide for three complements of equipment for previously funded construction, four major construction projects and three working drawings projects for future construction as follows.

*a. Initial complement of equipment* ----- \$160,200

This project proposes the second phase of providing initial equipment for the expanding enrollment in existing temporary rented quarters. This equipment will ultimately be moved to the permanent buildings as they are occupied. While we have not seen an equipment list it would appear that the amount proposed is in line with the anticipated increase in enrollment which is projected to increase by 50 percent from the current year to the fall of 1963.

*b. Equip outdoor physical education facilities and fieldhouse* -- \$43,800

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$250,000 for construction of outdoor physical education facilities and \$315,000 for the construction of a fieldhouse. No dates of completion are available and no work has yet commenced on the new site, as of this writing. However, it is our understanding that these two facilities will be under construction in the current fiscal year and may very possibly be completed before the end of the budget year. Consequently, it is proper to provide at this time for the purchase of the equipment needed to make the two facilities operable. We have not examined an equipment list in detail. However, the amount appears to be commensurate with the size and type of project. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

*c. Construct classroom building No. 1* ----- \$2,830,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$310,000 for what was designated in the act as "working drawings for science classroom building." At that time it was contemplated that a single large building would be constructed which would be designed to ultimately be entirely sciences but that initially it would serve both the sciences and general classroom uses in much the same manner as was done with the first building at Orange County State College. Subsequently, it was determined to design two separate buildings, one for sciences and the other for general classrooms each of which was susceptible of ultimate expansion. Of the initial appropriation \$155,300 was allocated to the classroom building

## Sonoma State College—Continued

for design and working drawings. It is now contemplated that the classroom building will have a gross area of 126,138 square feet in three stories which will be of reinforced concrete columns, floors and roof with precast exterior wall panels. The cost is estimated at \$18 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and \$23.78 per gross square foot for the total project which includes site and utility development and food service equipment which will make possible a small snack bar in the building on a somewhat temporary basis. We have reviewed the preliminary plans and outline specifications and have raised a number of important questions which have bearing on the ultimate cost and which have not as yet been resolved. However, we anticipate that they will be resolved before the legislative committees have completed their review of the budget. *Consequently we can make no recommendations at this time.*

d. Construct science building No. 1----- \$2,828,000

As mentioned above, the Budget Act of 1962 provided funds for working drawings of which \$154,700 were allocated for this project. This contemplates a building having a gross area of 99,430 square feet of three stories and basement in height and constructed of reinforced concrete columns, floors and roof with precast concrete exterior panels. The cost is estimated at \$20.05 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$30.17 per square foot for the total project which includes almost a half million dollars for fixed laboratory equipment as well as substantial amounts for site development and utilities. We have reviewed the preliminary plans submitted and have raised a number of important questions with respect to details which will have an influence on the cost of the building. As of this writing these have not yet been resolved, however it is anticipated they will be before the legislative committees have completed their review of the budget. *Consequently we can make no recommendation at this time.*

e. Site development, phase II----- \$750,000

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$500,000 for the first phase of developing the site of the new permanent campus. This would have provided some of the basic rough work, basic utilities and some access roads. The second phase will extend this work and will provide development in the immediate vicinity of the construction projects mentioned above. As of this writing we have not yet received a final preliminary plan, outline specifications or cost estimate to support the figure contained in the budget. However, it is anticipated that we will receive these before the legislative committees have completed their review of the budget. *Consequently, we can make no recommendations at this time.*

f. Construct boiler plant----- \$776,000

This project will provide a building to house the central heating unit for this campus and probably also a central refrigeration unit for air-conditioning purposes. As of this writing we have received no final

## Sonoma State College—Continued

preliminary plans, outline specifications or cost estimate to support the figures shown in the budget. However, it is anticipated that these will be forthcoming before the legislative committees complete their review of the budget. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

*g. Initial complement of library books—second increment----- \$110,000*

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$50,000 for the purchase of an initial complement of library books which ultimately will be moved into the permanent library when it is constructed. That amount would have provided approximately 12,500 books. The present proposal will provide about 18,500 books which would be part of the way towards the goal of 50,000 books available in the library when the permanent campus opens. *We recommend approval.*

*h. Working drawings for music classroom building----- \$62,000*

While we have reviewed the program for this project, to date we have not received final preliminary plans, outline specifications or a cost estimate on which to base an evaluation of the project. The budget states that it will have an initial capacity of 300 FTE students and will provide the various types of facilities usually found in a music classroom building. *Until we receive more concrete data it will not be possible for us to make a recommendation.*

*i. Working drawings for gymnasium (partial)----- \$50,000*

We have reviewed the basic program for this facility which the budget states will have a capacity for 106 FTE students which reflects its classroom capacity rather than the physical education capacity. However, we have not as yet received any preliminary plans, outline specifications or cost estimates to support the amount shown in the budget. *Consequently, we can make no recommendations at this time.*

*j. Working drawings for cafeteria----- \$48,500*

This project would provide a central feeding facility for the campus where at present there is contemplated to be only a small feeding area in Classroom Building No. 1. Preliminary plans for this project contemplate a gross building area of 49,000 square feet of one story brick and concrete and concrete construction with a vaulted wood roof and having an initial seating capacity of 300. Initial excess space will be used for other purposes temporarily such as a bookstore and student publication area. It is estimated at this time the total project will cost \$1,475,600 which produces a unit cost for the building alone of \$21 per gross square foot and \$30.11 per square foot for the total project. The latter figure includes over \$200,000 for fixed kitchen equipment and some utilities development. The cost and design appear to be line with previous construction and *consequently, we would recommend approval of the working drawing project.*

**California State Colleges  
SOUTH BAY STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 392 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 801

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT, SOUTH BAY  
STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION  
PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$350,000
Recommended for approval -----	None

<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b> -----	<b>\$350,000</b>
------------------------------------------	------------------

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide for two projects as follows.

*a. Master plans and site development, phase I* ----- **\$200,000**

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$5 million for the acquisition of a site in the South Bay area of Los Angeles for the establishment of a new college campus in accordance with statutory authorization of 1960. As of this writing a final choice of site has not been made and there is every indication that the available site funds may be substantially short of the amount necessary to purchase an adequate site. While the goal for this college is to open in the fall of 1965, in temporary facilities on the permanent site, we are frankly pessimistic that this will be possible because of the difficulties of purchasing a site in this area. Consequently, we believe that it is premature to provide funds for master plans and site development although we would agree that \$200,000 would be a reasonable amount for the purpose. *Consequently, we recommend deferral of this project.*

*b. Initial complement of library books, first increment* ----- **\$150,000**

This would provide approximately 25,000 books as an initial complement which would be procured by a private organization and stored until they could be installed in the temporary facilities. In view of the statement made in connection with the item directly above *we recommend deferral of the project.*

**California State Colleges  
STANISLAUS STATE COLLEGE**

ITEM 393 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 801

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
STANISLAUS STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$1,259,500
Recommended for approval -----	161,500
Unresolved -----	1,098,000

<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION</b> -----	<b>None</b>
------------------------------------------	-------------

## Stanislaus State College—Continued

## ANALYSIS

This item will provide for three equipment projects for previously funded construction, one construction project and two working drawings projects for future construction as follows.

a. Equip classroom building No. 1, phase I----- \$100,000

The Budget Act of 1961 provided a lump sum of \$510,000 for working drawings for a number of buildings, for master plans and some site development. Of this amount \$75,000 was allocated for working drawings and the Budget Act of 1962 provided \$1,872,736 for construction of the first permanent classroom building on the new permanent site for this campus which is now operating in temporary buildings on the Stanislaus County fairgrounds. The equipment being proposed is only a relatively small part of that which will be required for the building but it will be used in the temporary structures at first to provide for the growing enrollment and ultimately will be moved to the permanent building. While we have not seen the equipment list, the amount appears to be quite reasonable under the circumstances, *consequently, we recommend approval.*

b. Equip library building, phase I----- \$50,000

This building was also one of those for which working drawings were allocated out of a lump sum appropriation. The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$1,316,100 for construction of a library facility. The project is now in the working drawing stage, construction will not start for some time. The Budget Act of 1962 also provided \$50,000 for an initial complement of library books which would have provided approximately 9,000 volumes to be housed in temporary facilities and ultimately moved to the permanent library. It is now proposed to provide some of the movable equipment and furniture which will ultimately go into the library building but will initially be used in the temporary facilities. While we have not seen the equipment list the amount appears to be relatively modest for the purpose. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

c. Site development, phase II----- \$1,003,000

The lump sum appropriation of 1961 provided for working drawings for site development and some actual development as well and the Budget Act of 1962 provided \$1,096,500 for the first phase of the site development which involves extensive grading, utility development, roads and the installation of a utility tunnel which will loop around the campus.

It is now proposed to start on the second phase which will provide further extensions of the utility distribution system, parking spaces and additional roadways, lighting and other things necessary to the initial complement of buildings. We have examined the preliminary plans for this phase of the construction and have raised some questions which have not yet been resolved. *Consequently we can make no recommendation at this time.*

**Item 394****Capital Outlay****Stanislaus State College—Continued**

*d. Initial complement of library books, second increment----- \$11,500*

The project for library equipment above explains the situation at this library. The additional books would probably be in the vicinity of 2,000 volumes which are necessary to provide for an adequate collection at this campus. Ultimately they will be moved to the permanent library. *We recommend approval.*

*e. Working drawings for music classroom building----- \$45,000*

While we have reviewed the program proposed for this building, as of this writing we have received no preliminary plans, outline specifications or cost estimate to support this project or justify its inclusion in the budget. The building will probably be required since the projected enrollment for 1966 is 1,400 students whereas the total funded capacity is 945 FTE. This would be all contained in Classroom Building No. 1 and probably a relatively small capacity in the excess library space. *However, in view of our lack of information at this time we can make no recommendation.*

*f. Working drawings for gymnasium----- \$50,000*

We have also reviewed the program for this project but to date have received no preliminary plans, outline specifications or estimate to support it. Since the campus is totally new a gymnasium facility will be required to provide physical education programs in accordance with the statutes. *However, in view of the fact that we have had no information upon which to make a determination we can make no recommendation at this time.*

**California State Colleges****CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE**

ITEM 394 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 803

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE, FROM THE  
STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$3,668,300
Recommended for approval -----	1,030,800

<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION-----</b>	<b>\$2,637,500</b>
-----------------------------------------	--------------------

**ANALYSIS**

This item will provide for one working drawing project and one construction project on the San Luis Obispo campus and three equipment projects and one construction project on the Kellogg-Voorhis campus as follows.

*a. Site development, San Luis Obispo----- \$420,000*

This program is entirely involved in participation with the city of San Luis Obispo in expansion of the city's water treatment plant to pay for the share of these facilities that is represented by the amount

## California State Polytechnic College—Continued

of campus water that passes through them. The technique of joint use of facilities makes the capacity for the campus volume of use considerably less costly than if the campus were to attempt to build its own treatment facilities. Since the city proposes to move ahead with the project it is almost mandatory that the State participate at this time. *We recommend approval.*

b. *Working drawings for biological science addition, San Luis Obispo* ----- \$33,500

This proposal represent a relatively small project which will cost in the vicinity of \$500,000 for ultimate construction. While we have reviewed the program for the project, we have not yet seen any preliminary plans based on this program. It should be pointed out that the estimated existing and funded capacity as of the fall of 1966 for this campus, based on the current rates of utilization, is 6,073 FTE. The projected enrollment for the same date is 6,300 or an excess of enrollment over capacity of approximately 3.7 percent. In view of our statements at the beginning of the capital outlay section concerning the desirability of increasing the utilization of facilities at all state colleges with a view to stretching the available bond funds to cover a two-year period, 1963-64 and 1964-65, we suggest that this proposal is premature and can be deferred for at least one year and possibly longer. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval of the proposal.*

c. *Equip music-speech-drama building, KV*----- \$200,000

The Budget Act of 1960 provided \$2,146,500 for the design and construction of a music-speech-drama building having a gross area of approximately 55,000 square feet and containing a little theater, music rehearsal rooms, lecture rooms, studios, etc. It is now proposed to provide the equipment to make this project operable. We have not yet had an opportunity to examine this list in detail but it would appear from the amount of the request that the list would not be excessive for the size and type of building. *We recommend approval.*

d. *Equip engineering addition, phase I, KV*----- \$400,000

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$200,000 for working drawings and the Budget Act of 1962 provided \$4,833,000 for the construction of additions to the engineering complex at this campus. While the construction has not yet started, the equipping of an engineering complex usually involves a certain portion of items that require long lead times between ordering and receiving the equipment. This proposal covers the first phase involving this type of equipment. While we have not had the opportunity to examine the equipment list in detail, based on prior experience with engineering buildings we believe the sum is in line with the size of the project. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

e. *Equip pools, KV*----- \$10,800

The Budget Act of 1961 provided funds for working drawings and the Budget Act of 1962 provides \$248,000 for the construction of a swimming and diving pool complex immediately adjacent to the exist-

## California State Polytechnic College—Continued

ing gymnasium. It is now proposed to provide for the movable equipment of this facility. While we have not examined the equipment list in detail, from previous experience the amount proposed appears to be completely in line. *Consequently, we recommend approval.*

*f. Construct gymnasium* ----- \$2,604,000

The Budget Act of 1961 provided \$100,000 for working drawings for a men's gymnasium and a swimming pool complex. Of this amount approximately \$89,000 was devoted to the gymnasium and the balance to the swimming pools. The proposal involves the conversion of the existing gymnasium, which is now used by both sexes, as a women's gymnasium exclusively and the construction of a totally new gymnasium building with its playing and appurtenant spaces to be used more or less exclusively by the men.

The project involves a gross building area of over 100,000 square feet with a sufficient internal area around and adjacent to the playing floor to permit a total seating capacity of 5,000 most of which will be in permanently installed folding bleachers. The current estimate which we have shows a total additional requirement of \$2,704,000 as against the \$2,604,000 proposed in the budget. We assume that this reduction is based on certain questions that were raised by both the Department of Finance and our office and for which it would be anticipated that reductions in cost could be made. However, we have not yet seen a new estimate or the basis upon which this was arrived at. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation on the project at this time.* Over and beyond this question we would recommend against this project in principle on the basis that it is not critically needed, on this campus, to house the anticipated enrollment in the fall of 1966. We believe that the existing gymnasium plus the new swimming pools which are about to go under construction can, by judicious scheduling, be made to serve the anticipated enrollment. We point out that a gymnasium as such is not nearly as critical to the proper functioning of a state college campus as are science and classroom buildings and in view of *the points expressed in our statement preceding the capital outlay analysis concerning the desirability of stretching the bond funds to cover a two-year period, we would recommend that this project be deferred.*

## Department of Mental Hygiene

## LANGLEY PORTER NEUROPSYCHIATRIC INSTITUTE

ITEM 395 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 832

FOR SITE ACQUISITION, LANGLEY PORTER NEUROPSYCHIATRIC  
INSTITUTE, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION  
PROGRAM FUND

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$250,000  
Recommended for approval ----- No change



Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute—Continued  
ANALYSIS

This item provides the second increment necessary to purchase a new site for the Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute. The funds are being budgeted in increments so that the property purchases may be made over a period of time and acquired in an orderly fashion. The exact total cost of the entire site necessary is not known but it is estimated that it will be in excess of \$750,000.

We opposed the first \$250,000 increment for site purchase in our Analysis of the 1962-63 Budget. At that time we questioned the possible lack of proximity of the neuropsychiatric institute to the University of California Hospital and the lack of evidence that the existing institute might be expanded at a reduced cost. We have been convinced in the interim that the new site will enable the institute to make use of some of the university hospital facilities and that construction of the new institute is the most satisfactory solution to the expanding needs of both the institute and the university. *We therefore recommend approval of this item.*

Department of Mental Hygiene  
AGNEWS STATE HOSPITAL

ITEM 396 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 834

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND  
EQUIPMENT, AGNEWS STATE HOSPITAL, FROM  
THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted -----	\$324,570
Amount unresolved -----	324,570

ANALYSIS

This item provides for a major construction project and related equipment needs as follows:

- |                                                     |           |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| a. Remodel and modernize wards 22-24 -----          | \$319,570 |
| b. Equip remodeled and modernized wards 22-24 ----- | 5,000     |

Modernization of a typical mental hygiene ward involves two major tasks. The first is that of renovating the structure so that lighting, heating, plumbing and the general environment is brought up to date to provide a cheerful environment equal to that of a new ward. The second task involves relocating partitions and functions so that the modern program of treatment and care can be provided with minimum effort. This two-story reinforced concrete ward building includes two separate wards, one on the first floor and one on the second floor, both sharing a single dining room. The remodeled structure will house a total of 79 patients and the remodeled cost per bed is \$4,053. This cost per bed ranks this project in the area of marginal economic feasibility.

We have received the budget package but have not resolved some objections. We expect to arrive at a satisfactory solution prior to the legislative hearings. *We cannot make a recommendation at this time.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
CAMARILLO STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 397 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 836

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
CAMARILLO STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$1,961,900
Recommended for approval -----	481,900

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION -----	\$1,480,000
-----------------------------------	-------------

**ANALYSIS**

This item provides for one new construction project, a modernization project and necessary equipment related to the modernization project as follows.

*a. Construct laundry ----- \$1,480,000*

Item 382d of the 1962 Budget Bill provides \$80,000 for working drawings for a new laundry. The program for the new laundry has been delayed however due to an interest expressed by the Department of Corrections in handling the Camarillo laundry at the Los Padres Mens Colony. The Department of Mental Hygiene agreed that a trial should be made to determine the success of such an operation. This trial is scheduled to commence in mid February and results are expected to be indicative by the first week in April. Should this trial prove to be successful it is presumed that the \$1,480,000 budgeted would not be necessary. Should the trial be unsuccessful the working drawing moneys appropriated in 1962-63 would enable planning to proceed up to the point in which bids for construction are issued. This phase of the project would not be reached until December 1, 1963, at the earliest. The effect of budgeting construction funds at this time for a project that may not be necessary can at best accelerate construction by seven months. Experience indicates that the time would be something less than seven months and it is our opinion that the time element is not critical for this project. We suggest therefore that construction moneys be deferred until the 1964-65 budget year in the event they are found necessary. *We therefore recommend disapproval of this request.*

*b. Remodel and modernize wards 3 and 3A ----- \$463,900*

*c. Equip remodeled and modernized wards 3 and 3A ----- 18,000*

Wards 3 and 3A housing 119 female patients will be remodeled to provide more functional working conditions and an adequate living environment. The economic feasibility of the project is marginal as evidenced by the \$3,934 estimated cost per bed. The condition of the existing wards is not conducive to modern standards of treatment thus offsetting the marginal feasibility. It is hoped that the continuing trend towards increased turnover is augmented by projects of this nature. The \$18,000 equipment item is reasonable for the project. *We recommend approval of items b and c.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
MENDOCINO STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 398 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 839

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
MENDOCINO STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$264,410
Amount unresolved .....	264,410

**ANALYSIS**

This item provides for modernizing, altering and equipping wards as follows:

- a. *Remodel and modernize ward 15* ..... \$152,410  
 b. *Equip remodeled and modernized ward 15* ..... 7,000

The modernization proposal for ward 15 includes the standard improvements to the electrical, plumbing, heating and ventilating systems, and for general cleanup. The ward building houses 87 patients with sleeping quarters on the second floor and living and dining quarters on the first floor. The estimated unit cost of the project is \$1,763 per bed. This is a reasonable cost for a project of this nature. There are, however, portions of the programmed project that have not been resolved and must be considered prior to the budget hearings. *We therefore cannot make a recommendation at this time.*

- c. *Additional alterations, wards 7 and F, phase III* ..... \$105,000

The 1960-61 Budget Act and the 1962-63 Budget Act appropriated \$547,500 to remodel Wards 7 and F and \$10,000 to equip them. The Department of Mental Hygiene proposed during the planning stages for the second phase that additional treatment areas be added. It was determined that this was beyond the original scope of the project and therefore could not be augmented by the Public Works Board. This item provides the necessary funds for the added scope. A budget package has not been completed and we have not had a chance to review the project. *Consequently we cannot make a recommendation at this time.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
MODESTO STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 399 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 841

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
MODESTO STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$3,000,000
Amount unresolved .....	3,000,000

**ANALYSIS**

This item proposes construction of phase I of a mental health center at Modesto State Hospital. A \$50,000 appropriation was made in the

**Modesto State Hospital—Continued**

1961-62 Budget Bill to provide for the development of master plans and a \$100,000 appropriation was made in the 1962-63 Budget Act to cover working drawings for a receiving and treatment unit. Firm plans have still not been established for the master plan of Modesto State Hospital. The most recent proposal is that it be master planned as a 1,000-bed hospital and that the receiving and treatment unit include a day treatment center and aftercare facility. It has been tentatively proposed that the first phase provide a 250-bed acute treatment ward and that the receiving and treatment unit be postponed to a later increment.

The Modesto State Hospital facilities were constructed as temporary facilities by the federal government for use in World War II. The present capacity is approximately 2,400. The structures housing these patients will be gradually phased out of the hospital until the entire complex of 1,000 new beds is completed and thus the net reduction will be approximately 1,400 beds. We have not received a firm program or budget submittal but hope to have some information prior to committee hearings. *We cannot make a recommendation at this time.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
STOCKTON STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 400 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 845

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
STOCKTON STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$119,000
Recommended for approval -----	No change

**ANALYSIS**

Item 338a of the 1960-61 Budget Act provided \$2,300,000 for the construction of 240 new beds and for remodeling approximately 100 existing beds of cottage G at Stockton State Hospital. Item 387b of the 1962-63 Budget Act provided \$161,000 to air condition cottage G. Favorable bids were received on the project and the air conditioning portion was contracted within the 1960-61 \$2,300,000 appropriation. The \$161,000 was therefore reverted to the General Fund. The new ward unit is for the use of male and female geriatric patients. This item provides \$119,000 to equip the building upon completion in the early part of 1964. The equipment cost divided by 240 new beds results in a unit cost of approximately \$500 per bed. This is a little high for this type unit but when the remodeled portion of the project is considered it is more reasonable. We have not received a copy of the equipment list but expect to prior to budget hearings and will make a more complete review to make certain the cost is reasonable. *We recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
PACIFIC STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 401 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 848

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
PACIFIC STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$351,800
Recommended for approval .....	None
<b>TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION .....</b>	<b>\$351,800</b>

**ANALYSIS**

This budget item proposes installation of air conditioning systems into three one-story ward buildings that house a total of 194 non-ambulatory patients of both sexes. The Department of Mental Hygiene contends that installation of this system is necessary to provide adequate and satisfactory body comfort to those patients being treated. We have received the budget package and do not question the method of accomplishing the air treatment should such treatment be approved. We do not object to air conditioning for these structures as a matter of policy. The lack of adequate funds with which to provide air conditioning on a statewide basis requires that the State establish a priority of those areas that receive such treatment. It has been the policy for some time to air condition office areas housing state employees because of the resultant increased efficiency. It is our opinion that if additional air conditioning is provided the next order of priority would be in certain higher education facilities. The studies of those enrolled in the state colleges and the University require a high degree of efficiency and alertness in terms of the values to be gained or lost. Thus the return on the investment on those enrolled in these institutions may be increased by air treatment in the same manner as state employee productivity is increased. *Therefore, in view of the fact that air conditioning in these wards will contribute only to comfort and not to increased productivity, we recommend disapproval of this project.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
PORTERVILLE STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 402 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 849

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
PORTERVILLE STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$24,024
Recommended for approval .....	No change

**ANALYSIS**

This budget item provides for the second phase of equipment that is necessary for the proper functioning of the acute hospital annex that was funded for construction by the 1960-61 Budget Act. The 1962-63 Budget Act appropriated \$37,200 for equipment and it has since been

**Porterville State Hospital—Continued**

determined that that amount is insufficient. There are two reasons for this underestimate, one is that the number of beds to be serviced in the hospital annex will be 110 instead of the originally planned 92 and the second is simply higher costs than anticipated. *We consider the proposal reasonable and recommend approval.*

**Department of Mental Hygiene  
SONOMA STATE HOSPITAL**

ITEM 403 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 850

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT,  
SONOMA STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$693,335
Recommended for approval -----	340,585
Amount unresolved -----	185,000
Total Recommended Reduction -----	\$167,750

**ANALYSIS**

There are six projects proposed by this item as follows:

*a. Equip wards and treatment unit for severely handicapped \$166,000*

Construction of severely handicapped unit was founded by Item 381a of the 1961-62 Budget Act. We have received the proposed list of equipment necessary to make this unit operable and consider it to be the normal complement necessary. *We recommend approval.*

*b. Replace boilers ----- \$99,585*

Two boilers installed in 1928 and 1932 respectively have a combined capacity of 25,000 pounds of steam per hour and will be replaced by a package type water tube boiler with a 30,000 pound per hour steam capacity. The existing boilers both need brick work repair and it has been determined by the Division of Architecture that replacement provides the preferable solution. We have reviewed the budget package and consider it reasonable. *We recommend approval of this project.*

*c. Air conditioning of Tallman Nursery and Powers Cottage \$167,750*

This project consists of the addition of cooling equipment to the existing heating and ventilating system in Powers Cottage and the installation of a complete air conditioning system in Tallman Nursery. We have reviewed the proposed budget package and consider it satisfactory for the intended purpose. Justification for this project is similar to that of the proposed air condition at Pacific State Hospital. *We recommend disapproval of this item for the reasons stated in the analysis of the Pacific State Hospital air-conditioning project proposal.*

## Capital Outlay

Item 404

### Sonoma State Hospital—Continued

d. *Alterations and addition to radiology (Chamberlain Hospital)* ----- \$135,000

e. *Equip radiology with new X-ray equipment* ----- \$50,000

The existing radiology unit at the Chamberlain does not fulfill the needs. It is therefore proposed that alterations be made and that new equipment be purchased. *We have not received a budget package at this time and therefore cannot make a recommendation.*

f. *Additional electrical services, phase II* ----- \$75,000

Item 391 of the 1962-63 Budget Act provided \$60,100 for extension of the electrical primary distribution system. An additional extension to that project is proposed. This portion includes the extension of the 12-kv. primary to the hospital area and to provided standby facilities in the hospital building. This project is necessary to guarantee the continued basic services of the hospital. *We recommend approval.*

### DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

ITEM 404 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 918

### FOR SITE ACQUISITION, MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS AND EQUIPMENT, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	-----	\$2,791,162
Recommended for approval	-----	2,512,103
Recommended reduction	-----	279,059

#### ANALYSIS

This item proposes to provide for the construction and equipment of seven forest fire stations, and the construction and equipment of the first or second phase of four 80-man conservation camps, additional construction of a branch center conservation camp and construction and equipment of a special conservation camp situation as follows.

a. *Site acquisitions for two new conservation camps* ----- \$50,000

This proposal is part of the long range program of attempting to provide two new conservation camps each year and as such it represents the first step, by providing funds for acquiring sites which are usually difficult to acquire. *We recommend approval.*

b. *Site acquisition, Ben Lomond conservation camp* ----- \$85,000

This is a long established camp housing Youth Authority inmates which has functioned on approximately 40 acres of leased land. The lease is for \$800 per year and expires in 1972 with no options to extend. It is proposed to purchase the existing camp site plus additional acreage, possibly 48 acres, to provide for a dependable water supply by building on the additional site a reservoir and the necessary right of way for the pipelines to deliver the water to the camp site. Water in this area is becoming relatively critical and there have been several instances at this camp when they were almost out of water.

## Department of Conservation—Continued

The camp is located within less than 20 miles of the new Santa Cruz campus of the University of California. The proximity of this new campus will inevitably create an increase in land values in the immediate vicinity, and the location of this camp will almost certainly be subject to this influence. Since it is the desire of both the Youth Authority and the Division of Forestry to remain on this site because there is a more than ample workload for many years, and in view of the fact that the cost of the land will continue to go up every year, it appears prudent to purchase it at this time rather than wait until the lease has nearly expired. *We recommend approval.*

c. Construct Arnold forest fire station----- \$89,070

d. Equip Arnold forest fire station----- 2,450

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$10,000 for site and water development on a newly acquired site for this forest fire station. It is now proposed to proceed with the construction of permanent facilities to house a number three fire crew at this location in Calaveras County. Construction will be by the Division of Architecture, under contract, and will consist of Division of Forestry standard design barracks building, 22 feet by 80 feet, a messhall, 18 by 44 feet and equipment storage building, 80 by 32 feet and a small gas and oil house, 16 by 14 feet. The gross area represents a cost of about \$17 per square foot for the basic building including fees and services but exclusive of site development and utilities which were provided previously, as mentioned before. This appears to be a reasonable cost for construction of this type in locations away from urban centers. *We recommend approval.*

e. Construct Cayucos forest fire station----- \$62,750

f. Equip Cayucos forest fire station----- 3,265

The Cayucos forest fire station in San Luis Obispo County is now functioning in rented facilities which is basically an old beach house. This has been completely unsatisfactory and funds were provided in a prior budget for the acquisition of a permanent site. It is proposed to construct a 10-man combination barracks and messhall building, a 2 bay equipment building together with tool storage space and a gas and oil storage and shelter building. The buildings are based on standard, well established designs used by the Division of Forestry and the major part of the work will be accomplished by the Division of Architecture using contract forces. The equipment represents standard items such as beds, dining tables and chairs, cooking range, refrigerator, etc. *We recommend approval.*

g. Construct Groveland forest fire station----- \$81,885

h. Equip Groveland forest fire station----- 2,625

This fire station located in Tuolumne County comprises a number three crew which normally is housed in a so-called 12-man barracks unit. At present the crew is functioning, although under slightly crowded conditions, in a building which is still in relatively good condition, able to serve for a number of additional years. While we recognize



## Department of Conservation—Continued

that it is desirable to have all crews housed in reasonably similar facilities, in line with our position expressed at the beginning of the capital outlay section that the State should stretch the available bond funds over a full two year period we do not believe there is justification for abandoning the existing facilities and replacing them at this time.

There is proposed a messhall measuring 18 by 42 feet, a 12-man barracks measuring 22 by 80, an equipment storage and office building measuring 32 by 34 and a gas and oil storage and shelter building. These are all to standard established designs. The cost estimate appears commensurate with the size of the project. *In view of the foregoing we recommend disapproval of this project.*

i. Construct Leggett Valley forest fire station----- \$104,606

j. Equip Leggett Valley forest fire station----- 1,165

The present Leggett Valley fire station in Mendocino County has been functioning for some years as a tent camp principally because of difficulties in acquiring a permanent site. Actually the project was funded once before, but these difficulties led to a diversion of the funds to other purposes. The site problem has now been resolved. The project involves the construction of a 10-man combination barracks and messhall, a three-bay equipment building with a fourth bay providing office spaces, a gas and oil storage and shelter building and a three-bedroom residence building to house the ranger in charge of the station who is now being housed in a trailer. The buildings are all of standard, established design and the costs of construction are in line with experience in this area and the size of the project. Equipment consists of conventional items necessary to make the buildings functional. *We recommend approval.*

k. Construct Alder Point forest fire station----- \$120,714

l. Equip Alder Point forest fire station----- 2,130

This forest fire station is now functioning in temporary surplus metal buildings on a leased site with the lease still having approximately seven to eight years to run. A new permanent site has already been acquired. This is a relatively large ranger unit in Humboldt County.

In view of our position that the available bond funds should be stretched for a full two-year period, we do not feel that this project, although desirable, should be funded at this time.

The proposal involves the construction of an 18-man combination barracks, a four-bay vehicle storage building with an extra bay of offices, a gas and oil storage and shelter building and a three-bedroom assistant ranger's residence. Designs are based on established standard plans and the cost appears to be in line with experience in this location for the size of the project. Equipment consists of standard items needed to make the buildings operable. *We recommend disapproval of the project at this time.*

## Department of Conservation—Continued

m. Construct Porterville forest fire station----- \$81,600

n. Equip Porterville forest fire station----- 1,475

This forest fire station located within the City of Porterville functions as the headquarters location for the assistant ranger district. The existing facilities are constructed on a residential site which is extremely crowded and operations are hazardous because of its proximity to city traffic. A new site has been acquired on the grounds of the Porterville State Hospital just south of the city.

It is proposed to construct a combination 10-man messhall and barracks building, and equipment storage building of four bays for vehicles and one bay for offices and storage, and a gas and oil storage and shelter building. Designs of the buildings are based on standard plans established in the Division of Architecture and involves the use of concrete block walls as differentiated from most fire stations across the State which use wood frame walls. This adds to the cost of the building and its use is based on the fact that in District IV, for many years, the Division of Forestry built most of its facilities with its own manpower using concrete blocks obtained from county prison camp manufacturing facilities. This made construction relatively low cost and justifiable. However, now that almost all of the Division of Forestry's construction is by contract it would appear that there is no longer any justification for the use of this more costly material when it is not a statewide standard.

Consequently while we believe that the project is justifiable we would take exception to the cost which is probably several thousand dollars higher than it would be if the standard wood frame building designs were used. *Therefore, we would recommend approval of the project subject to a revision in the cost.*

o. Construct Shingletown forest fire station----- \$70,020

p. Equip Shingletown forest fire station----- 1,685

This fire station located in Shasta County is now functioning in structures that were originally erected in 1942. While they are somewhat substandard and somewhat crowded, we believe that they can continue to function for several years more. In line with our position expressed at the beginning of the capital outlay section concerning the stretching of available bond funds to a two-year period, we believe that this project is not justified for replacement at this time.

It is proposed to construct a 12-man combination barracks and messhall and a three-bay vehicle storage building with office and storage space and a gas and oil storage and shelter building. All buildings would be based on standard established designs used by the Division of Forestry and construction would be by the Division of Architecture. The cost appears to be in line with the size and location of the project. *We recommend that this project be disapproved.*

Department of Conservation—Continued

q. Construct Sierra branch center conservation camp----- \$5,500

r. Equip Sierra branch center conservation camp----- 155,868

This branch center camp located in Tuolumne County was funded in the Department of Corrections budget rather than that of the Division of Forestry, and is now scheduled for completion by April of 1964. Because of the difference in funding, the Department of Corrections program did not include the equipment normally required by the Division of Forestry for carrying out its various work projects, using inmate labor. The bulk of the proposal is involved in automotive and road building equipment including a large sized bulldozer at \$32,000, a transport for this bulldozer at \$20,000, a bus at \$8,000, a motor grader at \$17,000, etc. The balance is for items used in the field such as sleeping bags, chain saws and mobile communications equipment.

The original plan also did not include some minor structures normally required by the Division of Forestry, the most important of which is a powder magazine. *Since this equipment is essential in carrying out the basic function for which the camp is established, we recommend approval.*

s. Construct two conservation camps----- \$870,000

t. Equip two conservation camps----- 400,389

The Budget Act of 1962 provided \$310,000 for the first phase of the construction and equipment of two conservation camps as part of the long-range program of establishing two new camps each year. The first phase involves the rough grading, the development of off-site utilities, rough road work, etc. Much of this work is accomplished by the Division of Forestry, sometimes with the assistance of camp inmates. The second phase involves the actual construction of the building complex and providing the equipment for these buildings, plus the fieldwork equipment which is used by the inmates in their various work projects. The buildings generally follow established standard designs except where serious site conditions force a redesign. The cost represents a fairly standard picture running from \$750,000 to \$800,000 per 80-man camp which includes both the first and second phases of construction and equipment. The sites for these camps are under active negotiation. One of them will probably be in Monterey County on U.S. Forest Service land and will probably be referred to in the future as Piney Creek. The other one may be either in Cuyamaca State Park in San Diego County or at Bautista in Riverside County. *We recommend approval of the projects.*

u. Construct two conservation camps, first phase----- \$243,396

v. Equip two conservation camps, first phase----- 160,582

These two projects are in line with the program to establish two new 80-man conservation camps each year on the basis that they will be phased in two sections. The first phase will provide working drawings which will be accomplished by the Division of Architecture and

## Department of Conservation—Continued

site development which will be largely accomplished by the Division of Forestry with its own manpower and with, in many cases, inmate crews from other camps. The plans for these camps are fairly well standardized and the equipment lists are fairly well standardized both for in camp equipment as well as fieldworking equipment. *We recommend approval.*

*w. Construct Chino conservation camp*----- \$20,000

*x. Equip Chino conservation camp*----- 174,987

It is proposed to establish what might be referred to as a "phantom" conservation camp by using 100 inmates from the Chino conservation center as a mobile work force for field forestry work as well as fire fighting. A complete camp setup will not be required to be built for them since they will continue to be housed at the center. Consequently, all that is required are some relatively small inexpensive buildings to house equipment, and the necessary equipment for the fieldwork such as bulldozers, buses, hand tools, communications equipment, etc. *We recommend approval.*

## UNALLOCATED

ITEM 405 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 960

FOR PROJECT PLANNING TO BE ALLOCATED BY THE  
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE FROM THE STATE  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted ----- \$500,000  
Recommended for approval ----- No change

## ANALYSIS

This item represents the cost of preliminary planning and programing for all General Fund state agency major projects with the exception of the university and the Trustees of the California State Colleges. It is based on the assumption that the program for the fiscal year 1964-65 will require planning for approximately \$40 million worth of construction projects in the Departments of Mental Hygiene, Corrections, Youth Authority, Veterans Affairs, and Division of Forestry. While this \$40 million assumption appears to us to be somewhat too high, the fact that the funds being requested come from bond sources with cash being made available only as required and the fact that the allocation of this money is under the strict control of the Department of Finance it would appear to be satisfactory to accept the proposal. Incidentally, all of these preliminary programing and planning projects would be assigned to the State Division of Architecture in accordance with the State Contract Act.

It should also be pointed out that there will be two separate appropriations from state bond funds for this purpose, one to the University of California and another to the Trustees of the California State Colleges. At these two points the funds will be under complete control of those organizations and in the case of the university will be assigned

## Capital Outlay

Items 406-406.5

### Unallocated—Continued

to private architects as required and by the trustees to both private architects and the State Division of Architecture as the trustees see fit. *We recommend approval.*

### UNALLOCATED

ITEM 406 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 960

#### FOR PROJECT PLANNING FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	-----	\$275,000
Amount unresolved	-----	275,000

#### ANALYSIS

This item proposes to provide a deficiency appropriation for preliminary plans costs incurred in the 1961-62 and 1962-63 fiscal years and to provide some advance authority in the 1963-64 fiscal year to permit earlier commencement of preliminary plans to be presented at the 1964 session. We have not had a satisfactory explanation of the deficit nor the scope of the advance planning. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time.*

### UNALLOCATED

ITEM 406.5 of the Budget Bill

#### ANALYSIS

This item proposes that the Director of Finance be empowered to transfer, from the appropriations contained in this act, funds necessary as the State's contribution of matching requirements for federal grants, subject to certain restrictions. The transferred funds must be made available as the result of federal contributions to projects authorized by this budget bill and the projects for which the transfer will be made must be ones described in the Department of Finance report made pursuant to Senate Resolution No. 15 of the 1954 First Extraordinary Session entitled "Report on State Building Construction Program," as revised March 7, 1962. The total amount transferred and appropriated under this item shall not exceed \$20 million. It is recognized that adoption of this item can give the Director of Finance the authority for contributing state funds to a project that has not been reviewed by the Legislature but we believe that the possible opportunity of accepting federal funds that might otherwise be lost offsets this disadvantage. *We therefore recommend approval of this item.*