

**Courts of Appeal, Districts 1 to 5—Continued**

Legal research staff per division ranges from a low of 3.0 in the fifth district to a high of 4.0 in the third. The fourth district is staffed at a rate of 3.5 positions per division. The above table reflects also that the number of writs and appeals per legal research position is the second lowest in the fourth district. Without more definitive information as to the particular workload problems of the fourth district it would appear that this district is already adequately staffed in relation to other districts that are not requesting additional positions.

The total recommended reduction to the increase to recognize full workload change in the district courts is \$64,074.

**GOVERNOR**

**ITEM 24 of the Budget Bill**

Budget page 18

**FOR SUPPORT OF THE GOVERNOR  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested in Budget Bill		\$1,105,841
Budget request before identified adjustments	\$1,228,712	
Increase to recognize full workload change	None	

Budget as adjusted for workload change	\$1,228,712
Adjustment—undetailed reduction (10 percent)	122,871

**RECOMMENDED REDUCTION FROM WORKLOAD BUDGET** --- None

**BALANCE OF UNDETAILED REDUCTION—REVIEW PENDING** \$122,871

**GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT**

The Governor is the Chief Executive of the State of California.

The Constitution of the state grants broad powers to the Governor to conduct the following programs:

1. Plan, organize, direct and coordinate the activities of state agencies and to appoint various state officers and members of boards and commissions.
2. Prepare and present to the Legislature the state budget outlining anticipated programs and the means by which they will be financed.
3. Report to the Legislature on the condition of the state and make various legislative proposals.
4. Approve or disapprove legislation adopted by the Legislature.

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The 1967-68 Budget proposes a level of expenditure for the support of the Governor's Office in the amount of \$1,228,712. Upon application of a reduction of 10 percent, the Budget Bill proposes an appropriation of \$1,105,841.

**Governor**  
**GOVERNOR'S RESIDENCE**

ITEM 25 of the Budget Bill Budget page 18

**FOR SUPPORT OF THE GOVERNOR'S RESIDENCE  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested in Budget Bill .....		\$15,660
Budget request before identified adjustments .....	\$17,400	
Increase to recognize full workload change .....	None	
<hr/>		
Budget as adjusted for workload change .....	\$17,400	
Adjustment—undetailed reduction (10 percent) .....	1,740	

**RECOMMENDED REDUCTION FROM WORKLOAD BUDGET** None

**BALANCE OF UNDETAILED REDUCTION—REVIEW PENDING** \$1,740

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item finances the general operations of the Governor's residence and expenditures are not subject to audit. The budget proposes a sum of \$17,400 for the support of the residence during the 1967-68 fiscal year. Upon application of a 10 percent reduction, the Budget Bill proposes an appropriation of \$15,660.

**Governor**  
**SPECIAL CONTINGENT EXPENSES**

ITEM 26 of the Budget Bill Budget page 18

**FOR SUPPORT OF SPECIAL CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF  
THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested in Budget Bill .....		\$13,500
Budget request before identified adjustments .....	\$15,000	
Increase to recognize full workload change .....	None	
<hr/>		
Budget as adjusted for workload change .....	\$15,000	
Adjustment—undetailed reduction (10 percent) .....	1,500	

**RECOMMENDED REDUCTION FROM WORKLOAD BUDGET** None

**BALANCE OF UNDETAILED REDUCTION—REVIEW PENDING** \$1,500

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The budget proposes \$15,000 for special contingent expenses of the Governor for the 1967-68 fiscal year. Upon application of a 10 percent reduction, the Budget Bill proposes an appropriation of \$13,500. This amount is exempt from audit.

**Governor's Office**  
**OFFICE OF CONSUMER COUNSEL**

ITEM 27 of the Budget Bill Budget page 21

**FOR SUPPORT OF THE OFFICE OF CONSUMER  
COUNSEL FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested in Budget Bill .....		\$107,995
Budget request before identified adjustments .....	\$119,052	
Increase to recognize full workload change .....	943	
<hr/>		
Budget as adjusted for workload change .....	\$119,995	
Adjustment—undetailed reduction (10 percent) .....	12,000	

## Office of Consumer Counsel—Continued

RECOMMENDED REDUCTION FROM WORKLOAD BUDGET---	None
BALANCE OF UNDETAILED REDUCTION—REVIEW PENDING	\$12,000

## Summary of Policy Options

1. Transfer the position of Consumer Counsel directly into the Governor's Office as a staff secretarial position with greater reliance on the resources of other existing agencies for a General Fund saving of approximately \$100,000.

2. Abolish the office entirely with total reliance on other existing state agencies and the Legislature in consumer-oriented areas for a General Fund saving of \$119,052.

## GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT

The Office of Consumer Counsel was created within the office of the Governor by Chapter 467, Statutes of 1959. The act outlined the following programs to be carried out by the counsel.

1. Advise the Governor as to all matters affecting the interests of the people as consumers.

2. Recommend to the Governor and the Legislature the enactment of such legislation as he deems necessary to protect and promote the interests of the people as consumers.

3. Conduct such studies as he deems necessary and render such reports as necessary.

4. Appear before governmental commissions, departments and agencies to represent and be heard on behalf of consumers' interests.

5. Direct the activities of the 15-member advisory committee.

To carry out the programs outlined above, the staff of the Office of Consumer Counsel consists of the counsel, three professional and three clerical positions.

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 1967-68 fiscal year budget proposes a level of expenditures of \$119,995 which includes \$943 for full workload change. Upon application of a 10-percent reduction, the Budget Bill proposes an appropriation of \$107,995.

The budget document proposes to continue the activity and areas of emphasis of the office at the same level as previously presented by the Governor's office and approved by the Legislature.

## POLICY OPTION

1. The present office of the Consumer Counsel consists of seven positions, including four professional level positions and three clerical positions. In order to carry out the present activities of the office as listed above to the extent to which they are presently carried out, this size staff appears appropriate.

Should the Legislature desire to reduce the scope of the activity of this office and place greater reliance in those established agencies which have direct statutory responsibilities governing so-called consumer interests, it would be possible to eliminate three professional and two clerical positions for an annual saving of approximately \$100,000. Should this be done, the Consumer Counsel could be added to the Gov-

Office of Consumer Counsel—Continued

ernor's staff as another staff secretary to advise the Governor on all matters affecting the consumer. This type of advice is presently being given in many areas.

2. If complete reliance were to be placed in regulatory agencies or other agencies concerned with "consumer interests," as well as in the Legislature's function of developing and considering legislation in the interests of the consumer, this agency could be eliminated entirely at a saving of \$119,052.

**Governor's Office  
OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY**

ITEMS 28 and 29 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 22

**FOR SUPPORT OF THE OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested in Budget Bill-----		\$310,203
Budget request before identified adjustments-----	\$344,670	
Increase to recognize full workload change-----	None	
<hr/>		
Budget as adjusted for workload change-----	\$344,670	
Adjustment—undetailed reduction (10 percent)-----	34,467	

**RECOMMENDED REDUCTION FROM WORKLOAD BUDGET** \_\_\_\_\_ \$84,340

**RECOMMENDED REDUCTION FROM APPROPRIATION  
REQUEST** \_\_\_\_\_ \$49,873

**Summary of Recommended Reductions**

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Budget</i>	
		<i>Page</i>	<i>Line</i>
Maintain 90-10 federal-state matching ratio-----	\$75,335	22	5
Consolidation of consultant function:			
a. Eliminate 4 consultant positions-----	7,530	23	60
b. Establish 2 consultants-----	—2,800		
Eliminate 2 Department of Finance consultants-----	3,450	23	60
Reduce Youth Authority consultant by one-half-----	825	23	60

**GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT**

The State Office of Economic Opportunity was established administratively in September 1964 and placed in the Governor's office; its purpose is to represent state interests under all titles of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. Its function is threefold: (1) to advise the Governor in regard to his responsibilities in relation to the federal War on Poverty (P.L. 88-452, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964), (2) to provide technical assistance to local communities applying for anti-poverty grants, and (3) to administer the state Migrant Master Plan.

The original Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 permitted the Governor to veto specific antipoverty proposals submitted by local communities; the act has since been amended to permit the Director of the War on Poverty to overrule the Governor's veto. The Governor's loss of a final veto has been more apparent than real in California—the Governor has not been overruled by the Director of the War on Poverty but neither has the Governor proposed vetoes. This change does, however, somewhat reduce the importance of gubernatorial advisers on OEO matters. Nevertheless, the magnitude of the various OEO

**Office of Economic Opportunity—Continued**

funded programs—nearly \$170 million between 1964 and the fall of 1966—indicates that the Governor should be assured expert advice and information concerning poverty programs and grant applications. In addition, antipoverty grant applications must still flow through the state for the Governor's review even though the Governor no longer enjoys the absolute power to eliminate specific programs.

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The budget document proposes a General Fund workload level of \$344,670 for the Office of Economic Opportunity and the College Work-Study and Neighborhood Youth Corps in the budget year. Upon application of a 10-percent reduction, the Budget Bill proposes an appropriation of \$310,203 in Items 28 and 29. This amount is proposed as the state's share of federally supported Office of Economic Opportunity programs requiring state matching funds for implementation. Of the \$344,670, there is \$200,000 in the budget document for College Work-Study and Neighborhood Youth Corps projects which appears there for reporting purposes only. The state OEO neither administers nor participates in these programs. Federal matching funds at the ratio of 90-10 are provided for this program and will be reported in the agency budgets which participate in the program. The General Fund moneys will be allocated to participating state departments to match the federal moneys provided. The appropriation request for College Work-Study and Neighborhood Youth Corps projects appears in Item 29 of the Budget Bill.

Thus, of the \$344,670 reported in the State Office of Economic Opportunity budget document, \$144,670 is reported in this item of the Budget Act for General Fund support of the OEO program. Federal matching funds in the amount of \$578,684 are reported. The OEO amounts, however, reflect a proposed change from a 90-10 ratio in the past and current years to an 80-20 ratio for the budget year; this represents a 100-percent increase in cost to the General Fund.

In light of the 10-percent undetailed reduction reflected in the Budget Act, it should be pointed out that any reduction in General Fund support induces a proportional reduction in federal moneys; the exact amount is dependent upon the matching formula currently in effect.

Because the budget presentation for the State Office of Economic Opportunity reflects a change in the federal-state matching formula from 90-10 to 80-20, it should be noted that neither the Economic Opportunity Act as amended nor applicable Office of Economic Opportunity (Washington) rules and regulations indicates that a shift in matching formula is required. In addition, we have contacted the regional office of the Office of Economic Opportunity as recently as January 30, 1967, and have been informed that a shift in the matching formula is not required or anticipated. *Accordingly, we recommend a reduction in the General Fund amount proposed for the Office of Economic Opportunity from \$144,670 to \$77,335 to reflect a 90-10 rather than a 80-20 federal-state matching formula for savings to the General Fund of \$77,335 (budget page 22, line 5).*

## Office of Economic Opportunity—Continued

## Technical Assistance Program

The technical assistance component of the State Office of Economic Opportunity represents one of two functional divisions within the office. Fifteen and one-half of the 22.5 positions budgeted in the State OEO are technical assistance positions. In addition, there are nine contract consultants placed in various agencies. The technical assistance positions have been justified on the basis of providing expert advice to local communities to assist them in securing Economic Opportunity Act grants and keeping the Governor's office advised as to the size and scope of OEO programs in California. Six positions are designated community action representatives and their explicit responsibility is to deal directly with the local communities.

Two new factors may appreciably change the role of the technical assistance section. The first is the leveling off of the amount of anti-poverty funds in both California and the nation as a whole. Although the actual mechanics and guidelines for grant renewals are quite complex, the overall effect is as though the various antipoverty programs were being held at current expenditure levels. Although final word has not been received from Washington OEO and congressional appropriations have not been made, the need for state technical assistance positions will decline; not only may the OEO programs be frozen, there may be net reductions in certain areas. Of equal importance, the various community action programs throughout the state have had sufficient time to gain the necessary expertise and sophistication to operate without benefit of extensive state technical assistance.

However, the role of the community action representatives and the agency contract consultants in advising the state as to the progress of the War on Poverty is still important. The War on Poverty represents a significant departure from traditional state-federal relationships. The War on Poverty bypasses the state as a functional partner. While the relative merits of this procedure need not be of concern at this point, there are certain policy and administrative implications of importance to legislative review and analysis. If for no other reason than to avoid duplication of effort, the state should be advised as to the nature and magnitude of War on Poverty programs. Resources for handling the problems of the poor are scarce and duplication and overlap would be particularly wasteful in this area.

In addition to questions of functional overlap, the state should be fully aware of the policy implication of federal activity in the War on Poverty. On these bases, then, we believe that continuing Office of Economic Opportunity effort should be authorized. We believe, however, due to the deceleration of the War on Poverty and the increasing sophistication of community action programs that the staff of the Office of Economic Opportunity can be reduced. *To that end, we recommend the consolidation of the functions performed by the rehabilitation consultant, the public health consultant, the mental hygiene consultant, and the social welfare consultant, by the elimination of these four positions and the creation of two consultant positions in the office of the Administrator of the Health and Welfare Agency for a net saving to the General Fund of approximately \$4,730 (budget page 23, line 60).*

**Office of Economic Opportunity—Continued**

(Although funding in the budget document is proposed on an 80-20 matching basis, the amounts in the recommended reductions in the analysis are reported on a 90-10 matching basis; this is done to permit reconciliation of figures in light of our initial recommendation that state funds be supplied on the traditional 90-10 basis.)

In this way, the flow of valuable information, from agency to Community Action Program and vice versa, will be preserved while reflecting the decreased demands on state OEO time.

In addition, two positions in the Department of Finance were engaged as contract consultants for the initial phases of OEO operation. Neither of these positions has devoted any appreciable time to OEO; both positions have concerned themselves almost exclusively with the Service Center Program. *Accordingly, we recommend the elimination of the two Department of Finance contract consultants for a saving of \$3,450 (budget page 23, line 60).*

For the reasons expressed in the above recommendations, we feel that the full-time Youth Authority consultant position should be reduced to half time. *Accordingly, we recommend that the position of Youth Authority consultant be reduced by one-half man-year for a saving of \$825 (budget page 23, line 60).*

The primary thrust of the federal war on poverty and the state poverty reduction and prevention program is education, training and employment to the end that the cycle of poverty and dependence be eliminated. Due to the magnitude of these efforts and their program and policy significance, we believe that the full-time education and employment consultants should be continued as proposed.

Currently the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity is on contract from the office of the Administrator of the Health and Welfare Agency; this was done to bypass the \$16,500 salary ceiling occasioned by the OEO's organizational placement in the Governor's office. Currently the director's services are secured by a \$25,000 contract with the Health and Welfare Agency, of which \$22,500 represents salary. We believe that this procedure can only be condoned as an *ad hoc* stopgap measure. Proper organization and staffing would dictate placing the position of director within the office he directs.

**Migrant Master Plan Program**

The Migrant Master Plan program of the State Office of Economic Opportunity is responsible for the administration of a statewide OEO grant. This is a State OEO conduct and administration grant, which distinguishes this program from the technical assistance section of the State OEO.

The California Migrant Master Plan became operative when it received its first federal grant in May 1965. The primary purpose of the Migrant Master Plan is to provide emergency "flash peak" housing for migrant agricultural workers and their families in conjunction with a supportive program of child and adult education, child day care, health care and sanitation.

Briefly, there are five components of the California Migrant Master Plan.

Office of Economic Opportunity—Continued

1. Inexpensive, demountable family units have been designed for seasonal occupancy and include water and sewage service. These are provided in areas identified as severe housing deficit areas for migrant farm workers. Three basic units have been used or are being tested: the plydome, paradome and a more expensive plywood "prefab" type. The housing units are deliberately designed to have a short life span; the rationale is that "permanent" or semipermanent housing will remain in use beyond its intended life span regardless of condition. The OEO points out that many "temporary" shelters erected by the Farmers' Home Relief in the mid-30's are still in use.

2. Child and adult education concentrating on compensatory and remedial services is offered. In addition, classes in basic literacy, English, citizenship, nutrition, homemaking, money management and legal and vocational counseling are offered.

3. Supervised custodial care for children aged two to five is provided to permit parents to work in the fields. The care includes recreation, preschool cultural enrichment and health and nutrition. Care generally begins at 5 a.m. and lasts until late afternoon. It should be noted that there is no provision for infant care, which is considered by the administrators to be a considerable weakness in the program.

4. Complete sewage and waste disposal facilities and fresh, potable drinking water is supplied in the camps and fields. This includes centrally located toilets and washing facilities, as well as clothes washers and dryers. The newer plywood prototype housing includes toilet and shower facilities in the unit.

5. Health clinics are established in conjunction with the migrant centers; they provide immunization, general examinations, prenatal and postnatal care, followup and hospital referral, family planning, and other services.

Table 1 gives an index of the dimensions of the California Migrant Master Plan.

Table 1  
Housing Occupancy to October 1, 1966

<i>Camp location</i>	<i>No. of units</i>	<i>Families served</i>	<i>Families turned away</i>	<i>Average family size</i>	<i>Persons served</i>	<i>Dates of occupancy 1966</i>
Linden <sup>1</sup> -----	56	167	--	5.1	852	June-Oct.
Indio -----	80	144	240	5.9	849	Mar.-July
Harney Lane -----	96	307	498	4.9	1,504	May-Oct.
Mathews Road -----	96	146	232	5.3	774	July-Nov.
Cortez -----	50	83	--	5.1	423	July-Oct.
Merced -----	60	28	--	5.0	140	July-Oct.
Los Banos -----	90	67	--	5.5	368	July-Oct.
Hollister -----	75	207	41	5.0	1,035	June-Oct.
Madison -----	100	84	--	5.0	420	July-Oct.
Patterson -----	55	55	80	5.6	308	July-Oct.
Westley -----	50	169	116	5.5	930	July-Oct.
Empire -----	85	167	182	4.8	802	June-Oct.
Gridley -----	100	28	--	5.0	140	July-Oct.
Total -----	937	1,652	1,389	5.2	8,545	

<sup>1</sup> Linden camp closed down and buildings moved to Mathews Road.

## Office of Economic Opportunity—Continued

Eleven additional locations are proposed with 100 shelters in each location which will nearly double the size of the existing program.

The program is administered by the State Office of Economic Opportunity in cooperation with county housing authorities or other local jurisdictions such as county health departments. The state's responsibilities are fourfold: (1) assistance in project development, (2) supervision in program operation, (3) program evaluation, and (4) consultative services.

The State Department of Finance provides fiscal services and must authorize all contracts.

The migrant program of the State OEO is composed of one chief of migrant programs, three community action representatives, one fiscal officer and two clerical positions. The fiscal officer, one community action representative and one-half temporary help position were established administratively in the current year. The fiscal officer and community action representative are proposed for continuation in the budget year.

Federal grants for the program as a whole fall into three areas: (1) capital outlay, for which no state matching money is required; (2) migrant camp projects, e.g., day care, sanitation, for which 10 percent state matching funds have been required; and (3) program administration, for which 10 percent state matching money has also been required.

Only program administration funding is included in the budget totals presented in this item. The total funding proposed is \$142,880, of which \$114,304 is federal and \$28,576 is state. Ninety-ten funding would reduce the state's share to \$14,288 and increase the federal share to \$128,592. The funding for camp construction and operations of migrant services appears in Item 251, budget page 857. The total appropriations for both items and sources of funds by program element for past, current and budget years appear in Table 2 below.

Table 2

	State	Federal	Local	Total
<b>1965-66</b>				
Administration -----	\$6,382	\$57,436	--	\$63,818
Construction -----	--	1,937,828	\$215,079 <sup>1</sup>	2,152,907
Operations -----	124,372	1,243,730	--	1,368,102
Total -----	\$130,754 <sup>2</sup>	\$3,238,994	\$215,079	\$3,584,827
<b>1966-67</b>				
Administration -----	\$14,288	\$128,592	--	\$142,880
Construction -----	--	2,412,265	\$21,000	2,433,265
Operations -----	247,121	2,224,089	--	2,471,210
Total -----	\$261,409	\$4,764,946	\$21,000	\$5,047,355
<b>1967-68</b>				
Administration <sup>3</sup> -----	\$28,576	\$114,304	--	\$142,880
Construction -----	--	1,237,500	--	1,237,500
Operations -----	328,191	2,953,722	--	3,281,913
Total <sup>3</sup> -----	\$356,767	\$4,305,526	\$236,079	\$4,662,293

<sup>1</sup> The first construction grant required a 10-percent local matching share; the second grant does not.

<sup>2</sup> The appropriation was \$162,008; the difference reverted to the General Fund.

<sup>3</sup> Administration figures reflect the proposed shift to 80-20 federal-state matching formula for program administration.

Office of Economic Opportunity—Continued

The first migrant camp construction grant limited construction costs to \$500 for the building shell with detailed guidelines for additional facilities. It was on this basis that polyurethane and paper plydome and vinyl and aluminum paradomes were developed. It is noteworthy that many plydomes were very seriously damaged by the heavy storms in November and December 1966.

New guidelines permit the use of the more substantial and spacious plywood panel structure tested in the fall of 1966. Present guidelines provide a maximum of \$1,445 for a self-contained unit including floor, toilet and shower, wash basin, water heater, sink and stove, and room dividers. Site preparation and development and utilities are provided in addition to the \$1,445 limit.

As of this date no evaluation information for component elements has been prepared which would indicate the relative success of the program components.

Two positions were established administratively during the current year and are proposed for continuation. Evaluation by our office indicates that the positions are justified on the basis of workload and program size. *We recommend approval.*

In addition, it should be pointed out that the enabling legislation giving authority to the Director of Finance for contract negotiations in regard to the Migrant Master Plan expires on the 91st day after the final adjournment of the 1967 legislative session. Thus, technically, a full year appropriation is being requested for a program which carries a provisional termination date. New legislation will be required in this session to continue program operations.

Governor's Office

OFFICE OF TOURISM AND VISITOR SERVICES

ITEM 30 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 25

FOR SUPPORT OF THE OFFICE OF TOURISM AND VISITOR SERVICES FROM THE GENERAL FUND

Amount requested in Budget Bill.....		\$97,585
Budget request before identified adjustments.....	\$103,652	
Increase to recognize full workload change.....	4,775	
	<hr/>	
Budget as adjusted for workload change.....	\$108,427	
Adjustment—undetailed reduction (10 percent).....	10,842	

RECOMMENDED REDUCTION FROM WORKLOAD BUDGET.... None

BALANCE OF UNDETAILED REDUCTION—REVIEW PENDING \$10,842

Summary of Policy Options

Elimination of the Office of Tourism and Visitor Services for a saving to the General Fund of \$103,652.

GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT

The Office of Tourism and Visitor Services was established in 1964 and first funded in 1965; it has now operated for one full year plus the elapsed portion of the current fiscal year. Accordingly, experience with which to measure the office's impact or effectiveness is limited. However, activity reporting has been maintained and a summary re-

**Office of Tourism and Visitor Services—Continued**

view is possible. The office was created by Chapter 101, Statutes of 1964, and is charged with six major functions:

1. To conduct a research program to develop data on the number of visitors, their expenditures and economic impact, points of origin and destination, and other pertinent tourism and visitor information.

Such a study is currently underway; a \$150,000 contract with Economic Research Associates of Los Angeles under the terms of a federal Area Redevelopment Act grant was negotiated in the current year. General Fund moneys of \$25,000 were made available to match \$125,000 in federal moneys for research support. The results of this study will be available in the summer of 1967. It is expected that they will be useful in assessing the need for and effectiveness of a state level office of tourism as well as supplying detailed information on the magnitude of tourism in California.

2. Consult with and assist regional promotional organizations in their development and distribution of travel material and in their other activities designed to attract visitors to California.

The State Office of Tourism has been acting as a clearinghouse for tourist inquiries directed to the state and refers correspondents to the appropriate state or private organization, as well as supplying inquirees a California state brochure and Division of Highways map. Records of all correspondence are maintained on the basis of monthly volume. In addition, the public information officer provides newspapers with press releases describing the work of the tourism office, and records of public response as measured by the volume of mail for each press release are kept.

3. Prepare, develop and distribute basic literature to encourage and promote the tourist industry in the state.

A brochure on California has been prepared and has been reviewed and approved by the members of the Tourism and Visitor Services Commission. Its scope is general and statewide rather than specific and its function is to serve as an introduction to the major tourism areas of California. When requests are received for information regarding specific areas of California, the Office of Tourism will send copies of regional or area brochures it may have received from private organizations as well as its own brochure "The Golden World of California." The tourism office avoids the promotion of one area of California at the expense of another and stresses its role as representing broad state tourism interests.

4. Cooperate with private industry in supplying information concerning the state.

The Office of Tourism receives information from private tourist promotion sources which it distributes on the basis of specific requests, and in turn supplies private promotional organizations with general information on California as a whole. In addition, the office participates in private promotional ventures.

**Office of Tourism and Visitor Services—Continued**

5. Develop tourist information material for distribution in other countries through the United States Travel Service.

Tourism brochures have been made available to the federal government in connection with the State Department's "Discover America" and "Visit the USA" programs.

6. Cooperate with and assist other state agencies in providing facilities and services which will promote tourism.

Referrals and coordination are provided by the Office of Tourism. The Division of Highways, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Parks and Recreation are the major agencies involved.

In addition, a 15-member Tourism and Visitor Services Commission acts in an advisory capacity. The commission members are appointed by the Governor.

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The 1967-68 budget proposes an expenditure of \$108,427 which includes \$4,775 for workload increase. Upon application of a 10 percent reduction, the Budget Bill proposes an appropriation of \$97,585.

An examination of Office of Tourism records indicates that the tourism staff has been fully engaged in legislatively mandated activities. However, there is currently no information at our disposal which would demonstrate a causal link between the activities of the Office of Tourism services and increased tourism. Any economic impact the tourism office may have must be established by subjective and non-demonstrable criteria rather than by objective and independently verifiable tests. While the results of the Economic Research Associates study may provide objective indications of the economic impact of the State Office of Tourism, the only basis for measurement currently available is the extent to which the Office of Tourism has met its statutory responsibilities outlined earlier. Our review indicates that the Office of Tourism and Visitor Services has fulfilled its general responsibilities as set forth in the enabling legislation. On this basis its continuance at the level of service previously authorized by the Legislature is justified.

**POLICY OPTION**

While the Office of Tourism has satisfied statutory performance requirements, the inability to authoritatively measure economic impact on the tourist industry suggests that tourism services are of questionable utility. In addition, with the extensive services available in the private sector, tourism services are of low priority in any schedule of essential state services; accordingly, proposals to close a revenue gap by the reduction or elimination of nonessential state services could include the elimination of the State Office of Tourism and Visitor Services. Such elimination would produce direct savings to the General Fund in the amount of \$103,652.

**Governor's Office  
DISASTER OFFICE**

ITEM 31 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 26

**FOR SUPPORT OF THE DISASTER OFFICE  
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested in Budget Bill-----		\$1,158,763
Budget request before identified adjustments-----	\$1,170,171	
Increase to recognize full workload change-----	117,344	
	<hr/>	
Budget as adjusted for workload change-----	\$1,287,515	
Adjustment--undetailed reduction (10 percent)-----	128,752	
<b>RECOMMENDED REDUCTION FROM WORKLOAD BUDGET---</b>		None
<b>BALANCE OF UNDETAILED REDUCTION--REVIEW PENDING</b>		\$128,752

**Summary of Policy Options**

Reduce the operations of the Disaster Office to a level of service necessary to cope with naturally caused disasters and to aid local jurisdictions in obtaining federal aid. Estimated saving would amount to \$490,000 annually.

**GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT**

The mission of the California Disaster Office is to provide the means to ensure that the various state agencies, local governments, other public agencies, industry and other organizations are prepared to cope with conditions resulting from war-caused or natural disasters. The legal directives for this office are provided in the California Disaster Act, Chapter 1, Division 7, of the Military and Veterans Code and the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended.

The organization to perform the functions stipulated by law consists of a headquarters staff of 87.5 positions. These positions are categorized into functional units comprising the director and his staff, management services, planning and programing, support operations, medical and health, technical operations, fire and rescue and law enforcement. There are 41.5 authorized positions that perform functions authorized by headquarters staff away from headquarters working directly with local governmental entities, industry, etc.

The Disaster Office has developed a Civil Defense and Disaster Plan. The entire staff of the disaster office has been involved to some degree in the planning and coordinating for natural disasters and accidents and war-caused disasters (civil defense). The nonmilitary defense measure outlined in part two of the Civil Defense and Disaster Plan describes the measures to assist the State of California in achieving a state of readiness for an attack on our country. These measures are general in nature and designed to give local governments and state agencies the flexibility to make the most efficient use of shelter and other resources in the community to save lives during and immediately following an attack. Part one of the plan outlines the typical type of natural disasters which may occur such as flood, undersea earthquakes-seismic sea waves, fire, accidents in general such as industrial explosions, release of toxic or noxious chemicals, rupture of gas mains, nuclear accidents, airplane crashes in urban areas and train wrecks.

## Disaster Office—Continued

Public health hazards are listed as air pollution and civil disobediences such as riot, crowd and mob incidents.

Remedial actions are contained in the plan to cope with these situations when they occur. The civil defense plans must conform to provisions of the Federal Civil Defense Act as amended and be approved by the Federal Civil Defense Office.

Table 1 shows federal and state contributions for the fiscal years 1965-66 through 1967-68 for support of the Disaster Office. Table 2 shows federal expenditures in California for the same fiscal years for disaster relief and matching funds to local governments.

Support	Actual 1965-66	Estimated 1966-67	Proposed 1967-68	Change from 1966-67 Amount	Percent
General Fund -----	\$1,091,773	\$1,167,135	\$1,158,763	-\$8,372	-0.7%
Federal funds -----	791,200	863,566	871,562	7,996	0.9
Total -----	\$1,882,973	\$2,030,701	\$2,030,325	-\$376	0

Expenditures of federal funds not reported elsewhere:	Actual 1965-66	Estimated 1966-67	Proposed 1967-68	Change from 1966-67
Disaster relief -----	\$2,188,480	\$4,800,000	\$1,500,000	\$-3,300,000
Matching funds to local governments for personnel and admin- istrative expenses -	1,119,500	1,591,852	1,800,000	208,148
Matching funds to local governments for supplies and equipment -----	1,584,627	1,750,000	1,900,000	150,000
Totals -----	\$4,892,607	\$8,141,852	\$5,200,000	\$-2,941,852 (-36.1%)

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The amount requested for the fiscal year 1967-68 is \$1,158,763, a reduction of \$8,372 as compared with the estimated expenditure for the current fiscal year. There is a total reduction of 20.8 authorized positions in the proposed budget. Reimbursement was made by the federal government for 19.8 positions on contract. These contracts are not continued in fiscal year 1967-68.

We have examined the proposed increase of \$117,344 identified as an increase to recognize full workload change. This amount consists of \$34,850 for operating expense, \$75,174 for equipment and \$7,320 for personal services. The 2 major items of expenditure in operating expense are administrative communications in the amount of \$5,064, and equipment maintenance and supplies for firefighting and rescue in the amount of \$27,621. The 3 major items of expenditure for equipment are replacement of several communications items in the amount of \$19,300, replacement of 10 fire pumpers in the amount of \$38,000, and \$13,600 to purchase several additional communication items which are necessary for the network. The federal government purchased 103 fire pumpers and the state is now replacing these over a 10-year period; this is the

**Disaster Office—Continued**

fourth phase of the replacement program approved by the Legislature in 1964-65.

The increase of \$7,320 for personal services is for the continuation of an intermediate stenographer position and 0.3 man-years of a janitor position established in the current year.

We are in agreement with the proposed increase of \$117,344 for increase in workload.

**POLICY OPTION**

We believe that the activities of the State Disaster Office might be reduced to that level necessary to cope with naturally caused disasters only and the processing of the necessary documents for federal aid to local jurisdictions. The estimated state cost for such a reduced organization is estimated to be \$800,000 for a fiscal year. The nucleus for such a reduced organization might very well be the fire and rescue service which consistently each year performs the greatest overall service to local jurisdictions throughout the state in dealing with wildfires and also with flood damage. It would be possible to eliminate the entire medical and health section, the technical operations which involve radiological defense and monitoring, the various warning and communications systems which are primarily aimed at war-caused disasters, and the law enforcement section which is also aimed at widespread war-caused disaster, along with a commensurate reduction in management services, planning and programming and support operations which, as previously mentioned, would continue to retain the capability of providing the processing service to assure that local jurisdictions may obtain such federal help as they desire and are eligible to receive. The savings to the state for this reduced organization is estimated to be in the neighborhood of \$490,000.

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL COUNCIL ON URBAN GROWTH**

**ITEM 32 of the Budget Bill**

Budget page 29

**FOR SUPPORT OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL COUNCIL ON URBAN GROWTH FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested in Budget Bill .....		\$45,900
Budget request before identified adjustments .....	\$50,000	
Increase to recognize full workload change .....	1,000	
Budget as adjusted for workload change .....	\$51,000	
Adjustment—undetailed reduction (10 percent) .....	4,100	
<b>RECOMMENDED REDUCTION FROM WORKLOAD BUDGET</b> .....		<b>\$4,101</b>
<b>RECOMMENDED REDUCTION FROM APPROPRIATION REQUEST</b> .....		<b>\$1</b>

**Summary of Recommended Reductions**

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Budget</i>	
		<i>Page</i>	<i>Line</i>
Reduce contract services .....	\$4,101	29	59

**GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT**

The Intergovernmental Council on Urban Growth was created by Chapter 1809, Statutes of 1963 (Sections 34200-34211, Government

**Intergovernmental Council on Urban Growth—Continued**

Code) and was first formed January 14, 1964. Its original name was the Coordinating Council on Urban Policy; the present name better reflects the role and responsibilities of the council. The council is composed of 18 members appointed by the Governor. Three members represent cities, three represent counties, two represent school districts, six represent the state and four represent the public with an interest in state and regional affairs.

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The budget document proposes a level of expenditure of \$51,000 including \$1,000 as an increase to recognize full workload change. Upon application of a 10 percent reduction, the Budget Bill proposes an appropriation of \$45,900.

The council represents a statewide forum for the discussion and presentation of views and issues which are of mutual concern to the state and the various political subdivisions within the state. In this capacity, the council performs the important function of regularly bringing together representatives of the various governmental jurisdictions in the state reflecting the interests and perspectives unique to those jurisdictions.

The council is particularly concerned with problems of regional as well as interjurisdictional concern, and attempts to positively influence the creation and continuation of voluntary regional associations. The council's major efforts in 1966-67 were directed at encouraging regional associations, and liaison and assistance subcommittees were formed to work with such regional associations as the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) and the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG). Also, the council worked in conjunction with the County Supervisors Association and the League of California Cities to initiate discussion with the cities and counties of the nine-county San Joaquin Valley concerning the formation of a regional organization within the San Joaquin Valley.

In addition the council published a *Directory of State Services for Local Government*. This handbook contains reference to over 400 technical, financial, informational, and administrative aids available to local jurisdictions. It was published in October 1966.

An executive secretary and a stenographic position are provided for staff services to the council.

The council proposes expenditures of \$14,101 in contract services for the budget year. Contract services money is used by the council to support research programs in specialized areas of concern. The amount proposed represents an extension of the level of services for the current year and does not reflect an articulated program of research and evaluation. Rather it is, in effect, a research contingency reserve. Due to the structure of the council and its limited staff support, we believe that its varying research needs are properly met by engaging contract consultants on an *ad hoc* basis rather than by having a permanent

**Intergovernmental Council on Urban Growth—Continued**

research position. However, in the absence of a documented research proposal for the budget year, we believe that the extension of funding based on the current year research contract is arbitrary. Accordingly, we believe that contract services money be provided on the basis of the \$10,000 bench mark amount authorized by the Legislature when the council was originally formed. *We recommend a reduction in contract services for a savings to the General Fund of \$4,101 (budget page 29, line 59).*

**OFFICE OF LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR**

ITEM 33 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 30

**FOR SUPPORT OF THE OFFICE OF THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested in Budget Bill -----		\$132,165
Budget request before identified adjustments -----	\$142,174	
Increase to recognize full workload change -----	4,675	
	<hr/>	
Budget as adjusted for workload change -----	\$146,849	
Adjustment—undetailed reduction (10 percent) -----	14,684	

**RECOMMENDED REDUCTION FROM WORKLOAD BUDGET** --- None

**BALANCE OF UNDETAILED REDUCTION—REVIEW PENDING** \$14,684

**GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT**

The Lieutenant Governor is elected by the people of the state pursuant to Article V, Section 16, of the California Constitution.

The Lieutenant Governor carries out the following programs as prescribed by law:

1. He assumes the chief executive's responsibilities when the Governor is absent from the state.
2. He presides over the Senate when it is in session.
3. He serves as a member of several boards and commissions including: Board of Trustees of the State College System, University of California Board of Regents, State Lands Commission, Commission on Interstate Cooperation, State Toll Bridge Authority, California Disaster Council, Reapportionment Commission, the California Reciprocity Commission, the Committee of the Americas, and the Intergovernmental Council on Urban Growth.

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The budget for the 1967-68 fiscal year for the support of the office of the Lieutenant Governor proposes an expenditure of \$146,849 including \$4,675 for workload change. Upon applying a reduction of 10 percent, the Budget Bill proposes an appropriation of \$132,165.

The proposed \$146,849 would continue the present level of staffing of nine positions in addition to the Lieutenant Governor.