

## CAPITAL OUTLAY

### Summary

#### 1968 Program

The Budget Act of 1968 as signed by the Governor contained approximately \$146,046,000 for capital outlay. Of this, \$71,620,000 was from the General Fund and the balance from (1) various special funds (\$50,775,000), excluding water and highways, and (2) bond funds in the areas of recreation, parks and junior college state construction assistance (\$23,651,000).

There are a number of observations pertinent to the amount and nature of this 1968 outlay total. First, it was the smallest capital outlay appropriation since the fiscal year 1962-63. Second, the amount of bond funds was relatively minor for the first time in ten years. Third, it contained an item of some \$3,340,000 for purposes which had been treated as local assistance in previous budget acts. Fourth, overall it represented essentially a "pay-as-you-go" construction program.

In addition to the \$71,620,000 directly appropriated from the General Fund, it should be noted that of the special funds amount, \$37,730,000 was from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education. This fund is fed by tidelands oil revenue which otherwise would have accrued to the General Fund. Therefore, as a practical matter, approximately 75 percent of the total 1968 capital outlay appropriation had its origin in the General Fund.

The limited bond funds that were allocated by the 1968 Budget Act were largely directed to higher education (junior colleges). All of the balance of \$3 million remaining in the Higher Education Bond Act Fund was allocated to augment projects previously funded from it for the purpose of financing increased costs attributable to a sharp rise in the construction cost index.

In addition, some \$15 million was allocated for junior college construction assistance.

These bond funds for higher education, when combined with appropriations from (1) the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education and (2) direct General Fund allocations, resulted in some 75 percent of the total capital outlay appropriation being oriented to higher education.

Of the remaining capital outlay monies, approximately 10 percent was directed toward state and local recreational programs while the balance of less than 15 percent went to relatively minor programs in agencies such as mental hygiene, corrections, youth authority, fish and game, motor vehicles, highway patrol, etc. Included in these minor programs was the \$3,340,000 for purposes previously budgeted as local assistance which reflected the state's interest in local flood control programs to the extent of land purchases and easements and rights of way, the titles to which inured to the state.

## Capital Outlay

### Summary—Continued The Effect of Inflation

In the seven fiscal years 1962-63 through 1968-69, the rising cost of construction has made comparison of gross expenditures relatively meaningless.

The 1962 Budget Act, for example, provided \$169,325,000 for outlays, but during the 1962-63 fiscal year the "construction cost index" as determined by the Engineering News Record averaged 850. On the other hand, during the first half of the current fiscal year the index reached 1,200 and is rising at a relatively steep rate. The increase in the index over this seven-year period is therefore 350 points or 39 percent.

The total appropriation for each year includes not only construction but also equipment and land acquisition. Although the price fluctuation for both land and equipment is frequently wider than the construction cost index, the percentage increase is approximately the same over a long period. On this basis, it is evident that what could be purchased during the 1962-63 fiscal year for \$169,325,000 would have cost 39 percent more (\$66 million) during the 1968-69 fiscal year for a total of over \$235 million in relative value. Conversely, the \$146 million provided by the 1968 Budget Act for construction and equipment would purchase values approximating what \$104 million would have purchased during the 1962-63 fiscal year.

### 1969 Program

The 1969 Budget Bill now before the Legislature includes a total of \$158,152,149 for capital outlay programs from all funding sources. This is significantly higher than that provided by the 1968 Budget Act. Again, the major source of financing is the General Fund together with funds which are related to or arise from it. Of the grand total proposed, the General Fund will directly provide \$89,453,613 or 56.5 percent. While the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education will provide \$10,001,300 or 6.3 percent. The balance of \$58,697,236 or 37.1 percent includes \$47,844,241 in bond funds for state aided junior college construction, and for park and recreational programs as well as for augmentation of higher education projects previously funded from bond funds. It also includes other various special fund agencies as previously identified.

Higher education outlays totaling \$108,159,925 or 68.4 percent of the capital outlay budget will be financed from the General Fund, the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education and the bond funds for junior colleges. As in prior years, education continues to represent the major element of the capital outlay budget. However, because the amount proposed for the two segments which are direct state responsibilities, i.e., the university and the state colleges, is significantly less than requested by these two state agencies, every effort must be made to maximize the benefits of available funds in terms of academic quality and availability of space and facilities for each campus.

Summary—Continued

To that end we make several recommendations and suggestions in the specific analyses hereafter which fall in the following general categories:

- A. Intensified space utilization
- B. Design factors oriented towards cost reduction
- C. Construction and procedural factors oriented towards cost reduction

Higher Education

The growth problem of the two major segments of the state supported higher education in California is illustrated by Table 1, "Enrollment—Capacity Comparisons" which covers four fiscal years including the budget year under consideration.

Table 1  
Enrollment-Capacity Comparisons  
State Colleges

Year	1	2	3	4	5
	<i>Enrollment F.T.E. 8 a.m.- 5 p.m.</i>	<i>8 a.m.- 10 p.m.</i>	<i>Cumulative capacity</i>	<i>Proposed capital outlay five-year plan</i>	<i>Budget Act</i>
1969 -----	150,290	180,815	134,294	\$116,585,300	\$44,664,300 (38.3%)
1968 -----	134,770	165,295	122,828	110,380,900	44,571,000 (40.4%)
1967 -----	126,110	144,120	107,534	88,841,000	61,499,000 (69.2%)
1966 -----	114,100	130,468	104,699	68,670,600	54,760,435 (79.7%) (12,000,000)
<b>University of California</b>					
1969 -----	95,193	--	85,063	\$96,657,000	\$37,357,000 (38.6%)
1968 -----	90,224	--	77,814	79,634,900	44,571,000 (56.0%)
1967 -----	89,457	--	75,488	115,596,550	58,241,339 (50.4%)
1966 -----	78,923	--	69,701	92,362,700	67,894,100 (73.0%)

The state college enrollment figures shown in column 1 were obtained from the five-year capital outlay program for 1969 through 1973 as prepared by the state college system under date of July, 1968. For the University of California, the enrollment figures were obtained from the document labeled, "Budget for Current Operations" prepared by the University under date of November 21, 1968.

The enrollment figures for the state colleges in column 2 were obtained from supporting data prepared by the state college system in connection with its support program. The University provides no figures covering an expanded time period from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. and the column is blank for that reason.

Column 3 labeled "Cumulative Capacity" covers figures obtained from the five-year program of the state colleges and a similar five-year program from the University of California. The capacity is based on C.C.H.E. restudy standards which contemplate for the state colleges 25 hours per week for lower division laboratories and 20 hours per week for upper division laboratories. Lecture rooms are calculated at 34 hours per week. For the University, the figures are 27 hours for lower division laboratories, 22 hours for upper division laboratories and 36 hours for lecture facilities.

## Capital Outlay

### University of California—Continued

Column 4 indicating "Proposed Capital Outlay" covers figures contained in the five-year plans for each respective segment and represents programs and proposals approved by the State College Board of Trustees on the one hand and the Board of Regents on the other.

Column 5 covers actual appropriations made in the prior years, and for the 1969-70 budget year the figures represents the amount included in the Budget Bill now before the Legislature. The percentage following each figure is the relationship of the appropriated amount or in the case of the 1969 Budget Bill the budgeted amount to the proposals contained in the five-year plans. It will be noted that the percentage of funds made available has steadily decreased with respect to the proposals of the two major agencies. The \$12 million shown parenthetically for 1966 is for property acquisition for four new state colleges not contained in the trustees' five-year plan.

The University's enrollment figures and cumulative capacity deal with the general campuses only and do not include the enrollments or capacities for the medical schools and the veterinary medical school at Davis. On the other hand, the proposed capital outlay totals as well as the amounts appropriated do include medical and veterinary projects. The University's data tables simply do not include enrollment and capacity breakdowns on the same basis as the general campuses and therefore they have had to be excluded.

With respect to the state colleges, it will be noted that in each of the years included there is a negative gap between cumulative capacity and enrollment on a systemwide basis. This discrepancy has been absorbed simply by increasing utilization of existing facilities. When compared with the enrollment for the period from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m., the gap is even greater and indicates that the existing plant has a separate capacity for the period from 5 p.m. to 10 p.m. This tends to point up the fact that space utilization standards and so-called cumulative capacity are relatively arbitrary at best and consequently are generally amenable to intensification within reasonable limitations.

The tabulation demonstrates that, at least with respect to the standards established and adopted by both segments, they have been falling effectively behind as a result of the reduced funding compared with agency proposals. For the most part, the reductions in funds have prompted intensified utilization of existing or funded space. While the rate of enrollment growth has tended to level off, this has been accomplished to a considerable extent by diversion of students to the junior college system, which means that the growth which is continuing to occur in both segments is more heavily oriented to upper division and graduate enrollment which require more and costlier space per student than for lower division students. This gives rise to the paradox that while the rate of growth appears to be leveling off the demand for funds continues to grow. To some extent, the demand for funds is artificially increased by inflationary pressures as has been previously noted. In any case, if there is to continue to be a significant difference between the programs proposed by the two agencies and the amount of

### University of California—Continued

money made available to them, serious study must be made of alternatives that will help to maximize the effect of such funds as are made available without significant reduction in the quality of the academic program or the ability to accept all qualified students seeking admission. Unless techniques are found to accomplish these objectives the ultimate result, and in the very near future, will be a reduction either in the quality of higher education or in the ability of the two segments to accept students or a combination of both.

### SUGGESTED ALTERNATIVES

The suggestions we offer fall into two categories. The first deals with plant utilization and the second is technical in nature and concerns possibilities for construction cost reductions which could result in more space being obtained for the funds available.

#### I. Space Utilization Standards

(a) The utilization of facilities for higher education is deeply rooted in tradition and custom. To a minor degree, utilization is affected by the basic nature of the facilities and their ability to accommodate more people. For many years, the standard time span for facility use has been from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., five days per week. Within this span tradition has governed the days of the week when certain laboratory classes would be scheduled and even the times of the day. This has led to the phenomenon that on certain hours of certain days some buildings would be almost completely unoccupied. Laboratory type facilities were usually more commonly affected by this phenomenon than lecture type facilities.

The Budget Division of the State Department of Finance undertook a survey of space utilization on the San Diego State College campus during the first week of October 1968. The survey covered three major buildings, education, social sciences and business administration. It concentrated on Wednesday and Thursday as being the most typical of the week. In making the survey, rooms were tabulated as being in use as long as formal class instruction was in progress even though in numerous instances actual occupancy of the room was less than 30 percent of available stations. On this basis it was found that on Thursday from 8 a.m. to 11 a.m. the greatest utilization of available rooms occurred with 75 percent of the rooms occupied and 25 percent unoccupied. On Wednesday from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m., the figures were 63 percent occupied and 37 percent unoccupied and the lowest was on Thursday evening from 5 p.m. to 10 p.m. with 37 percent occupied and 63 percent unoccupied. On the basis of station occupancy, the percentages would be even lower. The main conclusion is that classroom utilization drops off sharply in the afternoon and evening hours. The survey covered 118 rooms, although in the chancellor's official tabulation only 103 of these rooms were accounted for as lecture rooms with the balance being either noncapacity or teaching labs generating laboratory FTE rather than lecture FTE. It is important to note that the lecture capacity officially tabulated by the campus totals 11,205 FTE

## Capital Outlay

### University of California—Continued

and the survey covered approximately 65 percent of that capacity indicating that it was reasonably representative of the whole.

The standard time span of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., five days per week produces 45 hours. From 5 p.m. to 10 p.m. adds another 25 hours and from 8 a.m. to 12 p.m. on Saturday adds another 4 hours making a total of a 74-hour weekly potential. We suggest that in the light of current restrictions in capital outlay availability and the continuation of such restrictions in the foreseeable future, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education should restudy the possibilities for increased space utilization standards and the use of computer scheduling to achieve maximum efficiency in utilization. Such study should ignore all traditional approaches in which certain types of classes are given during certain time slots and on certain days of the week. With respect to laboratories, we recognize that there are certain physical limitations which normally would prevent the use of a given laboratory station by more individuals than those which can be accommodated in the locker facilities which are part of most laboratory benches. However, we suggest that each laboratory station can provide increased utilization by relatively inexpensive additions of locker facilities either in adjacent corridors or perhaps in other unused areas of each laboratory room. In any case, because of the very high cost per laboratory station a maximum effort must be made to increase the utilization of each station and minimize the need for additional capital outlay funds for such facilities.

(b) As a starting point in the state colleges, we suggest that for capacity calculation purposes the utilization of lecture space be increased from 34 hours to 49 hours based on the following rationale. The 34 hours represents 75 percent of the 45 hours available from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., five days per week. The period from 5 p.m. to 10 p.m., five days per week totals 25 hours of which 75 percent would be 15 hours. The latter represents an increase of 44 percent over the current 34-hour standard.

Referring to the tabulation at the beginning of this section, we find that the systemwide cumulative capacity calculated on the 34-hour standard is 134,294 FTE of which 44 percent would be 59,089 FTE making a total of 193,383 FTE. This exceeds the projected 1969 enrollment of 180,815 FTE by a comfortable margin indicating that the physical plant can absorb all qualified students who apply. The calculation assumes that the same percentage of increased utilization would apply to laboratory facilities.

In making these assumptions for increased utilization, it should be recognized that such increase absorbs a substantial part of the elasticity inherent in the existing standard. Consequently, while additional facilities by way of rentals or otherwise are not justified in most instances for the fall of 1969 and perhaps 1970, additional capacity would be imperative by 1971. Therefore, the proposals contained in this budget are needed since most of the capacity projects included would not likely be available before the fall of 1971. *The main point is that based on our assumptions and projections no additional capacity capital outlay*

University of California—Continued

*is required in this budget beyond that proposed and no more than a like amount is needed annually thereafter.*

We also suggest that similar approaches should be considered for the university, particularly in lecture facilities and class laboratories. The same rationale cannot be applied to research or graduate research facilities.

A further discussion of this subject may be found on page 326 of our analysis in connection with the support budgets of the state colleges.

**II. Construction Cost Reduction**

The problem of construction cost reduction in the face of a rising construction cost index is a relatively complex one which to a considerable degree hinges upon certain basic policy considerations. It has been the practice of the state, for many years, to design and build facilities and structures of excellent quality with long life expectancies and maintenance factors that would provide reasonable economy of maintenance and operation over the years. Generally, the state has stopped short of designing superlative or monumental structures which entailed excessive costs for architectural or appearance purposes which would not augment the functional capabilities of the facilities.

(a) We suggest that the time has come to take another look at these policies and practices with the aim of reducing initial costs without reducing the functional capabilities of the projects and without significantly impairing the maintenance and operations factors. For example, it has been the policy to provide heating and air-conditioning systems on a relatively sophisticated basis which includes numerous controls and zones. In addition, it has been the general practice to design these systems on the basis of peak loads rather than average loads. We suggest that a significant degree of cost reduction can be achieved both by the simplification of these systems and by designing them for average loads. With respect to the quality of the elements used in these systems, we believe we should continue present practices because any reduction of this quality will soon be reflected in significantly increased maintenance costs.

(b) Another example which is common to practically every building although not a great cost element in itself, is the practice of providing two pipe circulating hot water systems serving washbasins, laboratory sinks, janitorial sinks, etc. The purpose of such a system is to provide almost instantaneous hot water at any fixture no matter how far removed from the source of supply.

(c) Another aspect of this particular example is the question whether we need to provide any hot water in restroom washbasins. It is interesting to note that in many junior college buildings scarce funds have dictated the elimination of this amenity without really impairing the usability of the facilities.

(d) Still another facet of this is the tendency to use copper piping throughout every building even when water conditions in given areas

## Capital Outlay

### University of California—Continued

would indicate a life expectancy for galvanized iron pipe which would be more than ample to justify its use at a lower cost than copper pipe. In any case we suggest that this type of cost factor should be carefully restudied.

(e) Similar reexaminations need to be made of electrical factors, particularly lighting fixtures, with a view to finding and using less costly elements without significantly impairing the end results such as lighting intensities, circuit flexibility, etc.

(f) Similar attention should be paid to the use of basic structural and finishing materials and construction techniques particularly with a view to maximizing the use of those prefabrication or mass production techniques which tend to reduce hand labor and costly field production practices and eliminating costly materials which principally serve visual architectural purposes.

(g) An important aspect which is relevant to all of the foregoing is the tendency of many architects to design custom detailing, presumably for architectural effects, rather than relying on standard, stock elements. This should be carefully avoided except where clear, ample justification would indicate otherwise.

(h) Another possible approach to construction economies lies in seeking the advice of outstanding mechanical, electrical and general contractors during the early design and working drawings stages of a project in order to take advantage of their expertise and their up-to-the-minute knowledge of the latest developments in construction techniques and materials as well as actual design considerations. We suggest that many top flight contractors would be happy to consult with prospective clients and to make suggestions which could result in savings even though the particular contractor might not be the successful bidder, ultimately. From discussions with a number of contractors, we conclude that such an approach is possible and practical.

(i) The final suggestion is concerned with the actual process of construction irrespective of the techniques that might be employed. We have frequently in the past called attention to the fact that the construction of any facility or project by the state generally was more costly than the construction of an identical facility with identical specifications and working drawings by a private client. The major reason for this is the fact that the state's approach through the use of its on-the-job inspectors has been to demand of the contractor what many of them believe are unnecessarily costly conditions. Generally, this inspection has been exercised rigidly, sometimes unnecessarily so. Each contractor who bids on state projects is aware of what will be expected of him and his bid inevitably reflects a contingency to cover rejected work and its consequent reconstruction based on unnecessarily rigid application of the specifications and working drawing designations.

It should be pointed out that the foregoing technical suggestions apply not only to state colleges and University campuses but to all state buildings.



### Community Colleges

The community college system had received a total of \$80 million in state aid, most of it from bond sources, when the last available bond authorization, for the purpose, was exhausted.

The Budget Bill of 1968, proposed an appropriation of \$15,609,533 contingent upon the acceptance of the "Junior College Construction Bond Act" program at the state primary in June of 1968. The bond proposal which was for \$65 million was passed by the electorate before the Budget Bill was enacted so that the bond funds were in fact available at the time the Budget Act became law. The appropriation made by the 1968 Budget Act therefore left a balance in the bond funds of something over \$49 million.

The 1969 Budget Bill proposes an appropriation totaling \$29,158,625 for the eligible community college districts statewide. This would leave a balance of slightly over \$20 million which would be available for appropriation by the Legislature at the 1970 session. However, there are anticipated to be federal reimbursements totaling \$6,700,000 which would in effect reduce the state appropriation by that amount if all the federal funds materialize. In the latter event, the balance remaining would be about \$27 million. In any case, there would probably be enough state bond funds available for one more year of construction assistance. Beyond 1970, the problem would again arise as to whether to finance the continuing needs of the community colleges by additional bond issues or to place these needs on a "pay-as-you-go" basis.

The Junior College Construction Bond Act provided an important change in the state's approach to junior college construction financial assistance. The act clearly required the state, through the Department of Education and the Department of Finance to establish standards of space utilization and project cost for various kinds of projects. This meant that the Department of Education and the Department of Finance are required to review each proposed project to about the same degree which the Department of Finance now reviews projects wholly financed by the state for the state college system and for the University of California. This should assure that the state's financial assistance will produce maximum effect consistent with durable design and ultimate economy in maintenance and operation. The projects contained in the budget proposal have been reviewed on the basis of preliminary plans, outline specifications and estimates submitted by the various districts qualifying for assistance. Of the 68 community college districts in California, 62 are eligible for state assistance on the basis of each district's relative ability which is a comparison of its needs and assessment base with the statewide needs and the total statewide assessment. The six districts that do not qualify, on the basis of the formula contained in the enabling legislation, each have more than adequate local resources to provide whatever facilities might be needed. The relationships are not static and are affected by increased enrollment growth, increased assessed valuation and to some degree the availability of federal assistance.

## Capital Outlay

### Other Agencies

#### General Administration

The program for General Administration as proposed for the budget year is significantly greater than that provided by the 1968 Budget Act, in fact, about three times as great. The major factor in this increase is for alterations in existing buildings related to the so-called "space recovery" program. This program is based on new space standards developed in 1967 which provide smaller areas for various categories of state personnel from the highest echelon to the lowest clerical positions. By applying these standards, it is anticipated that more people will be accommodated within existing buildings, thereby saving substantial annual rental payments for leased space. While we believe that the aim is commendable, we seriously question the ability to accomplish the program within the budget year and hence we question the need to provide all of the funds proposed at this time. More detailed comment is made in connection with the specific budget item.

#### Health and Welfare

The program for the 1969-70 fiscal year for Health and Welfare which includes the Department of the Youth Authority, Department of Corrections and Department of Mental Hygiene, is significantly reduced at approximately \$4,584,000 when compared to the 1968-69 fiscal year program at \$5,301,000, or about 15.6 percent.

The program as a whole might be characterized as a holding action in that it includes no new capacity in any one of the segments but consists largely of utility projects, environmental improvement projects, equipment and minor projects. The most significant factor is the failure to move ahead with the new correctional facility in San Diego County at Otay Mesa for which \$150,000 was appropriated for preliminary planning by the Budget Act of 1968. In fact, there is every indication in the Governor's Budget that the concept of a new facility at this location is to be totally abandoned and in all probability there will be ultimate proposals for the sale of the site which was recently purchased. We believe this is of very great importance and refer to our detailed analysis of the Corrections program in which we recommend that a project be added to the budget to provide for the first phase of working drawings.

#### Transportation

The 1969-70 fiscal year program proposed for the Transportation Agency also shows a decrease at \$6,827,000 as compared with \$7,382,000 in the 1968-69 budget. For the Department of Motor Vehicles the policy of providing new facilities on state-owned sites is continued although at a somewhat slower pace than in prior years.

On the other hand, for the California Highway Patrol there is a very significant increase aimed primarily at a program to replace the Highway Patrol academy on its existing site. While we have no particular quarrel with the premise that a new academy is required, we believe that the approach in attempting to rebuild on the same site is highly questionable. We refer the reader to a more detailed discussion in con-

### Other Agencies—Continued

nection with the major capital outlay program for the patrol, Item No. 400 which we discuss in considerable detail starting on page 1066 of our analysis.

### Resources

The Resources program for the budget year is nearly doubled when compared to the current fiscal year with over \$1,584,000 versus \$870,000. The bulk of the increase occurs in two areas. Funding for minor projects in the Division of Forestry is nearly doubled mostly to improve and expand the radio network. The ongoing program to maintain and improve existing facilities by minor additions and some alterations is funded at about the same level as in the prior year. A new element is added by the proposal to build a state-owned facility for the Air Resources Board which is now in quarters leased from Los Angeles County.

### Wildlife

The Wildlife Conservation program for the 1969-70 fiscal year is not significantly greater from a dollar standpoint than in the current fiscal year. However, it does include a very large project for a fish screen system at a diversion on the Sacramento River near Hamilton City at a cost of \$2.6 million for which it is hoped \$1.3 million will be available from federal funds. If the federal funds are forthcoming, they will be deposited to the Fish and Game Preservation Fund.

### Parks and Recreation

For Parks and Recreation, the Budget Bill proposes an appropriation program somewhat richer than that provided by the 1968 Budget Act. The program is funded from three sources, the General Fund, the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund (bonds) and the Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund. The total in 1968 from all three funds was over \$9,655,000 with nearly three-fourths of that being from the General Fund and the balance from the other two funds. The emphasis was largely on development of properties and areas already owned by the state with a relatively small amount going for acquisition and that mostly for augmentation purposes.

The 1969 proposal totals over \$12,840,000 with more than half coming from the General Fund and the balance from the other two funds. Again, the emphasis is on development and maintenance of existing facilities but with some relatively minor acquisitions principally at the Emma Wood State Beach and at the Santa Barbara Presidio State Historical Monument.

Generally speaking, the planning activities of the Department of Parks and Recreation have been unsatisfactory despite the fact that an ample staff is available at the departmental level. For an extended discussion of this problem, we refer to our analysis of Item 256 which is the major support for the Department of Parks and Recreation.

## DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

## Item 364 from the General Fund

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$1,902,950
Recommended for approval .....	250,400
Recommended for special review .....	91,000
Recommended reduction .....	\$1,561,550

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS

	Amount	Analysis page
Delete project (a) alterations—		
Sacramento buildings necessitated by relocation .....	\$375,000	978
Delete project (b) alterations—		
Resources Building .....	\$1,000,000	978
Delete project (c) improve elevators—		
Resources Building .....	\$186,550	979

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item contains five alteration and improvement projects at various state office buildings located within the downtown Capitol complex in Sacramento. The projects proposed are as follows.

(a) *Alterations—Sacramento buildings necessitated by relocation* ..... \$375,000

*We recommend deletion of the total amount requested.*

It is our understanding that the amount requested is intended to finance the alterations necessary to relocate and consolidate various related operations of the Department of Finance. A study is currently underway to determine if sufficient space can be recovered in the Sacramento Business and Professions Building to accommodate this proposal. Apparently, if this approach is unsuccessful, efforts will be made to find some other suitable location. Although we concur with the need to find more suitable office space for the Department of Finance, and to consolidate some of its operations, we feel this proposal has not been sufficiently developed to justify budgeting at this time.

(b) *Alterations—Resources Building* ..... \$1,000,000

*We recommend that this project be deleted.*

In October of 1967, the Office of Architecture and Construction conducted a space survey of the Resources Building to determine the amount of space that could be recovered with the application of new space utilization standards adopted by the Department of General Services. After projecting the needs of the agencies occupying the building, through the 1969-70 fiscal year, it was estimated that approximately 90,000 square feet could be recovered. It was determined that 90 percent of the existing partitions would have to be relocated and it would cost approximately \$1.5 million to recover the space.

As a result of this survey, \$400,000 was appropriated in the Budget Act of 1968 to initiate this space recovery program. It is our understanding that those funds have not been expended and that preliminary studies are just getting underway. To replan the layout of a building containing over 450,000 square feet of assignable area and presently oc-

## Department of General Services—Continued

cupied by approximately 3,500 state employees, is a sizable task. Concurrently, a determination will also have to be made as to which agencies can be relocated into the recovered space. We do not believe, with the magnitude of planning involved, that this space recovery program will have progressed to the point where funds in excess of the \$400,000 currently available will be required during the 1969-70 fiscal year. Consequently, we believe this \$1 million request is premature and will not be needed until the 1970-71 fiscal year.

(c) *Improve elevators—Resources Building* ----- \$186,550

*We recommend the project be deleted.*

This proposal is to revise the elevator dispatching and control systems in the Resources Building. It is based upon a 1967 survey conducted by a consulting elevator engineer engaged to examine the elevator system and its ability to meet the needs of then known traffic conditions. The 1968-69 Budget proposed a \$50,000 project to implement the recommendations of the consultant. We recommended against that proposal on the basis that the amount requested was not sufficient to accomplish what was proposed and that, in our opinion, the elevator service was adequate. Although the estimate has been revised, we have no reason to believe that the elevator service is less adequate. It is likely that changes will have to be made once the proposed space recovery program for the Resources Building is complete and the occupancy of the building increases. At that time, a new survey should be conducted to determine what needs to be done. Because of the status of the alteration program, any request to improve the elevator service at this time is premature. We believe the amount requested in this item should be deleted and the project deferred pending completion of the space recovery effort.

(d) *Increase capacity of electrical distribution system—  
State Capitol* ----- \$250,400

*We recommend approval.*

A survey conducted by the Office of Architecture and Construction in 1966 indicated that the electrical distribution system in the Capitol Building was not adequate to reliably carry existing loads or to meet future needs. It was recommended that a project be undertaken to correct these deficiencies. A portion of the work recommended was accomplished on the Assembly side of the east wing during recent remodeling. The \$250,400 recommended will provide for the remaining modifications recommended in that report.

(e) *Replace—fans, coils and duct work over Assembly  
Chamber* ----- \$91,000

*We recommend special review.*

Certain components of the air-conditioning system in the Assembly Chamber are nearing the end of their useful life. It is felt that further repairs are uneconomical and \$91,000 is requested to finance a major overhaul of the system. The Buildings and Grounds Division of the Department of General Services submitted this request which the Office

Department of General Services—Continued

of Architecture and Construction is currently reviewing. Until this review is completed and a formal estimate prepared, we cannot recommend the adequacy of the amount requested. We anticipate that this information will be available in time for the budget hearings.

**DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES**

**Item 365 from the General Fund**

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$300,000
Recommended for approval .....	300,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item represents the continuation of a standard practice to provide a lump sum appropriation for unforeseen alterations of various state office buildings during the budget year. This enables the department to finance the costs of minor alterations needed to accommodate personnel and program changes within various agencies.

In 1967, the Department of General Services embarked on a program to increase the space utilization of various state-owned office buildings by applying newly adopted space standards. The goal of this program is to recover sufficient space in state-owned office buildings to permit relocation of those agencies occupying rented quarters. Although this program is relatively new, some relocation has already been accomplished with a subsequent reduction in state rental costs. The amount requested in this item reflects this current emphasis on space recovery which usually necessitates alterations to partitions and other appurtenances.

**DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES**

**Item 366 from the General Fund**

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$216,364
Recommended for approval .....	216,364
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

The amount proposed will finance 11 minor construction, maintenance and improvement projects at various locations throughout the state. Five of those projects constitute facilities maintenance and more properly belong in the department's support budget. These projects account for \$60,750 and provide for sidewalk repairs in the Capitol planning area, replacement of the floor covering in the cafeteria of the Resources Building, and roof repairs to the Sacramento Garage, the Education Building and the Archives Building.

## Department of General Services—Continued

The west wall of the State Office Building in San Francisco, which is five stories in height, is showing signs of possible structural damage. Rainwater has penetrated cracks in the concrete and the subsequent corrosion and expansion of the reinforcing steel has caused spalling and additional cracking on the exterior surface. The Office of Architecture and Construction has recommended that the wall be repaired and estimates that \$30,500 will be required to perform the work. Lighting in the basement and first floor of the garage building in San Francisco is inadequate and \$3,600 is requested to correct this deficiency.

The two most significant projects proposed include \$65,000 to remodel a nine-story state-owned warehouse in Sacramento to accommodate the State Office of Procurement and \$47,000 to install a standby chiller at the Oakland State Office Building.

The remaining \$9,514 represents the state's pro rata share for off-site improvements at two locations. The City of San Diego has initiated a tree planting program and \$7,000 is requested for the cost of work to be done around the San Diego State Office Building. The City of Marysville has requested the state to participate in a street improvement program adjacent to a state-owned building now occupied by the Division of Highways. It is estimated the \$2,514 will be required for this project.

## Department of General Services

## STATE EXPOSITION AND FAIR EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## Item 367 from the State Fair Fund

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$58,500
Recommended for approval .....	58,500
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

Since the California Exposition and Fair opened on its new Sacramento site in June of 1968, it has been beset with numerous problems. The amount proposed will finance three minor items, two of which are to correct the problems described below while the remaining request is to satisfy a contractual obligation.

A flooding situation during the first day of horseracing at the new grandstand led to the discovery that the main sewerlines servicing the facility are improperly installed and inadequately sized. Subsequently, an agreement was worked out with the contractor whereby he will dig up the existing line and regrade the trench in order to provide the proper fall in the line. Coincident with that work, a new properly sized line will be installed. To comply with the agreement that was negotiated, the executive committee is requesting \$16,000 to offset the cost of the larger sewerline.

## State Exposition and Fair Executive Committee—Continued

The contract that was signed for construction of the minirail provided that electrical power to operate the train would be obtained from the nearest primary service points. The original master plans indicated three locations around the periphery of the minirail where electric service could be obtained, and the contractor had planned to connect at all three locations. However, a decision to delete the permanent amusement area eliminated one of those primary service points. To insure proper operation of the minirail, \$30,000 is requested to install the primary electrical service originally contemplated.

When the grandstand was constructed, the Cal-Expo Corporation signed a three-year contract for installation of the wiring that connects the ticket selling machines with the totalizator storage unit, which is the electronic equipment that records the sale of parimutuel tickets. The cost of the installation was \$55,000 and under the contract the Cal-Expo Corporation paid the first year's cost of \$30,000. The committee is now requesting \$12,500 to pay the second year's cost under that contract; one payment of \$12,500 remains for the following year.

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE****Item 368 from the General Fund**

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$28,750
Recommended for approval .....	28,750
Recommended reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

The Department of Agriculture's diagnostic laboratory, located in Sacramento on Meadowview Road, has cooling system problems. The lab presently has a central cooling system which is based on an evaporative type unit. Because of increasing humidity in the area, the unit has not been able to effectively stabilize atmospheric conditions in the laboratory. This poses a particularly critical problem because fluctuations in temperature and humidity reduce the reliability of the diagnostic tests being conducted as part of the agricultural pest and disease prevention program. The \$28,750 requested will finance the cost of replacing the evaporative cooler with a refrigeration-type unit.

**DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS****Item 369 from the General Fund**

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$267,639
Recommended for approval .....	267,639
Recommended reduction .....	None



Department of Corrections—Continued  
ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval of the amount requested.*

The Department of Corrections is able to maintain and thereby extend the life of its facilities well beyond what normally would be expected due to the availability of inmate labor at little or no cost for maintenance and improvement projects. The 36 projects represented by this \$267,639 request are primarily for the correction of deficiencies that do not fall in the scope of normal maintenance activities. Although some of the projects proposed will be accomplished by outside contract, a significant portion will be accomplished using inmate labor, thereby maximizing the total benefit within the funds requested. A summary of projects, by institution and purpose, is shown in Table 1.

Table 1  
Proposed Correctional Projects, 1969-70

Institution	Number of projects		Health and safety		Improve security		Improve program operations		Amount
California Conservation Center	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	\$12,100
California Correctional Institution ----	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	27,000
Correctional Training Facility -	4	0	0	1	3	14,226			
Deuel Vocational Institute ----	5	0	0	1	4	35,842			
Folsom State Prison -----	4	1	0	1	2	71,735			
California Institution for Men	5	2	1	1	1	29,630			
Vacaville -----	2	0	1	0	1	17,395			
California Mens Colony -----	2	0	1	1	0	11,435			
San Quentin State Prison -----	8	1	7	0	0	12,076			
California Institution for Women	1	0	0	0	0	1,200			
California Rehabilitation Center	1	1	0	0	0	35,000			
Total -----	36	8	10	6	12	\$267,639			

As indicated in Table 1, the projects requested are primarily of a mandatory nature essential to maintaining the status quo with only a few projects oriented towards improving inmate programming. Included in the proposals are such significant items as a \$35,000 request to install a fire sprinkler system in an inmate housing facility at the California Rehabilitation Center and a \$27,000 request for an addition to the activity building at the California Correctional Institution to provide additional program space to accommodate an increased number of inmates. The security projects range from a \$13,250 request for remodeling the custodial offices in the administration building at the California Institution for Men to a \$313 request for metal security doors at the end of each of four tiers in the south cell block at San Quentin. Plant operations will further be improved by a series of projects designed to facilitate employee efficiency and reduce maintenance problems.

## DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

## Item 369.1 from the General Fund

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	None
Recommended for approval .....	\$530,000
Recommended increase .....	530,000

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend that \$530,000 be appropriated for the first phase of working drawings for the Medical Correctional Institution to be constructed near San Diego.*

The 1968-69 capital outlay budget for the Department of Corrections proposed the expenditure of \$800,000 to develop the Medical Correctional Institution near San Diego. We recommend against that request because we believed the department first needed to:

- (1) Adopt a firm policy position with respect to its basic program, and
- (2) Devise a meaningful statewide plan for prison development based upon its policy position.

We further emphasized the need to support financially the department's program requirements once they were established. The Legislature subsequently reduced the amount requested to \$150,000 and added language which provided that future appropriations would be contingent upon legislative review and approval of a master plan for long-range facility development.

The Department of Corrections responded by preparing a comprehensive master plan based upon a statement of objectives and the establishment of standards to meet those objectives. We believe the department has presented a definitive report based on present population assumptions in responding to the legislative directive. The 1969-70 capital outlay budget, however, fails to include the funds necessary to implement any part of that master plan.

Construction of a new institution may be justified either because the number of inmates exceeds capacity, or to replace an obsolete facility. Development of the San Diego facility is being delayed and there are reports that the reason is that the inmate population is expected to decline. However, the population has been increasing and the budget projections show it continuing to increase. Further, the department indicates in its master plan that the facilities at Folsom, San Quentin and the California Mens Colony—West Facility do not meet standards, and it is questionable whether they can be renovated to meet the needs of the department. Thus, we believe replacement facilities are necessary, even if it can be shown that additional capacity is not required. It appears that the San Diego facility is being deferred because of the lack of a financial commitment to the department's program and not because of the absence of need.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY

## Item 370 from the General Fund

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$845,040
Reecommended for approval .....	845,040
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item covers a schedule of six noncapacity construction projects at two institutions. These projects, two of which are for working drawings only, represent critical utility replacements or expansions. Four of the projects are at one of the oldest Youth Authority institutions, the Preston School of Industry.

- (a) *Southern California Youth Center, sewage treatment and disposal facilities* ..... \$219,200

*We recommend approval.*

A utilities study was conducted by the Office of Architecture and Construction during the master plan development for the Southern California Youth Center by which it was determined that it would be to the state's best interest to participate with the City of Chino in the expansion of its sewage plant rather than to enlarge the state facilities which are presently operating at capacity. Because of timing considerations, the ensuing project was proposed in two phases. The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$185,000 to fund the first phase of this project. This will provide for sizing the trunk sewerlines sufficient to handle the sewage discharge from four institutions at the Southern California Youth Center as well as the discharge from the three institutions operated by the Department of Corrections on the same general site.

The amount proposed in this item will purchase capacity of 500,000 gallons per day in the city's treatment plant. This capacity will be sufficient to accommodate the existing 1,200-bed Youth Training School, the 375-bed Older Boys' Reception Center scheduled for completion in May of 1970, the 480-bed Medical Psychiatric Institution scheduled for completion in September of 1971 and one additional institution included in the ultimate master plan for this center. Although the trunk sewer lines will be sized to handle the sewage discharge from the Department of Corrections facilities, as a matter of expediency and in the interest of economy it is not proposed to reserve capacity in the city's plant for those institutions at present. This decision was based upon a recommendation by the Office of Architecture and Construction which recognizes that it would not be economically feasible to discontinue operation of the state's sewage plant at this time. Funds were expended in 1962 to improve the state's plant, which is currently operating at capacity, and it is anticipated that the elimination of the Southern California Youth Center's discharge will assure continued operation of the state's facility until at least 1975.

- (b) *Paso Robles School for Boys, electrical distribution system rehabilitation* ..... \$233,870

## Department of the Youth Authority—Continued

*We recommend approval.*

The Office of Architecture and Construction conducted an investigation of the electrical distribution system at this institution and concluded that it is seriously "outmoded and lacking in operational versatility and flexibility." The underground system consists of a single feeder which is unsectionalized and ungrounded. Consequently, any line or cable fault in the system results in a loss of power to a large part of the institution. It was recommended that steps be taken to provide a reliable system with the ability to localize trouble and allow critical segments of the institution to continue operation during power failures.

The amount requested in this item will provide a second underground feeder circuit in an existing spare duct paralleling the present system. The new system will be installed so as to permit sectionalizing at key points such as the kitchen, hospital, administration building and boiler plant to permit switching to an alternate feeder in case of failure. As part of this project, the state-owned power substation will be replaced by the utility company with a new, totally enclosed substation providing stepdown service.

(c) *Preston School of Industry, replace sound security and telephone distribution system* ----- \$157,270

*We recommend approval.*

The institution's sound security and telephone distribution system was installed in 1953 and consists of a single cable installed primarily in underground raceways. The cable is poorly insulated, resulting in considerable cross talk between lines and causing the sound security system to malfunction intermittently. Various proposals to correct the system's deficiencies were studied and rejected pending approval of a prototype solid state channel identification amplifier system being installed at the Northern California Reception Center and Clinic. The success of that endeavor has led to the recommendation for this project.

It is proposed to renovate the distribution system by installing new separate plastic insulated cables for the sound security and the telephone distribution system in the existing underground raceways and building service conduits.

The existing amplifiers for the 21-channel sound security system will be replaced with modern transistorized equipment while the existing microphones, loud speakers and other related equipment will be retained and reused. In addition, existing radio programming will be separated from the sound security system and new transistorized amplifiers and loudspeakers will be installed in the living areas to permit independent operation.

(d) *Preston School of Industry, steam distribution rehabilitation, phase II* ----- \$205,100

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$250,000 to replace some of the underground steamlines serving this facility. Several of these lines are prefabricated conduits buried directly in the ground. This method of

## Department of the Youth Authority—Continued

installation has permitted ground water penetration of the jacket in numerous places causing considerable heat loss and major failures. It was estimated that it will ultimately cost \$645,700 to completely rehabilitate the steam distribution system and the initial appropriation concentrated on replacing the most deteriorated and hazardous sections first.

The amount requested for this second phase of work will permit continued replacement of deteriorated lines and is based upon priorities and recommendations made by the Office of Architecture and Construction following an intensive utility survey and facility study made in 1967. Phase III is projected for the 1970-71 fiscal year at an estimated cost of \$128,100. It is anticipated that this amount will successfully complete this rehabilitation project and assure efficient and trouble-free operation of the steam distribution system for a long period of time.

- (e) *Preston School of Industry, working drawings—rehabilitate electrical distribution and emergency electrical power systems* ----- \$12,100

*We recommend approval.*

The Office of Architecture and Construction published a Utility Survey and Facility Study in May of 1968 covering electrical code violations on the entire institution and making recommendations for corrective action. In order to adequately evaluate the scope of work to be accomplished in relationship to the cost, funds for working drawings only are requested. Concentration will be on correcting the most serious deficiencies which the institution is not capable of correcting through its normal maintenance programs. Construction funds in the amount of \$150,090 are projected for the 1970-71 fiscal year but it is not possible at this time to anticipate accurately the scope of work involved or attest to the adequacy of that estimate.

- (f) *Preston School of Industry, working drawings—replacements and repairs to water distribution system* -- \$17,500

*We recommend approval of the amount requested.*

This institution presently has two water systems. Drinking water is purchased from the Pacific Gas and Electric Company and piped five miles via a line installed in 1930 to the institution's water treatment plant which serves as the distribution point. Nonpotable water is transported nine miles to the institution in an open ditch and pipeline system. The latter system has a number of deficiencies which have caused a significant reduction in the quantity of water that ultimately reaches the institution. The Office of Architecture and Construction conducted a survey of this system in April of 1968 and outlined a corrective program to be accomplished in six phases at an estimated cost of \$631,000. The amount requested in this item will permit additional field testing in order to more thoroughly define the scope of work involved, as well as the preparation of working drawings to more accurately determine the costs of corrective measures.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY

## Item 371 from the General Fund

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$370,220
Recommended for approval .....	370,220
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

The amount proposed in this item will finance 14 minor construction and improvement projects at seven of the department's eleven institutions and one of the department's four conservation camps. The proposal is \$211,720 greater than allocated in the current year and represents an increase in excess of 133 percent. This increase has been offset by a comparable reduction in the amount proposed for maintenance projects and included in the department's support budget request. The net effect of this shift in emphasis is a proposed total funding level only slightly above the current year. Of the 14 projects proposed, seven are improvements at the Preston School of Industry and the Southern California Reception Center and Clinic and account for two-thirds or \$248,970 of the total amount requested. Following is a description of the projects proposed, by institution.

*Northern California Reception Center and Clinic..... \$41,870*

In order to implement a 45-bed residential treatment program, \$30,000 is requested to modify a portion of the Youth Authority's Sacramento facility. One 50-bed dormitory, by virtue of its location on the institution grounds, and a portion of the existing commissary building will be utilized for this program. Because the concept for this facility represents a significant departure from the normal activities of the center, a fence will be constructed to separate it from the remainder of the institution. The additional work to be accomplished within the funds requested includes some minor modifications to the existing dormitory facility and the remodeling of a portion of the commissary building to provide office space for administrative staff. We are skeptical as to the adequacy of the amount requested because it has not been substantiated by the preparation of preliminary plans or a formal estimate. We anticipate that this deficiency will be corrected in time for the budget hearings.

The hospital at this institution is presently without a room of sufficient size, within visual staff supervision, to serve as an activity space for ward patients who are not confined to their beds. An \$11,870 project is proposed to convert three rooms and a linen closet into a single hospital dayroom to provide space for television viewing, games, group discussion, reading and visiting. The proposed room will be immediately adjacent to a nurses' station.

*Southern California Reception Center and Clinic..... \$119,600*

When this center was originally constructed, no architectural provisions were made for indoor or outdoor visiting. Consequently, the

## Department of the Youth Authority—Continued

institution has been forced to use day room space and an uncovered outside lawn area to satisfy the visiting program requirements. This arrangement has seriously hampered programming non-visitor activities, particularly during inclement weather. To alleviate this situation, \$59,350 is requested to provide a covered visiting area and adjacent toilet facilities in the area presently used for outdoor visiting.

The institution's laundry and clothing building is not large enough to handle the amount of incoming and outgoing laundry and there is no provision for loading and unloading the bulky hampers utilized by correctional industries in their laundry program. To correct this situation, it is proposed to construct an 800-square-foot addition to the existing building and provide a covered loading dock at an estimated cost of \$30,850. Also proposed for this institution is a \$29,400 project to install fans on the roofs of seven living unit dayrooms. Since these dormitories were originally constructed, program offices and storage rooms were added on each side of the dayrooms. This construction virtually eliminated cross ventilation, causing considerable discomfort during inclement and hot weather and affecting ward behavior. It is felt that the installation of roof-mounted ventilation units will alleviate this condition.

*Washington Ridge Youth Conservation Camp*----- \$3,700

To insure that the two Youth Authority vehicles assigned to this facility are available for emergency use at all times, particularly during severe inclement weather, \$3,700 is requested to construct a garage.

*Fricot Ranch School for Boys*----- \$19,000

At the time the Fricot program center was constructed, it was necessary to delete from the program a proposed parking lot due to insufficient funds. This request will complete that project and provide adequate parking for employees and visitors at the center.

*Paso Robles School for Boys*----- \$43,000

A program was initiated in 1966 to improve the roads and drainage system at this institution. A study conducted by the Office of Architecture and Construction in 1965 recommended a project be undertaken in six phases to correct a drainage problem which had existed since the institution was constructed. A total of \$91,300 has already been appropriated for this program and the \$43,000 requested will continue it. Additional phases will be proposed in subsequent budgets.

*Preston School of Industry*----- \$129,370

A three-phase project has been proposed in an effort to achieve consolidation of the institution's maintenance shop space into a corporation yard complex. Phase I for \$64,070 will initiate that proposal with the construction of a 500 square foot combination paint shop, warehouse and office structure. We concur with the need for this project because the existing maintenance shops at this institution are small, inadequate and scattered, causing supervision problems and promoting inefficiency.

## Department of the Youth Authority—Continued

A \$16,930 project is proposed to initiate modernization of the institution hospital. This request will start remodeling and renovation intended to improve heating, cooling, lighting and utility service along with related interior refinishing work.

During certain periods, food handling areas in the institution are subjected to a serious flying insect problem. The Office of Architecture and Construction has proposed installing fan-type air screens over the outside doors leading to food handling, preparation and storage areas at an estimated cost of \$30,230.

The remaining project proposed at this institution will correct a security and life safety problem in one of the housing units. This unit, known as Acacia Lodge, houses the institution's more disturbed wards. The individual rooms in this facility are located on two levels. Access to the second level is via an enclosed stairway and an open balcony type corridor. The enclosed stairway represents a serious security and supervision problem and the balcony railing is too low. To correct these problems, \$18,141 is requested to permit the installation of open prefabricated steel stairways at each end of the two-story space and to increase the height of the railing.

*Youth Training School*..... \$6,680

Combustible materials used in the vocational shop area are stored at random throughout the premises. The amount requested will permit construction of a roof over an area that is presently fenced to enable consolidation of these combustible materials and remove some hazardous situations that now exist.

*Ventura School for Girls*..... \$7,000

The storage capacity at this institution has become inadequate due to an increasing utilization of frozen foods. The amount requested will correct this deficiency with the installation of a prefabricated 16-foot by 10-foot walk-in freezer to be installed in one corner of the existing commissary building.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY

## Item 372 from the General Fund

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$541,500
Recommended for approval .....	541,500
Recommended reduction .....	None

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item covers a schedule of three equipment proposals at two institutions for facilities now under construction or funded for construction as follows:

(a) *Southern California Youth Center, equip central facilities* ..... \$220,000



## Department of the Youth Authority—Continued

*We recommend approval.*

The central administration and service facilities at the Youth Training School near Chino, are undergoing expansion in order to service a new institution that is currently under construction as well as two additional facilities being planned. This phase of the expansion program is scheduled for completion in August of this year. The amount requested will provide equipment for expanded food service facilities, maintenance shops, expansion of the fire station, additional warehousing space and an initial increment of automotive equipment. We have examined the itemized list which supports this request and feel the amount is justified. Although the budget projects an additional \$20,000 increment for the 1970-71 fiscal year, we believe that the amount presently requested will be sufficient to equip this program.

(b) *Southern California Youth Center, equip older boys reception center* ----- \$306,500

*We recommend approval.*

The older boys reception center is scheduled for completion in May of 1970 with a projected capacity of 375 wards. The total estimated cost of the equipment required for this facility is \$640,000. The \$306,500 requested by this item is the first increment of a split-funding proposal.

(c) *Los Guilucos School for Girls, equip adjustment unit modification* ----- \$15,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$180,000 to provide the additions and alterations necessary to initiate an intensive treatment program for the more disturbed girls in this institution. The program will provide for 32 girls when modifications are completed in early 1970. This request will provide the equipment required to make the program operational. We have examined the itemized list prepared by the department to substantiate this request and feel it is reasonable and justified.

## Department of Education

## SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF, BERKELEY

## Item 373 from the General Fund

Requested 1969-70	\$27,000
Recommended for approval	27,000
Recommended reduction	None

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

Many of the buildings at this school were built in the early 1930's. Consequently, certain areas are showing signs of deterioration due to weathering or extended use. This item proposes four minor projects totaling \$27,000. Three are needed to correct some of the environmental

## School for the Deaf, Berkeley—Continued

deficiencies that result from this deterioration. The most unusual item is a request for \$5,600 to reinforce a portion of a 75-year-old stone wall paralleling Dwight Way at the north boundary of the school. This wall was constructed without any foundation and a segment of it approximately 160 feet long is presently leaning inward in some places over seven inches out of plumb. A structural survey by the Office of Architecture and Construction recommended stabilization as the most economical approach to correcting a potential hazard.

The remaining two rehabilitation projects totaling \$9,000 affect two dormitories. The ceramic tile floors in the two toilet areas of Norton Hall are badly deteriorated and it is estimated that \$2,000 will be required to replace them with seamless epoxy floor coverings. A similar project for Rund Hall proposes the replacement of old linoleum and ceramic tile floors in the hallways, toilets and showers. The latter project also includes the replacement of existing toilet stalls with new baked enamel partitions for a total project cost of \$7,000.

The remaining project constitutes a request for \$12,400 to initiate fire and life safety corrections in the carpenter and paint shop areas of the maintenance building. This request is based upon recommendations made by the State Fire Marshal following an inspection which disclosed several conditions that present a distinct safety hazard.

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

**Item 374 from the General Fund**

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$85,000
Recommended for approval .....	18,000
Recommended reduction .....	67,000

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS**

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Analysis page</i>
Reduce amount to provide only for the preparation of preliminary plans .....	\$67,000	--

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend that this item be reduced by \$67,000, leaving \$18,000 for the preparation of preliminary plans.*

A program for the construction of a facility for the multihandicapped deaf, to be located at Riverside, was developed in 1963. A master plan was subsequently prepared providing for a facility with an ultimate capacity of 240 resident students with sufficient classroom space for an additional 40 students. In 1965, preliminary plans were prepared for what was designated, Multihandicapped Unit, Phase I. Essentially what was done was to carve out of the original master plan those elements that would initially provide for 60 students. This included dormitory and classroom space, a multipurpose building and a combination clinic and administrative office building.

**California School for the Deaf, Riverside—Continued**

The \$85,000 requested is to provide working drawings for a facility based upon the concept developed in 1965 from the 1963 program. The estimated project cost has been updated to reflect current construction costs, but the plans have not been updated to reflect current program needs. This is because the department is currently in the process of updating the original program. This updating is underway even though the department has had no experience with all the various types of multihandicapped deaf children which the unit will ultimately serve.

We have recommended in our analysis of Items 98 and 99 for support of the California School for the Deaf, Riverside, the implementation of an experimental program, accommodating 16 children and utilizing existing facilities, for the multihandicapped deaf. We believe this experiment will provide operational experience which can have a substantial bearing on the ultimate design of a permanent facility and the nature of the program offered. We therefore recommend that this item be reduced to \$18,000 to provide only for the preparation of preliminary plans for a new multihandicapped facility.

**Department of Education****CALIFORNIA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF, RIVERSIDE****Item 375 from the General Fund**

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$38,615
Recommended for approval .....	2,150
Recommended reduction .....	36,465

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS**

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Analysis page</i>
Delete project for temporary multihandicapped unit .....	\$36,465	993

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend the item be reduced by \$36,465.*

This item finances three minor construction and improvement projects. The most significant is a request for \$36,465 for ground preparation and the installation of utilities for a temporary multihandicapped unit. This site preparation would provide for the installation of three mobile units in order to establish a temporary program for 30 multihandicapped deaf children. The installation of these units would enable the school to expand an existing program from 16 to 30 children. In our analysis of Items 98 and 99 for support of the California School for the Deaf, Riverside, on page 269, we recommend against this expansion. Instead, we recommend implementation of an experimental program utilizing the existing facilities which presently accommodate the 16 children. Consistent with that approach, we recommend deletion of the funds provided for site development.

The two remaining proposals total \$2,150. This amount includes \$875 to construct portable backstops for the softball diamonds and \$1,275 for asphalt road repairs. The latter request will provide for the appli-

## California School for the Deaf, Riverside—Continued

cation of an asphalt emulsion type sealer to 31,875 square feet of roadway to prevent deterioration and to extend the useful life of the original paved surface.

**HIGHER EDUCATION****Item 376 from the General Fund**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$69,000,000
Recommended for approval .....	69,000,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Bill proposes a total capital outlay program of \$82,029,300 for both major and minor projects in the University of California and the state college system. The program is proposed to be made payable from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education.

This fund receives, along with General Fund transfers, royalties from state tidelands and Long Beach tidelands. The accumulated surplus in this fund as of July 1, 1969, is projected at \$9,917,490. During the fiscal year, revenues to the fund from tidelands sources are estimated at \$22,990,946, making a grand total of \$32,908,436 available. This is substantially below the total amount of proposed appropriations.

This item proposes to transfer from the General Fund to the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education a lump sum total of \$69 million. This transfer would then require only \$13,029,300 to be financed from the balances in the special fund. The result of this combination financing would be to leave a projected surplus, as of June 30, 1970, of \$19,879,136 in the special fund. However, \$9 million of this surplus is intended to be reserved for anticipated increased costs of construction of projects funded in the 1968-69 fiscal year and those proposed for the 1969-70 fiscal year. This reservation is based on the indicated rate of rise of the national construction cost index. Furthermore, this reservation would leave a balance of \$10,879,136 as apparently available for appropriation. However, it should be recognized that the projected revenues for this fund in the new fiscal year may not materialize in the amounts indicated. Consequently, this apparent surplus may turn out to be substantially less and should be left as a cushion for this reason.

The total proposed "package" compares with the current fiscal year in that appropriations were \$90,787,737 towards which a lump sum appropriation from the General Fund of \$53 million was made so that the demand on the special fund was under \$38 million, which left a carryover balance for July 1, 1969 of the \$9,917,490 as previously mentioned. We suggest that it is prudent not to appropriate or commit expenditures from the special fund beyond the amount proposed. In any case, transfers will be made from the General Fund only as cash is required.

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

## Item 377 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$23,962,000
Recommended for approval .....	20,377,000
Recommended for special review .....	3,585,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The total contemplated major working drawing, construction and property acquisition program, for the University of California exclusive of preliminary plans, equipment and minor projects, is \$41,161,000. This includes the \$23,962,000 in the item under discussion \$3,028,000 appropriated by Item 328.1 Budget Act of 1968, \$13,838,000 of federal funds and \$333,000 of state funds in a special "control item" for land acquisition at San Francisco. Of the total of \$41,161,000 \$15,271,109 represents new major capacity construction directly funded by the state, \$13,000,109 represents new major academic capacity funded from federal sources and \$637,000 represents working drawings for major capacity facilities which when constructed, will ultimately cost in excess of \$15 million from both state and federal sources. The balance of \$12,253,891 represents mostly utilities developments and expansions, some minor remodeling of existing facilities to suit new purposes and some property acquisition. The following deals with the 26 subitems contained in the direct state appropriation and comments on the project funded by Item 328.1 in the 1968 Budget Act for expenditure after July 1, 1969.

## Berkeley

(a) *Alterations—Doe Library* ..... \$105,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Doe Memorial Library Building was built in two stages in 1908 and 1915. The basic building consists of a basement and four stories with an internal, free-standing book stack of steel framing having nine levels. The proposal to provide alterations revolves around the need to meet serious code violations particularly with respect to fire exits and separations. In addition, ventilation improvements are urgently needed and improved access is required in order to provide for free student access to the book stacks instead of the more costly present system of using employees to obtain and issue books. We have examined the project very carefully on site and have reviewed it with campus personnel. As now proposed it is significantly lower than the original estimate because of the elimination of certain marginal elements.

(b) *Alterations—life science building* ..... \$528,000

*We recommend approval.*

The life science building was completed in 1930 and probably represents a classic example of stringent fund limitations with excess attention paid to outward appearances and inadequate attention paid

## University of California—Continued

to interior function. As a result the building has always been substandard in lighting, ventilation, elevators, utilities and in almost any interior functional aspect that might be named. While it served largely as a lower division laboratory building, it was reasonably tenable with all its shortcomings. However, as it grew into an upper division and research facility, successive waves of alterations had to be performed to upgrade the building to meet the demands of sophisticated programs. This is a continuing phenomenon since much of the building still remains as it was originally constructed.

The present proposal covers a wide variety of improvements and alterations to permit new and more sophisticated programs to take over existing spaces. Many of the existing laboratory spaces are so crude and primitive as to be substandard even when compared with a modest high school plant. We have reviewed, on site, every detail of the proposal and there has been elimination of some marginal elements so that the amount that remains is fully justified.

(c) *Alterations—Cory Hall* ----- \$77,000

*We recommend approval.*

This building was originally completed in 1949 as a laboratory building with large high ceilinged interior spaces generally oriented towards electrical engineering. With the increase in upper division and graduate engineering programs, the spaces have gradually been altered and in a number of instances mezzanine floors have been constructed in the high ceilinged areas.

This proposal continues the program of remodeling and increased sophistication. We have reviewed the details in the building and a number of marginal elements have been eliminated. The total remaining program includes, in addition to the \$77,000 of state funds, an anticipated grant of \$175,000 from federal sources.

## Davis

(d) *Construct—utilities, 1969-70* ----- \$843,000

*We recommend approval.*

This project represents a conglomeration of utilities extensions, some to new buildings currently under construction and others to increase capacities on the campus generally where acute shortcomings now exist.

It covers chilled waterlines for air conditioning, distilled water lines, domestic and utility waterlines, steamlines for heating, gaslines, sanitary sewer and storm drain lines and various power and communication lines. The list of individual segments was carefully screened on site and a number of marginal elements eliminated. The amount now proposed is completely justified and necessary.

(e) *Construct—utilities and site development—experimental animal housing* ----- \$476,000

*We recommend approval.*

A new veterinary teaching hospital is under construction in the area of the campus to be devoted to the health sciences. This hospital is

## University of California—Continued

expected to be ready for occupancy in the fall of 1969. In order to function properly, it must have a large supply of experimental animals. It is proposed to develop a special area for this purpose which is about one mile from the hospital. Financing for the first unit of experimental animal housing is contained in another item in this budget and is provided from state funds released by federal grants.

The project under consideration here is to provide the utilities and roads necessary to make the new site functional and usable. It will consist of a domestic water system, a sanitary sewer system, gas supplies, overhead powerlines and switchgear, a storm drainage system and major access roads. We have reviewed the project in detail and the costs are in line. The facilities are essential to the new teaching hospital.

(f) *Acquisition of land at Sacramento General Hospital---* \$200,000  
*We recommend approval.*

An integral and important part of the medical education program at Davis includes the use of the Sacramento General Hospital for intern programs and research. The facilities at the hospital are inadequate to provide all of the space required for university medical school purposes. Consequently, it is proposed to purchase 20 acres of the adjoining old State Fair site to permit construction, from time to time, of additional technical and office facilities required to make the program adequate. We have reviewed the concept in detail and we are in agreement with the approaches and goals. The amount proposed is based on estimates provided by the Department of General Services as to the value of the land. The first project to use this site is the one immediately following.

(g) *Construct—facilities—Sacramento General Hospital,*  
*Step 2 -----* \$423,000

*We recommend approval.*

In the immediately preceding subitem we pointed out the need to acquire land on which to provide additional space for university medical school needs. Originally the concept was to renovate some of the existing general hospital complex which proved to be unsuitable and probably even more costly than the present proposal. It is now planned to build or put in place approximately 14,000 gross square feet of so-called "relocatable" buildings similar to the surge medical buildings that were built on the Davis campus last year. This building will have a useful or assignable area of 9,800 square feet giving an efficiency ratio of 70 percent which is excellent for the purpose. The cost as of October 1968, when the construction cost index was 1170, is estimated at \$23.50 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and \$30.36 per square foot at total project level exclusive of movable equipment.

The building will provide faculty research labs, operating rooms, central support and administrative offices. Facilities of this kind when built in the more conventional permanent type of buildings would be substantially more costly. The proposal appears to be justified.

## University of California—Continued

(h) *Working drawings—veterinary medical facilities, unit 2 \$406,000*

*We recommend approval.*

This project, which will provide plans for student laboratories and clinical science departments, is the second step of a three-step program to implement major expansion and relocation of the school of veterinary medicine. In its relocation it will become an integral part of the health sciences complex on this campus.

The project contemplates a highly sophisticated and complex four-story structure having a gross area in excess of 267,500 square feet with a net assignable area of over 151,000 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of about 56.5 percent which is the minimum limit we would consider acceptable for a science facility of this type. The ultimate cost based on estimates made in October of 1968 would be nearly \$13,500,000 at total project level including all fees and contingencies but excluding movable furnishings and equipment. Almost 60 percent of the cost will probably be covered by federal grants. The balance, plus groups II and III equipment, will require state financing.

The building will provide classrooms, multidiscipline laboratories, research laboratories, related service facilities and offices. All of the veterinary medicine facilities will have a strong interrelationship with the human medical facilities and there will be a joint use of library, instructional resources and student oriented spaces. The concept appears to be sound and justifiable. It should be noted, however, that the cost including all sources of financing, will probably be well over \$43 per gross square foot for the basic building alone and over \$50 per gross square foot at total project level.

## Irvine

(i) *Construct—utilities and site development, 1969-70— \$1,005,000*

*We recommend approval.*

This project provides for the construction of utility tunnel extensions to serve administration unit 1 for which construction funding is proposed in another subitem. In addition, it will provide the mechanical and electrical services in the new tunnel as well as in the existing so-called "spoke" tunnel in order to make up the total runs to the administration building. The major part of the proposal covers the extension of mechanical and electrical utilities in the ring and spoke tunnel to serve the social sciences unit 1 for which construction funds are also proposed in another subitem. There will be minimal road and walk extensions, minimal lighting and an extension of a storm drainline.

In a closer review of the project, at least one-third of the original proposal has been deferred either on a timing basis or because needs were not absolutely critical. Costs have been carefully reviewed and appear to be in line.



## University of California—Continued

(j) *Working drawings—humanities-social science unit 1, conversion* ----- \$10,000

*We recommend approval.*

The humanities-social sciences building was one of the five initial permanent structures erected on this campus. Originally, it served as a multidisciplinary facility with the expectation that, as additional permanent buildings were constructed, certain temporary uses would be phased out. The fine arts unit 1 and engineering unit 1 are under construction with the latter nearing completion. Social sciences unit 1 is proposed for construction in this budget. When these new buildings are complete, activities occupying nearly 15,000 assignable square feet in the building will be moved to the new ones. It is proposed to remodel the vacated space to provide changed air distribution, changed lighting, switches and outlets and some partition alterations. The altered areas will provide essentially teaching and laboratory facilities. Additional space will be vacated but little or no work will be required in these phases although some equipment may be added. Essentially, the change will permit the School of Humanities to expand to meet enrollment growth. Based on estimates made in October 1968, the ultimate total cost of the project will be over \$230,000 exclusive of groups II and III equipment. The costs appear to be in line for the purpose.

(k) *Construct—administration unit 1* ----- \$3,585,000

*We recommend special review.*

The Budget Act of 1966 appropriated \$100,000 for the preparation of working drawings for an administrative office unit and the University allocated \$48,000 from preliminary plans funds under its control, making a total of \$148,000 available for planning and working drawing purposes. The structure is contemplated as having almost 103,000 square feet of gross area with a net assignable area of nearly 61,200 square feet. This gives an efficiency ratio of 59 percent which we consider to be the minimum acceptable level for what is essentially an office building. The most current estimate of the total project cost based on a construction cost index of 1,200 is \$3,733,000 which would indicate a cost of over \$30 per square foot for the basic construction and over \$36 per foot at total project level. We have raised some questions concerning this cost which we feel is relatively high. They have not as yet been resolved but it is anticipated that some clarification will be available by the time the project is heard by the legislative committees.

## Los Angeles

*Construct—hospital and clinics unit 1, alterations, step 2* \$3,038,000

*We recommend approval.*

*It will be recalled that fairly well along in the legislative session of 1968, a proposal was made to include in the budget the above amount with the restriction that no funds would be available for expenditure until July 1, 1969. The proposal was accepted and became Item 328.1*

## University of California—Continued

of the Budget Act of 1968. The purpose of making the appropriation in this way was to indicate to the federal government the state's preparedness to provide its share of the funds so that the federal government could make the necessary commitment for a grant to this project. In effect, this made the project the number one priority of the University and its inclusion in the present budget is part of the total University package for 1969. The project is discussed here for that reason although it is not a new appropriation.

The total project cost from all sources, exclusive of movable equipment is almost \$5,800,000. The alterations are extremely complex and include work to be done in many areas of the facility. Generally they can be categorized as, (1) expanding and modernizing various clinical facilities to accommodate the expanded instructional research and public service programs, (2) expanding and modernizing the basic service and ancillary facilities necessary to support the expanded level of operations and (3) improving and modernizing various basic elements in the existing structure to bring them to present-day standards and code requirements. Areas to be remodeled include operating rooms and related surgery facilities, kitchen facilities to accommodate new food preparation and service techniques, facilities for orthopedics—neurosurgery in the outpatient clinic and improvements in the departments of radiology, clinical laboratories, pharmacy, pediatrics, nurseries, and the delivery suites as well as hospital administration. One of the major elements is the addition of airconditioning to critical areas which did not have this in their original construction. The project was reviewed on site on a number of occasions in great detail and we have concluded that all the elements of the proposal are justified and the costs are in line.

## Riverside

(l) Construct—utilities, 1969-70 ----- \$316,000

We recommend approval.

This project provides the most essential utilities necessary to accommodate the expansion of Webber Hall, the funding for which is included in this budget. The amount proposed represents about one-fourth of the project as originally submitted. The balance has been deferred either for timing reasons or because the nature of the various elements was not of sufficiently critical importance to justify funding at this time.

(m) Construct—library building alterations, step 2----- \$162,000

We recommend approval.

The third and final addition to the library on this campus is nearing completion and certain minimum alterations to the existing facilities are necessary to permit proper functioning of the newest addition with the balance of the facility. Alterations include the moving of walls, lighting changes, air distribution changes and alterations at certain access points to increase operational efficiency. The changes are justified and the costs appear to be in line.

## University of California—Continued

(n) *Construct—Webber Hall addition* ----- \$5,588,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$175,000 for the preparation of working drawings and the university allocated \$126,200 from its preliminary plan funds for an extensive and sophisticated addition to Webber Hall. The new structure would have over 156,000 gross square feet of area with a net assignable area of approximately 85,200 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of only 55 percent. However, this is a complex laboratory building in which the efficiency ratio is degraded by virtue of the fact that it must be connected to the existing building at every level and the connecting bridges count as part of the gross area. If these are eliminated as part of the gross then the efficiency is considerably improved and falls within the acceptable range for this type of structure. Actually, the addition consists of three distinct elements one of which is state funded, another totally federally funded and the third a computer center also state funded. If the two state elements are measured without the federal wing, the efficiency exceeds 60 percent. The federal wing is totally supported by federal funds and its poor efficiency is essentially a result of the great fragmentation of the space into small research laboratories.

The total project cost will be almost \$7 million of which the federal wing will represent \$1,431,000. The balance is a combination of both state and federal grant funds. The current cost is about \$36 a gross square foot for the basic building and over \$42 at total project level. The costs appear to be in line for the purpose.

## San Diego

(o) *Construct—addition, central utilities building, step 2* \$1,415,000

*We recommend approval.*

The first step in the development of a central utilities plant for this campus consisted of a building large enough to accommodate several phases of equipment and original equipment sufficient to carry the initial load. There is presently under construction on the San Diego campus probably more total square footage than on any other university campus. When these buildings are completed, and completion will occur in steps rather than all at one time, substantial increases in central utility plant capacities will be required.

This proposal essentially covers equipment to increase boiler and chiller capacities together with instrumentation and ancillary equipment such as pumps, piping, cooling tower, etc. The total project cost will probably be on the order of \$1,748,000 with anticipated federal grant funds to make up the difference. It should be recognized that the major equipment requires very long lead times between placing orders and final delivery. Consequently the expanded capacity would probably not be available for at least two years. Therefore, it is essential that funds be provided now to permit immediate placement of orders. We believe the costs are in line for the facilities contemplated. The major elements are one steam boiler rated at 50,000,000-BTU-per-hour, natural

## University of California—Continued

gas fired with fuel oil standby, one heat exchanger to convert steam to high temperature hot water of a similar capacity, one centrifugal water chiller, steam turbine driven with a 4,000-ton capacity and one cooling tower cell.

(p) *Construct—utilities and site development, 1969-70* --- \$240,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal covers extensions of water and storm drain systems to the central university library area which is now under construction, extension of some elements of the campus water system where needs have become critical and some relatively minor service road construction. All are considered critical and the amount proposed represents less than half of the original project as submitted. We believe the need is justified and the costs are in line.

(q) *Construct—alterations to Urey Hall and physics-chemistry building* ----- \$219,000

*We recommend approval.*

Urey Hall was the first permanent building on the campus at Revelle College and as such was used for multidisciplinary purposes. As additional buildings have been or are being constructed, some of the extraneous elements will move out of the building into new facilities vacating space which will then be converted to more or less permanent uses in the building. In Urey Hall, about 9,200 assignable square feet will be converted to chemistry-aerospace laboratories. The vacated space in the physics-chemistry building is relatively minimal at 1,400 assignable square feet which will be converted to physics laboratories. The changes have always been part of the plan and the proposals are fully justified. The costs appear to be in line for the purpose.

(r) *Construct—improvements, San Diego County-University Hospital* ----- \$939,000

*We recommend approval.*

This project proposes working drawings and construction for a series of four major elements at the San Diego County Hospital which is now under the operational control of the University as a teaching hospital. The first element is for the remodeling and expansion of radiology facilities. It now has eight rooms while the expansion will result in a total of 11 rooms plus considerable remodeling and modernization of the existing spaces. The expansion logically moves into the area now occupied by the emergency suite which will move to another part of the first floor.

The movement of the emergency suite is the second major element which places these facilities in a more favorable position with respect to other elements on the first floor.

The third element is the remodeling of the existing operating room suite which contains 10 operating rooms of which only six are operable because of lack of adequate central facilities. The other four are being used for storage. The proposed remodeling will make all 10 operating

## University of California—Continued

rooms available plus adequate support facilities such as recovery rooms and rooms for instrument and equipment cleanup and repacking.

The fourth element is an expansion of the operating suite by building new space on the second floor on top of the roof of the first floor space which projects beyond the main building above. This will add almost 3,900 gross square feet of area with a net usable area of 2,950 square feet, giving a very high efficiency ratio of over 76 percent. To some degree the expansion is needed to permit the proper remodeling of the existing suite of 10 operating rooms. However, in addition, three new surgeries will be created, each larger than any now existing, which will be used for the more complicated surgical procedures such as organ transplants.

We believe the proposal is thoroughly justified if the hospital is to serve as an adequate facility for a university medical school curriculum. The cost for the proposal appears to be in line.

## Santa Barbara

*(s) Construct—utilities and site development, 1969-70— \$671,000*

*We recommend approval.*

This project consists of a conglomeration of utilities elements such as extensions of water mains, gas mains, sewer lines, etc. In addition, it includes the installation of a standby liquid petroleum fuel plant which will permit the entire campus to go on the "interruptable" natural gas rate at a very significant annual savings in gas consumption costs. It is anticipated that those activities, such as residence halls which are not state supported will either contribute in a proportionate measure to the cost of this element or will continue to pay to the campus the old gas rate as an offsetting value.

The total utilities and site development project as originally presented exceeded \$1,700,000. The two-thirds reduction represents timing deferments and elimination of elements for which critical needs did not exist. The project was reviewed in great detail both at conferences and on site. We consider those portions now included to be thoroughly justified and the costs are in line.

*(t) Working drawings—central heating and cooling system \$80,000*

*We recommend approval.*

The Santa Barbara campus has heretofore been developed on the basis that each separate building would contain its own heat generating equipment and, where justified, its own air-conditioning equipment. When the enrollment goals for this campus were relatively modest, this approach was reasonable and adequate. Now that the campus contemplates an enrollment goal of 20,000 or more, the fragmented approach to heating and cooling systems becomes costly both in ultimate total capital investment as well as significantly larger costs for operation and maintenance.

The University commissioned a study of the total problem on this campus by a highly qualified engineering firm. One of the elements in the study was the possibility of a "total energy" concept in which the

## University of California—Continued

campus would, in addition to heating and cooling, generate its own power. The study indicated that this would be uneconomic. However, the study has otherwise clearly indicated that a centralized heating and cooling system would save a significant amount of capital investment and annual cost over a 30-year period. The savings, of course, vary in accordance with the rate of growth of the campus and the extent to which it grows within that period. Nevertheless, based on current assumptions of campus and enrollment growth, the potential savings are conservatively in excess of \$10 million for the 30-year period. In addition, there would be the greater reliability of the heavier equipment used in a central plant. In the past, we have always recommended in favor of the central plant approach, particularly for large institutions. Nationally, the trend is accelerating in this direction, being applied even to large shopping centers and other noninstitutional installations. The initial phase to be covered by the working drawings proposed would have a total project value, including a small amount of movable furnishings and equipment, of over \$2,360,000 based on October 1968 cost levels. We suggest that the central plant approach for this campus is the most logical and prudent one. It should be borne in mind that the investment in the central plant does not represent an additional investment but a substitution of an accumulation of investments in individual buildings which would reduce the cost of each building accordingly.

(u) Construct—biological sciences unit 1, alterations----- \$200,000

*We recommend approval.*

Biological sciences unit 2 was recently completed and a number of activities were transferred from unit 1 to unit 2 in order to unify the various subdivisions under biological sciences. The alterations in the vacated space will convert existing lower division class laboratory and service areas to research laboratories and offices, an electron microscope room and satellite facilities, general teaching laboratories and preparation and storage rooms. The work will include some partitions, fume hoods, casework, laboratory benches, etc. The changes are justified in order to accommodate expanding enrollments in upper division and graduate areas. The costs are in line.

(v) Construct—physical sciences unit 1, alterations----- \$304,000

*We recommend approval.*

Physics unit 1 is expected to be completed in the spring of 1969 which will then permit the removal of the physics department from the physical sciences unit 1 structure. This will enable geology to expand into the vacated space which totals about 24,000 assignable square feet. The alterations will provide additional research space as well as teaching space for the department of geology. The changes represent planned expansions in these fields since it was always known in building physical sciences unit 1 that ultimately a physics building would permit the removal of physics from that building into its own structure. The proposals are justified by increased enrollment in the geology department and the costs are in line.

## University of California—Continued

(w) *Construct—engineering unit 2* ----- \$4,557,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$147,000 for the preparation of working drawings for engineering unit 2 and the University allocated \$70,500 for preliminary plans from its planning funds. The project contemplates a five-story reinforced concrete building having a gross area in excess of 115,300 square feet with a net assignable area of over 72,150 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 63 percent which is good for facilities intended to be used by upper division and graduate activities. The building will house some of the specialty activities such as chemical and nuclear engineering and mechanical and aeronautical engineering, all of which are significantly more costly, generally speaking, than the electrical engineering laboratories which were included in engineering unit 1. The cost estimate based on the construction cost index of October 1968 is approximately \$34.25 per gross square foot at building construction level and nearly \$42 per gross square foot at total project level. These compare favorably with costs of engineering facilities on other campuses. This unit together with engineering unit 1 will accommodate 785 FTE students based on current utilization rates.

## Santa Cruz

(x) *Construct—utilities and site development, 1969-70*----- \$612,000

*We recommend approval.*

This project covers a conglomeration of water, gas, electrical and sewerline extensions to accommodate buildings now under construction and in some cases for a new college to be constructed because the nature of the site is such that the utilities must be installed before any access road or building construction can take place on the site itself. Some road and pedestrian walk extension are included as well as storm drainage facilities. Generally, the various segments represent crucial needs for major projects already funded or under construction.

The proposal as originally presented came to over \$1,600,000. The reductions covered elements that could be deferred on a timing basis and others that were deferred because of failure to demonstrate acute need. The cost elements contained in the proposal are in line for the various kinds of work.

(y) *Construct—alteration to existing facilities, 1969-70*\_\_ \$265,000

*We recommend approval.*

The completion of natural sciences unit 2 made it possible to move certain activities from natural sciences unit 1 to the new building. Particularly these were astronomy, earth sciences, physics and some chemistry.

The vacated areas will be converted principally for the use of biology and organic chemistry. The alterations include the addition of a considerable amount of laboratory benches plus fume hoods, duct work and some partition work. To a considerable extent, the altered space will provide for upper division and graduate programs, including

## University of California—Continued

research. The project was reviewed at considerable length on site and in conference and the proposals appear to be justified on the basis of projected enrollments in these areas. The costs are in line.

(2) *Construct—academic portions, college 6* ----- \$736,000  
*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$28,000 for the preparation of working drawings for that portion of College No. 6 representing the state's interest in academic space. The university provided \$12,000 in preliminary plan moneys from funds under its control for this purpose. The academic area will be about 20,900 gross square feet with 13,400 square feet as assignable, giving an efficiency ratio of 64 percent which is average for the purpose. Estimates based on the construction cost index of October 1968 indicate a unit cost of \$29 per gross square foot of the basic building and \$36.17 at total project level. This compares with \$24.57 at construction level for the housing areas which are financed by loan funds and \$26.49 per gross square foot for auxiliary areas financed by gift funds. We have several times questioned the considerable discrepancy between the academic space and the other types of space, insofar as cost levels are concerned.

College No. 5 is to be bid on a segregated basis so that the academic areas, which are physically separated from the rest of the facilities, will receive a separate and distinct bid and thus provide some yardstick of what would be a fair share of the total cost to cover the state's area of responsibility. As of this writing, these bids are not available. Consequently, our recommendation for approval is based on the assumption that when such bids are available, appropriate adjustments will be made in College No. 6, if necessary.

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

## Item 378 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education

---

Requested 1969-70	-----	\$6,299,000
Recommended for approval	-----	6,299,000
Recommended reduction	-----	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item covers a schedule of 24 equipment projects related to construction projects previously funded and in most cases already under construction. Generally, these projects represent minimum equipment needed to make each facility operable and we concur with the amounts proposed.

## Berkeley

(a) *Equip—engineering materials, laboratory addition*----- \$165,000  
*We recommend approval.*

The addition to R. E. Davis Hall is scheduled for completion early in the current calendar year. State construction funds were provided by



## University of California—Continued

the Budget Act of 1964 and the Budget Act of 1968 provided a first equipment increment of \$500,000. In addition, there has been some federal assistance in equipping the project. It is anticipated that this second increment should complete the basic complement for the building.

The construction project will provide 87,500 square feet of assignable area which will be allotted to the division of structural engineering and structural mechanics plus a small amount for the divisions of hydraulics and sanitary engineering and transportation engineering. The equipment represents about 15 percent of the total construction project cost and as such is quite reasonable for the purpose.

## Davis

(b) *Equip—classroom and office unit 3* ----- \$55,000

This building with over 61,000 square feet of assignable space was funded for construction by the 1966 Budget Act. In addition, the Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$206,000 for a first phase of equipment. The construction cost of the building was partially supported by the federal government which also provided some equipment. The current proposal was reduced from an initial \$114,000 to the amount now requested and should represent the completion of the basic complement for this building.

Basically, the building accommodates instructional and research activities in the departments of mathematics, education, political science and sociology. A student lounge is also included in the building, but it is funded both for construction and equipment from nonstate sources. The two increments of equipment represent about 8 percent of the construction cost of the total project including the federal funds. This appears to be quite reasonable for the purpose.

(c) *Equip—medical surge unit* ----- \$304,000

*We recommend approval.*

Medical Surge Unit 3 was funded for construction in the Budget Act of 1967 and provided over 40,000 square feet of assignable area. The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$720,000 for the first phase of the initial complement of equipment. The present proposal will complete the equipment of unit 3 plus equipping laboratories in rented, so-called "speed space" buildings.

Because the surge buildings were constructed at a much lower cost than is normally experienced for permanent multistory structures, it becomes relatively meaningless to make any comparisons on a percentage cost basis. However, on the basis of the class sizes to be accommodated, it would appear that the equipping costs are lower per student than has heretofore been experienced, taking into account the effect of inflation. In this regard it should be noted that the types of equipment used in the medical sciences usually involve high costs and these costs have been escalating at a more rapid rate than less sophisticated and simpler types of equipment used in other scientific curricula. On this basis, the proposal appears to be fully justified.

## University of California—Continued

(d) *Equip—veterinary medical facility, unit 1—hospital* — \$485,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Teaching and Research Hospital Unit 1 was funded for construction by the Budget Act of 1965. The first phase of the initial equipment was appropriated for by the Budget Act of 1968 at \$300,000. In addition, there has been some substantial assistance in equipment by federal grants. The two phases of equipment totaling \$785,000 represent about 15 percent of the construction cost of the project which was over \$5 million including federal assistance. For a veterinary medical facility this is quite modest but it must be borne in mind that a substantial amount of equipment will be transferred from the existing hospital. Taking this into account, the cost appears to be reasonable.

## Irvine

(e) *Equip—physical sciences unit 1* ————— \$477,000

*We recommend approval.*

This building was funded for construction by the Budget Act of 1966 and \$500,000 was appropriated for a first phase of the initial equipment by the Budget Act of 1968. In addition, there were federal grants which assisted in equipping the building. The two phases represent about 19 percent of the total construction cost of the project including federal funds but excluding that portion of the building which was wholly federally financed and wholly equipped from federal sources. This percentage is reasonable for a complex physical sciences building.

(f) *Equip—medical surge facilities* ————— \$700,000

*We recommend approval.*

Construction funds for the construction of the medical surge facilities were provided in the Budget Acts of 1967 and 1968 in two steps. \$100,000 was appropriated for a first phase of initial equipment by the Budget Act of 1968. The present proposal represents a reduction of about one-third from the amount as originally submitted and it is anticipated that this will be adequate together with the prior amount to permit operation of the facilities. As previously noted, it is not practical to attempt to relate equipment costs to construction costs in a surge type of facility because the construction cost is so much less than in conventional buildings. Nevertheless, on the basis of enrollments to be accommodated, the cost for equipment appears to be reasonable.

## Los Angeles

(g) *Equip—north campus library unit 2* ————— \$258,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1968 funded the construction of Library Unit 2 which is an addition to an existing building. The present proposal is a first step in equipping the building and a second is scheduled for 1970. Some assistance in both construction and equipment has also been forthcoming from federal sources, particularly in connection

## University of California—Continued

with graduate teaching functions. At present, the second step is projected at \$533,000. In both cases, books are included in addition to book stacks and other reader station equipment. The costs appear to be reasonable.

(h) Equip—old public health building, alterations----- \$50,000  
We recommend approval.

Approximately 24,000 square feet of assignable space is being altered in the old Public Health Building for use by the language departments of the humanities division. The alteration work is scheduled for completion in mid-1969 and construction funding was appropriated in the Budget Act of 1968. The altered areas will provide general assignment classrooms for 635 FTE in addition to offices, conference rooms and research laboratories. The proposal in its present form appears reasonable.

(i) Equip—theater arts unit ----- \$45,000  
We recommend approval.

Theater Arts Unit 2 was funded for construction by the Budget Act of 1965 and an initial complement of equipment at \$300,000 was appropriated by the Budget Act of 1967. Since occupancy of the building in October of 1967, some areas have been found to be either inadequately equipped or have been entirely slighted. The growth of the program now requires this additional equipment. The proposal as initially received was over \$150,000. The equipment is mostly for a studio which could not be properly utilized because of inadequate equipment. In its present form, we believe that the additional request is reasonable.

(j) Equip—hospital and clinics unit 2b, step 2 ----- \$558,000  
We recommend approval.

The construction of this facility was appropriated for by the 1964 Budget Act and an initial increment of equipment at \$1 million was in the 1968 Budget Act. The present proposal is the second and presumably final increment. In addition, there have been several federal grants for both construction and equipment.

The two state funded increments totaling \$1,558,000 represent less than 16 percent of the total construction cost including the federal financing. This seems to be reasonable.

## Riverside

(k) Equip—library unit 3 ----- \$99,000  
We recommend approval.

The construction of Library Unit 3 was appropriated for in the Budget Act of 1966 and an initial phase of equipment was appropriated at \$292,000 by the Budget Act of 1968. In addition, there have been federal grants which assisted both in construction and equipment.

The addition has 88,000 assignable square feet. The two increments represent about 13 percent of the total construction cost of the project which was approximately \$3 million including federal aid. This appears to be reasonable.

## University of California—Continued

## San Diego

(l) Equip—buildings 2a and 2a'—John Muir College----- \$320,000

We recommend approval.

Buildings 2a and 2a' are the first permanent buildings in the second college, named John Muir. Funds for construction of the two buildings were appropriated by the Budget Act of 1966. A first increment of equipment at \$500,000 was appropriated for by the Budget Act of 1968. In addition, there has been federal grant assistance for both construction and equipment.

Building 2a has 71,000 assignable square feet of laboratories, classrooms and offices as well as the campus computer center. Building 2a' has 32,000 assignable square feet containing offices and laboratories for graduate instruction and research. The buildings will be occupied principally by the mathematics department, applied electro physics department, applied mathematics and computer services and an institute for physical sciences. The construction cost of the building including federal assistance was approximately \$5,400,000 and the two increments of equipment represent about 18 percent of that cost which is reasonable for science buildings of this type.

(m) Equip—buildings 2b and 2b', John Muir College----- \$400,000

We recommend approval.

The description of this project appears to be in error because the wing labeled as 2b' is to be federally financed including its equipment although some small amount of state equipment may go into it. In any case, building 2b has an assignable area of about 44,400 square feet mostly in laboratories for biology use but with some classrooms and offices as well. The construction of 2b was appropriated for in the Budget Act of 1967 and it is estimated that the total project cost including some federal grant funds will be about \$3 million. Consequently, this proposal represents slightly over 13 percent of the project cost which is lower than average and probably signifies that there will be a further proposal at some time in the future.

(n) Equip—buildings 2c and 2c', John Muir College----- \$385,000

We recommend approval.

This building of two wings was funded for construction in 1967 and federal grant funds were added to it. The two wings together have in excess of 63,000 square feet of assignable area which will house principally the departments of psychology and linguistics plus graduates and post-doctoral trainees in human information processing and language acquisition. These activities are presently being carried on in Revelle College which will gain considerable space when they are moved into these two new buildings.

The project cost is in excess of \$3 million and the equipment represents slightly less than 13 percent of the project cost which is within an acceptable range for facilities of this type.

## University of California—Continued

(o) Equip—central university library, step 1 ----- \$200,000

We recommend approval.

The central library, which will have over 110,000 square feet of assignable area, was funded for construction in 1967 and it is scheduled for occupancy in the spring of 1970. The cost at project level, including federal funds, is over \$5,200,000. This proposal represents only a first step in equipping the building, particularly with those elements which require the longest lead times to procure.

(p) Equip—basic science building ----- \$300,000

We recommend approval.

This complex facility was first funded for construction in the Budget Act of 1965 and an initial complement of equipment at \$228,000 was appropriated for in the Budget Act of 1967. In addition, \$53,800 was provided from minor funds and \$250,000 from institutional funds. The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated another increment of \$500,000, making a total of \$1,031,400 to date. The present proposal would increase this to a total of \$1,331,400 which, when compared with the cost of the project at over \$13 million including substantial federal grants, appears to be quite reasonable. However, it should be borne in mind that some of the federal grants covered equipment as well as construction. In any case, it would appear that the total funds available for equipment should be adequate until such time as the facility is more fully utilized.

(q) Equip—improvements at university hospital ----- \$15,000

We recommend approval.

In Item 377 for the University, there is a project (r) for remodeling and additional construction at the University-County Hospital which, among other things, provides additional surgeries and related spaces.

This equipment proposal covers the items necessary to make the surgeries operable and the amount appears reasonable for the purpose.

## San Francisco

(r) Equip—unit for pharmaceutical chemistry graduate  
program ----- \$131,000

We recommend approval.

The Budget Act of 1966 appropriated funds for equipment and the construction of space on one floor of the east tower of the twin health sciences buildings at this campus. It was anticipated that the amount for equipment was minimal and this proposal represents the total for the space which consists of about 8,000 square feet of assignable area on the 11th story of the tower. It will be recalled that the 16-story tower was originally constructed, with several interior floors still unfinished and to be funded by future appropriations either from the state or from the federal government. The equipment appears to be totally justified for the purpose.

## University of California—Continued

## Santa Barbara

(s) Equip—physics unit 1 ----- \$318,000

*We recommend approval.*

This structure has about 75,000 square feet of assignable area of which 61,000 feet were constructed by state funds and the balance by federal funds. State construction funds were appropriated in the Budget Act of 1966 and \$597,000 was appropriated as a first increment of equipment by the Budget Act of 1968. The building is scheduled for completion in the middle of 1969.

The total project cost, exclusive of the special federal portion, was about \$4,700,000 and this proposal, together with the earlier appropriation for equipment, represents nearly 19½ percent of the cost of the project. This is in line for physics buildings which are among the most costly of science buildings to equip.

## Santa Cruz

(t) Equip—fourth college (Merrill) ----- \$45,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1966 appropriated funds for the construction of 10,800 square feet of assignable area for academic and administrative purposes at this college. The Budget Act of 1968 provided \$62,000 for initial equipment. This was sufficient for most of the area except for a language laboratory which will be completed in the spring of 1970. The present equipment proposal is to provide a 30-station language laboratory with fairly sophisticated electronic sound equipment. The amount appears to be justified.

(u) Equip—natural sciences unit 3 ----- \$314,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1966 appropriated funds for construction of this project which provides approximately 61,000 square feet of assignable space. The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$500,000 for a first increment of equipment. In addition, federal funds were available for both construction and equipment.

The total of \$814,000 of state funded equipment represents about 27 percent of the total project costs. This is near the limit that we normally consider reasonable for a building which is totally devoted to laboratory facilities, both instructional and research, for the departments of chemistry, physics, astronomy and earth sciences. It will be recalled that this campus differs from other campuses in that lecture facilities are provided in the individual college plants whereas laboratory facilities are concentrated in the central core buildings without the diluting effect of lecture facilities which occurs in science buildings on other campuses.

(v) Equip—college No. 5 ----- \$120,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated funds for the construction of the academic portion of this college which would provide approximately

## University of California—Continued

14,000 square feet of assignable area. Completion is anticipated for the fall of 1969. The equipment proposal represents approximately 16 percent of the construction project cost of approximately \$750,000, including federal grants. Percentagewise, this is somewhat high but it is deceiving because comparisons are usually made with the more massive and permanent types of construction that occur on other campuses. Because of the small college approach on this campus, the unit cost of classroom facilities is generally less than occurs in the large concrete structures on other campuses, principally because the academic facilities at Santa Cruz are usually of stud and stucco construction with simple heating facilities and no air conditioning. On this basis, the amount proposed appears to be reasonable.

(w) Equip—classroom unit 1 ----- \$55,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated funds for the construction of a relatively small unit having an assignable area of 9,820 square feet containing a 400-seat lecture hall, a 150-seat lecture hall and seminar and tutorial rooms. The proposed equipment represents slightly less than 16 percent of the construction cost of the project and for reasons similar to those mentioned above, this appears to be justified.

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

## Item 379 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education

---

Requested 1969-70 -----	\$2,008,000
Recommended for approval -----	2,008,000
Recommended reduction -----	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

The \$2,008,000 will provide for 64 minor construction and improvement projects at nine University campuses and five field stations. This is the largest budget request of this nature since the Budget Act of 1964 when \$2,016,100 was appropriated for 72 projects at nine University campuses and six field stations. Since 1964, the appropriation for minor construction projects for the University of California has been approximately \$1,500,000 annually although this amount dropped to \$1,256,000 for the current year. During this time, the University's initial request averaged around \$4 million annually. The result of this inadequate funding has been the accumulation of a significant backlog of minor construction and improvement projects, thereby perpetuating functional deficiencies and inadequate space utilization.

It should also be pointed out that the \$2,008,000 requested in this item will fund approximately 34 percent less than it would have in 1964 because of rising construction costs. Therefore, although the amount requested in this item is 60 percent greater than appropriated

## University of California—Continued

in the current year, it falls far short of offsetting rising construction costs and meeting University needs.

The minor construction program proposed in this item contains a preponderance of projects to improve the utilization of existing space which is indicative of the problems created by changing curriculum requirements and technological advancements. A summary of the project justifications is contained in Table 1.

Table 1  
Summary of Minor Construction Proposals for 1969-70

Campus	Number of Projects	Justification					Amount
		1 Correct Space Defi- ciency	2 Improve Space Utiliza- tion	3 Improve Utilities or Mechan- ical Services	4 Correct Health and Safety Defi- ciencies	5 Site Improve- ment	
Berkeley -----	10	1	4	2	3	0	\$317,600
Davis -----	5	0	4	1	0	0	234,500
Irvine -----	5	2	0	2	0	1	161,000
Los Angeles -----	9	0	6	2	1	0	307,200
Riverside -----	8	3	4	0	0	1	151,200
San Diego -----	5	3	1	1	0	0	144,000
San Francisco -----	5	1	2	1	1	1	152,000
Santa Barbara -----	7	0	4	1	1	1	136,000
Santa Cruz -----	4	2	0	0	0	2	158,500
Ag Field Stations--	6	4	1	1	0	0	246,000
Total -----	64	16	26	11	6	5	\$2,008,000

Hereafter is a brief description of one project selected from each of the categories shown in Table 1.

### 1. Correct Space Deficiency

A 600-square-foot headhouse with water deionizer and a 4,500-gallon septic tank and sewage pit is proposed for the life sciences experimental area at Riverside. The project is estimated to cost \$29,400 and will provide needed space to enable the area to begin functioning as a research and teaching facility.

### 2. Improve Space Utilization

Proposals included in this category consist of conversion or re-modeling projects required to better utilize existing space. As an example, upon completion of the Veterinary Medicine Teaching Hospital at Davis, clinic space will be vacated in Haring Hall. The removal of partitions and cabinets and the installation of laboratory benches and utilities will effectively convert this space into offices and research laboratories at an estimated cost of \$65,000.

### 3. Improve Utilities or Mechanical Service

Alterations and additions to utilities for mechanical service are often required to accommodate additional equipment, reduce maintenance or provide for new facilities. Included in this category are such projects as the proposed extension of domestic water, sewer and electric



## University of California—Continued

power to the permanent grounds maintenance facilities at Irvine for \$14,000 and the addition of air conditioning at the medical sciences building animal tower at the San Francisco Medical Center to reduce the possibility of animals dying during extremely hot weather. The latter project is estimated to cost \$65,000 and consists of the installation of a 90-ton capacity chiller unit and evaporative condenser to supply cool air via a ventilation system which was originally designed to accommodate such an addition.

4. *Correct Health and Safety Deficiencies*

A \$17,000 project is proposed to replace the present outdated fire alarm system at Santa Barbara with a modern emergency fire alarm and communications system. The system will be centrally controlled from the campus fire and police station and it is anticipated that the new system will increase the efficiency of the operation, eliminate hazards in the existing system and reduce operational costs.

The Lawson Adit at Berkeley is a mine used for instruction and research in rock mechanics, geological mapping and soil stresses, for engineering. The mine extends about 1,000 feet under the hills. It is felt that the timbers supporting the opening and shaft need to be reinforced to insure the safety of the students and staff using this facility. An estimated \$15,000 will be required to correct this hazard.

5. *Site Improvement*

The Santa Cruz campus is proposing a \$37,500 project for the installation of storm drainage facilities and minimal landscaping at the main campus entrance to prevent the flooding and erosion that occurs during the winter months.

Although we have only had the opportunity to investigate a limited number of the proposals on site, we are sufficiently familiar with the campuses and review processes to feel that this total request has been carefully developed and is justified. As indicated in our opening statement, however, we believe the amount requested is inadequate to meet total needs, although it represents a considerable increase from recent budgets.

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

## Item 380 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$1,735,000
Recommended for approval .....	1,335,000
Recommended reduction .....	\$400,000

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS

	Amount	Analysis page
(a) Preliminary planning .....	\$400,000	1016

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item covers a schedule of three separate and distinct planning proposals. In general, the approaches covered by these proposals have

## University of California—Continued

been subscribed to in principle by the Legislature for a number of years. We continue to believe that adequate advance planning is essential to sound budgeting. However, in the case of one of the proposals we take exception to the amount.

(a) *Preliminary planning* ----- \$1,435,000

We recommend that subitem (a) be reduced by \$400,000 to a level of \$1,035,000.

The University proposes to continue basing its requests for construction projects on well-developed preliminary plans and outline specifications which would be presented in support of proposals for working drawings or working drawings and construction together. Preliminary plans generally cost about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  percent of the potential construction value of a project. Because the construction program at the University is funded both by the state and to a lesser degree from federal sources, preliminary plans funds need to be provided on the basis of the composite program instead of state-funded projects only. The Budget Act of 1966 appropriated \$1,151,500 for preliminary plans preparation for projects to be funded in the 1967-68 Budget Act. The latter budget act funded some projects for working drawings and construction combined and some projects for working drawings only. Together these had a potential construction value of about \$25,513,000, which was considerably less than the preliminary plans appropriation in 1966 should have supported. It is recognized that some expenditures were made for projects which were not funded by the 1967 Budget Act.

The Budget Act of 1967 provided \$1 million for preliminary planning to cover projects to be included in the 1968 Budget Act. The latter act funded projects having a construction value of over \$71 million.

The Budget Act of 1968 provided \$1,100,000 for preliminary planning for projects to be included in the 1969 Budget Bill. The latter now contains working drawing or working drawing and construction proposals having a potential total value of approximately \$28,700,000.

In view of the foregoing and in view of the limited funding conditions which are likely to continue for the next several years, we find it difficult to rationalize an increase in preliminary plan funds when no increase in capital outlay programs appears likely in the succeeding year. Using the assumption that  $1\frac{1}{2}$  percent is the reasonable value for the cost of preliminary planning as a percentage of potential construction value, the proposed amount for preliminary plans should support a construction value of about \$95 million. In the three years noted above, the highest was in the 1968 Budget Act at over \$71 million with 1967 and 1969 both at under \$30 million and the prospect for 1970 at considerably less. Therefore, we suggest that the University recognize these low funding levels as a realistic basis and program preliminary plans accordingly with a maximum value of approximately double the base, for which \$1 million in preliminary plans funds should be more than ample. In addition, the \$35,000 represents a special situation for a restudy of the Langley-Porter project to try to reduce the land base. This should be specifically retained and set aside for that purpose only.

## University of California—Continued

(b) *General studies* ----- \$100,000*We recommend approval.*

The Legislature first adopted in 1964 a broad policy covering funds for planning and studies which would not necessarily lead to specific individual projects. Growing campuses are in effect communities with more complex problems than are generally faced by conventional communities of the same size. Problems are varied including interrelations and interactions with surrounding conventional communities, traffic and traffic pattern studies, ongoing studies of utilities and their expansion problems as the campus expands and many other internal problems. We continue to believe that this type of planning is imperative if each campus is to avoid serious and costly future problems.

(c) *Advance planning studies* ----- \$200,000*We recommend approval.*

This subitem covers long-range master planning studies for sophisticated and complex subcampuses such as the medical school at Davis, the California College of Medicine at Irvine and the medical school at San Diego. It also includes some long-range master planning on the San Francisco medical campus. At Davis, part of the complexity is occasioned by the proposal to use part of old state fairgrounds in Sacramento for broad spectrum medical and paramedical purposes.

The facilities involved are extremely complex and sophisticated and failure to thoroughly plan for future development could ultimately lead to substantial amounts of wasted or unnecessary capital investment. We believe that such planning is prudent and economical.

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA****Item 381 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education**


---

Requested 1969-70 -----	\$333,000
Recommended for approval -----	None
Recommended for special review -----	333,000
Recommended reduction -----	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item consists of a single project and includes special control language limiting the funds to allocations by executive order of the Department of Finance.

(a) Land acquisition—dentistry, San Francisco----- \$333,000

*We recommend special review.*

The master plan which was adopted by the regents for the San Francisco medical campus, places a new School of Dentistry Building on the southernmost portion of the block facing Parnassus Avenue and bounded by Fourth and Fifth Avenues. This area is not yet owned by the University and it was proposed originally in the five-year plan that

## University of California—Continued

the University be allowed to acquire the property by the use of state funds at a cost of well over \$1 million.

The University already owns property on the eastern half of the block bounded by Parnassus Avenue, Third Avenue, Fourth Avenue and Irving Street. However, in order to provide a usable site for the dentistry building, it would have to buy up some remaining parcels. There has been considerable discussion about the steep grade of this site, resulting in a claim by the university staff that construction on this site would cost an additional \$750,000 or more because of associated foundation problems. Furthermore, it would violate the master plan which contemplated other facilities for that area.

In a previous item, we made reference to the fact that \$35,000 was being provided for a restudy of the Langley-Porter plan which was to go on the property immediately south of Parnassus Avenue adjoining old U.C. Hospital and directly across the street from the property that the University would like to buy for the dentistry school. One of the purposes of the restudy is to attempt to reduce the land base occupied by the current preliminary plan for Langley-Porter to the extent that sufficient ground might be made available facing on Parnassus Avenue for the School of Dentistry which then would not require any acquisition funds because that site is already owned by the University.

For these reasons, we do not feel we can make favorable recommendation at this time. We are still investigating the validity of the assertion that the site between Third Avenue and Fourth Avenue would cost over \$750,000 as a foundation premium. Furthermore, we believe there needs to be more study of the effect on the master plan if the School of Dentistry is put on the latter site. Hopefully, these differences will be resolved by the time the legislative committees review the capital outlay budget of the University.

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

## Item 382 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$13,838,000
Recommended for approval .....	13,838,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item is actually a zero appropriation insofar as additional cash is concerned. It is based on the anticipation that federal grants will be forthcoming for other projects, particularly in the main appropriation item for the University, in a total amount equivalent to the schedule attached to this item which will release a like amount of state funds from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education to be used for the schedule. However, because the ultimate effect is that the schedule is financed from state funds, each project is treated as though it were in fact a cash appropriation at this time.

## University of California—Continued

While the schedule is placed in the alphabetical order of the campuses, the University is free to choose the projects in the schedule which will be financed in the event the total amount anticipated does not materialize from the federal government. In any case, before released funds can be expended for any project in the schedule, approval must be obtained from the State Public Works Board which effectively provides a control because the Department of Finance is represented on the Public Works Board and the Legislative Analyst prepares comments to the legislative members of the board.

## Berkeley

(a) *Construct—alterations to Cory Hall*..... \$175,000

*We recommend approval.*

Project (c) in the main item for direct appropriation to the University proposes \$77,000 for alterations to Cory Hall which together with these released funds will provide a total of \$252,000 to carry out the alterations necessary to upgrade this engineering building and increase its efficiency and effectiveness. The costs appear to be in line for the purpose.

## Davis

(b) *Construct—experimental animal housing—vet med facilities, unit 1*..... \$2,212,000

*We recommend approval.*

This project consists of a large conglomeration of buildings of various kinds to house a wide range of experimental animals. The poultry research unit will be a single building having a gross area of over 4,350 square feet with a net usable area of 3,815 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 87 percent.

The large animal field research and quarantine unit will contain four buildings with a total gross area of 5,140 square feet and an assignable area of 4,688 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 91 percent. Another group of buildings for large animal field research and quarantine units will provide 16 buildings having a total of 10,384 gross square feet of area with an assignable area of 9,376 square feet and an efficiency ratio of 90 percent. Large animal research units will provide four buildings with a total of 29,816 gross square feet and 24,576 feet of assignable area, giving an efficiency ratio of 82 percent.

The small animal research unit will provide four buildings totaling 18,448 gross square feet with an assignable area of 11,520 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 63 percent which is second lowest of the total group.

Central services will be a single building having a gross area of 3,588 square feet and an assignable area of about 3,113 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 87 percent.

The foaling unit will be a single building having 882 gross square feet and 790 assignable square feet with an efficiency ratio of 90 percent.

## University of California—Continued

The stud barn will be a single building having 1,386 gross square feet and 900 assignable square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 65 percent.

The mare research buildings will provide three structures with a total of 14,307 gross square feet and 8,352 assignable square feet with the lowest ratio of the group at 59 percent.

The feed storage will be a single building having 3,600 gross square feet and 3,480 assignable square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 97 percent.

The turkey research unit will provide eight buildings totaling 1,920 gross square feet and 1,604 assignable square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 84 percent.

Collectively, the total project will be 93,827 gross square feet with 72,214 assignable square feet, giving an average ratio of 77 percent. In addition to the buildings, there will be nearly 50,000 square feet of cemented corrals.

Many of these buildings are highly specialized; some of them have laboratory characteristics. For example, the poultry research unit is estimated to cost over \$40 a square foot at building construction level. On the other hand the mare research buildings are estimated to cost only \$7.75 per gross square foot at building level. The total project will average \$18.50 per gross square foot at building level and about \$23.13 at total project level. These satellite facilities are absolutely essential to the functioning of the veterinary medical facility. The costs appear to be in line with the various types of buildings required.

## Irvine

(c) *Working drawings—biological sciences unit 2*----- \$190,000

*We recommend approval.*

This project contemplates a seven-story building with a basement in which the six upper stories will provide upper and lower division class laboratories, faculty offices and research laboratories and the various preparation rooms and other laboratory supporting facilities. The ground floor will provide for division administration, seminar rooms and a student directed learning center. The basement will house animal facilities, a service and storage facility and the electrical and mechanical rooms.

The principal occupants will be the departments of molecular and cell biology, biochemistry, and biophysics and psychobiology. It is anticipated that the structure will have a capacity of 450 FTE students.

The present concept of the building is based on a gross area of almost 142,000 square feet with a net assignable area of over 86,500 square feet, giving a 61 percent efficiency ratio which is acceptable for a science building. The cost estimate as of October, 1968, was \$44.03 per gross square foot for the basic building and almost \$53 per square foot at total project level. Because this is a very complex structure with sophisticated laboratories, high costs should be anticipated. However, it is our opinion, at this time, that cost per square foot estimated is excessive. More accurate figures will develop as the design progresses.

## University of California—Continued

The total cost of the structure, exclusive of groups II and III movable equipment, is currently estimated at approximately \$7,520,000 of which it is anticipated that approximately \$3,500,000 may be forthcoming from federal sources. Subsequently, the requirements for movable equipment to make the building operable will probably be on the order of \$1 million.

## San Diego

(d) *Construct—addition to central utilities building, step 2, \$333,000*  
*We recommend approval.*

The University's main capital outlay Item 377, project (o), proposes \$1,415,000 towards the second step in the central utilities building. The actual total cost is estimated to be \$1,748,000. The additional amount is anticipated to be made available from released funds by the allocation of federal aid. As pointed out in the comments on that item, the costs are principally concerned with providing additional equipment in an already existing building which has the necessary extra space.

(e) *Construct—clinical science building----- \$8,383,000*  
*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$321,000 for preparation of working drawings and prior to that the University had allocated \$40,000 for preliminary plans toward the design of a seven-story plus basement reinforced concrete structure to house facilities for the clinical sciences. The design contemplated that the building would be connected at five levels by bridge structures to the existing basic science building. In addition, there would be a connection at the basement level between the two buildings.

The structure will have a gross area of almost 191,000 square feet which includes the area of the bridging elements and a net assignable area of about 102,000 square feet. This gives an efficiency ratio of only 53 percent which is ordinarily too low to be acceptable. However, when the bridging elements are eliminated from the gross area and allowances are made for the excess corridor width on the first floor, which is necessary because it becomes a through connection between the basic sciences building and the veterans hospital, the efficiency increases to about 56 percent. For a highly complex facility such as this in which space is greatly fragmented for small examining rooms, small research laboratories, etc., the efficiency ratio at 56 percent is acceptable. The current cost estimate is \$38.24 per gross square foot of the basic building including the bridges and \$45.60 per square foot at total project level. It should be pointed out that this cost is more favorable than the one experienced in the basic sciences building when the latter is updated to the same construction cost index, despite the fact that it is only about half the size of the basic sciences building and somewhat more complex and sophisticated as well as being more fragmented. Consequently, we believe that the cost is reasonable.

## University of California—Continued

## Santa Cruz

(f) Construct—social science unit I ----- \$2,514,000  
*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$105,000 for the preparation of working drawings, and the University allocated \$37,800 for preliminary plans toward the design of a four-story reinforced-concrete structure, having a gross area of about 64,800 square feet with a net assignable area of 42,200 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 62 percent. This is acceptable in a classroom building having a substantial number of faculty research laboratories, class laboratories and auxiliary service spaces in addition to some lecture classrooms. When this project was first presented for the funding of working drawings, it had an efficiency ratio of 59 percent to which we objected. As a result, a restudy improved the efficiency ratio significantly by reducing the gross area, but more or less maintaining the same unit cost. This means that the total cost of the project will be less than had been projected at that time. The current cost estimate based on a construction cost index of 1,200 is approximately \$32.50 per gross square foot at building construction level and over \$40.90 per square foot at total project level. Taking into account that the Santa Cruz area carries a construction cost premium of about 10 percent, these figures are acceptable. It is anticipated that the project will have a capacity of approximately 670 FTE students.

(g) Working drawings—college No. 7 ----- \$31,000  
*We recommend approval.*

This project is more or less a repetition of the six colleges that have previously been authorized in that each college complex contains non-state funded residence facilities, eating facilities and other amenities, plus state funded academic space. The proposal covers classroom areas having a gross area of 23,700 square feet with a net assignable area of 15,420 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 65 percent which is quite good for the purpose. The current cost estimates based on the construction cost index of October 1968 are \$29 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$36.39 per foot at total project level which includes substantial external utilities and site development plus all fees and contingencies.

In Item 377 for the University, project (z) we questioned the reliability of the cost of the state portion when compared with the nonstate funded portion which we hope will be resolved by the separate bid procedure for college No. 5. Until such time, the cost for this state portion represents the same relative ratio as the state provided in the first four colleges which are completed or under construction.

This college will have a total of 600 undergraduates of whom 400 are residents and the balance commuters and 200 graduates of whom 50 would be residents and the balance commuters. The major academic emphasis of this college will be the processes and implications of urbanization. However, like the other colleges at this campus, its basic concern will be to provide a disciplined liberal education.



## CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

## Item 383 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$39,235,000
Recommended for approval .....	31,911,000
Recommended for special review .....	6,550,000
Recommended reduction .....	774,000

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS

	Amount	Analysis page
(b) Construct central plant .....	\$774,000	1023

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item covers 14 proposals, one of which is for land acquisition and the balance for (1) construction of projects for which working drawings had been previously provided or (2) for projects in which both working drawings and construction are being proposed. Sixty percent of the total amount is for library construction and nearly 13 percent is for site development, utilities and central utilities plants. The balance, excluding the land acquisition proposal, will cover additional academic instructional space and faculty offices.

## Chico

(a) Construct—site development, utilities 1969 .....

\$1,058,000

*We recommend approval.*

This campus is constructing a new and larger central plant, at a new location, to provide steam and chilled water for heating and air conditioning. The new plant makes necessary a new system of utility tunnels and distribution lines which will serve the new physical science building, the new applied arts building, the new life science building and a new classroom-office building, all of which are presently scheduled for completion fairly early in 1971. The new central plant itself is scheduled for completion in about August of 1970. The timing is such that it appears necessary that the utility and tunnel extensions be funded in this budget. Additionally, the utility extensions will include gas lines, water lines which would be partly in the tunnel and partly out, storm sewers, sanitary sewers and electrical distribution lines with the latter being mostly in the tunnel. In connection with the latter, a high voltage distribution switchboard and primary switchgear are included in the project. The costs appear to be in line for the purpose. A number of deferrable elements were excluded from the original proposal.

## Dominquez Hills

(b) Construct—central plant .....

\$1,438,000

*We recommend a reduction of \$774,000.*

The initial facilities which are now complete and in operation at this campus are of one-story design and in order to make it possible for them to be occupied immediately upon completion, the design included a local heating and air-conditioning source. However, for the major permanent

University of California—Continued

campus buildings, the master plan has always contemplated at least one central plant and possibly a second as the major campus expanded.

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$774,000 to permit advance ordering of those elements of fixed equipment which required very long lead times between ordering and delivery. To that extent, the central plant is already committed. The present proposal covers the cost of construction of the central plant building and its outside fenced area (which will, among other things, house the cooling tower), the balance of group I equipment and fees and contingencies. There appears to have been a major error made in the presentation of the project in that no credit was taken for the prior appropriation. The current estimate is \$1,438,000 for the total project including all of the group I equipment and consequently it would appear that the correct proposal should be \$1,438,000 less the \$774,000 appropriated in the 1968 Budget Act or a net of \$664,000. We recommend that subitem (b) be reduced accordingly.

(c) Construct—utilities, 1969 ----- \$240,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal continues the utilities development of this new campus. The major portion is concerned with storm drainage from the physical education area and the balance is for some minor water line extensions and a fairly extensive expansion of the on-site sewer system. The costs appear to be in line for the purpose and the need is justified.

Fullerton

(d) Construct—utilities, 1969 ----- \$235,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposals covers extension of the utility tunnel and the included utilities to the education and engineering buildings. The former is due for occupancy late in 1970 and the latter early in 1971, which makes it essential that utilities extensions be funded in this budget.

The utilities, in addition to the tunnel housing them, include high temperature hot water supply and return for heating purposes, chilled water supply and return for air-conditioning, main electrical distribution, signal lines, water and gas. Sewer lines are never placed in utility tunnels but are run outside. The cost appears to be in line for the purpose and the project is justified.

Long Beach

(e) Construct—general classroom and faculty office building ----- \$2,555,000

*We recommend approval.*

Earlier appropriations provided \$34,300 for preliminary plans and the Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$103,000 for working drawings for a building having a gross area of 88,625 square feet with a net assignable area of 58,058 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 65.5 percent. The project would provide instructional space for approximately 2,500 FTE students plus office spaces for 189 faculty members.

## California State Colleges—Continued

The instructional spaces are general purpose classrooms, but space for journalism is included.

Based on current utilization standards, the Long Beach campus has, with one exception, the lowest ratio of capacity to projected enrollment. For 1969, the cumulative capacity is calculated at 11,099 FTE and the 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. instructional load at 15,050 FTE so that the cumulative capacity represents about 74 percent of the instructional load. Because this building could not be ready for occupancy earlier than the fall semester of 1971, over two years away, the need appears to be substantiated, even taking into account intensified utilization possibilities.

The current cost estimate is \$24.77 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$31.36 per square foot at total project level. This is based on the construction cost index as of October 1968. By the time the project is actually put to bid, the index will very probably have risen at least 5 percent. The cost appears to be reasonable for a combination office and classroom building.

## Los Angeles

(f) *Construct—site development—utilities, 1968* ----- \$489,000

*We recommend approval.*

To some extent the description of this project is ambiguous in that it provides more than the utilities lines outside of and between buildings, which is normally the definition of utilities. The major cost is in fact concerned with providing a hot water boiler with all of its appurtenant facilities and a water chiller with its appurtenant facilities including a cooling tower in a small new structure to be built east of classroom building No. 2 and from which piping will be extended to the physical science building which will rely on this source for its cooling. The hot water boiler and its accessories will be installed in the existing equipment room in classroom building No. 2 and lines will be extended to the physical science building. The latter building was designed without either the space or the basic hot water and chilled water production equipment in anticipation that these would be handled in the manner herein proposed.

The Budget Act of 1968 provided working drawings for the purpose and the current total cost estimate for the project is \$527,000 including the previous funding. Because the physical science building is anticipated to be ready for occupancy by mid-1970, the installation of this equipment becomes critical. The cost appears to be in line for the purpose.

(g) *Land acquisition—1969* ----- \$500,000

*We recommend approval.*

This campus has received a series of appropriations for the acquisition of land to the north of Gravois Avenue which was the basic northern boundary of the campus. This is an area of relatively old, low-cost housing. It is flat land and substantially lower in elevation than the main campus. The area provides an access from the north on Valley Boulevard. The balance of the property to be acquired in accordance

## California State Colleges—Continued

with the master plan is approximately 12.4 acres. The five-year program approved by the trustees broke this land into two properties, one of 9.4 acres at \$1,600,000 and the other, which would provide corridor property leading out to Valley Boulevard, of three acres at \$700,000. These together would complete the acquisition contemplated in that area.

The Governor's Budget proposes to provide only \$500,000 to acquire the most critically needed part of the property which may be about three or four acres and which will enable the closing of certain streets. Generally, the property in this entire north area is to be used for parking and access although at some future time it could provide room for academic expansion by the construction of buildings which would be underpinned by multilevel parking facilities. Because this college's land base is the smallest of all of the campuses and its utilization is now more intensive with respect to acreage occupied by buildings than any other campus, it would appear that there is ample justification for the acquisition of the additional land. It should also be pointed out that the present owners of the land, all of them individual home owners, have long been led to believe that the state would acquire this property and as a consequence they are unable to dispose of the property and are unwilling to make any further improvements. Because of the acceptance and publication of the master plan, there is an inferred commitment to these owners that the state will buy the land.

## Sacramento

(h) Construct—utilities, 1969 ----- \$822,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal covers almost exclusively the extension of a utility tunnel and the utilities therein to the psychology building which is scheduled for occupancy late in 1970. Related to this is a substantial drainage problem which is also covered by extension of storm water drainage lines. A small part of the proposal concerns improvement in the lighting of certain areas of the campus which is presently considered inadequate for the safety of female students at night. The costs appear to be in line for the purpose and the project is justified on a timing basis.

(i) Construct—library building ----- \$6,680,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$198,000 for working drawings which, together with \$58,000 of preliminary plan funds previously allocated by the Trustees, made a total availability of \$256,000 for the preparation of the design and working drawings for a new library building to supersede the existing library, the latter to be converted ultimately to administrative, instructional and faculty office space.

The design contemplated a multistory structure having a gross area of nearly 210,500 square feet, a net usable area of almost 150,000 square feet and an efficiency ratio in excess of 71.5 percent. It was intended to provide book stack and reader station space for an enrollment level of approximately 10,320 FTE students. In addition, the building would

## California State Colleges—Continued

provide facilities for the honor study and library science program with a capacity of 120 FTE students. The target date for completion of the project is late in 1971. While the project itself provides little academic instructional capacity, it should be recognized that the old library upon being vacated would have a fairly large potential for instructional facilities as well as office spaces. The new location is more centrally located for the students and hence should be more effectively used. The old library is inadequate and does not lend itself to economical expansion.

The current cost estimate, based on the construction cost index of October 1968, is \$27.40 per gross square foot at the basic construction level and \$32.39 per square foot at total project level. This includes all fees and contingencies as well as fairly extensive site work. The costs appear to be in line for the purpose.

## San Bernardino

(j) Construct—site development—utilities, 1968 ----- \$750,000

*We recommend special review.*

The original site development proposal for 1968 included funding for utilities for both the library and the cafeteria. Timing considerations were such that installation of the cafeteria utilities was not funded in that budget. However, the library utilities were funded and it was agreed that working drawings for the cafeteria utilities would be accomplished. The site of the cafeteria is considerably removed from the library and long tunnel and utility runs are required. Despite the fact that working drawings were provided for, we have seen no material to indicate precisely what is involved in the cafeteria area proposal and consequently, as of this writing we have no basis for making a recommendation.

For this reason, we propose to defer any recommendations until the material is available which should be prior to the time the two finance committees of the Legislature consider the capital outlay budget.

## San Fernando Valley

(k) Construct—library building ----- \$6,051,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$320,000 for working drawings and the Trustees allocated \$32,300 for preliminary plans for a multi-story library building having a gross area of almost 190,000 square feet and a net usable area of over 133,000 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of slightly over 70 percent. The building is to be constructed in a location on the campus about 1,000 feet north of the existing library at a point where it is believed the center of student population will develop. The structure which will probably be completed late in 1971 will function in conjunction with the existing library building so that the two together can provide book stack and reader station capacity for an enrollment of 14,020 FTE students, in addition to space for audio-visual service and supply facilities. Ultimately, an addition will be built on this building so as to permit the existing library building

## California State Colleges—Continued

to be converted to academic instructional space and administrative and faculty office space. The target date for this change has not yet been definitely established but it is probably at least five years away.

The current construction cost is estimated at \$24.70 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$33.34 per gross square foot at total project level. This includes very extensive utility extensions and site development as well as all fees and contingencies. The cost appears to be in line for this type of structure in the Los Angeles area and the project appears justified on the basis that the enrollment has substantially outgrown the existing library capacity.

## San Francisco

(l) Construct—humanities classroom building ----- \$5,800,000

*We recommend special review.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$214,000 for the preparation of working drawings and the Trustees allocated \$73,000 for preliminary plans for a multistory structure having approximately 173,500 square feet of gross area with a net usable area in excess of 112,700 square feet. This gives an efficiency ratio of 65 percent which is average for general classroom purposes.

The project will have one of the highest capacities in the system at 3,400 FTE students plus 257 faculty offices. In addition to the conventional lecture room spaces, it will provide a language laboratory and an instructional media center. It is anticipated that the building will be constructed on top of a 700-car multistory garage which is to be funded from nonstate sources. It is currently projected that the building will be ready for occupancy in mid-1971. As of this writing, we have not yet received a current construction cost estimate, nor have we received the necessary preliminary plans upon which to base a recommendation. However, it is our understanding that these will be forthcoming before the capital outlay budget is reviewed by the legislative finance committees. Consequently, we recommend special review. However, we should point out that for the fall of 1969, this campus indicates the least capacity in relation to instructional load in the period from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., five days per week. The capacity is calculated at 9,361 and instructional load at 12,770 indicating that the capacity is about 73 percent of the instructional load. Because the building will not be complete until mid-1971, almost 2½ years away, it would appear that there is reasonable justification for proceeding with the project subject to the qualifications mentioned above.

## San Jose

(m) Construct—central library building ----- \$11,290,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$325,000 for the preparation of working drawings and the trustees allocated \$71,451 for preliminary plans for an 18-story library structure having a gross area of 365,204 square feet with a net usable area of almost 258,500 square feet. This

**California State Colleges—Continued**

gives an efficiency ratio of about 71.2 percent which is excellent for a building of this height.

The structure will provide the book stack and reader station requirements for a total campus enrollment of 17,000 FTE, plus instructional space for the library science program having 183 FTE and the audio-visual supply and service area. The building will supersede the existing library which will ultimately be converted to general instructional use as well as some faculty and administrative office space. The target date of completion of the structure is late in 1971. Current cost estimates based on the construction cost index of October 1968, are \$25.52 per gross square foot at building constructional level and \$31.72 per foot at total project level which includes substantial demolition, site development, utilities, fees and contingencies. The cost appears to be reasonable for the purpose. Incidentally, it should be pointed out that it is virtually impossible to continue to expand the existing library which already represents three separate phases resulting in poor efficiency and effectiveness.

**Cal-Poly K.V.**

(n) *Construct—library building conversion* ----- \$1,327,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Legislature previously provided for the construction of a new library building to totally supersede the old one. The new building has recently been completed. The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$87,000 for the preparation of working drawings and the trustees allocated \$17,725 for preliminary plans for the conversion of the old library building to general classroom purposes with some specialized space as well. The building has 75,350 gross square feet of area and the conversion will provide a net usable area of 44,440 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of about 59 percent. This is acceptable in view of the fact that the construction module of a library is not the best one for classroom purposes and certain excess unusable space results from this type of conversion.

The converted building will provide for a capacity of 1,119 FTE students in classrooms, a graduate laboratory, a language laboratory, a curriculum library and 54 faculty office stations. In addition, the building will be air-conditioned as part of the conversion since the original construction did not include this amenity. Completion is scheduled for late in 1970, hopefully in time for the fall semester. The current cost estimate based on the construction index of October 1968 is \$12.04 per gross square foot at building construction level and \$19.65 at total project level. This is about half the cost of building a new air-conditioned structure with the same capacity and the same efficiency ratio. Consequently, the cost appears to be reasonable.

**CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES****Item 384 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$243,000
Recommended for approval .....	243,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item covers a single proposal for master planning at state college system campuses as required. The funds will be allocated to provide architectural master planning and consulting services, landscape master planning and consulting services and engineering consulting services for each of the 19 campuses. It is to be available for the budget year only.

(a) *Master planning—statewide* ..... \$243,000

*We recommend approval.*

On a number of occasions in the past, we have supported the concept of continuous master planning for all campuses in order to cope with, insofar as possible, the difficulties arising from changes in ultimate enrollment goals, changes in the mix of lower division, upper division and graduate relationships, changes in curriculum demands and changes in the surrounding community generally, but particularly in the immediate, privately owned area surrounding the campus boundaries. Master planning is one of the most important ways in which economics can be exercised. We believe the proposal is justified.

It will be noted that the item does not include funds for preliminary plans or general studies as has been the case for the past several years. This is principally because the funds which were appropriated last year for these purposes have not been expended and it is believed there are adequate amounts remaining to take care of the budget year. This will require reappropriation which will be proposed in one of the control sections of the Budget Bill.

**CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES****Item 385 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$3,186,300
Recommended for approval .....	3,186,300
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item covers a schedule of 17 equipment proposals for projects previously funded for construction at various campuses. The proposals have been carefully screened and in many cases sharply reduced either because of timing delays or because critical need could not be demonstrated for some items of equipment or for some quantities. In any case, it is anticipated that the amounts included will enable the various



## California State Colleges—Continued

building projects to function on an initial basis. It will be noted that the appropriation is for one year on the premise that funds should be committed or expended within that time.

## Bakersfield

(a) *Equip—initial buildings* ----- \$181,500

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal represents the first of what may be three phases of equipping the initial buildings which were funded for construction in the Budget Act of 1968 on a contingent basis dependent upon the release of state funds by the receipt of federal grants of like amounts for other projects. The five-year plan indicates that construction is anticipated to be completed by the middle of 1970. We are somewhat pessimistic about the ability to achieve this date. However, because of the anticipated date, the equipment should be provided in this budget.

The initial buildings will probably cost between \$2 million and \$2.3 million for about 75,000 gross square feet of area with a capacity of 620 FTE in lecture and laboratory rooms plus offices, library, etc. Because the buildings are one story and of less costly construction than the usual multistory state college buildings, it becomes difficult to relate the cost of equipment as a percentage of construction cost and instead the relationship must be to the FTE and the types of activities to be housed. On this basis, it would appear that the first phase is fully justified and the cost is reasonable.

## Chico

(b) *Equip—physical science addition* ----- \$100,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal represents the first of what will probably be a three-phase process in equipping this addition. It is scheduled to be completed about the middle of 1971.

The first phase will be used in temporary laboratories and the equipment will then subsequently be moved to the addition when it is completed. The present estimates indicate that the two future phases will total about \$400,000.

The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$2,286,000 for construction of a building having over 41,600 square feet of gross area and over 27,000 square feet of net usable area. The total project cost will probably exceed \$2,350,000 and because physical science buildings are among the most costly to equip, it may be anticipated that the total equipment cost will be on the order of 20 percent to 25 percent of the project cost. In any case, since the first increment represents only a small portion of the total, the proposal appears to be reasonable.

(c) *Equip—life science building* ----- \$100,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal represents the first of what will possibly be four phases for equipping the project for which construction was funded in the 1967 Budget Act. Completion of the building is now scheduled for mid 1971.

## California State Colleges—Continued

The four phases of equipment will probably exceed \$1 million. The total project cost will probably exceed \$5,200,000. On the basis that life science buildings average about 20 percent of the project cost for equipment, the ultimate proposal appears to be in line and this first phase, therefore, appears to be justified.

## Fresno

(d) *Equip—science building* ----- \$163,200

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the first of what will probably be three phases of equipping a science building for which working drawings funds were appropriated by the Budget Act of 1968 on a contingent basis dependent upon released state funds resulting from federal grants towards other projects. The construction of the project is not yet funded and consequently there is no firm completion date.

However, the present proposal covers equipment for new masters degree programs in geography and biology which will be housed in the existing science building to be eventually relocated in the new building when it is completed. For the purposes of the two programs mentioned, the amount appears to be reasonable.

## Fullerton

(e) *Equip—art building* ----- \$210,300

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the first of two phases to equip the new art building which is expected to be ready for occupancy by the fall of 1969. Construction was funded in the Budget Act of 1967 and it is anticipated that the total project cost will exceed \$2,400,000 for a building having over 74,000 gross square feet of area with a net assignable area of nearly 47,000 square feet. The building will provide a capacity of 252 FTE in 240 student stations plus auxiliary facilities.

The two phases of equipment will probably total about \$300,000 representing about 12 percent of the cost of the project. The first phase, therefore, appears to be justified and reasonable.

## Long Beach

(f) *Equip—library building II* ----- \$400,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the first of what will probably be two phases of equipping what is actually the third construction phase of the library building. Construction was funded by the Budget Act of 1967 for a five-story addition to the existing building which would add over 201,000 gross square feet of area with a net assignable area of 141,000 square feet. It is intended that the expanded library will provide facilities for an enrollment in excess of 15,000 FTE. The building is scheduled for late in 1970 and the first phase of equipment is necessary to make it operable. The construction cost will probably exceed \$5,500,000 and the first phase of equipment represents about 7 percent of that cost against a statistical average of about 10 percent, indicating that a second phase of equipment is probably justified.

## California State Colleges—Continued

(g) *Equip—psychology building* ----- \$300,000*We recommend approval.*

This proposal represents the first of two phases of equipping this project which is scheduled for completion in late 1970. Construction was funded by the Budget Act of 1967 and total project cost will probably exceed \$2,900,000. The two phases of equipment will probably total about \$450,000 which would represent something over 15 percent of the cost of constructing the project. Psychology buildings are nearly as costly to equip as general science buildings because of the large quantities of highly specialized equipment required in psychology laboratories and testing facilities. The amount appears reasonable.

(h) *Equip—home economics building II* ----- \$91,500*We recommend approval.*

This proposal represents a single phase for equipping the addition to the home economics building which is scheduled for completion early in 1970.

Construction was provided for by the Budget Act of 1968 for a two-story addition having 24,500 gross square feet of area with 16,280 square feet of assignable space. The space will have a capacity of about 50 FTE students. The total project cost will probably exceed \$750,000 and the equipment represents about 12 percent of the project cost which is reasonable for the purpose.

(i) *Equip—drama building* ----- \$189,000*We recommend approval.*

This proposal represents the first of what will probably be two phases of equipping a project which is scheduled for completion late in 1970.

Construction was provided by the Budget Act of 1968 and total project cost will probably exceed \$2 million for a structure having slightly over 49,000 gross square feet of area with a net usable space of 32,000 square feet. The current equipment proposal represents less than 10 percent of the construction cost of the project. This is significantly below the statistical average for the equipment of drama buildings. Consequently, it is reasonable to assume that there will be at least one more increment and that the current proposal is reasonable.

## Los Angeles

(j) *Equip—classroom building No. 2* ----- \$420,300*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the first of two phases for equipping a project which is scheduled for completion late in 1969. The building has a somewhat tortuous history since the first working drawing funds were appropriated by the Budget Act of 1961. The first major delay resulted from a significant change in concept proposed by the master plan that the building be combined with a parking structure beneath it in order to conserve land on what is basically an extremely tight campus. This required a complete restudy of the proposal and occasioned delays because of the funding problems for the parking structure portion. Additional

## California State Colleges—Continued

delays were occasioned by the procedures for obtaining a federal grant towards construction. In any case, the project is under construction and it is anticipated that the cost will exceed \$6,380,000, exclusive of the cost of the parking structure, for a building having over 173,000 gross square feet of area. The underlying parking structure was anticipated to have over 261,000 square feet of area and was funded from parking revenues. The building which is largely lecture classroom space will have a capacity approaching 3,000 FTE. The first increment represents about 6½ percent of the construction cost of the classroom project which is below the statistical average for lecture facilities of this type. Consequently, it would appear that a second increment will be required and the cost of the first proposal is justified.

(k) *Equip—administration building addition* ----- \$168,000  
*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the first of possibly two phases of equipping the administration building addition which has had an interesting history and design background.

Working drawings for the building were first funded by the Budget Act of 1962 and augmented by the Budget Act of 1963. Construction was funded by the Budget act of 1964. The long delay between the time of initial appropriation and the start of construction was occasioned by a number of problems, of which the major one was the question of the ultimate size of the building and its location. Because this campus has a very small land base, it was finally decided that the only practical solution was to build the structure on top of or straddling the existing two-story administration building and because a future expansion would be difficult if not impossible, the question arose as to its size in order to avoid attempts at future expansion. These were ultimately resolved and the addition is a nine-story tower which will have about 77,415 gross square feet of area with about 48,000 square feet of net usable area. The project construction cost will probably exceed \$2,800,000 and the first increment of equipment represents about 6 percent of that cost indicating that a second increment will be very likely. The amount proposed appears to be justified.

(l) *Equip—plant growth facility* ----- \$55,500  
*We recommend approval.*

This proposal covers the complete equipment for a facility which is being constructed on the roof of the physical sciences building and is essentially a specialized, sophisticated greenhouse type of structure having a gross area of over 5,500 square feet. In a sense it represents a laboratory condition and as such is relatively costly to equip.

The construction was funded by the Budget Act of 1968 on a contingent basis with the money to become available by released state funds upon receipt of federal grants for other projects. The cost of the structure will probably exceed \$310,000 and the proposed equipment represents over 17 percent of that cost. In consideration of the nature of the facility, the amount appears to be within reason.

## California State Colleges—Continued

## Sacramento

(m) *Equip—remodeled speech-drama I and II* ----- \$189,000  
*We recommend approval.*

This proposal covers the complete equipment for a complex project consisting of both remodeling existing space and constructing new additional space in the speech-drama building. The project was funded for construction in 1966 and 1968 as two separate phases. However, work was held up in the first phase so that the two could be combined and offered as one project to prospective bidders. Completion is now scheduled for early 1970.

Approximately 30,000 gross square feet of area is added to the building and almost that much is converted to additional capacity in the existing building. The construction project will probably cost in excess of \$1,300,000 and this proposal represents about 14 percent of the project cost which is reasonable for areas requiring expensive theatrical production equipment, speech equipment and related items. The additional capacity provided by the expansion and remodeling will exceed 400 FTE.

## San Bernardino

(n) *Equip—library-classroom building* ----- \$250,000  
*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the second and final of two phases of initial equipment for this combination library and classroom project. The building was funded for construction by the Budget Act of 1967 and a first increment of equipment was funded by the Budget Act of 1968.

The structure will contain over 165,000 gross square feet of area with a net usable area of about 110,000 square feet of which a substantial portion will be devoted to interim classroom use. When the building is fully utilized as a library, its size will provide capacity for a campus enrollment of 3,800 FTE. The interim classroom use will accommodate almost 1,300 FTE students plus faculty offices. While this second phase of equipment should complete the initial complement, it should be recognized that as classroom space is phased out of the building and into other new buildings, additional library equipment will be required to utilize the vacated space for library purposes.

The construction cost of the project will exceed \$4,900,000 and the two phases of equipment totaling \$369,000 represent less than 8 percent of the cost of the structure. Statistically, this is on the low side for a building of this type and it indicates that future equipment phases will probably be proposed. The present proposal appears to be reasonable.

(o) *Equip—cafeteria* ----- \$137,900  
*We recommend approval.*

This proposal represents the total equipment for the facility which is scheduled to be completed in mid-1970. The project represents the basic cafeteria which is supplied at state cost to every new campus with all future expansions or additions being funded from nonstate sources, generally student funds.

## California State Colleges—Continued

The construction of the cafeteria was funded by the Budget Act of 1968 on a contingent basis by the use of state funds released upon receipt of like amounts from federal sources for other projects. The building has a gross area of 31,500 square feet with a net assignable area of 22,300 square feet which provide a seating capacity of 615 plus serving, kitchen and auxiliary facilities. The construction cost will probably be on the order of \$1,400,000 and the equipment proposal represents less than 10 percent of that cost which is statistically in line for the purpose.

## San Francisco

(p) *Equip—music-speech building* ----- \$117,800

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal represents the total equipment for areas in the music-speech building which were unfinished originally but for which completion construction funds were appropriated in the Budget Act of 1967. The newly finished space will be principally concerned with programs in the field of motion picture production. The equipment is therefore relatively expensive in terms of cost per unit. No meaningful relationship of the cost of the equipment can be made with respect to the cost of the construction because the basic space was already there and only funds for completing the space were required. The list, however, has been very carefully reviewed and each costly item has been thoroughly justified. Consequently, the proposal appears to be in line.

## Cal-Poly K.V.

(q) *Equip—agriculture classroom addition* ----- \$112,300

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the first of two phases to equip a project which was funded for construction by the Budget Act of 1968. The building which is separate and distinct from any other and not physically an addition, will have a gross area of 50,550 square feet with a net usable area of over 32,150 square feet. It will provide capacity for 206 FTE students in landscape architecture, soil sciences and food and nutrition sciences.

The cost of the structure will probably exceed \$1,750,000 and the two phases of equipment will probably exceed \$270,000 which represents about 15 percent of the project cost. Because this is basically a science building, although not as complex and sophisticated as a physics or chemistry building, the cost of equipment statistically would exceed that of a simple lecture classroom building. Consequently, the proposal appears to be justified.

## CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

## Item 386 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$2,000,000
Recommended for approval .....	2,000,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

The \$2 million proposed covers a schedule of 19 campuses and will finance a total of 147 minor construction and improvement projects at the various state colleges. This is the largest budget request for minor capital outlay ever proposed for the state college system. The situation that we discussed with respect to the University's minor capital outlay program on Analysis page 1013, is also applicable to the state college program. We do not believe the 60 percent increase reflected by this budget request is sufficient to offset rising construction costs and adequately meet the needs of the state college system. Table 1 summarizes the proposals by campus, purpose and amount.

Table 1  
Proposed State College Projects and Justification, 1969-70

Campus	Number of projects	1 Correct space deficiency	2 Improve space utilization	3 Improve utilities or mechanical service	4 Correct health and safety deficiencies	5 Site improvement and equipment	Amount
Bakersfield .....	2	0	0	0	0	2	\$16,000
Chico .....	19	4	6	5	2	2	119,000
Dominguez Hills ..	1	0	0	0	0	1	10,000
Fresno .....	9	1	4	0	2	2	125,000
Fullerton .....	8	0	3	1	3	1	43,300
Hayward .....	7	2	1	0	3	1	132,000
Humboldt .....	4	1	1	0	1	1	103,000
Long Beach .....	6	0	1	2	2	1	169,400
Los Angeles .....	8	0	4	2	0	2	94,300
Sacramento .....	4	2	1	0	0	1	64,500
San Bernardino ..	1	0	1	0	0	0	50,000
San Diego .....	20	1	3	5	2	9	192,700
San Fernando ....	6	0	2	1	3	0	144,600
San Francisco ....	5	0	1	1	1	2	192,000
San Jose .....	16	0	6	6	3	1	191,000
Sonoma .....	4	0	2	1	0	1	63,400
Stanislaus .....	1	0	0	0	0	1	12,800
Kellogg-Voorhis ...	11	0	3	1	2	5	140,400
San Luis Obispo...	15	2	0	1	7	5	136,600
Total .....	147	13	39	26	31	38	\$2,000,000

It is proposed to allocate the amounts outlined in Table 1 to each campus directly, not subject to Trustee control or transfer between colleges. This approach was initiated in the Budget Act of 1967 on the premise that the amount of administrative effort devoted to the preparation of this program at the state college level should be recognized

## California State Colleges—Continued

and the colleges should be given the opportunity to demonstrate their responsibility and ability to spend these funds wisely. We have reviewed the projects actually accomplished in the field under this method of appropriation on a postaudit basis. We believe the colleges have administered these funds wisely and we continue to support the approach of lump sum allocation under campus control.

## CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

## Item 387 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$6,370,000
Recommended for approval .....	3,347,000
Recommended for special review .....	3,023,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item actually represents a zero appropriation insofar as additional cash is concerned. The proposal is based on the anticipation that federal grants will be forthcoming for other projects, particularly in the main construction appropriation item for the state colleges. The total amount anticipated is equivalent to the total of this item which would release a like amount of state funds from the Capitol Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education for this purpose. Because the projects are ultimately financed from state funds, each project is treated as though the amount for it were, in fact, a cash appropriation at this time.

While the schedule is in the alphabetical order of the campuses, the Trustees are free to choose which projects in the schedule will be financed in the event the total amount anticipated does not materialize from the federal government. In any case, before released funds can be expended for any project in the schedule approval must be obtained from the State Public Works Board. This effectively provides a control because the Department of Finance is represented on the Public Works Board and the Legislative Analyst provides comments to legislators.

The item covers 18 projects of which four represent construction based on previously financed working drawings. Two of these represent new or altered academic instructional space and the other two central plant facilities. Four of the projects are for working drawings and construction. Of these, three are for conversion of existing space to other uses and one is a relatively small utility project. The balance, with one exception, is for working drawings only and almost entirely for academic instructional facilities or academic related facilities such as a library building. The one exception is for an initial complement of books at a new campus. Collectively, the construction and working drawings projects covering academic instructional facilities would provide nearly 12,000 FTE of additional capacity statewide and will require construction funds in excess of \$26 million.



## California State Colleges—Continued

## Bakersfield

(a) *Acquire—initial complement of books II*----- \$202,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$187,000 for the first complement of library books. This and the amount proposed here would provide approximately 50,000 library volumes needed when the campus opens in September of 1970. The proposal appears justified and the cost is in line.

Initial complements of library books for new campuses have traditionally been treated as acquisitions rather than equipment and have been appropriated for the same three-year period as construction projects rather than the one-year period for equipment. Because of the relatively slow process of book acquisition, cataloging and temporary storage, the three-year period is justified.

(b) *Preliminary and working drawings—science building I* \$110,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal covers the first permanent laboratory structure for the campus. It will provide facilities for life and physical sciences, a nursing laboratory, general purpose classrooms, 26 faculty offices and auxiliary spaces having a calculated capacity of 355 FTE students. The building will have a gross area of approximately 38,000 square feet and its present schedule is for completion by late 1972. Construction cost will probably exceed \$1,700,000.

No preliminary plans are available for this structure because of the change in policy which took place in 1968 by which it was agreed that advance preliminary plans would not be prepared for projects for which only working drawings were to be proposed and for which the project cost would exceed \$1 million. This change is based on the premise that before funds are released by the State Public Works Board for working drawings adequate preliminary plans must be presented and reviewed. The proposal as to size and scope meets the approved program for this new campus and the amount appears to be in line for the purpose.

## Chico

(c) *Construct—chiller plant*----- \$1,076,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$55,000 for the preparation of working drawings and the Trustees allocated \$24,545 for preliminary plans for the design of a chiller plant which would become part of the new central heating plant. The chiller addition would be completed late in 1970.

Funded buildings not yet put to bid will be slightly redesigned to eliminate chilling equipment and appurtenant facilities because these buildings will now be serviced by the central system. Projects already under construction will be change-ordered to eliminate such equipment so that they can be tied to the central system. Existing buildings also will gradually be changed over to the central system and

## California State Colleges—Continued

local chilling equipment will be taken out of service. A central system represents great economies over a long period and we have consistently recommended this approach. As campuses grow in size, the potential for savings increases proportionately by the use of a central plant. Consequently, we are in favor of this particular proposal. The square foot costs are relatively meaningless in this type of project because 75 percent of the cost is for the major pieces of equipment in what is otherwise a very simple structure. The estimate appears to be in line for the purpose.

## Dominguez Hills

(d) *Construct—theater arts building* ----- \$1,971,000

*We recommend special review.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$77,000 for the preparation of working drawings and the trustees allocated \$15,000 for preliminary plans for a little theater building which would provide a 500-seat theater with auxiliary spaces plus some classrooms which together with the little theater would provide a capacity of 93 FTE students. The design contemplates a structure having a gross area of 40,230 square feet with a net assignable area of 27,100 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of about 67.5 percent. This is low in consideration of the fact that a large portion of the structure is in the 500-seat little theater. The current cost estimate, based on the construction cost index of October, 1968, is \$32.30 per gross square foot for the basic building and over \$49 per square foot at total project level which includes a substantial amount of fixed group I equipment.

In our discussions of the project working drawings in the 1968 Budget Bill, we generally favored this project. However, we believe that because of the relatively small FTE capacity generated by the project and the fact that the projection for enrollment in the period 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., five days per week, for the fall of 1971 is 2,530 FTE, the proposal should be reviewed again by the Legislature. The completion date for the project is estimated for the fall of 1971.

(e) *Working drawings—library building* ----- \$77,000

*We recommend special review.*

The Budget Act of 1967 appropriated \$206,000 and the trustees provided \$23,600 for preliminary plans of an addition to the existing library. The present proposal is to increase the working drawing funds. The concept is for a combination classroom and library structure which ultimately would become entirely library by phasing out the classroom portion. At such time, the two structures together would presumably provide book stack and reader station capacity for a campus enrollment of 12,000 FTE students. The cost of construction would probably exceed \$6 million.

As of this writing, there is considerable uncertainty as to whether this structure should actually be an addition to the existing building or be sited at another location and designed to supersede the existing library building which would then subsequently be converted into class-

## California State Colleges—Continued

room use. Until this question can be clearly resolved, we do not feel that we can make a positive recommendation. It is anticipated that the question will be resolved before the two legislative finance committees review the capital outlay budget and at that time we will have an appropriate recommendation. *This project is out of sequence in the bill. It should be (d) under Chico.*

## Fresno

- (f) Preliminary and working drawings — business classroom building ----- \$225,000

*We recommend special review.*

This proposal contemplates a rather large multistory structure having about 129,000 gross square feet of area with about 82,000 square feet of net usable area, giving an efficiency ratio of 63½ percent. This appears to be on the low side for what is essentially a lecture classroom building having a capacity that will probably exceed 3,000 FTE students. While the current cost estimate at \$26.13 per gross square foot for the basic building construction and \$33.77 per square foot at total project level appears to be reasonable, we would question the justification for the capacity addition at this time. The construction cost will probably exceed \$4,200,000.

In our opening statement on capital outlay in higher education, we raised questions concerning utilization of space and suggested a higher utilization goal. At Fresno there appear to be some ambiguities in the capacity projections which require clarification. In the statistical appendix of the trustees' five-year plan, it is indicated that for the fall of 1971 for the 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. period Fresno will have a cumulative capacity of 9,010 FTE versus an instructional load of 10,510 FTE or an 86-percent ratio. In the fall of 1972 when the business classroom building is scheduled for completion with an FTE capacity exceeding 3,000, the projection is only 11,098 FTE cumulative capacity against an instructional load of 11,180 or a 99-percent ratio. It would appear that the cumulative capacity should be more on the order of 12,000 which would appear to exceed the instructional load for the fall of 1972 by a substantial amount even basing the capacity on the existing utilization standard for the 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. time span. By applying the more intensive utilization we have suggested, it would appear that the cumulative capacity in the fall of 1972 would meet or exceed the instructional load without this building. Consequently, we feel that the project should be carefully reviewed and discussed before any approval is given.

## Fullerton

- (g) Construct—boiler plant addition III ----- \$557,000

*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$50,000 for the preparation of working drawings and the trustees allocated \$2,700 for preliminary plans for expansion of the boiler plant. This would represent the third expansion of the plant necessitated by the fact that several buildings

## California State Colleges—Continued

under construction will be completed by the fall semester of 1969 and will require cooling capacity for the following year as well as some heating capacity for the winter of 1969-70. The existing plant has the space to add one 1,100-ton chiller and one boiler. This expansion is essential and the costs appear to be in line.

(h) *Construct—science building conversion IV*----- \$543,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal covers working drawings and construction for the conversion of space being temporarily occupied by administrative services into 10 lecture rooms, one seminar and 12 laboratories, for biological science, chemistry and general science. The academic instructional capacity that will result is 595 FTE students.

The science building was the first major structure on this campus and was initially used for all general campus purposes although it was designed to be used exclusively for science with a capacity for that purpose which would meet the needs of a total campus enrollment of 10,000 FTE. This conversion is needed and justified and the cost appears to be in line.

(i) *Convert—library, third floor*----- \$165,000

*We recommend approval.*

The main library building on this campus was constructed at a sufficient size to provide for library requirements for some years. However, initially several floors were temporarily assigned to and partitioned for general classroom use with the intention that these would be phased out as new academic structures were completed and additional library space was required. The net area to be converted is over 26,000 square feet. It will add 494 reader stations and additional stack capacity for over 115,000 volumes. The present occupants, business administration and economics, will move to the new School of Business of Administration and Economics Building. The cost appears to be in line for the purpose.

## Sacramento

(j) *Preliminary and working drawings—engineering addition and remodeling*----- \$155,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal covers fairly extensive remodeling work in the existing engineering building plus the addition of air conditioning in the existing building and the construction of new facilities having a gross area of almost 53,000 square feet with a net usable area of nearly 37,000 square feet. This gives an efficiency ratio of over 69 percent which is satisfactory for engineering buildings.

The remodeling and additional space requirements are brought about by the growth in engineering enrollments on this campus plus considerable expansion in graduate engineering which includes masters degree programs in civil, mechanical, and electrical engineering. Prior to 1967, this campus offered only the masters degree in applied mechanics. The engineering program in the past tended to be more oriented toward

## California State Colleges—Continued

industrial arts than professional engineering. This has changed rapidly and is continuing to change and the additional space appears justified on this basis.

The total project cost, including working drawings, will probably exceed \$3 million which includes the remodeling and air conditioning of the existing building. The new addition would, of course, also have air conditioning.

The cost of the new space is estimated at \$28.81 per gross square foot for the basic building construction and the remodeling including the air conditioning is estimated at \$11.07 per gross square foot at building construction level. These costs appear to be in line. The new space will generate a capacity of 256 FTE students including the graduate programs.

## San Diego

(k) Preliminary and working drawings—humanities classroom building No. 1 ----- \$140,000

*We recommend special review.*

This proposal covers a structure having a gross area of almost 81,500 square feet with a net usable area of about 53,000 square feet. This gives an efficiency ratio of 65 percent which is average for what is essentially a lecture classroom building. The building which is scheduled for occupancy in mid 1973 would have a capacity of 2,000 FTE students and 125 faculty office stations for the humanities program including English and mathematics. The current cost estimate would indicate a total project value in excess of \$2,800,000 and unit costs of \$25.19 per gross square foot at building construction level and over \$33 per foot at total project level.

As in a previous project in this item, we find that there are some ambiguities with respect to capacities and their relation to instructional load. The calculated cumulative capacity for the fall of 1972 is 20,301 against an instructional load of 20,660, giving a ratio of 98 percent which would be quite good.

For the fall of 1973 when this building would come on the line, the cumulative capacity is shown at only 20,966 despite the fact that this structure would have a 2,000 FTE capacity. In any case, enrollment for the same period would be 20,920 or a ratio somewhat in excess of 100 percent. In view of our earlier statements concerning more intensive utilization of space, it would appear that the funding of working drawings for this project is questionable at this time and should be reviewed by the finance committees.

(l) Preliminary and working drawings—chemistry-geology building ----- \$123,000

*We recommend special review.*

This project contemplates a laboratory building having a gross area of almost 60,000 square feet with a net usable area of over 41,600 square feet. This gives an efficiency ratio of 69.5 percent which is relatively high for laboratory buildings. However, the program indicates that a substantial part of the area will be lecture facilities calling for 235

## California State Colleges—Continued

lecture stations and 172 laboratory stations plus 23 faculty office stations. A further element in raising the efficiency is the fact that there will be a central receiving and shipping facility in the lower level of the building opening onto College Avenue. The building is scheduled for occupancy in mid 1973. Construction cost will probably exceed \$2,200,000.

Unfortunately, the state college system does not provide statistical breakdowns of FTE enrollments by lecture room and laboratory room separately so that it becomes difficult to determine whether there is, in fact, a specific shortage in laboratory space as compared to lecture room space. In any case, the questions we have expressed with respect to increased utilization of both lecture and laboratory facilities leads us to suggest review.

(m) *Working drawings—central chilling plant, phase I  
and utilities, 1969* ----- \$130,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal combines into one project, two projects which were set forth in the trustees five-year plan for both working drawings and construction. One is for the central chilling plant at \$1,470,000 and the other for utilities extension from the plant and for other types of utilities extensions at \$804,000. The current estimate for the combined projects based on the construction cost index for October, 1968, is in excess of \$2,350,000. The trustees have already allocated \$32,000 for preliminary plans.

The initial impact of the central chiller plant would affect the library and the new art building, both of which are now under construction. It is estimated that by removing the individual air-conditioning facilities for major buildings, there would be a savings of \$300,000 which would be used in financing of the central plant. In addition, all future air-conditioning projects would be tied to the central plant both with respect to new buildings and to the addition of air-conditioning to existing buildings.

The utilities portion represents the main distribution runs of the chilled water lines plus a new electrical feeder system and new steam conduits. We believe that a start toward a central chiller plant is essential and will result in very substantial economies over the years. The working drawings proposal appears to be in line.

## Sonoma

(n) *Construct remodeling—classroom building No. 1* ---- \$183,000

*We recommend approval.*

Classroom building No. 1 was the first permanent academic instructional building on this campus and as such it initially provided space for other purposes, particularly the library. This proposal covers the remodeling of about 30,000 square feet of space which was occupied by the library and will now be removed to the new library building when it is completed in July of 1969. The remodeled space will provide an additional capacity of 454 FTE students, 37 faculty office stations and

## California State Colleges—Continued

6 departmental chairman office suites. The remodeled space is scheduled to be occupied in February of 1970. This proposal covers only the construction work since working drawings were funded by the Budget Act of 1967 at \$14,000, in addition to which the trustees provided \$2,725 for preliminary plans. The costs appear to be in line for the purpose and the conversion is justified since the space would otherwise remain vacant upon removal of the library function.

## Cal-Poly K.V.

(o) *Preliminary and working drawings—science building \$325,000*

*We recommend special review.*

This proposal covers the design and preparation of working drawings for a multistory laboratory and classroom building having a gross area in excess of 150,000 square feet with a net usable area of nearly 96,000 square feet. This gives an efficiency ratio of about 63 percent and is satisfactory for this combination which would have 27 classrooms and 21 laboratories with a capacity of 1,702 FTE students. In addition, the building would provide 103 faculty office spaces, administrative offices and a computer facility. The current projections contemplate its completion by the fall of 1972. The total cost of the project, including working drawings, will probably exceed \$6,400,000 and the current unit cost estimate is \$29.16 per gross square foot for the basic building construction and \$41.58 per square foot at total project level.

We have heretofore in other projects raised the question of space utilization and have indicated the fact that the state college system does not supply a breakdown of its enrollment by lecture space and laboratory space. Therefore we have no positive knowledge as to the situation with respect to the need for laboratory space. In any case, we would point out that in the fall of 1971 for the time span of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., the cumulative capacity is indicated at 6,931 with an instructional load of 7,430 or a ratio of 93 percent. For the fall of 1972 when this building would presumably come on the line, the cumulative capacity is calculated at 8,620 which accounts for the additional capacity of the building. The instructional load, however, is 7,980, giving a ratio of 108 percent. On the basis of the possibility that more intensive utilization of laboratory as well as classroom space could result in the existing and funded plant being able to handle the indicated instructional load, we believe that this proposal may be questionable. On that basis, we recommend a thorough review of the problem by the Legislature.

## Cal-Poly S.L.O.

(p) *Working drawings and construction—utilities, 1969 - \$66,000*

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal covers principally the construction of a sanitary sewer to eliminate current serious overloading of the existing system. In addition, it will cover some steamlines needed to increase capacity. The costs appear to be in line and the project is justified.

## California State Colleges—Continued

(q) Preliminary and working drawings—classroom building No. 3 ..... \$162,000

*We recommend special review.*

This proposal contemplates a multistory building having a gross area of nearly 93,000 square feet, with a net usable area of over 58,000 square feet. This gives an efficiency ratio of 62.8 percent which we would consider on the low side for a building which is essentially a lecture classroom facility. It will have the capacity of 2,130 FTE plus 180 faculty office stations and a home management facility. The current completion date is projected for the fall of 1972. The total project cost is estimated at over \$3,200,000 with unit costs at \$25.15 per gross square foot for the basic building construction and \$33.60 per square foot at total project level. The costs appear to be in line for the purpose.

We raise the same questions with respect to intensification of the utilization of existing space and the possibility that this proposal could be deferred for some time. For the fall of 1971, cumulative capacity is calculated at 8,917 FTE against an instructional load of 10,000 FTE giving a ratio of 89 percent. For the fall of 1972, the cumulative capacity is 11,343 FTE which reflects the addition of this building, against an instructional load of 10,610 FTE for a ratio of about 107 percent. These figures would indicate the possibility that intensification of utilization of existing space could defer the need of this building for a year or more. On this basis, we recommend a careful review by the Legislature.

(r) Construct-remodel—science building No. 1 ..... \$160,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal would cover the preparation of working drawings and construction for the remodeling of 4,000 square feet in three existing 24-station botany laboratories to provide three 16-station upper division chemistry laboratories. The existing botany laboratories are being replaced by space in new biological science building now nearing completion. The chemistry program requires additional laboratory space and in any case the botany laboratories would remain vacant if they were not converted to some other use. On this basis, the proposal seems justified and the cost is in line.

## CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

## Item 388 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$2,152,000
Recommended for approval .....	2,152,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item covers 13 proposals for equipping projects previously funded or proposed to be funded in this budget. Funding is contingent



## California State Colleges—Continued

upon the release of state moneys from other state projects to the extent that federal grant funds are received. Consequently, the net effect is a zero appropriation. However, we review each proposal in the same manner as if it were a direct cash appropriation.

## Fullerton

(a) *Equip—humanities-social science building* ----- \$200,500

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the second and final phase of equipping the humanities-social science building which was funded for construction by the Budget Act of 1966 and is expected to be occupied by the middle of 1969. The first phase of equipment was appropriated by the Budget Act of 1968.

The building is expected to have a capacity of nearly 2,000 FTE students and 269 faculty office stations.

The structure of almost 145,000 gross square feet will contain nearly 87,500 square feet of net usable area, and will probably cost in excess of \$4,200,000. The two equipment phases, totaling over \$562,000, represent approximately 13 percent of the construction cost which appears reasonable for the purpose.

(b) *Equip—engineering building* ----- \$131,400

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal represents the third of what may possibly be six phases of equipping the engineering building which will soon be under construction and is scheduled for occupancy early in 1971. The first two phases funded in the Budget Acts of 1967 and 1968 were used to equip temporary engineering spaces in the science building and this equipment will be moved to the new building upon its completion. The new building will have a capacity of 277 FTE students plus 41 faculty office stations.

Construction funds were appropriated by the Budget Act of 1968 and the cost is expected to exceed \$3,200,000 for a building having a gross area of 72,000 square feet with a net usable area of about 49,000 square feet. The first three equipment phases would total \$661,500 or about 20 percent of the construction cost. Statistically, movable equipment costs in engineering buildings have averaged about 35 percent of construction cost. Several have gone as high as 45 percent, some years ago. Consequently, it appears that the third increment proposal is reasonable.

## Hayward

(c) *Equip—science building* ----- \$100,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the sixth of what will probably be an eight phase program to equip the science building which was the first permanent structure built on this campus and initially occupied in the fall of 1963. The building housed many disciplines and activities in the beginning and as nonscience assignments were phased into other permanent buildings, the vacated space required additional equipment to accommodate

## California State Colleges—Continued

science occupancy. The five previous phases provided a total of \$1,684,000. Each phase has been carefully reviewed and the present proposal appears to be justified in relation to the space being vacated. Five laboratory rooms are included in this changeover plus some graduate laboratory spaces.

## Long Beach

(d) Equip—engineering building II ----- \$400,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the second of what may be four or more phases of equipping the engineering building which is scheduled for completion late in 1970. The first phase which was funded by the Budget Act of 1968 was principally to cover equipment items having unusually long lead times between ordering and receipt.

The structure, for which construction funds were appropriated by the 1967 Budget Act, will have a gross area of 83,900 square feet with a net usable area of 55,550 square feet which will provide space for 460 FTE students plus offices for 32 faculty members. The project cost of the facility will probably exceed \$3,600,000 and the first two phases of equipment will total \$425,000 representing something less than 12 percent of the project cost. As previously noted, engineering buildings have historically run as high as 35 percent for equipment in relation to construction cost. Consequently, it appears that the second phase is justified at this time.

## Los Angeles

(e) Equip—library addition ----- \$441,900

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the second of a scheduled three phases of equipping a large library addition planned for completion late in 1969. The first phase of equipment was funded by the Budget Act of 1968.

Construction was funded by the Budget Act of 1965 for a structure which would add over 259,000 gross square feet of area with over 181,000 square feet of net usable area which together with the existing library would provide book stack and reader space, plus auxiliary service areas, to accommodate an FTE enrollment of almost 17,000.

The construction cost of the project will probably exceed \$6,500,000 and the two increments of equipment will total \$836,500 representing nearly 13 percent of the cost of the project which is actually at the upper limit of what has been provided on a statistical basis. It would seem therefore that this proposal should be the last and that there should not be one in the future unless it can be related to changed activities or functions. Because the equipment list has been carefully reviewed and justified on the basis of the actual requirements of the building, we would consider the proposal acceptable.

## San Bernardino

(f) Equip—biological science building ----- \$42,800

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the fourth of what will probably be a five-phase program to equip the building which was completed in September of

## California State Colleges—Continued

1967 but not fully occupied for biological science purposes. Some of the space was devoted to other activities on an interim basis. These are now to be phased out into other permanent buildings and the space utilized for biological science purposes.

The structure was funded by the Budget Act of 1965 at a cost of just under \$2 million. The first four phases of equipment have totaled \$425,200 and the fifth will make a total of \$468,000 or about 23 percent of the construction cost of the project. The so-called hard science buildings have statistically required from 20 to as high as 30 percent for the cost of equipment as compared with the project cost. The current proposal falls within that range and is therefore justifiable.

(g) *Equip—physical science building* ----- \$118,400

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the fourth and final phase of equipping the physical science building which was completed in August of 1967. Construction of the project was funded by the Budget Act of 1965 and the three previous equipment phases were funded in each of the following budget years. The building has a capacity of 560 FTE. The cost of the structure was over \$1,815,000 and the total of the four equipment phases will be slightly over \$487,000 or about 22.5 percent of the project value which falls well within the range for hard science buildings. On this basis, the proposal is justified.

## San Diego

(h) *Equip—music classroom building* ----- \$150,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the last of two phases for equipping a building which is scheduled for completion late in 1969. Construction was funded by the Budget Act of 1965 and the total project cost will probably exceed \$2,600,000. The building will have a capacity of about 424 FTE students plus offices for 42 faculty in over 76,000 gross square feet of area. The two phases of equipment total \$389,000. This is about 15 percent of the construction cost and is statistically appropriate for this type of facility. The proposal, therefore, appears to be justified.

(i) *Equip—library classroom building* ----- \$300,000

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is the second of what will probably be three phases of equipping the new library building which is scheduled for completion in the middle of 1970. Construction funding was appropriated by the 1966 Budget Act for a building which would totally supersede the existing library by providing 314,500 square feet of gross area with a net usable area of almost 243,000 square feet. This will provide book stacks and reader station capacity for a campus enrollment of 16,000 FTE when the building is fully utilized for library purposes. Initially, part of the library will be used for classrooms with a total capacity of about 2,200 FTE students.

The cost of the structure will probably exceed \$8,185,000 and this proposal together with the first phase would provide a total of \$400,000

## California State Colleges—Continued

for equipment, representing less than 5 percent of the construction cost of the project. However, it should be borne in mind that all of the equipment and books in the existing library will be moved to the new library and a substantial part of the new building will be used for classroom purposes. Consequently, it appears that the second phase is justified and that in all probability at least one more phase will be justified.

## Sonoma

(j) Equip—library building ----- \$43,000  
We recommend approval.

This proposal is the second and possibly the last phase for equipping the library building which is scheduled for completion in mid 1969. Construction was funded by the Budget Act of 1966 for a building having approximately 64,500 square feet of gross area with a net usable area of nearly 49,000 square feet. The structure is intended to have capacity for book stacks and reader stations plus auxiliary activities for a campus enrollment of 2,400 FTE students. The project cost will be nearly \$2 million and the two equipment phases will total about \$155,000 which represents less than 8 percent of the project construction cost. Statistically, this is below the average. However, equipment from the existing library occupying temporary space in the initial buildings will be moved to the new building and the total result in value will probably equal the average. On this basis, the proposal appears to be justified.

(k) Equip—physical education facilities ----- \$52,000  
We recommend approval.

This proposal is the second and final phase of equipping the new physical education building which is scheduled for completion in mid-1969. The Budget Act of 1966 funded construction of the project which contemplated a structure having over 66,750 gross square feet of area with about 48,500 square feet of net usable area. In addition to the main gymnasium which will have seating for 2,500 using folding bleachers, there are two classrooms, a seminar room and departmental and faculty offices for 20 people. The classroom and seminar room spaces will have a capacity of 74 FTE students.

The construction cost of the project will probably exceed \$2,200,000 and the two equipment phases will total about \$163,000 or about 7 percent of the project construction value. This is about average for gymnasiums and on this basis the proposal appears justified.

(l) Equip-remodel—classroom building No. 1 ----- \$84,100  
We recommend approval.

In Item 383 Project (n), there is a proposal for remodeling space vacated by library activities to be used for classrooms and faculty office stations with a total capacity of 454 FTE. The library activities will move into the new library building which is scheduled for completion in July of 1969. The equipment appears to be reasonable for the purpose and the project is otherwise justified.

## California State Colleges—Continued

## Cal-Poly S.L.O.

(m) Equip—remodeled science building I ----- \$87,900  
 We recommend approval.

In Item 387 project (r), there is a proposal for the remodeling of three botany laboratories with about 4,000 square feet of assignable area to provide three upper division chemistry laboratories. The existing botany laboratories will be replaced by facilities in the new biological science building which is expected to be completed early in 1969.

This proposal covers the movable furnishings and equipment needed to make the remodeled laboratories operable. The amount appears reasonable for the purpose.

## CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY

## Item 389 from the General Fund

Requested 1969-70 -----	\$264,000
Recommended for approval -----	234,000
Recommended for special review -----	30,000
Recommended reduction -----	None

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item covers two projects, one for construction based on working drawings previously funded and the other for working drawings for a new project.

(a) Construct—library building ----- \$234,000  
 We recommend approval.

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$20,000 for the preparation of working drawings and prior allocations of \$5,000 were made for preliminary plans for the design of a one-story, wood frame building on a concrete slab, having a gross area of 6,441 square feet and a net assignable area of 4,896 square feet, giving an excellent efficiency ratio of 76 percent. The building is intended to provide all the library facilities required for this campus which heretofore had been housed in about 1,200 square feet, in the residence facility, which was totally inadequate for the purpose. The building will have a capacity for about 20,000 volumes and 60 reader stations.

The current cost estimate is \$23.04 per gross square foot for the basic building and \$40.21 per gross square foot at total project level. This includes a substantial amount of site development and utilities as well as all fees and contingencies. The cost appears to be in line for the purpose.

(b) Working drawings—residence hall ----- \$30,000  
 We recommend special review.

The permanent residence hall facility on this campus was constructed about 10 years ago with a capacity of 200 cadets on the basis of two per room. The average enrollment has been running somewhat above

## California State Colleges—Continued

250 with the excess being quartered aboard the academy's 8,000-ton vessel which is moored in Carquinez Straits immediately adjacent to the site. The residence quarters aboard the ship are clearly substandard when compared to facilities provided for officers in the Merchant Marine and even more so when compared with the facilities provided in the permanent residence hall on shore. On this basis, there is reasonable justification for providing additional on-shore residence facilities.

The proposal is for a 75-capacity facility for which we have received no details, no preliminary plans and no outline specifications. The Governor's Budget indicates \$200,000 as the possible construction cost in the 1970-71 fiscal year, but we have no material to justify this figure. Consequently, while we are basically in favor of the project, we cannot make a recommendation at this time. Presumably we will have the necessary information by the time the capital outlay budget is reviewed by the Legislature.

Beyond the points raised above, we believe that there needs to be some study and review of the students' contribution toward the cost of this and the other residence facilities, in view of the fact that the proposal for the working drawings and ultimate construction is totally at state cost without any form of direct or indirect reimbursement. We would point out that the gross cost of instruction, residence and maintenance is calculated at \$4,450 per student for the 1968-69 fiscal year. Towards this cost the student pays \$750 and the federal government pays to the state \$400 toward the student's subsistence. Furthermore, the student receives \$200 directly from the federal government to help defray the cost of uniforms and textbooks. In addition, the academy receives certain lump sum grants from the federal government which add from \$200 to \$250 per student. This results in a net cost to the state of about \$3,100 per student. This would compare to an average of \$1,500 at the state colleges. The latter is, of course, exclusive of residence and feeding costs borne by the student. Because the academy is operated on a trimester year with a three-year total for the bachelor's degree, the cost to the state is something in excess of \$9,000 per student. This compares with the four-year bachelor requirement at the state colleges with a cost to the state of about \$6,000 per student.

From the student's standpoint, his total cost per year is the \$750 payment he makes to the academy plus any amount which the cost of his uniforms and textbooks exceed the \$200 allowance from the federal government, plus any personal expenses. By comparison the average university or state college student who lives in a campus residence facility pays probably about \$1,000 per year for residence facilities (which includes amortization of the construction cost) and feeding plus various student fees, textbooks and personal expenses which bring the cost up to an average of well over \$1,400. It is apparent that a university or state college student is required to make a significantly greater out-of-pocket contribution to his maintenance and education towards an equivalent bachelor's degree than is required of the academy student. Consequently, it would appear that there should be some increase in the charges made to the academy student sufficient to offset the cost of the additional residence facility.

**CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY****Item 390 from the General Fund**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$4,500
Recommended for approval .....	4,500
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item covers two minor construction projects. One is for a survey of the electrical services to the site at a cost of \$1,000. The electrical supply and distribution system has been in service at this institution for a substantial number of years and demands have been added from time to time as activities expanded. It appears appropriate at this time for a survey to be made to determine the condition and capacity of the system.

The second project is to complete the resurfacing of the road which runs from the main entrance road to the area containing faculty residences. This is a steep road which has been deteriorating and some resurfacing work has been done in the past. The additional work is well justified on the basis of the safety of those using the road.

**DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HYGIENE****Item 391 from the General Fund**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$1,163,610
Recommended for approval .....	533,540
Recommended for special review .....	630,070
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This request covers a schedule of five projects. Four of the projects involve improvements to utilities, mechanical equipment and patient facilities at two hospitals for the mentally ill and one hospital for the mentally retarded. The fifth project is a request for statewide master-planning. No new capacity is included.

- (a) *Mendocino State Hospital, improvements to electrical distribution system—phase I* ..... \$244,600

*We recommend approval.*

In 1966, the Office of Architecture and Construction conducted a survey of the electrical distribution system at this hospital. Its findings disclosed that the recorded maximum power demand was 10 percent above the system's capacity yet remained below similar recorded demands at other state hospitals. The survey also uncovered various code infractions which make the system unsafe for workmen to maintain and repair. Another study conducted in 1968 cited the critical nature

## Department of Mental Hygiene—Continued

of the situation and suggested what was considered an economical solution to the problem.

The amount proposed in this item will cover additional electrical distribution capacity and the removal of various safety hazards. This will be accomplished by replacing the existing primary switchgear and substation and by adding switching points at various locations to facilitate locating and isolating faults in the system. The replacement of transformer vaults and the correction of secondary distribution problems and related code infractions is not within the scope of this project.

(b) *Porterville State Hospital, install primary electric cable* ----- \$108,760

*We recommend approval.*

Most of the electrical power duct system at this hospital was installed on top of the steam tunnel. The insulation on this cable consisted of both shielded and unshielded butyl rubber with a neoprene jacket. Subsequent failures in the unshielded cable resulted in replacement in 1965 and 1966 with a shielded cable insulated with silicone rubber and a braid jacket.

A survey by the Office of Architecture and Construction in 1968, revealed that the original shielded cable has deteriorated due to the extremely severe environmental conditions in the proximity of the steam tunnel. The amount requested in this item will implement the recommendations of that survey. The work contemplated consists of the replacement of the primary electric cable not replaced previously with a shielded cable insulated with silicone rubber and a polyvinyl chloride jacket.

(c) *Napa State Hospital, replace heating, children's unit complex* ----- \$130,180

*We recommend approval.*

The children's unit complex was constructed in 1961. Three years later, problems developed with the gas-fired heating units and they have since become a constant maintenance and repair problem. It is proposed to replace the 26 gas furnaces located throughout the complex with hot water heating coils. The heat exchanger and circulating pumps will be provided at the mechanical room in the adjacent laundry building and will be connected via new underground piping to the fan rooms in the children's unit complex. To complete the project, new pneumatic temperature controls will be installed throughout the complex and connected with the existing pneumatic system.

(d) *Napa State Hospital, remodel wards for mentally retarded patients* ----- \$630,070

*We recommend special review.*

In April of 1968, the Department of Mental Hygiene submitted a program to the Legislature outlining a proposal to redistribute mentally retarded patients into hospitals for the mentally ill. In accordance with



## Department of Mental Hygiene—Continued

that proposal, the department has successfully moved 52 patients from Sonoma to Napa State Hospital. The Public Works Board recently approved the allocation of \$434,500 to remodel the interiors of the six wards at Napa State Hospital which will eventually be occupied by 480 mentally retarded patients. This allocation was made from funds appropriated in the Budget Act of 1966 to improve ward environmental conditions at various hospitals. However, the criteria established for allocating funds from that source limited funding for any one project to a specific amount per bed. As a result, the funds allocated were not sufficient to make all the modifications necessary to accommodate the patient relocation. This item is proposed in order to provide a complete project.

We have reviewed the preliminary plans and specifications for the proposed project and concur with the need for some additional work to complete the ward remodeling. However, we believe the proposal includes some extraneous items that are not essential to the relocation and treatment of mentally retarded patients at Napa. We have discussed our objections with the Department of Mental Hygiene which is currently in the process of reviewing the documents prepared by the Office of Architecture and Construction. The department concurs with our belief that the scope of this project can and should be reduced. We believe there is a potential for a significant reduction in the cost of this phase of the project. Because an agreement has not been reached and the estimated revised, we are unable to make a positive recommendation. We anticipate that this problem will be solved and a new estimate developed in time for the budget hearings.

- (e) *Master planning for hospitals for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded* ----- \$50,000

*We recommend approval.*

In February, 1968, the California Medical Association published a survey of the state hospital system in which the statement was made that: "Efforts should be made to correct, at the earliest possible time, the existing defects in physical plant and maintenance." In April the Department of Mental Hygiene outlined a three-phase program to be undertaken in conjunction with the Office of Architecture and Construction to evaluate the physical facilities and maintenance program of each hospital.

Phase I of that program consisted of an overall survey of the presently occupied facilities at the hospitals to determine the number of windows to be glazed, the extent of plaster patching and interior painting required, the amount of floor covering to be repaired or replaced and the extent of exterior painting required. This survey was accomplished with funds appropriated in the Budget Act of 1966 to assist the department in developing a master plan. The recommendations of that survey were implemented with \$500,000 out of funds appropriated for environmental improvement in the Budget Act of 1966.

## Department of Mental Hygiene—Continued

Phase II would consist of an architectural and engineering examination of the hospital buildings to determine the scope of work required to maintain them for patient occupancy at least through 1973, including a joint survey of the buildings to be retained to determine their adequacy for the treatment program. Landscaped grounds and other areas surrounding each hospital would be reviewed to determine the extent of improvement work required and a demolition program would be begun as soon as practical to remove any buildings not required for patient use or administrative purposes.

Phase III would include the full inspection of all buildings to be occupied beyond 1973 to determine any structural defects or major improvements required in the interest of fire and life safety or economical maintenance. In addition, a complete review of the basic utilities and service buildings would be made to permit completion of a plan to bring essential functions to a satisfactory level for the next 10 years.

The department originally requested \$250,000 to engage the services of the Office of Architecture and Construction to implement phases II and III. However, because of funding limitations, this figure was reduced to the \$50,000 currently proposed and the department intends to proceed to the extent of funds available. We have recommended in our analysis of the Department of Mental Hygiene's support budget on pages 587 to 589 that the department prepare a long-term comprehensive mental health plan. We believe an architectural and engineering evaluation of the existing treatment and services facilities is essential to the implementation of that plan. We therefore recommend that the studies outlined under phases II and III of this proposal be coordinated with the development of the mental health plan in order to establish a meaningful long-term masterplan for facility development.

## DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HYGIENE

## Item 392 from the General Fund

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$1,396,024
Recommended for approval .....	1,396,024
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

The Department of Mental Hygiene presently maintains 16 facilities for the care and treatment of the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. This includes five hospitals currently housing mentally ill patients, four hospitals housing mentally retarded patients, five hospitals housing mentally ill and mentally retarded patients and two training and research institutes. This request will finance 122 minor construction and improvement projects at these facilities. The amount will cover a total of seven projects less than are underway in the current year and in-

## Department of Mental Hygiene—Continued

cludes a significantly greater number of maintenance projects which more appropriately belong in the department's support budget. Table 1 contains a summary of the projects proposed at each hospital.

Table 1  
Projects by Institution and Justification

Hospital	Number of projects	Improve patient environment	Health or safety improvement	Facilitate employee efficiency	Improve utility service	Maintenance	Amount
<b>Hospitals for Mentally Ill</b>							
Agnews	7	2	1	1	2	1	\$147,090
Atascadero	2	0	2	0	0	0	45,500
Camarillo	7	5	0	0	0	2	149,000
DeWitt	10	4	2	2	1	1	77,670
Mendocino	12	4	3	4	0	1	67,120
Metropolitan	3	0	0	1	0	2	125,050
Napa	16	9	2	2	0	3	153,000
Patton	6	2	3	1	0	0	78,324
Stockton	11	2	4	2	0	3	103,300
Total	74	28	17	13	3	13	\$951,054
<b>Hospitals for Mentally Retarded</b>							
Fairview	16	6	6	2	1	1	\$55,000
Pacific	6	3	1	1	0	1	114,300
Porterville	6	2	1	0	1	2	102,670
Sonoma	13	4	3	2	2	2	135,000
Total	41	15	11	5	4	6	\$406,970
<b>Institutes</b>							
Langley-Porter	2	1	0	1	0	0	7,000
U.C.L.A.	5	0	1	1	0	3	31,000
Total	7	1	1	2	0	3	38,000
Grand Total	122	44	29	20	7	22	\$1,396,024

As indicated in Table 1, a significant number of the requests are environmental improvement projects. In a sense these requests constitute a piecemeal approach to improving patient areas and updating the treatment program. The projects proposed for this purpose include such items as a \$39,000 request to provide a beauty or barbershop and a personal care unit in eight wards in the west area at Agnews and a \$20,000 request to air condition the school buildings at Porterville.

Health and safety standards have changed considerably since the older hospitals were originally constructed. This factor coupled with changing program requirements leads to a continuing need to upgrade health and safety provisions for patients and employees. At Mendocino, \$3,000 is requested for the third phase of an ongoing project to install sneeze guards over food serving areas of patient dining rooms. Hallway lighting in the receiving and treatment building at Patton is inadequate and \$20,000 is requested to correct this deficiency.

The improvement of overall plant operations by facilitating employee efficiency often results in improved patient treatment. Numerous projects are proposed for this purpose, an example of which is a \$59,000

## Department of Mental Hygiene—Continued

request to install a grounds irrigation system at Agnew to permit more effective use of available labor and water. This also permits effective irrigation of lawn areas at night. Presently lawns are irrigated by hand during the daytime, which restricts patient use.

The remaining two columns in Table 1 cover projects requested to update electrical service, replace waterlines, paint exterior surfaces, and replace wornout floor covering. As we noted in our opening statement, the majority of these projects more properly belong in the department's support budget since they represent on-going maintenance essential to the continued operation of the facilities.

**MILITARY DEPARTMENT****Item 393 from the General Fund**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$165,000
Recommended for approval .....	165,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

The federal government annually provides funds for the construction of organizational maintenance shops, vehicle storage buildings, warehouses, hangars and other facilities that relate primarily to the care and maintenance of federal equipment issued for state use. The state's contribution to these facilities is to finance the preparation of plans, specifications and supervision of construction provided by the Office of Architecture and Construction. The Military Department estimates that a federal construction program in excess of \$1,400,000 will be initiated during the budget year and the \$165,000 requested in this item represents the estimated cost of architectural services.

**MILITARY DEPARTMENT****Item 394 from the General Fund**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$193,850
Recommended for approval .....	193,850
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

The amount requested in this item provides for a number of minor maintenance and improvement projects at various existing armories. Two projects totaling \$80,250 are for ongoing facilities maintenance and have become an annual budget request. This includes a \$42,000 roof repair proposal for an unspecified number of armories and a \$38,250 proposal to surface the unpaved vehicle storage compounds and

**Military Department—Continued**

parking facilities at six armories. The total estimated cost of the latter proposal is \$69,000 but it is anticipated that the federal government will provide \$30,750 to offset a portion of the cost. This program is to correct a deficiency which exists at some of the older armories built prior to National Guard Bureau authorization to install asphaltic concrete surfacing.

The department is requesting \$26,900 for off-street parking at four armories. This will provide for grading, paving and the improvement of access drives. To conform with a local ordinance, \$2,500 is requested to install curbs, gutters and a driveway entrance at the Monrovia Armory.

A group of five projects for general site improvements is proposed with a total estimated cost of \$32,700. This includes a request for \$10,000 to construct a new retaining wall at the front of the Manhattan Beach Armory and raise the existing wall at the rear property line. When the Ventura Armory was constructed, it was necessary to defer certain elements of the project due to insufficient funds. The department now proposes to complete that project and is requesting \$18,000 for paving, landscaping and installing a sprinkler system. The remaining \$4,700 is for fencing and drainage improvements at the Upland, Barstow and Gilroy Armories.

Two identical floor replacement projects are proposed for the San Francisco and the San Jose Armories. It is estimated that \$14,500 will be required to replace deteriorated wooden flooring with a concrete slab at the two facilities. A total of \$24,000 is requested for two additional projects at the San Francisco Armory. The sewer piping, plumbing fixtures and fittings at this armory were installed in 1912 and are showing signs of deterioration. It is estimated that \$20,000 will be required to replace those elements that are unserviceable. A \$4,000 project is also proposed to replace the kitchen exhaust duct and to install a new fan in the existing exhaust hood.

The remaining project is a \$2,000 request to reimburse the Office of Architecture and Construction for services required pursuant to the acquisition of real property for armory construction. These funds will provide site surveys, soil bearing capacity tests and the costs of recording and title insurance.

**DEPARTMENT OF PROFESSIONAL AND VOCATIONAL STANDARDS****Item 395 from the Professional and Vocational Standards Fund**

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$60,350
Recommended for approval .....	50,000
Recommended reduction .....	\$10,350

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS**

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Analysis page</i>
Delete project for conference and testing room, Business and Professions Building .....	\$10,350	1060

## Department of Professional and Vocational Standards—Continued

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend this item be reduced by \$10,350.*

The amount requested in this item provides for minor modifications and improvements to the Sacramento Business and Professions Building in which the Department of Professional and Vocational Standards is a major tenant. The most significant of the two items proposed is a \$50,000 request to rehabilitate and modify the existing heating system. A survey in September of 1967 by the Office of Architecture and Construction recommended a \$953,000 project to improve the heating and air-conditioning system in this building.

The survey also recommended a smaller interim project to correct critical deficiencies in the heating system. This proposal is based upon that survey and the latter recommendation. The work proposed consists primarily of replacing the existing 30-year-old steam heating coils in the main supply fans in the basement with new coils having a greater heat transfer surface. It should be noted that the work proposed does not relate to the central heating and cooling system for the capitol complex as indicated in the budget, but instead represents necessary improvements to an inefficient system irrespective of the source of heating energy.

Experience over the past several years has indicated an increasing demand for an additional conference and testing room space in the Business and Professions Building. The building presently has only one room capable of accommodating any large number of examinees. It is proposed to remodel a 1,500 square foot storage room in the basement to provide an additional conference and testing room. The proposal includes the installation of a suspended ceiling, flooring, wall finishing, lighting, necessary heating and air-conditioning and an additional exit door. However, the \$10,350 requested to perform this work has not been substantiated by the preparation of preliminary plans or a formal estimate. It is our observation that the amount requested is grossly inadequate. In addition, although we concur with the need for this project, we believe this remodeling should be deferred pending completion of the Department of General Services space recovery proposal for this building. We understand the department is currently studying the feasibility of relocating the Department of Finance and the audit division into the Business and Professions Building. In order to provide for this relocation, virtually all the space will have to be replanned. Undoubtedly this will have an effect on the project currently proposed. The capital outlay budget for the Department of General Services contains a \$300,000 proposal to provide for alterations to various state office buildings. That request is partially justified by the need to provide funds for implementation of the department's space recovery program. Because this program is underway, we feel that the \$10,350 requested in this item is premature.

**Resources Agency  
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION**

**Item 396 from the General Fund**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$492,185
Recommended for approval .....	492,185
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item covers a schedule of five specific land acquisition proposals and three construction projects together with equipment for them as follows:

(a) *Land acquisition—Oakridge Lookout* ..... \$5,000

*We recommend approval.*

This lookout is on one and one-half acres of land which is under lease due to expire 1972 with no provisions for renewal. The state has built lookout facilities on the site and it would appear prudent to purchase the site in order to protect the state's investment and because the location is needed as part of the total detection system in the northwest part of Sonoma County and the southwest part of Mendocino County.

(b) *Land acquisition—Sandy Point Forest Fire Station*..... \$4,000

*We recommend approval.*

The present station site is on a short-term lease from the County of San Mateo and in any case is too small to provide for parking and the construction of needed additional facilities and improvements. The proposal is to buy two acres adjoining the site on which will ultimately be constructed new, adequate facilities built to current Division of Forestry standards. The proposal appears to be reasonable.

(c) *Land acquisition—Almaden Forest Fire Station*..... \$12,500

*We recommend approval.*

The present site for this fire station in Santa Clara County measures approximately 150 feet by 325 feet and the facilities on it are old and substandard. In the long-range plan for the Division of Forestry, it is intended to rebuild the station but the site would be too small and the access too steep to justify new facilities on it. The proposal is to buy an immediately adjoining parcel of the same dimensions which would then provide adequate space for a new station and would eliminate the steep approach. However, it is our understanding that the adjacent two acres have been sold and it may be that the division will have to look for a different site entirely. The amount proposed should be enough for an adequate site if no difficult topographic problems are encountered. The proposal for an adequate site appears to be reasonable as part of the long-range plan.

## Department of Conservation—Continued

- (d) *Land acquisition—Dulzura Forest Fire Station*----- \$10,000  
*We recommend approval.*

This station in San Diego County is presently operated on a seasonal basis using a 100 foot by 150 foot lot on a six-month lease, renewable annually. Temporary seasonal housing in the form of trailers or tent platforms are set up for crew quarters but no cover is available for the fire equipment. The long-range plan contemplates a permanent fire station, possibly in the 1972-73 fiscal year, and it appears appropriate at this time to purchase the five acres proposed at a location approximately 35 miles southeast of the City of San Diego.

- (e) *Land acquisition—Yucaipa Forest Fire Station*----- \$25,000  
*We recommend approval.*

The present station near the City of Yucaipa in San Bernardino County, is on a site consisting of 0.13 acre, about the size of a city lot, and the buildings on it are approximately 30 years old, having been constructed in 1936 by the W.P.A. This station is supposed to function as a combination fire station and assistant rangers' headquarters and for this purpose at least two and one-half acres are required. The amount proposed should be adequate for a site of this size on the basis of about \$10,000 per acre.

- (f) *Construct—San Juan Capistrano Forest Fire Station*— \$206,600

- (g) *Equip—San Juan Capistrano Forest Fire Station*----- \$3,830  
*We recommend approval.*

This station functions as a 12-man or No. 4 unit in buildings which were constructed in 1938 and have been repeatedly treated for termite damage, particularly within the past three years. In addition, the buildings are generally substandard as compared with the modern facilities of the Division of Forestry.

The proposal covers a building which would be of wood frame construction with stucco exterior and would have a gross area of 4,949 square feet. It is estimated to cost \$23.28 per gross square foot at basic building level approximately \$42.25 per square foot at total project level, which includes substantial amounts for site development, utilities and all service fees. The structure includes a kitchen, restroom and shower facilities and other relatively high-cost elements, so that the costs appear to be in line.

- (h) *Construct—Bieber Forest Fire Station*----- \$135,700

- (i) *Equip—Bieber Forest Fire Station*----- \$1,890  
*We recommend approval.*

This station in the Lassen-Modoc ranger unit consists of a 20-year-old surplus metal army building which was erected after World War II. Because the station is located at an elevation of 4,500 feet, the building becomes extremely difficult to heat in the winter and even in the late fire season when fairly cold weather develops in this area. In addition, the building leaks rather badly during windy rainstorms which makes maintenance difficult and costly.



## Department of Conservation—Continued

The proposal contemplates the construction of a one-story wood frame building with cement asbestos shingle exterior. It would be a combination structure providing both barracks and messhall for a 14-man crew plus living quarters for the cook. The building would have a gross area of 3,064 square feet which is estimated to cost \$27.30 per gross square foot for the basic building and over \$43.92 per square foot at total project level. This includes extensive utility development and all service fees. The location is relatively remote and the costs appear to be in line on this basis.

(j) Construct—radio and auto shop building, Nevada City  
ranger headquarters ----- \$87,000

(k) Equip—radio and auto shop building, Nevada City  
ranger headquarters ----- \$665

*We recommend approval.*

The Nevada City ranger headquarters unit is the central support point for eight fire stations and four fire lookouts. As such, it stores a substantial amount of valuable equipment and materials, particularly during the winter months when some of the stations and lookouts are closed down. The present storage is scattered among six locations and repeated thefts at the outlying stations dictate that the equipment be stored at a safe central point. Furthermore, the automotive shop and radio shop are usurping four vehicle stalls, thus requiring equipment to remain out in the weather.

This proposal would provide a building containing auto shop facilities and radio repair facilities. The one-story structure will be of wood frame with redwood plywood siding and providing a gross area of 4,681 square feet. The project is estimated to cost \$17.39 per gross square foot for the basic building and almost \$29.12 per foot at total project level, which includes utilities development, group I shop equipment and all related service fees plus contingencies. The costs appear to be in line for the purpose.

## Resources Agency

## DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

## Item 397 from the General Fund

Requested 1969-70 -----	\$757,815
Recommended for approval -----	757,815
Recommended reduction -----	None

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

This item covers a wide variety of minor projects in all six of the districts of the Division of Forestry at a cost which is very nearly twice the amount that was appropriated for generally similar purposes

## Department of Conservation—Continued

by the Budget Act of 1968. The major single element in this increase is associated with the Forestry statewide radio system for the modernization and expansion of which a first phase was initiated several years ago. This proposal includes almost \$250,000 for a second phase. More than half of the cost of the second phase is concerned with additional equipment required to establish ranger unit local nets, to eliminate "dead" areas, and includes such things as mobile relays, portable radios, monitor receivers, base stations and control circuits. The balance of phase II is concerned with the establishment of nine new radio sites, the modification of some of the existing equipment, the cost of installing the new equipment mentioned above and the cost of a series of surveys to establish radio coverage limitations.

The balance of the minor construction project program is concerned with conventional elements such as the construction of 10-man barracks buildings at the Leesville and Gordon Valley Forest Fire Stations, mess-halls at the Diddy Wells and Paskenta Forest Fire Stations, a residence unit at the Paskenta Forest Fire Station and numerous alteration and improvement projects, each under \$20,000. In addition, the general projects include over \$120,000 for inmate labor work such as road, firebreak and bridge repairs; construction and improvements to sewer, water and utilities systems, and related minor categories which can be performed with inmate labor.

Generally, the foregoing maintains the statewide plant of the Division of Forestry at a level near the minimum that could be tolerated without progressive deterioration of the plant.

## DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

## Item 398 from the General Fund

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$84,650
Recommended for approval .....	84,650
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

This request will finance five minor construction and improvement projects. The most significant item is \$51,000 to replace one of seven bridges providing access to the Sutter Bypass from the east levee across the bypass channel. The state has responsibility for the **maintenance of** four of the seven structures as part of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project. These four wooden structures are difficult to maintain due to annual inundation and are becoming hazardous because of increasing dry rot. The proposed replacement structure will be of reinforced concrete, one lane wide and approximately 190 feet long. A similar project is funded in the current year and we anticipate that eventually the remaining two wooden structures will have to be replaced.

## Department of Water Resources—Continued

Another of the proposals is also similar to a project funded in the current year. The department is requesting \$4,000 to construct another snow survey cabin in the Kern River Basin near Mt. Whitney. This is part of a network of such shelters constructed, maintained, and utilized under a cooperative agreement with the U.S. Forest Service. The state utilizes these facilities to provide winter shelter for snow surveyors gathering snow water content data relative to summer runoff conditions. The proposed shelter will replace a U.S. Forest Service summer guard station which has deteriorated and is inadequate for winter use. Under the agreement, the state supplies the necessary materials and the federal government transports it to the site and constructs the facility.

Three projects account for the remaining \$29,650 requested. A 390-foot section of the Sacramento River levee adjacent to the Sacramento maintenance yard is damaged and \$10,500 is requested for permanent repairs. The paved sample storage yard at the Bryte Laboratory, adjacent to the Sacramento River, is deteriorating and cannot adequately accommodate the storage needs of the laboratory. The department is requesting \$9,550 to construct 15,000 square feet of additional paved storage yard and to repair and sealcoat the existing yard. To reduce maintenance and extend the useful life of its equipment, the department is also requesting \$9,600 to construct a carport for the storage of six vehicles and two boats with trailers at the Sutter field office.

## AIR RESOURCES BOARD

## Item 399 from the Motor Vehicle Fund

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$250,000
Recommended for approval .....	15,000
Recommended reduction .....	\$235,000

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS

	Amount	Analysis page
(a) Delete major portion of project for land acquisition and working drawings.....	\$235,000	1065

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- (a) *Land acquisition and working drawings, motor vehicle emissions laboratory—Los Angeles* ..... \$250,000

We recommend that the item be reduced to \$15,000 to provide funds only for preliminary plans.

The Air Resources Board is presently leasing space from Los Angeles County to provide for a laboratory to support the board's activities and program. The Air Resources Laboratory conducts such activities as the testing of various motor vehicle emission control systems and the evaluation of instrumentation used for assembly line testing and road inspections. In addition, it conducts studies of air quality and air pol-

Air Resources Board—Continued

lutants and examines chemical processes occurring in the atmosphere. The space currently occupied by the lab was built to meet the needs of the Los Angeles Air Pollution Control District 15 years ago. The state has a lease which is due to expire in 1973.

The board feels that the existing lab is inadequate to meet current and future needs of the state's emission control programs. Present lab equipment is old and needs replacing and overcrowding has led to numerous operational inefficiencies. We concur with the need to provide new and expanded facilities.

The staff members of the Air Resources Laboratory have outlined the space and equipment needs for a new facility. Their projections contemplate a facility with 44,880 square feet of usable building space and 9,100 square feet of fenced outside storage area. Based upon their projected needs, they have estimated a construction cost of \$1,004,300 with an additional \$256,927 being required for equipment. It is anticipated that the \$250,000 requested in this item will provide funds sufficient for land acquisition and working drawings for the projected new facility. We believe this request is premature inasmuch as preliminary plans have not been prepared or a specific site selected. Because these steps have not been taken, we cannot recommend the adequacy of the amount proposed. Therefore, we recommend that this item be reduced to \$15,000 to provide funds only for preliminary plans. We do not feel that the deferral of funds for working drawings and acquisition until the 1970-71 fiscal year will seriously delay the relocation of the lab when the present lease expires. We do feel that the provision for preliminary plans will permit sufficient project development to enable the Legislature to more adequately evaluate the board's proposal. Thus, allowing time for proper selection of a site, the preparation of an adequate program and the development of architectural and engineering documents to more accurately determine the ultimate cost of this facility, seems to be the most prudent approach.

DEPARTMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Item 400 from the Motor Vehicle Fund

Requested 1969-70	\$1,794,595
Recommended for approval	1,239,595
Recommended reduction	555,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS

	Amount	Analysis page
Reduce (a) for working drawings and construction for a new academy and provide for preliminary plans and site acquisition for a new academy on a new site	\$530,000	1067
Delete (d) for construction program planning	\$25,000	1069

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The amount requested finances a schedule of four projects which provide for land acquisition, equipment purchases, architectural services

## Department of the California Highway Patrol—Continued

and some construction. The budget fails to provide for the construction of new field offices despite the apparent need for such facilities. This omission is discussed in our discussion of the department's support budget on page 818 of this analysis.

(a) *Working drawings for new academy and construction of access driveways and parking areas* ----- \$1,110,000

*We recommend that this item be reduced to \$580,000 to provide for preliminary planning and site acquisition for a new academy on a new site.*

The California Highway Patrol Academy commenced operations in 1953 on a rural site in south Sacramento. Physical training facilities were provided for 120 cadets with sleeping accommodations for 80. This facility was sufficient until 1965 when legislation was passed authorizing a doubling of the uniformed strength of the patrol over a three-year period. Thus, in 1966 temporary structures were leased to supplement existing space in order to triple the training capacity of the academy.

This sudden expansion made apparent the inadequacy of the academy design. As a result, the department requested a study by the Office of Architecture and Construction to determine the feasibility of retaining the academy at its present location. The Budget Act of 1966 appropriated \$50,000 for this purpose. The prospectus for this study established functional criteria and outlined three alternatives to be considered: (1) expand the existing facilities, (2) rebuild on the existing site, and (3) replace the academy on a new site. It was concluded after an extensive study that retention of the existing site was not functionally or economically feasible based upon the criteria established. Two major factors affected this decision. First, the development of the area around the academy into a light commercial and residential neighborhood has contributed to a growing incompatibility of the academy's type of operation with its surrounding environment. Second, the transfer of property on either side of the academy to other state agencies and the encroachment of residential development has introduced a space limitation affecting expansion and precluding the development of adequate outdoor training facilities. It was determined that relocation within a 20-mile radius of Sacramento was the most acceptable alternative and would allow for growth in an orderly manner and provide for a training program at the highest standard possible.

One year later, despite the outcome of its study, the department directed the Office of Architecture and Construction to prepare a master plan for reconstruction of the academy on the existing Sacramento site. A master plan was prepared which proposed replacement of the facility in three phases. This plan was submitted with the reservation that the replacement facility would not be expandable and that the operation would continue to be incompatible with the adjoining commercial and residential neighborhood and future development of the area. The amount requested in this item is based upon that proposal. However, it was administratively determined to resort to funding in

## Department of the California Highway Patrol—Continued

four phases in order to hold expenditures in any one budget year to a minimum. In explanation of this ultimate decision, the department contends that it could not find a new site, its training operation was and will continue to be compatible with the surrounding environment and it cannot foresee the need for any expansion beyond what is proposed. The consequence of this decision would be to commit the state to an \$8 million facility and a solution which had previously been ruled out by the Highway Patrol as representing an undesirable alternative.

The Office of Architecture and Construction has estimated that it would cost approximately \$300,000 more to construct a new facility on a new site, exclusive of land costs. In 1967, the Department of General Services estimated that three-fourths of the existing site might be sold for \$550,000. This indicates that the eventual disposal of the undeveloped portion of the existing academy site would offset the acquisition cost of a larger site in a rural undeveloped area. We believe the estimated additional cost of \$300,000 represents a prudent investment. The budget proposal to invest \$8 million in a site no longer suited to the department's purposes and incapable of expansion should the need arise, in our opinion is shortsighted.

We concur with the need to construct a new Highway Patrol Academy. However, we believe the department's original conclusion to relocate on a new site is still valid. We therefore recommend that \$580,000 be appropriated for land acquisition and preliminary planning to permit ultimate construction of a new academy on a new site.

(b) *Land acquisition—Oakland* ----- \$410,000

*We recommend approval.*

The department's Oakland area office currently consists of portable, relocatable facilities leased from a manufacturer. These facilities are located on a site that is currently being leased from the Division of Highways. The department plans at some future date to replace these portable facilities with a permanent state-owned facility. The Division of Highways considers this property nonessential to the freeway development program in the bay area. The amount requested in this item is for acquisition of the Oakland area site.

(c) *Radio communications equipment—statewide* ----- \$249,595

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal provides the California Highway Patrol share of fixed equipment required for expansion, maintenance and replacement of the basic radio and microwave systems operated by the state and available to a number of agencies. The equipment attached to the automobiles and motorcycles is included in the support section.

The amount requested is required for the following purposes:

1. The purchase of additional base station equipment including transmitters, consoles and tape recorders to support the takeover of the Los Angeles freeway network -----

\$38,300

**Item 401****Capital Outlay****Department of the California Highway Patrol—Continued**

2. Purchase additional control station equipment to permit participation in the California Law Enforcement Mutual Aid Radio System .....	10,200
3. Replace and purchase additional communications vault, equipment, including standby and auxiliary generators, receivers, antennae, radio microwave towers and related conditioning and heating equipment.....	201,095
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>\$249,595</b>

As indicated above, the new equipment requested will enable the patrol to more effectively assume its responsibilities and permit participation in a statewide communications network being established for use by state and local law enforcement agencies during periods of local disaster or other emergencies requiring interagency coordination. Replacement equipment is justified by functional obsolescence, high maintenance due to age, and inability to convert economically to modern modes.

(d) *Construction program planning .....* \$25,000

*We recommend the item be deleted.*

This item provides funds for the preparation of preliminary plans, specifications and estimates for those projects to be requested in the 1970-71 budget. The Budget Acts of 1967 and 1968 appropriated \$65,000 for this same purpose with a three-year availability. We understand that the amount of funds currently available for this type of service are sufficient to plan over \$4.5 million worth of construction. In light of past performance, we feel the amount of funds currently available will be sufficient for any project planning that may take place during the 1969-70 fiscal year. Consequently, we do not believe the amount requested in this item is needed for this purpose.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL****Item 401 from the Motor Vehicle Fund**

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$51,500
Recommended for approval .....	51,500
Recommended reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval of the amount requested.*

The three minor improvement projects proposed in this item total \$51,500, which represents a reduction of \$108,950 from the amount appropriated for such projects in the current year. One of the proposals is to expend \$20,000 to repair and improve roadway surfaces and drainage ditches in the vehicular training area at the training academy on Meadowview Road. This request represents a special repair

## Department of the California Highway Patrol—Continued

and maintenance project which more appropriately belongs in the department's support budget.

The two remaining projects totaling \$31,500, are for necessary alterations to accommodate personnel and accompanying vehicle augmentations at various field offices. Of that amount, \$11,500 is specifically identified for an expansion project at a state-owned facility in Merced. The expansion contemplated will increase the capacity of the office from 50 to 65 traffic officers by extending the building 10 feet. This is intended to provide space to increase the size of the report writing, briefing, and locker rooms and permit the addition of an office for the field operations lieutenant. The foregoing expansion will also necessitate modifications to the heating and cooling system and an enlargement of the service yard to accommodate additional vehicles.

The remaining \$20,000 requested will provide a contingency fund for miscellaneous unforeseen alterations at various leased and state-owned facilities.

## DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES

## Item 402 from the Motor Vehicle Fund

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$4,855,950
Recommended for approval .....	1,797,250
Recommended for special review .....	2,750,200
Recommended reduction .....	308,500

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS

	Amount	Analysis page
Delete (a) working drawings for additional office space— Santa Barbara .....	\$8,500	1070
Delete (m) working drawings and construction of additional parking facilities—Sacramento .....	\$300,000	1072

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The amount requested finances a schedule of 14 items for land acquisition, planning and construction of new field offices. The projects proposed will ultimately provide for 11 new state-owned facilities. This includes \$1,737,250 to purchase four new sites and \$2,750,200 to construct seven new field offices to be located on sites acquired with previously appropriated funds. In addition, this item includes a request for working drawings for an office addition, the development of additional parking and a provision for construction program planning.

(a) *Working drawings for additional office space—Santa Barbara* ..... \$8,500

*We recommend deletion of the item.*

The department has informed us that this facility, which is adjacent to Highway 101 in Santa Barbara, is currently involved in a freeway controversy. The outcome of that controversy could mean abandonment of the existing Department of Motor Vehicles facility and construction



## Department of Motor Vehicles—Continued

of a new facility on a new site. We do not believe that it is economically justifiable to expend funds on a facility that may be razed in the near future. However, a decision must be made whether to continue operating in an inadequate facility until the controversy is settled or to proceed to construct a new facility at a new location.

(b) <i>Land acquisition for office building and parking facilities—Whittier</i> .....	\$693,000
(c) <i>Land acquisition for office building and parking facilities—Anaheim</i> .....	\$396,750
(d) <i>Land acquisition for office building and parking facilities—Salinas</i> .....	\$287,500
(e) <i>Land acquisition for office building and parking facilities—Santa Rosa</i> .....	\$360,000

*We recommend approval of the scheduled items listed above.*

These land acquisition proposals are required to provide for new facilities to replace existing ones which have become inadequate to handle the increased workload of their service areas. The department has produced a reasonable substantiation, on a project-by-project basis, that it is in the best interest of the state to construct state-owned facilities at the locations indicated. It is proposed to purchase a sufficient amount of property to permit construction of buildings of adequate size with adequate public parking facilities at locations where the greatest workload potential exists.

(f) <i>Working drawings and construction of office building and parking facilities—Bellflower</i> .....	\$470,250
(g) <i>Working drawings and construction of office building and parking facilities—Los Gatos</i> .....	\$274,750
(h) <i>Working drawings and construction of office building and parking facilities—Midway City</i> .....	\$515,750
(i) <i>Working drawings and construction of office building and parking facilities—San Leandro</i> .....	\$324,450
(j) <i>Working drawings and construction of office building and parking facilities—Culver City</i> .....	\$406,350
(k) <i>Working drawings and construction of office building and parking facilities, northeast area—Sacramento</i> ..	\$503,150
(l) <i>Working drawings and construction of office building and parking facilities—Redding</i> .....	\$255,500

*We recommend special review of the scheduled items outlined above.*

In our analysis of the department's 1968-69 Budget request for construction, we expressed concern that the design solutions for the proposed projects were not aesthetically satisfactory. We recommended that additional funds be provided to redesign the proposed projects to insure that each facility enhanced its community and offered a pleasant working environment. The Legislature approved a \$38,000 augmentation in support of that concept. Considerable effort has been expended to comply with the legislative directive and to develop a new approach.

## Department of Motor Vehicles—Continued

We believe the results have been worth the time and effort involved. The design solutions for the currently proposed construction projects should reflect the new approach. However, we have not received preliminary plans and a formal estimate to substantiate this conclusion and to support the amount of funds requested. We understand that this information will be available prior to budget hearings and in sufficient time to permit adequate review.

One of the construction projects proposed requires further comment. The Department of General Services is currently studying the possibility of locating the Department of Motor Vehicles Redding operation in vacant space in an existing state office building. However, we believe that funds should be made available to construct a new facility in the event that the current proposal is not economically or functionally feasible.

(m) *Working drawings and construction of additional parking facilities—Sacramento* ----- \$300,000

*We recommend this item be deleted.*

The supplementary report of the Committee on Conference reflecting agreed language on statements of intent, limitations and requested studies contained in the Senate Finance and Assembly Ways and Means Committee reports on the Budget Bill, 1968–69 fiscal year included with respect to the Transportation Agency complex the following statement: "The Transportation Agency Complex Master Plan upon which the Legislature in recent sessions has appropriated funds for extensive land acquisition is to be updated to include the proposed use, development and disposition of land and facilities within the complex. Consideration is to be given to the interrelationships of the Capitol Complex Master Plan and the projected space needs of the state. Future capital outlay appropriations for the Transportation Agency complex shall be contingent upon legislative review and approval of an updated master plan."

The Department of Motor Vehicles is now requesting funds to develop additional parking facilities in the Transportation Agency complex without having submitted the master plan called for. We understand the Department of Public Works was asked if it intends to relocate as originally contemplated and its response was that it does not intend to move from its downtown location. The Department of Public Works now occupies over 200,000 square feet of space in the Capitol master plan area. Consequently, a decision by the department not to move affects the planning for both the Transportation Agency complex and the downtown Capitol complex. The Legislature approved extensive land acquisition for the Transportation Agency complex based upon a plan to relocate the Department of Public Works. We believe the department should seek the Legislature's approval if that plan is to be changed. We supported the plan to move the department to the complex shared by the California Highway Patrol and the Department of Motor Vehicles and we are not aware of any compelling reason for abandoning that plan.

**Department of Motor Vehicles—Continued**

We are opposed to this proposal to develop surface parking also because a policy for financing the development of parking facilities has not been developed for either the Capitol plan area or the Transportation Agency complex. A master plan that does not encompass a financial plan is incomplete.

The policy of the state is inconsistent also with respect to charging employees for parking.

One method of financing needed parking facilities would be to levy sufficient parking fees to support revenue bond or equivalent financing of the facilities required. Parking on the higher education campuses is financed in this way. We believe that the parking facilities required in both the Capitol area and Transportation Agency complex should be developed based on this kind of financial plan.

We believe, however, that any parking facility, however financed, should be submitted to the Legislature for approval. Among other reasons, this is particularly important now because of the Department of General Services current interest in constructing a very low cost parking structure in downtown Los Angeles based on revenue bond financing. Our concern is that low cost parking structures often are unsightly. We do not believe the state should be responsible for constructing unsightly structures if it can be avoided, and we believe the Legislature needs an opportunity to make such determinations.

In summary, we oppose this proposal to construct a parking facility because an adequate masterplan remains to be developed for the Transportation Agency complex, the method of finance needs to be determined, and the problem of developing acceptable parking facilities needs attention.

(n) *Preliminary planning* ----- \$60,000

*We recommend approval.*

This item represents a continuation of the Legislature's policy of providing advanced funds for the preparation of preliminary plans, specifications and the cost estimates for projects that will be proposed in a subsequent budget. This is done in order to give the Legislature sufficient information upon which to make judgments.

**DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES****Item 403 from the Motor Vehicle Fund**

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$125,200
Recommended for approval .....	125,200
Recommended reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

The amount requested in this item will finance maintenance work and improvements at three field offices. The Yuba City office was originally constructed to house the operations of the Department of Motor Ve-

**Department of Motor Vehicles—Continued**

hicles and the California Highway Patrol. The Highway Patrol recently vacated its portion of the facility. Because of this development, the Department of Motor Vehicles is proposing to expand its operation to alleviate overcrowded conditions. It is estimated that \$50,000 will be required to make the necessary modifications.

An assortment of projects is proposed for the Oakland office with a total estimated cost of \$51,700. This includes an upgrading of the lighting level on the first floor, which is the main public lobby and work area. The compliance services section has moved to the second floor and it is proposed to remodel the vacated space on the first floor in order to enlarge the existing conference room and to create a larger work area. A metal ladder will be installed from the roof of the first floor extension to the roof of the second floor to permit access to the air-conditioning equipment located on the roof. This two-story office building has not had a complete paint job in over six years and \$21,300 out of the \$51,700 requested is for painting the exterior and interior surfaces of the building.

The remaining project is a \$23,500 request to upgrade the lighting level in the main work area and public lobby of the San Francisco office building.

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

**Item 404 from the General Fund**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$53,150
Recommended for approval .....	53,150
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This request covers four minor projects to improve patient treatment and correct operational deficiencies. Although the number of projects is less than the number underway in the current year, the \$53,150 requested represents an increase of \$23,550 or 80 percent. Following is a description of the projects proposed.

The home is requesting \$18,470 to remodel two wards into a combined intensive care and coronary care unit. This will enable concentration of the more acutely ill patients into one area for intensive and continuous treatment. The project that is envisioned will provide for visual supervision of 13 patients with the removal of sections of the corridor walls adjacent to two wards and the installation of glass partitions. Also included is the installation of bedside equipment and ward storage units, suction piping, emergency call system to the nurses' station, and extensive electrical outlets for specialized diagnostic and monitoring equipment.

The hospital presently has two wards which do not have a treatment room where physicians may examine and treat patients instead of at

**Veterans Home of California—Continued**

their bedside. To alleviate this situation, \$8,000 is requested to remodel a two-bed dormitory area adjacent to the nurses' station in each ward into a treatment room. This will be accomplished by the removal of an existing bed divider partition and the construction of a new eight-foot-high room divider with a side door. New plumbing, lighting and convenience outlets will also be installed to complete the space conversion.

Space in the main culinary building for storage of frozen foods is not adequate to accommodate large shipments of commercially packed frozen goods which have become an important adjunct to an economical feeding program. The hospital proposes to convert a 200-square-foot portion of the existing meat refrigerator, which is too large, to a frozen food locker at a cost of \$17,200. This will be accomplished by constructing an insulated divider wall and installing a new package refrigeration system.

Many of the existing showers at the hospital are so constructed as to preclude their use for wheelchair patients. Presently, these patients must be lifted into tubs, a procedure which is dangerous for both patients and employees. It is estimated that \$9,480 will be required to remodel the shower stalls in nine wards to permit wheelchair access. Work consists of modifying the shower stall floor and drains so they are flush with the surrounding floor area and the installation of new shower doors.

**UNALLOCATED****Item 405 from the General Fund**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$300,000
Recommended for approval .....	300,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS***We recommend approval.*

This item proposes to continue the well-established policy by which the Legislature provides advance funds for the preparation of preliminary plans, outline specifications and estimates to be used as supporting data for requests for working drawings and/or construction in a succeeding budget.

The proposed appropriation would be allocated by the Department of Finance only to those agencies which normally receive their support or capital outlay from the General Fund. The University of California and the state college system are excepted since they are separately provided for elsewhere in the bill. The major agencies which would make use of these funds are the Departments of Parks and Recreation, the Youth Authority, Corrections, Conservation, Mental Hygiene and General Services.

The amount proposed is sufficient to provide for an ultimate construction value of approximately \$20 million on the premise that preliminary plans and outline specifications will cost about 1½ percent of

## Unallocated—Continued

the total project cost. At this time, we believe that it is reasonable to assume that the program for these agencies in the 1970-71 budget proposal may total as much as \$20 million. However, we would point out that this figure would include projects for which only construction funds would be requested because working drawings and prior preliminary plans would already have been provided either in the 1969-70 budget proposal or in a prior one. Consequently, it appears somewhat questionable that \$300,000 can be legitimately expended if it is assumed that the total volume of General Fund appropriations in the 1970 Budget Bill will not exceed \$20 million. We believe, nevertheless, that it would be prudent to permit preliminary planning to some reasonable degree beyond this amount. On this basis we believe the \$300,000 is justifiable.

**UNALLOCATED****Item 406 from the General Fund**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$50,000
Recommended for approval .....	50,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item is intended to cover unanticipated miscellaneous repairs, improvements and equipment which would be allocated to eligible agencies by the Department of Finance upon approval of the State Public Works Board.

Generally, the projects financed from this item would be of an emergency nature requiring action before the next session of the Legislature. For example, the failure of a primary electrical feeder to a building or an institution would require immediate repair in order to safeguard the health and welfare of the occupants of the facilities affected. The amount appears reasonable for this purpose.

**DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME****Item 407 from the Fish and Game Preservation Fund**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$98,000
Recommended for approval .....	98,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item covers a schedule of three projects for architectural services and an equipment purchase. This includes planning for the expansion of the Region I office in Redding, working drawings for the construction of new rearing ponds at the Darrah Springs Hatchery and the replacement of a patrol boat.

## Department of Fish and Game—Continued

- (a) *Replacement of patrol boat* ----- \$75,000  
*We recommend approval.*

The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$390,000 to replace three patrol boats. At the time, it was anticipated that two additional patrol boats would eventually have to be replaced. This request is to replace one of those boats which is a 45-foot wooden-hulled vessel constructed in 1938 at a cost of \$11,500. This vessel is assigned a patrol area between San Francisco Bay and Monterey Bay, but due to its deteriorated condition, is confined to patrolling only inside San Francisco Bay. The replacement is to be a 40-foot aluminum-hulled vessel at an estimated cost of \$75,000. The new vessel will be equipped with twin diesel engines and will have a cruising speed of 25 knots and a minimum range of 300 miles.

- (b) *Replace hatchery ponds at Darrah Springs—working drawings* ----- \$20,000

*We recommend approval.*

The 60 existing raceway rearing ponds at this hatchery were originally constructed with sloping earth banks and a gravel bottom. The extensive use of these ponds has caused erosion of the banks resulting in a corresponding loss in depth. This erosion has destroyed the raceway action in the ponds by prolonging the exchange of water which raises the water temperature and lowers the oxygen content. It is felt that some of the fish losses at the hatchery are attributable to the loss of efficiency in the ponds. The amount requested will provide for the preparation of working drawings, specifications and estimates for the construction of new rearing ponds which will have concrete bottoms and vertical concrete sidewalls and will be constructed where the existing ponds are now located. These new ponds will permit the utilization of mechanical equipment developed to improve hatchery operations and to reduce labor costs.

- (c) *Preliminary planning—region I office expansion* ----- \$3,000  
*We recommend approval.*

Headquarters personnel at the Department of Fish and Game Redding office are presently crowded into three scattered buildings that were not originally designed for use as office space. In addition, storage of supplies is in two outside buildings and there is no conference room available. It is proposed to engage the services of the Office of Architecture and Construction to survey the situation and determine the most economical approach to correct these deficiencies. It is anticipated that the \$3,000 requested will provide for a thorough study of the situation, followed by the preparation of preliminary plans once a solution is found.

## DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

## Item 408 from the Fish and Game Preservation Fund

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$2,600,000
Recommended for approval .....	2,600,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

The Glenn-Colusa Pumping Plant near Hamilton City diverts from 10 to 18 percent of the total Sacramento River flow during its normal operating period which runs from March through October. The slough, which conveys water from the Sacramento River to the irrigation district pumping forebay, is presently screened to prevent the diversion of salmon on their way upstream to spawn. However, this screen is too large to prevent the downstream migration of juvenile salmon and steelhead from diverting into the pumping forebay. The subsequent destruction of these fingerlings in the pumping operation results in a significant loss to the commercial and sport fishery. Assuming the downstream migration is diverted in proportion to the riverflow diverted, it is estimated that approximately ten million juvenile king salmon and 230,000 juvenile steelhead are lost annually.

This item provides \$2,600,000 for the construction of a 500-foot long reinforced concrete structure across the mouth of the slough, upstream from the existing screen which is to be removed. This structure will house 44 rotating drum fish screens, 17 feet in diameter and 8 feet wide. A precast concrete trestle on steel pile bents will be constructed for utilization by the contractor installing the screens and housing structure and will remain to facilitate the operation and maintenance of the facility by the state. A welded steel, fish bypass pipeline 48 inches in diameter and approximately 1,520 feet long will be installed in the bottom of the slough. Additional work includes the dredging and widening of the bottom of the slough adjacent to the fish screen structure and the construction of service roads and paved service areas.

It is anticipated that federal construction funds in the amount of \$1,300,000 will be available on a matching basis from the Anadromous Fish Act to reimburse the Fish and Game Preservation Fund for one-half of the amount requested in this item.



## DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

## Item 409 from the Fish and Game Preservation Fund

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$417,600
Recommended for approval .....	417,600
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

The amount requested finances a series of 12 minor construction, equipment and improvement projects at various locations throughout the state. Following is a brief description of the projects proposed.

Fish Springs Hatchery currently receives its fingerlings from both Hot Creek and Mt. Whitney Hatcheries. It is proposed to make Fish Springs Hatchery self-sufficient with the construction of two nursery tanks and an incubator. This would free trough space at Hot Creek and Mt. Whitney Hatcheries for additional fingerling production. It would also relieve crowded conditions that now exist at the two hatcheries. It is estimated that \$40,000 will be required to provide these incubation and hatching facilities.

The department is requesting \$65,000 to construct a fish disease wet laboratory at the American River Hatchery. This facility will be used to house and provide working facilities for the fish disease personnel presently located at the Sacramento field station. The proposed facility will be a 3,000-square-foot building with short troughs, circular tanks and a water table for disease study and experiments. Currently, this type of operation is carried on in available production troughs at the hatchery which increases the danger of spreading diseases among the fish population.

A \$65,000 project is proposed for expansion and improvements at the Kern River Hatchery. Production facilities will be enlarged with the construction of 20 additional concrete rearing ponds plus four ponds for fish food experiments. This expansion requires the construction and installation of concrete weirs, valves, rotary screens, pipelines and drainage facilities. The completion of this work will permit an increase in production of 600,000 catchable trout annually. The proposal will also provide for the addition of garages to two employee dwellings and the construction of a 12-foot extension of the existing truck garage.

Two projects are requested for the Darrah Springs Hatchery to improve the facilities and increase the efficiency of the operation. The existing equipment shelter was constructed in 1940 and is no longer suitable for that purpose. It is estimated that \$25,000 will be required to construct a new prefabricated metal building as a replacement. In addition, \$3,600 is requested to install automatic trough feeders at the hatchery. The latter item will complete a project that was initiated in 1966 when feeders were installed on approximately two-thirds of the hatchery troughs.

The 36 rearing ponds at the Moccasin Creek Hatchery were originally constructed with concrete sidewalls and a gravel bottom. The ponds

## Department of Fish and Game—Continued

were later found to leak badly, hampering efficiency and causing loss of fish. This request marks the conclusion of a program initiated to replace these defective ponds with new all concrete structures. It is estimated that \$64,000 will be required to replace the remaining 12 rearing ponds that were part of that original construction.

A \$28,000 project is proposed for the Mt. Whitney Hatchery to repair and enlarge employee residences. Mt. Whitney is relatively isolated, and adequate living accommodations within a reasonable commute distance are difficult if not impossible to find. The state is therefore obliged to provide adequate living quarters if employees are to remain for any length of time. The amount requested is to enlarge four small two-bedroom residences by adding a service porch and an additional bedroom.

The Black Rock rearing ponds near Mt. Whitney are supplied with water from two sources: Black Rock Springs and Division Creek. When the Los Angeles Aqueduct is placed in operation, it is anticipated that the flow of water from the springs will disappear. The total water supply will then have to be obtained from Division Creek. In anticipation of the adverse effect of the aqueduct, \$30,000 is requested to construct two keyways to permit relocation of the rotary screens from Black Rock Creek and to construct three 5-foot by 25-foot concrete loading and grading pens at the Division Creek intake.

The California State Fisheries Laboratory at Terminal Island presently utilizes two 20-foot boats to conduct diving operations related to the Inshore Fisheries Habitat Evaluation and Modification program and the California Spiny Lobster Investigation program. Many dives have been canceled during the past six years due to weather conditions which make it unsafe to operate from these small boats. It is felt that a larger boat would allow the diving team more time before being forced into port for shelter. The department is therefore requesting \$64,000 to purchase two 32-foot diving boats for this program. The new boats would have a cruising speed of 28 knots with sleeping accommodations for four and would be equipped with the necessary appurtenances to permit a 300-mile cruising range. The increase in size of the new vessels would also permit the incorporation of sufficient storage space to accommodate the needs of a typical marine ecological survey expedition.

The five remaining projects account for \$33,000 out of the total amount requested. Included is a \$9,000 request to construct a 250-foot-long foot bridge to provide hunting access to the Sutter National Wildlife Refuge in the Sutter Bypass. When the federal government honored the state's request to open up this area to public hunting, it was with the understanding that the state would conduct the program. This project is necessary to insure the success of that program. The existing garage at the Eureka Screen Shop is unusable due to the construction of Interstate 5, and \$15,000 is requested to construct a 28-foot by 90-foot metal building to replace that facility. Fish screens are needed at three locations to prevent downstream migrant juvenile salmon from being lost in irrigation diversion ditches. A total of \$9,000 is requested to construct and install the screens.

## DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

## Item 410 from the General Fund

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$6,796,709
Recommended for approval .....	5,829,709
Recommended for special review .....	667,000
Recommended reduction .....	300,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	Amount	Analysis page
(c) Carpinteria State Beach .....	\$300,000	1084
We recommend that the degree of development be reduced.		
(d) Castaic Reservoir .....	\$667,000	1085
We recommend that the expenditure for sewerage facilities be placed in the category of special review.		
(f) Lake Tahoe and Donner Lake Basins for export of sewage .....		1087
We recommend the approval of this item with limitations.		
(g) Statewide preliminary planning reservoir development ..... (\$190,684)		1088
We recommend transferring this item to the department's support budget.		

## GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT

This item would appropriate \$6,796,709 from the General Fund for major development projects of the state park system. Included in the \$6,796,709 is the sum of \$2,000,000 for export of sewage at Lake Tahoe, \$677,000 for sewerage facilities at Castaic, \$86,625 for beach erosion in Orange County, \$190,684 for reservoir recreation planning, \$75,000 at Fort Ross, which is mostly for road relocation, and \$1,685,200 for reconstruction and enlargement of existing facilities at Carpinteria State Beach. Although we recognize the importance of utilities to the park system, the Legislature should note that only \$386,700 at Butano State Park and \$1,695,500 at Castaic will actually add new user facilities to the state park system.

No General Fund money is being requested for day use or camping facilities at any park units being purchased with 1964 Recreation Bond Act money. In Section 10.4, the Budget Bill proposes to revert the appropriation made last year for the Bidwell Bar areas at Oroville in order to finance camping and day use facilities at Loafer Creek. Item 422 would appropriate \$2,875,000 in 1964 Recreation Bond Act funds (which is virtually all the reserve in bond acquisition money) for more acquisition while Item 423 would appropriate only \$1,242,094 in bond funds for minimum development. Numerous other smaller amounts are to be appropriated for minor projects and marina developments.

The 1964 Recreation Bond Act acquisitions authorized in the 1965 and 1966 Budget Acts are being reappropriated and extended. Several reversions of so-called acquisition savings are being proposed along with the working plans money already appropriated for Delta Meadows and Marin Headlands plus Gold Bluff Beach (which presumably will be developed by the federal government as part of the National Redwoods Park). Approximately \$3,250,000 in savings and reversions show in the budget which we have not had an opportunity to review in detail.

**Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued**

The 1967 Budget Act appropriated only \$1,015,000 in new General Fund money for development of the state park system while reverting most of the prior year appropriations. The 1968 Budget Act appropriated only \$5,429,000 from the General Fund for major development and only about \$3,000,000 of this was new money. The remainder was a reappropriation of the savings resulting from the decision not to acquire the Mt. St. Helena project which was part of the 1963 acquisition program. Almost half of the 1968 money was appropriated for historic monuments. The paragraphs above indicate that Item 410 contains only about \$2,100,000 for new day use and camping facilities in the 1969 Budget Bill.

In our opinion, this is an inadequate level of expenditure for the recreational users of the state park system and particularly in view of the major acquisition program begun under the 1964 Recreation Bond Act. After allowance is made for certain past shortages in General Fund money, it would seem very important to have expedited the expenditure of the \$20,000,000 in 1964 Recreation Bond Act funds earmarked for minimum development. A review of the department's five-year capital outlay program shows no schedule which would resolve the above problems. Therefore, our support and our capital outlay analyses give major attention to problems involved in scheduling and planning for the capital outlay development needs of the state.

We should emphasize at this point that the lack of appropriations to develop the state park system is due more to a lack of projects adequately planned for development than a lack of funds (at least this year). It should be noted that the small development program received no augmentation although many other state programs did.

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The department's 1969-70 Capital Outlay Program is not based on firm development policies and guidelines nor does it reflect structured decision-making processes which furnish us with adequate information to review the projects. In particular, as discussed in the support budget analysis, Item 256, the department does not produce a comprehensive written master plan report for each project. We receive only a series of drawings and brief cost estimates which do not explain the program and policy decisions which are most important to the Legislature.

Although the present system is inadequate for review, it still involves an immense amount of background work. The difficulties which seem to delay the department are failure to identify problems, to make the policy decisions required, and to support this decision making by adequate data. This inability to produce hard data when requested would seem to indicate that the ultimate decisions and policy are made on a subjective basis with inadequate thought to long-range policy implications, feasibility of the project, or total costs.

Examples of this type of planning process include Oroville State Recreation Area, Point Mugu State Recreation Area which is still being rescoped three years after the Legislature appropriated development funds, and Angel Island which is still being revised several years after its acquisition.

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

In our capital expenditure analysis, we have attempted to identify for the Legislature where the department has not provided data to support development priorities, where operational concepts which relate to design need to be clarified, where the expenditures will affect long-range policy, and where the department is unable to provide sound and detailed information to support its decisions.

In order to facilitate review of the department's 1970-71 capital outlay program, we have recommended in our support budget analysis that the Legislature direct the department to provide a master plan report for each major capital outlay project. This plan as outlined on Analysis page 772 covers need, scope, utilities, costs, staging, and special considerations for each project.

Item 410 finances the construction of six projects, one of which is also partly funded by the Harbors and Waterfront Revolving Fund, and one project planning allocation. One of the projects, Castaic Reservoir, is a new project, the others are development of existing units of the state park system.

(a) *Bolsa Chica State Beach, for beach erosion control*----- \$86,625

*We recommend approval.*

This is the department's portion of the state's share of a \$1,500,000 beach erosion control project being constructed by the U.S. Corps of Engineers. The Department of Water Resources is responsible for the state's participation and funds its portion of the project through Item 350. This year's expenditure represents the fourth stage of the project which includes five steel pile groins and 900,000 cubic yards of sand fill for the reach from Surfside to Newport Beach. This particular project will directly benefit Huntington and Bolsa Chica State Beaches and therefore a part of the state's costs are budgeted by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

(b) *Butano State Park, for development*----- \$386,700

*We recommend approval of this project.*

We note below various planning deficiencies or opportunities for improvement the department might consider. This development project includes 86 campsites, a road system, water system, and related administrative facilities. The area is divided into three camping units. The upper area includes 19 camp units and a "series 200" comfort station, the middle area includes 40 camp units and one combination building type C, and the lower area includes 27 camp units, one combination building type D and a comfort station series 100. The park entrance will contain a park office trailer sanitation station and parking for 20 cars.

This project is a continuation of the original development plan for Butano State Park which was originally budgeted at \$299,459 in 1962-63. The project was then reestimated by the Office of Architecture and Construction and found to be deficient by \$340,000. The project was subsequently cut back within the funds available to provide graded camp roads, 43 camping spurs, a rough graded entrance road, and water and power systems.

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

The project is justified by the department as the only state camping facility in San Mateo County which is easily accessible from Highway 1. The department indicates that it will be used as an overnight stopping place for visitors who want to use the state beaches and other recreational facilities in the immediate area. The department estimates annual operation and maintenance costs of \$20,000 but provides no basis for the estimate.

The usage data for this unit is presently unclear as is the basis for its further development ahead of other projects such as those acquired under the 1964 Recreation Bond Act. The department proposes to develop all 86 campsites to the high-cost Class A standard. Butano would seem to present an opportunity to construct various classes of campsites with their corresponding graduated fees. This would increase the availability of the unit to the various economic groups in the San Francisco metropolitan area, reduce costs and could provide a variety of experiences from recreational camping to overnight accommodations. The physical layout of this park with its three distinct camping areas could be considered as an excellent pilot project to experiment with user reactions to various classes and fees for camping facilities. Analysis of such usage data might be one way of determining the number of various classes of campsites which should be provided by the park system.

(c) *Carpinteria State Beach, for development*----- \$1,685,200

*We recommend that the project be reduced by \$300,000. This figure is an approximation of the cost of the embellishments discussed below.*

This is the phase II or day use redevelopment which includes an entrance, access roads, parking for 850 cars, 250 picnic sites, 75 concrete fire rings, lifeguard facilities, three comfort stations, underground utilities, and four multipurpose turfed areas.

The phase I development at this unit will provide 140 campsites complete with tables, stoves, cupboards, parking spurs, utility hookups and area lighting at a cost of \$755,000 which was appropriated last year.

We have not been provided with information from the department's statewide planning program nor from the master planning branch which would indicate the justification for redeveloping this project ahead of undeveloped beaches and areas in Southern California. The major justification for the project is apparently that the unit turned away 53,000 visitors or 8 percent of the total 610,000 visitors last year. Of course, the department is not in a position to indicate whether or not those turned away traveled down Highway 101 to other units of the state park system. The number of turnaways is probably higher relative to camping sites than to day use facilities.

The redevelopment of this unit includes many features which will highly modify the natural beach environment. These include lighting with photo-initiated time switches, a fully automatic irrigation system, a large public address system, a wooden promenade with tables along the beach line, colored concrete and four artificially created multipurpose turfed areas with drainage facilities.

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

The degree of development for day use is important because of the balance required between this type of recreation and those who will be camping in the same unit. We believe that the experience of camping at this unit should not be derogated by a day use concept which so modifies the unit that the camping experience is lost.

The intensity of development of this unit can be contrasted to the department's budgeted request for an environmental protection study for Asilomar State Beach which is intended to restore the natural environment. This study includes among its goals:

1. Determine, from any available sources, reliable information as to the character of the forest complex in the Asilomar area before significant modification by man.
2. Describe significant changes in the forest complex.
3. Identify current deleterious influences, both local and regional, that affect the forest community.
4. Provide an inventory of current resources of the subject area.
5. Identify specific measures needed for management and protection of these resources.

In the Carpinteria project the department proposes to remove or modify the natural and ecological resources with recreational embellishments. The extent of environmental modification proposed for a naturally attractive area seems inconsistent with the department's goals for the above study at Asilomar to restore those same or similar values. The environmental manipulation costs plus the features already noted above approximate \$300,000.

The department admits that this area is already heavily used. Some of the above features will only draw more attendance and increase the degree of overuse. The basic question before the Legislature is whether this park unit will be developed to retain its natural values as nearly as possible consistent with major public use or whether these natural values will be modified in order to increase and perhaps stimulate public use.

(d) *Castaic Reservoir, for development* ----- \$2,372,500

*We recommend that the \$1,695,500 for construction of the Castaic Afterbay recreational facilities be approved but that \$667,000 for sewerage facilities be placed in the category of special review.*

The department presently proposes that this on-shore development be limited to the Castaic Afterbay, which is a small body of water in a borrow area below Castaic Dam. Castaic Dam is the terminal reservoir for the West Branch aqueduct of the State Water Project. The department has also requested funds for a six-lane paved launching ramp to serve boating needs on the reservoir itself. This request will be discussed in more detail under Item 413(a).

The afterbay development will include an access road, 1,100-car parking, landscaping of 20 acres, entrance station, seven-acre beach construction, 200 picnic units, sanitary facilities, lifeguard facilities, utilities, and storm drains. It consists of a \$1,695,500 estimate by the Office of Architecture and Construction for the afterbay recreation area

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

and an estimate of \$677,000 by the County of Los Angeles for sewerage facilities.

The justification for this expenditure is the overwhelming recreational demand in the Los Angeles metropolitan area. At this time, we have seen no current plan for the ultimate recreation development at the reservoir. As we stated in our support budget analysis these are serious problems in the on-shore recreation development planning under the Davis-Dolwig Act. In the case of Castaic there is the further problem that the entire recreation development had to be replanned when a pumpback power feature was added to Castaic Reservoir.

The relationship of this request at Castaic to future funding and the special problems of turning the project over to Los Angeles County for operation and maintenance are unclear. This may become particularly important because some of the high recreation development costs to achieve limited recreation values at this site may hinder the state in developing reservoir recreation at other units of the State Water Project.

The estimate for sewerage connections to serve recreation needs at Castaic was made by Los Angeles County. It involves connecting the Castaic Recreation Area to the Wayside Honor Rancho and increasing the main pipeline capacity from the Wayside Honor Rancho to Sanitation District 32 to meet the needs of both the state and the rancho. The estimate includes a 500,000-gallon initial capacity and a 150,000-gallon capacity for each user in the year 1970. The costs from the Wayside Honor Rancho to the Sanitation District 32 is \$238,000 shared equally by the county and state and an additional cost of \$270,000 to the state to extend the facilities from the rancho to Castaic. Total costs for the state as estimated by Los Angeles County for construction, engineering and purchase of capacity will be \$677,000 plus annual treatment (operating) charges of \$25,000. The capacities of this system appear to be oversized to some degree because there are vague references to a reimbursement arrangement with the state when and if adjacent areas proposed to be subdivided by the Newhall Land and Farming Company join the system.

We have seen no evidence that the department has verified these estimated costs. In addition, even without outside parties joining the system the capacity figures are open to question because the plans for the entire recreational development at Castaic are not complete. This problem can become even more acute when the department turns the entire operation of the Castaic Recreation Area over to Los Angeles County.

In any event, we see no reason why the state park system should finance the costs of capacity for local subdividers who have substantial financial resources of their own. We recommend that the sewerage facilities be placed in the category of special review until the actual capacities for Castaic are determined and the capacity for subdivisions is eliminated from the state's share.



## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

(e) *Fort Ross State Historic Park, for construction*----- \$75,000

*We recommend approval.*

This project request consists of a 900-foot entrance road, parking for 165 cars and 10 buses, fencing, stockade restoration, and 1,500 feet of natural rock walkways.

The reconstruction is timed to coincide with the Division of Highways relocation of Highway 1 which now passes through the grounds of old Fort Ross. The relocation will make possible the removal of the old highway from the stockade area, and will permit the restoration of the stockade. The cost estimates for this project were made by the Division of Highways for the parking areas and roads and by the Department of Parks and Recreation for the restoration. Parks and Recreation in the past has underestimated project costs. Therefore we doubt that the restoration of the stockade at Fort Ross can be done at the department's estimated cost of only \$5,000.

(f) *Lake Tahoe and Donner Lake Basins, for export of  
sewage* ----- \$2,000,000

*We recommend approval of this appropriation with the limitation stated below.*

We believe that \$200,000 of the \$2,000,000 should be made available to the Department of Water Resources for a comprehensive study of the sewerage facilities needed by the state park system along the west side of the Tahoe Basin and in the Donner area. The capacities, funding and timing of these park sewage export facilities needs to be determined. Upon receipt of this report and after a joint hearing and favorable recommendation from both the State Water Resources Control Board and the Parks and Recreation Commission, the Director of Finance should authorize the expenditure by the Department of Parks and Recreation for the recommended facilities.

This sum of \$2,000,000 was budgeted for a sewage system in the Tahoe and Donner Lake drainage basins at the direction of the Resources Agency Secretary. The Lahonton Regional Water Quality Control Board has adopted a resolution to require export of all sewage from these lake basins by January 1970. The state and the department should carry their full responsibility for state sewerage facilities in the Tahoe and Donner Basin. However, we have seen no estimate or plan by OAC to substantiate the figure of \$2,000,000. It is not clear exactly what is proposed to be constructed with this money and what the timing for construction will be once the plans are formulated and approved.

There is a further problem as to the role of the state (through Parks and Recreation and other departments) in accomplishing the overall objective of exporting sewage. We know of no local plan which will complement the money in this appropriation and it is probable that a state loan for the local agency constructing the export facilities will be needed in addition to this \$2,000,000. Such loans have already been made for other facilities at north and south Tahoe by the Legislature through the Water Resources Control Board. An agreement between the state and local agencies should be required prior to expenditure

Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

of this appropriation in order to assure that the state does not pay twice for the facilities provided.

(g) *Statewide preliminary planning reservoir development—\$190,684*

*We recommend transferring this item to the department's support budget.*

In order that substantial support sums can be reviewed adequately by the Ways and Means and Senate Finance Subcommittees that have the responsibility for the department's support budget, we recommend that this item be transferred to a new support item. This would also give the Legislature a more accurate picture of planning expenditures by the department.

As we stated in our support budget analysis, the objective of this request seems to be to budget the planning money with the construction money so that both can be identified and can be eliminated when the particular capital outlay effort ceases. While this objective may have been appropriate at one time, the number and individual size of planning appropriations budgeted in capital outlay has grown to the point that almost half the planning budget is appropriated in the capital outlay portions of the budget or financed from reimbursements.

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 411 from the General Fund

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$625,340
Recommended for approval .....	625,340
Recommended reduction—None	

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval as budgeted.*

This item funds a series of minor improvement projects to develop or conserve the natural and man-made resources at various state beaches, parks and historic monuments. Included are projects for beach erosion control, water and sewerline improvements, fire protection and construction of sanitary facilities. The projects requested are:

Park unit	Improve or develop public facilities	Conser- vation of park resources	Improve or develop utilities	Roadway mainte- nance
Brannon Island .....	\$24,000	--	--	--
Folsom Lake .....	--	--	--	\$22,500
Hearst San Simeon .....	--	--	\$40,000	--
Humboldt Redwoods .....	--	\$65,000	--	--
La Purissima Mission .....	\$29,200	--	--	--
Malakoff Diggins .....	--	--	\$39,140	--
MacKerricher State Park .....	\$47,000	--	--	--
New Brighton .....	\$65,000	--	--	--
Pismo State Beach .....	--	--	\$50,400	--
San Mateo Coast .....	--	--	\$30,000	--
Statewide Sanitary Dump Stations .....	--	--	\$65,000	--
Alteration & Improvement projects \$20,000 or less (15) .....	\$148,100	--	--	--

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 412 from funds accumulated under the provisions of Item 219.5  
Budget Act of 1968**

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$50,000
Recommended for approval .....	50,000
Recommended reduction—None	

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This is a continuation of a rehabilitation and repair program by the Office of Architecture and Construction for the Hearst Castle complex including repairs of the Purduh Screens, stonework, terrace, tile, and termite control. This is an ongoing project which is being funded by the revenues, which exceed the operating costs of the unit.

At present, the state is responsible for the maintenance and repair of the castle but the personal property and artifacts of the castle are still the responsibility of the Hearst Corporation. Since the state will soon be taking over responsibility for both the real and personal property at Hearst Castle, a study should be started to set maintenance, repair, restoration and rebuilding standards. This problem will become acute when the department is required to decide whether the cost and esthetic values of a particular item require it to be reconstructed or restored. Without adequate standards, the costs of maintaining this monument may become very great and engender a controversy with various historical societies.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 413 from the Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund**

---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$819,400
Recommended for approval .....	819,400
Recommended reduction—None	

---

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend that the \$595,800 for Folsom Lake Brown's Ravine Marina be authorized subject to the condition that the Department of Parks and Recreation execute a consessionaire agreement prior to constructing the project.*

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item includes three projects for boating and marina facilities in the State Park System, one of which, Castaic Reservoir, is dependent on General Fund expenditures.

*(a) Castaic Reservoir for development of boating facilities \$163,600*

*We recommend approval.*

This request is for the surfacing of a six-lane boat launching ramp for Castaic Reservoir. Construction is currently underway on Castaic

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

Dam by the Department of Water Resources and scheduled for completion in 1971. According to the department, funding the project at this time will provide for construction prior to the impounding of water behind the dam, which substantially reduces the cost compared to other construction methods used if the reservoir is filled.

This launching ramp represents a coordinated construction project between the Department of Water Resources and the Department of Parks and Recreation. Because of this cooperation, a great deal of the preliminary construction work will be undertaken as the dam itself is actually constructed and should result in a lower cost for construction.

(b) *Del Valle Reservoir for development of boating facilities—Phase II* ----- \$60,000

*We recommend approval.*

This project will continue development and consists of completing a 191-car and trailer parking area by adding a double seal coat on a previously laid base, constructing a "series 600" comfort station, six courtesy docks with access ramps, and installing water, sewer and utility extensions for future connections.

The department indicates that completion of this project is timely in that the reservoir is scheduled to be filled to the high pool elevation in the spring of 1970.

(c) *Folsom Lake Brown's Ravine Marina for development* \$595,800

*We recommend that the Legislature limit this expenditure by requiring the Department of Parks and Recreation to execute a contract with a concessionaire who is willing to meet the terms of the Brown's Ravine prospectus dated November 26, 1968.*

This project includes the excavation for a 600-slip marina basin, rough graded boat launching ramp, placing of excavated material for future parking areas, and rock riprap for protection from wave action and erosion. The department plans that after providing initial construction of the above facilities, a concessionaire will complete development of this marina to replace a smaller one of 170 berths.

This project has two major policy considerations. The first is that the department proposes this expenditure on the basic plan that a concessionaire will finish the project. This policy may be beneficial if in fact a concessionaire can be found. However, it becomes readily apparent that problems will arise from this type of development if a concessionaire is not found because the state's investment will be lost or else a concessionaire will have to be subsidized to undertake the marina operation.

The second consideration is the timing which the department has used in advertising for bids. The department invited bids in this case prior to legislative approval of this item. Such a procedure may tend to commit the Legislature to a project. On the other hand, the Legislature should know whether a concessionaire is available before it appropriates funds for the state's portion of the costs. The Legislature may wish to establish a policy regarding the timing of concessionaire bids where these bids are dependent on state financing.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****Item 414 from the Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund**

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$30,400
Recommended for approval .....	30,400
Recommended reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval of this item as budgeted.*

This item proposes three projects:

1. Emerald Bay State Park, campground docking .....	\$15,000
2. McArthur-Burney Falls, floating docks .....	5,400
3. Oroville Reservoir, floating docks .....	10,000

**RECLAMATION BOARD****Item 415 from the General Fund**

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$3,375,202
Recommended for approval .....	2,923,989
Recommended reduction .....	\$84,602

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS**

Reduce support .....	<i>Amount</i> \$84,602
----------------------	---------------------------

*We recommend that \$451,213 be transferred from this item to the Reclamation Board support Item 266 after reducing \$84,602 (as discussed under Item 266) for planning in Butte Basin and six rights-of-way acquisition positions.*

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. We recommend that the Nelson Bend and Cache Creek projects be shown separately in the schedule of Item 415.

2. We recommend that the Reclamation Board be made subject to the Public Works Board for approval for all but its land acquisition activities by deleting the exemption from Control Section Nos. 6 and 8.

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This capital outlay item appropriates all funds for the Reclamation Board. The support funds are transferred from this item to support Item 266.

The Reclamation Board traditionally has purchased in behalf of the State of California the lands, easements and rights-of-way and has relocated the utilities required for construction of Corps of Engineers, flood control, levee and channel projects. The board has acquired the lands with its own staff. It has followed various procedures in relocating facilities and utilities which must be moved for the flood control works. It has designed and constructed bridges itself, it has contracted

**Reclamation Board—Continued**

with the Division of Highways to do the work and it has frequently paid the Corps of Engineers to do the work as part of the construction of the flood control works.

In recent years, the board has also been responsible for constructing two major works. It reimbursed the Department of Water Resources which designed and constructed the Upper San Joaquin River Flood Control Project. The board is now completing the design and construction supervision of the Colusa Weir project with its own staff. This next year, it has budgeted \$600,000 for reconstruction of the Nelson Bend levees. In 1969-70, it is seeking money for working plans to construct a project at the Cache Creek Settling Basin which will cost about \$250,000 for interim works. The long-term solution may cost several million dollars.

Our analysis of the board's support budget discusses at length the problem the board has at Butte Basin where suit has been brought against the board, presumably with the hope that this will expedite construction of certain facilities desired by the plaintiffs.

We have observed an increasing tendency for the board to hold executive (closed) sessions to decide important problems confronting the board. We have pointed out several times in the past, that members of the board are permitted by statute to have a conflict of interest (Water Code, Section 8575). Finally at various times in the past our analysis, the Assembly Water Committee, the Little Hoover Commission and the Governor's Task Force on Economy and Efficiency have recommended abolishing or reorganizing the board because it does not perform a state-wide program or is performing functions which could or should be performed by the Department of Water Resources.

In the light of the above circumstances, we recommend three actions which the Legislature can take to improve the budget. The first has already been discussed under the support analysis of the board's budget (Item 266) where we have recommended that \$451,213, which is properly classified as support expenditures, be moved from capital outlay to support after eliminating \$84,602. The second action is to list the Nelson Bend and Cache Creek projects in the schedule under the capital outlay item so that they will be properly identified and subject to expenditure control.

The third action is to amend the last provision in Item 415 to eliminate the exemption of the board from Sections 6 and 8 of the Budget Bill. This will have the effect of requiring the board to present its expenditures and projects except for land acquisitions (which consists of a large number of small acquisitions) to the Public Works Board for approval. The Reclamation Board is a regional agency which gets its funds from the entire state (from the General Fund). It appears reasonable and equitable for the board's construction and relocation expenditures to receive Public Works Board scrutiny in the same manner as most other General Fund agencies.

**UNALLOCATED****Item 416 from the State Construction Program Fund**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$5,000,000
Recommended for approval .....	5,000,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

The State Higher Education Construction Program Bond Act of 1966 provided funds specifically only for higher education projects in the state college system and the University of California as well as a reservation for junior colleges exclusively. This fund has now been exhausted through the Budget Acts of 1966 and 1967, but a number of projects for which funds were appropriated from this source have not yet gone to bid and it is anticipated that there will be substantial deficits due to the unusually high rate of rise in the construction cost index.

This item proposes to appropriate remaining balances in bonds authorized prior to the 1966 Bond Act to provide a source of augmentation for the projects mentioned above. Based on projects that have been presented to the Public Works Board in the last 12-month period, there seems little doubt that the cost escalation will require a substantial part if not all of this amount.

**COMMUNITY COLLEGES****Item 417 from the State Construction Program Fund**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$29,158,625
Recommended for approval .....	29,158,625
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Chapter 1555 of the Statutes of 1967, known as the "Junior College Construction Program Bond Act of 1968," provided that a bond proposition be put before the electorate in the June primary of 1968, seeking an authorization of \$65 million for community college construction assistance. This was subsequently approved by the electorate and was placed in the State Construction Program Fund. The Budget Act of 1968 appropriated \$15,609,333 for a schedule of projects which specified each district and the amount for each project which the state would allocate. In addition, Chapter 931, Statutes of 1968, appropriated \$1,625,000 from the same source in augmentation of the budget item to meet certain increases in the anticipated allocation. This leaves an unencumbered balance of \$47,765,467 in the State Construction Program Fund from which it is now proposed to appropriate \$29,158,625 to a schedule of 149 projects located in 44 of the 68 junior college districts.

**Community Colleges—Continued**

This \$29,158,625 will be applied against the projects' total cost of \$53,575,744 with the balance of \$24,417,119 coming from district funds. However, there are anticipated to be federal reimbursements of \$6,700,000 which would be allocated by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. To the extent these federal funds actually materialize and are allocated, the state's appropriation will be reduced by an equivalent amount and the reduction will revert to the unappropriated balance of the State Construction Program Fund. Assuming that all of the federal funds will be forthcoming, the net state appropriation will then be \$22,458,625 or 42 percent of the total project costs. It will leave a balance of \$25,306,842 in the State Construction Program Fund dedicated to junior college purposes.

The five-year projection in the Governor's Budget shows a need for state participation in the 1970-71 fiscal year of over \$24,390,000. For all practical purposes, this would leave less than \$1 million remaining in the fund and available for the 1971-72 fiscal year. Projections for subsequent years show a continuing requirement of state participation at the rate of \$25 million annually.

Preliminary plans, outline specifications and cost estimates were made available to the Department of Finance prior to the inclusion of these projects in the Governor's Budget. These have been carefully reviewed both by the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst. In many instances the Department of Finance has arrived at costs below those initially proposed by the particular districts. Our review substantiates and concurs in the amounts budgeted by the Department of Finance.

As previously noted, the schedule covers 44 districts with 149 individual projects ranging from equipment for buildings already funded or in existence, working drawings for construction to be funded in the future, construction for projects already having working drawings, combination working drawing and construction projects and site acquisition.

**ALLOCATION DETERMINATIONS**

The program proposed for community colleges in the Budget Bill is the first to come under the provisions of Chapter 1550, Statutes of 1967 (SB No. 691) which added Chapter 19, entitled "Junior College Construction Act of 1967," to Division 14 of the Education Code.

This statute set forth a formula for the determination of the ratio of state funds to local funds for qualified projects and a new procedure for screening and reviewing the projects to qualify them for entry into the Governor's Budget. The gist of this procedure is that the Department of Finance is required to review the preliminary plans, specifications and estimates essentially in the same manner in which it reviews projects for the state colleges or the University of California. Basically, there are two key procedural elements. The first is to qualify the inclusion of the project in the budget from the standpoint of need and scope and the second is to determine the state's share of the justified cost.



## Community Colleges—Continued

The need for a project is based on the projection of student enrollments using a standard known as "weekly student contact hours" against an inventory of existing or funded capacity in which each square foot of academic instructional space is equivalent to one and one-half weekly student contact hours for lecture spaces and varying values for different types of laboratories or vocational shops. The difference between the resultant cumulative capacity and the anticipated enrollment is the basis for the size and capacity of a proposed academic instructional project. The need for nonacademic instructional facilities such as libraries, administrative offices, etc., is based on other criteria.

The financial sharing between the state and the district is based on a formula in which the ratio of total weekly student contact hours to assessed valuation of the district is compared with the ratio of statewide total weekly student contact hours to statewide assessed valuation of all districts. Where these ratios are on a par, the state and district shares are equal. Where the district ratio exceeds the statewide ratio, the state's share is proportionately reduced and where the district ratio is below the state average, the state's share is proportionately increased. This is based on Section 20081C of the Education Code which was added by the "Junior College Construction Act of 1967."

To illustrate the formula we find that for calculating the 1969-70 budget, the statewide district assessed valuation as of July 1, 1968, was \$43,591,185,944. This figure divided by the statewide weekly student contact hours totalling 5,174,049 gave an average of \$8,425 per hour. The Foothill Junior College District, as of the same date, had an assessed valuation of \$810,118,256 with a weekly student contact hour total of 139,361. This resulted in an average of \$5,813 per hour, which is obviously lower than the state average. The latter figure divided by the state average produces a ratio referred to as "relative district ability." In the case of Foothill Junior College District, this came to .690. Because parity would have resulted in 50 cents of each dollar being paid by the state and 50 cents by the district, the Foothill ratio of .690 results in  $34\frac{1}{2}$  cents of each dollar of recognized costs being paid by the district and  $65\frac{1}{2}$  cents by the state. The spread of state participation runs from a low of 12.5 percent at Victor Valley Joint Junior College District to a high of 72.1 percent at Merced Junior College District. The recognized cost of the project is an outgrowth of the review made both by the board of governors and the Department of Finance to determine a fair value for the project based on its design and justified scope or size. The amounts in the schedule attached to this item reflect the foregoing techniques of calculation.

Earlier, we indicated that the total number of projects in the item was 149 which would require a prohibitive amount of space if each project were to be individually described in this analysis. Consequently, we propose to group the projects into five broad categories and to describe one or more projects in each. The total shown for each category is the state's share, not the gross cost.

## Community Colleges—Continued

(a) *Real property acquisition* ----- \$516,002

*We recommend approval.*

This category covers four projects at three districts. In each case, the acquisition represents an accomplished purchase, usually on a time-payment basis, for a campus already established or being established. The largest of the four is \$800,000 for payment towards a purchase of approximately 150 acres at Fremont-Newark Junior College District. Because this district has a relative ability of 1.176, the state's share at 329,600 represents approximately 41 percent of the cost.

The smallest is \$17,962 in connection with an acquisition for the South Eastside campus of the San Jose Junior College District which is described in the Governor's Budget as an acquisition of approximately 55 acres to round out a total of 155 acres. This description is in error. The 155 acres have been purchased on a time payment basis and the \$17,962 proposed here represents approximately 47 percent of the payment due in 1969 which is something over \$38,000. It is our understanding that two additional payments will complete the purchase.

(b) *Site development—utilities and maintenance plant* -- \$4,117,821

*We recommend approval.*

This category includes 27 projects in which the largest single one, insofar as the state share is concerned, is the offsite development at the 150 acre campus of the Fremont-Newark Junior College District. The project includes clearing, grading, drainage, water, sewer and electrical services, etc. The total project cost is estimated at \$1,586,809 based on a construction cost index of 1260 which is projected for July 1969. The reason for this projected level is to allow for some cost rise because there is no augmentation authorization or procedure in connection with the junior college assistance. The state's share of the project will be \$653,765, representing 41.2 percent of the total cost. The percentage is based on the relative district ability which was previously explained. The project has been reviewed in some detail and the scope and costs appear to be in line.

In contrast, the smallest single project in this category is for the construction of an access from the highway including a drainage culvert and headwalls at Lassen Junior College District at a total estimated cost of \$2,477 of which the state's share is \$2,170 or 87.6 percent.

Within this category also is a project for the construction of a warehouse and maintenance building at Merced Junior College District, having a gross area of 10,200 square feet and an assignable area of 9,651 square feet, giving a very high efficiency ratio of 95 percent. The total cost of this project is \$158,856 with the state's share at \$114,615 or 72 percent. The unit cost would be approximately \$12 per gross square foot for the basic building and over \$15.50 per square foot at total project level including utilities, local site development and all fees. These are comparable figures for similar facilities at the state colleges.

In this group there are also a number of projects for working drawings only. An example is a project for initial site development on the

## Community Colleges—Continued

new north campus of Marin Junior College District. This would cover site clearance, grading, access roads and walks and basic utility development. The total working drawing cost is estimated at \$129,231 of which the state's share would be \$57,508, or 44.5 percent. The ultimate cost of the project including the working drawings and construction will probably be on the order of \$2.5 million on a site which probably exceeds 150 acres in size and has some difficult development areas.

(c) *Academic instructional facilities* ----- \$12,040,858

*We recommend approval.*

This category with 34 projects covers lecture, laboratory and vocational technical facilities and includes projects for working drawings alone as well as those for working drawings and construction.

The largest single project in the group is for the construction of a science facility having over 95,300 gross square feet of area and almost 63,500 square feet of assignable area at the Cypress campus of the North Orange Junior College District. With an efficiency ratio of 67 percent, it is more efficient than the average science building built in a state college which usually runs about 60 percent. However, it should be realized that at a junior college the science facilities consist of large lower division class laboratory spaces with little or none of the fragmentation that occurs in a science facility at a state college which provides space for lower, and upper division laboratories as well as some research facilities.

The total project cost is estimated at \$3,690,075 of which the state's share is \$2,374,563 or 64.3 percent. The unit cost would be about \$30.50 per gross square foot for the basic building and almost \$38.70 per foot at total project level. This is somewhat less than state college science buildings have been averaging and is to be expected in view of the lesser sophistication of the junior college building.

One of the smaller projects is for the construction of a police science building having 2,625 gross square feet of area and an assignable area of 2,516 square feet, giving an extremely high efficiency ratio of 96 percent, indicating that this is essentially a single large room. This project is at the Golden West campus of the Orange Coast Junior College District. It is estimated to have a total project cost of \$95,110 of which the state's share will be \$62,345, representing 65.5 percent. Unit cost will be about \$26.50 per gross square foot at building level and over \$36.20 per square foot at total project level. It is difficult to make a direct comparison with any facility constructed on a state college campus because state colleges normally do not build such small units to fill highly specialized needs. Nevertheless, the costs appear to be in line for the purpose. There is also a project for the construction of a creative arts annex at the San Francisco Unified School District which would have a gross area of 30,355 square feet with a net assignable area of 21,717 square feet, giving an excellent efficiency ratio of 72 percent for this type of facility. The total cost of the project is estimated at \$1,181,234 of which the state's share would be \$313,027

## Community Colleges—Continued

representing 26.5 percent. This is among the lowest of the state participation percentages, indicating that the district has a relatively high financial ability from its own resources. The unit cost estimate is about \$31 per gross square foot for the basic building and over \$38.90 per square foot at total project level. To some degree, this cost is relatively higher than the average for similar facilities at state colleges, because it reflects the more stringent code requirements in the San Francisco area. We believe that the cost is justifiable for this type of facility and in this location.

There is also a project for construction of a humanities building at the Santa Ana Junior College District with a gross area of 22,353 square feet, and a net assignable area of 17,726 square feet, giving an excellent efficiency ratio of 79 percent. The total project cost is estimated at \$592,613 with the state's share being \$417,496 representing almost 70.5 percent and indicating a relatively poor district financial ability. Unit costs would be about \$22.50 per gross square foot for the basic building and over \$26.50 per foot at total project level which is below the average cost for similar facilities at state colleges by 10 to 15 percent. To some degree this reflects the lesser sophistication of the junior college facility and simpler construction.

One example of a working drawings project is for a humanities and fine arts building at the West Valley Joint Junior College District. This project is proposed at 44,983 square feet of gross area with 32,110 square feet of assignable area, giving an efficiency ratio of 72 percent. Working drawings cost has been estimated at \$104,094 of which the state's share would be \$47,883 representing 46 percent. The ultimate total project cost will probably be on the order of \$1,500,000.

(d) *Noninstructional academic and auxiliary facilities*— \$8,356,341

*We recommended approval.*

This category covers 39 projects, a few of which are for working drawings only but most of which are for working drawings and construction. The category is something of a catch-all in that it includes libraries, eating facilities, administrative office facilities, faculty office facilities, audiovisual facilities, physical education facilities, etc. More than half of the total represents physical education facilities in one form or another with libraries being second in magnitude.

The largest project in this group, insofar as the state's cost is concerned, is for the construction of a physical education building at the Santa Barbara Junior College District. It will have a gross area of 59,200 square feet with 40,126 square feet of assignable area, giving an efficiency ratio of 68 percent which is slightly below the state college level. The project is estimated to cost \$2,238,923 of which the state's share will be \$1,099,311 representing 49 percent. The unit costs are about \$27 per gross square foot for the basic building and over \$37.81 per square foot at total project level. This is slightly higher than the average cost for similar state college facilities and reflects the premium cost at Santa Barbara.

## Community Colleges—Continued

The costliest library project from the standpoint of the state's share, is for the construction of library expansion at the Santa Ana Junior College District which is in fact a combination of new space and the remodeling of existing space. The gross area of the new space is 26,099 square feet and of the remodeled area is 15,900 square feet, while the assignable of both together is 34,935 square feet, giving an excellent efficiency ratio of 83 percent. The total project cost is estimated at \$936,486 of which the state's share is \$659,754 representing 70.5 percent. The unit cost is about \$22.50 per gross square foot for the new area and about \$13.50 per gross square foot for the remodeling at building construction level. We do not have a breakdown of the two types of space at total project level but jointly they average about \$22.30. These costs are somewhat below average, insofar as the new space is concerned, when compared with similar state college facilities. Principally, this is occasioned by the fact that the design and materials are simpler, and the expansion is added to an existing building.

An example of an administration building is a project at the Solano County Junior College District for the construction of a building having a gross area of 13,056 square feet with a net assignable area of 10,270 square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 79 percent which is excellent. The cost estimate of the project is \$403,001 of which the state's share will be \$238,980 representing 59.3 percent. The unit cost will be somewhat over \$25 per gross square foot for the basic building and over \$30.85 per square foot at total project level. These costs compare favorably with similar facilities at state colleges.

For food service buildings, a typical example would be a project at the Orange Coast Junior College District on its Goldenwest Campus. This unit would have 3,613 gross square feet of area with 3,219 assignable square feet, giving an efficiency ratio of 92 percent which is excellent and indicates an open plan having very little unassignable space. The project cost is \$258,328 of which the state's share will be \$169,334 or 65.5 percent. The unit cost will be about \$30 per square foot for the gross area at building level and almost \$71.50 per square foot at total project level which includes all of the kitchen equipment, serving area equipment, refrigeration, etc. These costs are comparable with similar facilities at state colleges taking into account the relatively small size of the unit.

The typical working drawing project is one at the West Valley Joint Junior College District for a physical education building which would have a gross area of almost 79,300 square feet with a net usable area of over 58,400 square feet, giving an acceptable efficiency ratio of 74 percent. The cost of the working drawings is estimated at \$240,306 with the state's share at \$110,541 or 46 percent. The ultimate total project cost will probably approach \$2,500,000 with a unit cost for the basic building alone in excess of \$27 per gross square foot which is about equivalent to similar facilities in the state colleges.

## Community Colleges—Continued

(e) *Equipment* ----- \$3,028,292*We recommend approval*

This category totaling 44 projects covers equipment for construction projects previously funded and for construction projects proposed in this budget. In addition, there are a number of various construction projects, particularly the smaller ones which include some equipment but the amounts have been relatively too small to justify segregating them.

The largest single proposal, insofar as the state's share is concerned, is for equipping a group of facilities at the Goldenwest Campus of the Orange Coast Junior College District. This group, having almost 94,500 square feet of assignable area, includes a gymnasium, outdoor physical education facilities, science and technology building, a forum and a communications facility. The total cost of the equipment is \$586,690 and the state's share is \$386,542 or 65.5 percent.

One of the smallest proposals is for equipping a seminar building having 1,436 square feet of assignable area at Columbia Junior College in the Yosemite Junior College District. The total cost is \$2,781 and the state's share is \$1,835 or 66 percent.

In between these extremes, for example, is a proposal to equip a machine and mechanics addition having 4,720 assignable square feet at the Reedley Campus of the State Center Junior College District. The total cost is \$102,026 and the state's share is \$51,880 or almost 51 percent.

Equipment for an auto diesel shop expansion area having 16,163 assignable square feet at the Santa Ana Junior College District will cost \$147,538 with the state's share at \$103,941 or almost 70.5 percent.

Equipment for junior college projects entail rather difficult cost comparison problems because we have no history of equipment versus construction cost relationships and we have had to rely entirely on the equipment lists and rough rules of thumb with respect to the cost of equipping a square foot of different kinds of space. In subsequent budgets, we hope to be able to establish a more meaningful basis.

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

It will be noted from the total amounts for each category that actual academic instructional space, excluding libraries, represents approximately only 41 percent of the total state assistance. On the other hand, noninstructional space, which includes the libraries but excludes site development and maintenance facilities, represents over 32 percent of the total state assistance. It is difficult to draw clear inferences or conclusions from these comparisons, but we suggest that if the community colleges are to accept increasing numbers of lower division students who would be diverted from both the state colleges and the University perhaps more emphasis should be placed on academic instructional space and less on physical education facilities, auditoriums and other related facilities.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****Item 418 from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund**


---

Requested -----	\$7,247,611
Appropriated in 1968-69 -----	2,290,516
Appropriated in 1967-68 -----	9,588,868
Requested increase \$4,957,095 (215 percent)	
Total recommended reduction -----	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval as budgeted.*

The State Beach, Park, Recreation and Historical Facilities Bond Act of 1964 allocated \$40 million of bond proceeds for local and regional park projects to be distributed as grants to the 58 counties on the basis of their estimated population on July 1, 1975.

The Legislature, under provisions of the Bond Act, approves appropriation requests for these local project grants. To date, 130 projects have been approved by the Legislature and \$30,734,421 has been appropriated. The 1969-70 budget proposes 54 additional projects to be financed from local grant funds at a cost of \$7,247,611. A list of these projects and the grant amounts is provided in Item 418 of the Budget Bill. The Department of Parks and Recreation estimates that this will leave approximately \$1.3 million of local grant money available for future appropriation.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****Item 419 from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund**


---

Requested -----	\$81,364
Appropriated in 1968-69 -----	60,546
Appropriated in 1967-68 -----	51,665
Requested increase \$20,818 (34 percent)	
Total recommended reduction -----	None

---

*We recommend approval.*

This item is to finance the project review of local grant projects under the State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Bond Act. The appropriation finances five positions and related expenses in the department to review the local grant requests.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****Item 420 from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund**


---

Requested .....	\$655,216
Appropriated in 1968-69 .....	1,158,352
Appropriated in 1967-68 .....	1,706,595
Requested decrease \$503,136 (44 percent)	
Total recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval as budgeted.*

Under provisions of the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, federal grants are available on a 50-50 matching basis to state and local agencies for planning, acquisition and development of outdoor recreation areas. The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation establishes eligibility criteria and makes final project approval on state and local grant applications. In order to be eligible for grants under this program, states must have prepared a comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan and there must be a designated state official who has the authority and the responsibility to receive and administer funds. The Director of Parks and Recreation is the state official so designated.

Land and Water Conservation Funds are allocated 45 percent for state recreation projects and 45 percent for local agency recreation projects with 10 percent held aside as a contingency reserve under current apportionment rules established by the director.

All projects in which local grant bond moneys are used for matching purposes with the federal Land and Water Conservation Act funds are listed in Item 420 of the Budget Bill as required by the Recreation Bond Act of 1964. This item meets the technical requirements of legislative appropriation of the federal funds. There are eight such projects proposed for fiscal 1969-70 for a total cost of \$655,216.

**Department of Fish and Game****WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD****Item 421 from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund**


---

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$1,181,349
Recommended for approval .....	1,181,349
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

In 1965, the Wildlife Conservation Board authorized a pilot project to determine the feasibility of constructing a warm water hatchery to



**Wildlife Conservation Board—Continued**

produce channel catfish for stocking in southern California reservoirs and lakes. The board authorized the allocation of \$20,000 from the Wildlife Restoration Fund to construct a pilot hatchery in the Imperial Water Fowl Management area operated by the Department of Fish and Game. This project was initiated to determine the suitability of water quality and the stability of water temperature to insure successful operation of a full scale hatchery. The subsequent success of the test hatchery verified the feasibility of constructing a warm water hatchery in the Imperial Valley.

In 1968, the Wildlife Conservation Board approved development of the hatchery and allocated \$46,000 from the Wildlife Restoration Fund for the preparation of preliminary plans, working drawings and specifications. The \$1,181,349 requested in this item is an estimate of the remaining funds available from the bond act program. The current estimated cost of this facility is \$1,060,800 based on plans and specifications prepared by the Office of Architecture and Construction. Earth type rearing ponds will be the hatchery's main production facilities. The board anticipates that this hatchery will have the capacity to produce one-half million catchable size channel catfish annually. This request will substantially complete the expenditure of the \$5 million available to the Wildlife Conservation Board under the bond act program.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****Item 422 from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund**

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$2,875,000
Recommended for approval .....	1,000,000
Recommended reduction .....	\$1,875,000

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS**

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Analysis page</i>
(b) We recommend that acquisition of 32 acres at Emma Wood State Beach be disapproved .....	\$1,425,000	1104
(c) We recommend that acquisition of three parcels at El Presidio de Santa Barbara be disapproved .....	\$450,000	1104

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item requests funds from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund for 3 acquisitions. See Item 426 for a discussion of the status of previously authorized acquisition projects.

(a) *Land acquisition program: statewide* ..... \$1,000,000

*We recommend that this item be approved but that its expenditure be subject to the same limitations as previously imposed on acquisition projects and further that it be available only for additional costs due to condemnation decisions.*

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

This expenditure is requested to augment unspecified acquisition projects funded from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Act of 1964. The augmentation is requested on the basis of escalating land costs.

(b) *Emma Wood State Beach: for acquisition*----- \$1,425,000

*We recommend disapproval.*

This beach acquisition is situated between the downcoast boundary of Emma Wood State Beach and the mouth of the Ventura River. The acquisition will provide for 32 acres and 4,000 feet of ocean frontage to be added to the easterly end of the existing Emma Wood unit. This acreage will extend the existing state beach into the City of San Buenaventura where the state already has a major beach.

Last session, the department requested the Legislature to augment its budget to acquire 76 acres at the same unit for \$1,000,000. The Legislature did not approve the project. This year the project is back again for authorization to purchase approximately half the previously proposed acreage for about 50 percent more money. We have received no details on the scaleback in boundaries of the revised project.

The department is presently unable to complete acquisition of the major acquisition projects which are already authorized. In addition, it is highly probable that any savings from the presently authorized bond acquisition projects will be required to augment the already authorized acquisitions because of price escalation due to delays in acquisition. If \$1,425,000 is appropriated for acquisition of this project, there will be virtually no acquisition reserve left for any major increase in costs due to condemnation, escalation or other unforeseen events.

(c) *El Presidio de Santa Barbara: for acquisition*----- \$450,000

*We recommend disapproval.*

After a lengthy discussion, the Parks and Recreation Commission approved a resolution to request \$450,000 from the State Park Bond Fund to be included in the 1969-70 budget request for acquisition of the El Presidio de Santa Barbara State Historical Monument. The commission indicated that this would be the last contribution by the state for the project. However, members of the commission indicated that local supporters of the project are not cognizant of this fact and that the boundaries of the monument even now are not exact.

This presidio is one of four established during the Spanish period of California history and dates back to 1782. The proposed acquisition would cover three parcels of land which would be across the street from a small parcel previously deeded to the state and would result in the state's ownership of two adobe houses which were part of the original presidio. The reconstruction of the entire presidio would include 94 acres in downtown Santa Barbara as well as demolition and restoration costs estimated at \$7,150,000 in 1965.

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

The proposal now before the Legislature, although consisting of only \$450,000 in acquisition funds, would only be a minor start on the entire project, but it would serve as a commitment for further state acquisition and restoration.

The historical value of the project is high and the local interest and desire to control zoning and to develop the surrounding area in a proper manner appear to be excellent. However, the project is located in an area of such high-cost land that its feasibility is doubtful. In addition, to have a completed project would require reconstruction of the entire presidio since for all practical purposes none of it now exists.

Three other presidios were established in California by the Spanish, two of these, Monterey and San Francisco, are still occupied by modern military facilities. The other, San Diego, is in the possession of the City of San Diego and therefore is in public ownership. It represents a more feasible opportunity for the state to participate in reconstructing economically a presidio of substantial historical value which would have similar major statewide interest if the park system is to contain a presidio.

The Legislature deleted this item from the 1967 Budget Bill. It included the project in the 1968 Budget Bill, but the Governor removed it. We have consistently recommended that the project be disapproved.

## DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

## Item 423 from the State Beach, Parks, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund

Requested 1969-70	\$1,242,094
Recommended for approval	992,094
Recommended reduction	250,000

## SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS

	Amount	Analysis page
(a) San Diego "Old Town"	\$250,000	1105

We recommend disapproval of the request for minimum development funds until a master plan is prepared.

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 1969 Budget Bill contains only two requests for expenditure of the \$20 million made available in the 1964 Recreation Bond Act for minimum development of projects acquired with bond funds.

(a) San Diego "Old Town": for development \$250,000

We recommend disapproval.

This is a continuing project to restore "Old Town", which includes two comfort stations, restoration of the Machado de Silvas Adobe, structural stabilization of the Pedorena Adobe, utilities, and relocation of electrical, telephone, and fire alarm systems. The only two existing Spanish historic structures are being restored this year.

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

In the current calendar year, "Old Town" will be a focal point in the California Bicentennial Celebration. After this it will be largely razed to make room for reconstruction of the original historic structures for which the site was purchased. It is important for the department to formulate a master plan for this unit. During our field trip to this unit, the area superintendent for the project discussed several operational concepts and noted that consultants on history of the area wanted to develop a multi-era historical unit. At this stage in the project's development, the department should be formulating a final historical development concept with firm decisions as to the historical era represented and the manner in which these decisions will be implemented before any further work is undertaken.

We recommend that this project not be approved until the department can provide the Legislature with a detailed operational and conceptual plan for the "Old Town" unit. Otherwise, it may lose its historical value and become a commercialized tourist attraction.

(b) *Sugar Pine Point State Park: for development*----- \$992,094

*We recommend approval.*

This project includes construction of access roads, parking areas, bridges, trails, underground electrical supply line, sanitary facilities, sewerage lift stations, water systems, a 200,000-gallon storage tank, a contact station, signs, bicycle roads, traffic barriers, fences, and removal of existing buildings. The work is classified as minimum development under the 1964 Recreation Bond Act. This summer, 150 campsites will be opened using funds appropriated three years ago.

A prospectus, or statement of intended development for this project was reviewed by the Parks and Recreation Commission in its December, 1968, meeting and several aspects were cut back to emphasize more traditional state park recreational facilities. Specifically, the commission expressed its desire that this park be preserved as much as possible in its natural condition, and subsequently excluded a small camper supply store, a snack bar, bicycle rental shop, equestrian center, and summer or winter lodging facilities.

This prospectus which represents the planning effort of the department is not a decision-making document. It merely contains general guidelines. As an example, the prospectus states "In the most accessible portion of the lake front portion of the area is the living complex, constructed by the Hellman family just after the turn of the century. In later years, this property has been known as the Ehrman estate and should continue to bear that name. It is composed of the mansion, a large impressive stone and frame building, and several modest houses. The report entitled *A Summary of Historical Values at Sugar Pine Point* dated October 7, 1968 by the Historical Resources Section of the Department of Parks and Recreation declares that the preservation of these estate buildings cannot be justified on a basis of statewide historical interest. The whole complex, however, represents a way of life and is a symbol of the effect of early San Francisco affluence on the west shore of Lake Tahoe. It should be retained." Thus after three

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

years, the department still does not know what it is going to do with the mansion since it has always been assumed by everyone that the mansion would not be torn down. The costs of maintenance or repair, and many of the other relevant issues confronting the department concerning the mansion have not been evaluated.

Although we do not believe that the project is adequately planned to justify further construction, we recommend approval of this request only because of the strong guidance of the Parks and Recreation Commission in rescoping the project and the need to expedite development.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****Item 424 from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund**

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$133,920
Recommended for approval .....	133,920
Recommended reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

In line with our detailed recommendation for a master plan report containing the elements discussed in our support budget (Analysis page 772), we recommend approval of this item which reimburses the department for Bond Fund project planning.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****Item 425 from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund**

Requested 1969-70 .....	\$269,062
Recommended for approval .....	None
Recommended reduction .....	\$269,062

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS**

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Analysis page</i>
Delete item .....	\$269,062	1107

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend that this item not be approved because unspecified planning is not in accordance with Item 378.9 Budget Act of 1968, but we do recommend that the provisions of Item 378.9 Budget Act of 1968 be extended in the Budget Act of 1969.*

As we stated in our support analysis last session, the Legislature added Item 378.9 to the Budget Bill to place reimbursements for state park system land acquisitions received from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund in a reserve account in the Special Deposit Fund of the General Fund. The sum of \$910,514 is now in that reserve.

**Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued**

The transfer to the reserve was made in order to preclude using the money for acquisition purposes and to assure that the funds be used for development, which was and still is the most underfunded portion of the department's budget. The item requires the Director of Parks and Recreation to submit "a program in the Governor's Budget for expenditure of such money on projects to develop the state park system."

The Budget Bill proposes in Item 425 to appropriate \$269,062 of the reserve for further unidentified planning work rather than for development. Because the work to be planned has not been identified and the Legislature did not establish the reserve for planning, we recommend that the appropriation be disapproved and that Item 425 be removed from the Budget Bill. However, in order to provide continuity for the policy established in the Budget Act of 1968, we recommend that any money received in the 1969-70 fiscal year from the federal government and deposited in the State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Bond Fund, pursuant to Section 5096.26 of the Public Resources Code, which in the determination of the Director of Finance is intended to be allocated to or expended for the State Park System be transferred to the Special Deposit Fund provided that the money so transferred shall be held in trust in the Special Deposit Fund for development of the State Park System and shall be available for expenditure only upon appropriation by the Legislature, after the Director of Parks and Recreation has submitted a program in the Governor's Budget for expenditure of such money on projects to develop the State Park System.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION****Item 426 for Reappropriation of Acquisition Funds from the State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Fund****General Comments on Park Acquisitions**

Table I provides a brief review of the status of the land acquisition program under the 1964 Recreation Bond Act. The Department of Parks and Recreation has furnished up-to-date information on the status of expenditures and the acreage acquired to date. We have added citations to the original appropriation authority which authorized acquisition of the lands and have shown in addition any reappropriations and proposed reversions.

The table provides a concise method of determining the status of any of the acquisition projects which are being reappropriated by Items 426, 430, 431, 432, and 433 in the 1969 Budget Bill. Under each of these reappropriation or reversion items we have listed the names of the projects affected.

The 29 projects included in Table I have been authorized over a period of years from 1965 to 1968. Therefore, no acquisition should be expected on the projects only recently authorized. However, speaking in general terms, the acquisition program has been slow. Of the 29

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

projects in the table only six have been completed, 11 have been partially acquired and 12 have not had any acreage acquired. The completed projects were all originally funded in 1965. However, an equal number of projects funded in that year have either not yet been acquired or acquisition has not been completed.

In addition, of the \$2,800,000 in opportunity purchase appropriations made to the department in six separate appropriations between 1963 and 1967, the sum of \$315,206 remains unexpended although it is allocated to projects.

It should be noted that the column titled "Amount Available" may not always agree with the original appropriation cited for the project. This is because in several instances augmentation appropriations were authorized by the Legislature which have not been cited or the department may have shifted funds from one acquisition to another within the latitude granted by the original appropriation authority. In each case, the column titled "Amount Available" shows the amount now available for acquisition of each project listed. This may not be enough money in each instance to purchase the project. Item 422(a), proposes appropriating \$1,000,000 for augmenting any of the projects shown in the table. Even with this additional \$1,000,000 there may not be enough money available to purchase all the projects shown. For this reason, we are not recommending authorizing any further acquisitions with bond proceeds until the acquisition program has proceeded to the point where it is clear that sufficient funds are available to purchase all the authorized projects.

Items 426, 430 and 431 reappropriate funds for projects which have reached the three-year limitation of availability for capital outlay projects. Because the reappropriation language used in these three items does not make specific reference to continuing the limitations that the Legislature placed in the appropriating language for a number of projects, we recommend that language be added to each of these three items to assure that the Legislature's limitations are carried over with the reappropriations. This can be done by adding after the phrase "are reappropriated for the purposes" the language "and with the same limitations."

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval with continuation of the limiting language.*

Item 426 reappropriates funds for acquisition of nine projects originally financed in the 1965 Budget Act as follows:

- (a) Point Mugu
- (b) Delta Meadows
- (c) Camp Pendleton-San Onofre
- (d) Huntington State Beach—Expansion
- (e) Marin Headlands
- (f) Pfeiffer-Big Sur—Expansion
- (g) Malibu Lagoon State Beach
- (h) North Coast Redwoods-Gold Beach
- (i) Topanga Canyon

Table 1

**State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Fund Acquisition  
Appropriations and Expenditures as of December 31, 1968<sup>3</sup>**

Project Appropriations	Reappropriations	Amount		Balance	Acres		Reversions	Estimated Savings
		Available	Expenditures		Acquired To Date	To Be Acquired		
Ano Nuevo (Item 423/1966) -----	Item 431/1969	\$1,000,000	\$820,873	\$179,127	291	50	--	-0-
Bolsa Chica (Item 423/1966) -----	Item 431/1969	4,480,000	34,693	4,445,307	-0-	39	Item 432/1969	\$400,000
Calaveras Big Trees (Item 423/1966) -----	Item 431/1969	445,000	7,963	437,037	-0-	1,387	--	-0-
Carpinteria (Item 377.1/1968) -----	--	191,000	236	190,764	--	--	--	--
Coyote River (Item 423/1966) -----	Item 431/1969	2,500,000	2,724	2,497,276	-0-	370	--	-0-
Delta Meadows (Item 362/1965) -----	Item 426/1969	1,085,000	68,568	1,016,432	-0-	1,110	--	-0-
Drum Barracks <sup>1</sup> (Item 343.5/1967) -----	Item 380/1968	125,000	32,787	92,213	1	-0-	Item 433/1969	90,000
(Item 378.2/1968) -----	--	18,000	-0-	18,000	-0-	-0-	--	-0-
Fort Funston (Item 423/1966) -----	--	1,239,000	120	1,238,880	-0-	116	--	-0-
Gaviota Refugio (Item 423/1966) -----	--	4,540,000	3,485,649	1,054,351	2,759	275	--	798,000
Huntington Beach (Item 362/1965) -----	Item 426/1969	2,538,000	18,834	2,519,166	-0-	48	--	-0-
MacKerricher (Item 423/1966) -----	Item 431/1969	55,000	4,789	50,211	-0-	1	--	-0-
Malibu Lagoon (Item 362/1965) -----	Item 426/1969	2,757,000	2,755,653	1,347	13	-0-	--	-0-
Marin Headlands (Item 362/1965) -----	Item 426/1969	800,000	766,599	33,401	338	-0-	Item 346/1967	-0-
Mitchell Caverns (Item 423/1966) -----	Item 431/1969	24,000	4,852	19,148	16	660	--	-0-
Montana de Oro (Item 423/1966) -----	Item 431/1969	1,788,000	12,230	1,775,770	-0-	967	--	-0-
Montgomery Woods (Item 362/1965) -----	Item 431/1968	203,500	19,947	183,553	-0-	999	--	-0-
Mount Tamalpais (Item 423/1966) -----	--	4,000,000	3,841,163	658,837	2,472	12	--	400,000
North Coast Redwoods (Item 362/1965) -----	Item 426/1969	1,028,040	1,028,040	-0-	1,246	-0-	--	-0-
Old River Island (Item 423/1966) -----	Item 431/1969	800,500	9,617	790,883	-0-	980	--	-0-
Old Sacramento (Item 423/1966) -----	Item 431/1969	1,232,000	387,053	844,947	1	7	--	-0-
Pepperwood (Item 423.1/1966) -----	--	1,500,000	1,492,094	7,906	611	1,009	--	6,500
Pfeiffer Big Sur (Item 362/1965) -----	Item 426/1969	1,317,000	1,122,147	194,853	2,142	15	--	-0-
Picacho (Item 423/1966) -----	Item 431/1969	178,500	88,369	90,131	95	146	--	-0-
Point Mugu (Item 362/1965) -----	Item 381/1968	16,981,960	15,188,547	1,793,413	6,438	125	--	935,000
Salt Point (Item 362/1965) -----	--	2,875,000	2,333,134	541,866	3,174	-0-	Item 433/1968	540,000
San Diego Old Town (Item 423/1966) -----	Item 380/1968	2,500,000	1,641,187	858,813	4	3	--	-0-
Santa Monica Mountains (Item 423/1966) -----	Item 431/1969	8,000,000	2,768,157	5,231,843	242	800	--	-0-
Sugar Pine Point (Ch.5/1stSp.Sess./1965) -----	--	8,400,000	8,335,313	64,687	1,975	-0-	--	64,687
Topanga Canyon (Item 362/1965) -----	Item 426/1969	9,480,000	98,343	9,381,657	-0-	167	--	-0-
Torrey Pines (Item 343.6/1967) -----	--	900,000	-0-	900,000	-0-	174	--	-0-
Twin Lakes (Item 378.3/1968) -----	--	300,000	-0-	300,000	--	--	--	--
Totals -----		\$83,281,500	\$45,869,681	\$37,411,819	21,818	9,460	--	<sup>2</sup> \$3,234,187
Project Planning -----		286,399						
		<u>\$83,567,899</u>						

<sup>1</sup> Item 343.5/1967 officers quarters; Item 378.2/1968 powder house.<sup>2</sup> The Department of Parks and Recreation indicates that all estimated savings are subject to adverse condemnation awards.<sup>3</sup> All fiscal data provided by the Department of Parks and Recreation.



**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 427 for Reappropriation of Development and Acquisition Funds for Local Grants Department of Parks, and Recreation, from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund**

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item reappropriates local grant funds from the Recreation Bond Act of 1964 for three projects which were appropriated by the Budget Act of 1965 as follows:

City of Los Angeles, Del Rey Palisades for acquisition----	\$320,000
City of Los Angeles, Harbor Regional Park for develop- ment -----	\$750,000
County of Los Angeles, Vasquez Regional Park for acquisi- tion -----	\$525,000

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 428 for Reappropriation of Grant to Local Agencies for Recreation, from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund**

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item reappropriates local grant funds from the Recreation Bond Act of 1964 for 15 projects which were appropriated by Item 418, Budget Act of 1966 as follows:

City of Berkeley, Berkeley Regional Shoreline Area—phase II, Marine Park, for acquisition and development

City of Oakland, Lake Merritt—Estuary Park, for acquisition and development

East Bay Regional Park District, Brooks Island Regional Park, for acquisition and development

East Bay Regional Park District, John Marsh Historical Regional Park, for acquisition and development

Counties of Fresno and Kings, Laton-Kingston Regional Recreation Area, for acquisition

County of Los Angeles, Charmlee Regional Park, for acquisition

City of Los Angeles, Sepulveda Dam Recreation Area, for development

Cities of Monterey Park and Montebello, Repetto Regional Park, for acquisition

County of Monterey, Toro Park, for acquisition

County of Plumas, Taylorsville County Park, for acquisition and development

County of Sacramento, C. M. Goethe County Park, for development

City and County of San Francisco, John McLaren Park, for development

City and County of San Francisco, Lake Merced Recreation Development, for development

County of San Joaquin, B and L Ranch Oak Grove, for acquisition

County of Tehama, Mill Creek Recreation Area, for acquisition and development

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 429 for Reappropriation of Recreation Grants to Local Agencies, from the State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Fund**

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item reappropriates local grant funds from the Recreation Bond Act of 1964 for three projects from the grant program which were matched by Federal Land and Water Conservation Act funds in Item 420, Budget Act of 1966. The projects are as follows:

- Counties of Fresno and Kings, Laton-Kingston Regional Recreational Area, for acquisition
- City of Los Angeles, Harbor Regional Park, for development
- County of Orange, Sycamore Flat Regional Park, for acquisition and development

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 430 for Reappropriation for Acquisition, from the State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Fund**

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item reappropriates Item 423 (q) Budget Act of 1966 for acquisition augmentations for:

- Bolsa Chica
- Calaveras Big Trees
- Cima Dome
- MacKerricher
- Mitchell Caverns
- Montana de Oro
- Montgomery Woods
- Old River Islands
- Old Sacramento
- Picacho
- Santa Monica Mountains
- Whipple Mountains

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 431 for Reappropriation of Acquisition and Development Funds, from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund**

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

Approve reappropriations with continuation of limiting language except for initial minimum development at Point Mugu (Item 424 (c) Budget Act of 1966).

Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued  
ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend that all the projects listed in Item 431 be reappropriated with continuation of the limiting language with the addition of Ano Nuevo State Reserve and Fort Funston which are missing from the list. We do not recommend reappropriation of the unencumbered balance for Point Mugu initial development funds, Item 424 (c) Budget Act of 1966.*

This item reappropriates funds for land acquisitions and development at 10 different projects financed in the Budget Act of 1966 with funds from the Recreation Bond Act of 1964. The funds were appropriated for three years and the appropriation authorization expires June 30, 1969. The projects are as follows:

- (1) Land Acquisition Statewide
  - (a) Bolsa Chica
  - (b) MacKerricher State Park
  - (c) Montana de Oro State Park
  - (d) Montgomery Woods State Reserve
  - (e) Red Bluff Diversion Dam
  - (f) Calaveras Big Trees State Park
- (2) Coyote River Parkway—land acquisition
- (3) Mitchell Caverns State Reserve—land acquisition
- (4) Old Sacramento State Historic Park—land acquisition
- (5) Picacho State Recreation Area—land acquisition
- (6) Old River Islands—land acquisition
- (7) Acquisition costs for:
  - (a) Bolsa Chica
  - (b) Calaveras Big Trees
  - (c) Cima Dome
  - (d) MacKerricher
  - (e) Mitchell Caverns
  - (f) Montana de Oro
  - (g) Montgomery Woods
  - (h) Old River Islands
  - (i) Old Sacramento
  - (j) Picacho
  - (k) Santa Monica Mountains
  - (l) Whipple Mountains
- (8) Santa Monica Mountains—land acquisitions
- (9) Point Mugu—initial minimum development

Because it has been rescoped by the department, we recommend that the Point Mugu Project (Item 424 (c) Budget Act of 1966) not be reappropriated in order to provide the department with a year to prepare a master planning report which can detail the plan for this unit and provide the Legislature with information on many view policies and development concepts proposed for this project.

The Legislature was originally informed of this project by the department's acquisition study in December 1964, which indicated that

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

Point Mugu area was the "last remaining potential major state park unit with ocean frontage in either Los Angeles or Ventura Counties."

The study went on to indicate that:

- (1) The site possesses significant landscape worthy of preservation.
- (2) The site possesses outstanding examples of flora, fauna, geology, and terrain representative of the Santa Monica Mountain range.
- (3) The site is the last remaining potential major state park unit with ocean frontage from the Mexican border to Santa Barbara County.
- (4) The site is ideally located in respect to the state's recreational responsibility.

- (5) Large numbers of visitors can be safely accommodated at any one time in a wide variety of nonurban types of recreational facilities.

The originally proposed development facilities were presented on plate No. D2 of the acquisition study as camping, picnicking, family camping, beach recreation, and an equestrian camp.

In December of 1968, the department proposed a scope change for picnic and camping facilities at Point Mugu which shifted the emphasis from Big Sycamore Canyon to the La Jolla Valley. More importantly, the new plan modified the entire Point Mugu project to include a variety of extensive concessionaire developments including major hotel type accommodations, a shooting range, restaurants, motorcycling areas, a conference lodge, a model airplane area, an archery complex, motorcycle campground, beach hotel, and dormitory hotels.

The present plan for the project will incur large expenses to develop facilities necessary to encourage concessionaire development prior to the more traditional outdoor recreation furnished through camping and day use. We believe that the Legislature disapproved this approach last session when it eliminated the Kelly Ridge Visitor Center at Oroville and inserted funds for camping at Loafer Creek.

These scope changes raise the policy question of the degree of urbanized type development which the Legislature and Park and Recreation Commission envision in our state park units. Originally Point Mugu was proposed as a state park. However, it later was designated as a state recreation area based in part on the fact that a golf course was presented in the department's acquisition study in 1964.

Section 5001.5 of the Public Resources Code states that state recreation areas shall be selected and developed primarily to provide non-urban outdoor recreation opportunities to meet other than purely local needs but having the best available scenic quality. Camping, picnicking, swimming, hiking, horseback riding, boating, fishing, and hunting may be provided. The provisions of such activities shall be the primary reason for operating recreational areas. The development of this project as presently rescoped with its emphasis on many urban and non-traditional forms of recreation probably is not included in the statutory definition of a state recreation area.

The thoughtful comments of the Marin Conservation League on the Angel Island development plan which also originally included a high degree of commercial development were presented at the December 1968, meeting of the Parks and Recreation Commission. They appear to

## Department of Parks and Recreation—Continued

apply to Point Mugu and merit quoting here. "The charm of Angel Island and its great value for outdoor recreation lie in its open space and remoteness from an intensively developed metropolitan area. Introduction of the same attractions and commercial facilities to the island as are available on the mainland would destroy this contrast. People would be deprived of a refuge in which to enjoy simply the earth, sky, and water of San Francisco Bay, free of commercialized developments and densely populated areas.

"If the planned facilities were constructed, Angel Island would be heavily overused, visitors who seek commercially oriented activities and accommodations would be favored, and concessionaires would be given the advantages of major private enterprises in a public park. Development of Angel Island State Park should be held to the absolute minimum necessary to provide access and basic conveniences for people who are seeking a place of tranquillity and beauty.

"The problem faced by the Department of Parks and Recreation seems to be where to draw the line between preservation of natural beauty and mass recreation. Both are legitimate needs, but this master plan appears to overemphasize recreation to the point of probably destroying the essential character of Angel Island.

"The department should not confuse the idea of recreation for the underprivileged with the more long-range goal of conservation of natural scenic beauty for those very same people and their descendants. Recreational facilities of all sorts could be constructed within already developed urban areas with easier access than is possible to Angel Island."

These comments not only help to clarify the policy decisions which are needed before developing our recreation areas but also raise a specific issue at the Point Mugu unit.

The Santa Monica Mountains State Park was acquired for the specific purpose of providing recreation and open space within easy access of the Los Angeles metropolitan area. Since the Santa Monica Mountains unit was acquired in part for the purpose of providing a high level of day use recreational development, that unit and Point Mugu should contain a balance of recreational qualities. The Santa Monica Mountains project should be considered relative to Point Mugu. However, the lack of a master planning report for either unit precludes any comparative analysis at this time.

We recommend that this reappropriation be denied so that the department can adequately plan the development of Point Mugu and secure legislative approval of the plan.

In the alternative, the Legislature may decide that the department can provide it with the necessary information for the rescoping of Point Mugu during the current session and reappropriate later this session.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 432 Reversion to the Unappropriated Balance of the State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Fund**

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend that the \$400,000 reversion of Item 423(q) Budget Act of 1967 for acquisition of Bolsa Chica State Beach not be approved by the Legislature.*

As indicated in Table I, page 1110 of the Analysis, the department has acquired none of the 39 acres in this project as of December 1968. Although the department estimates that the acquisition will be completed by June of 1969, reversion at this time is premature. The reversion for this project should take place after the land acquisition has been completed.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 433 Reversion to the Unappropriated Balance of the State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historic Facilities Fund**

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item reverts \$540,000 in savings from Item 343.6(b) Budget Act of 1967 for acquisition of Salt Point State Beach.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 434 Reversion to the Unappropriated Balance of the State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historic Facilities Fund**

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item reverts \$90,000 in savings from Item 343.5 Budget Act of 1967 as reappropriated by Item 380 Budget Act of 1968 for Drum Barracks.

**CONTROL SECTIONS**

Sections 4.5 through 36 of the Budget Bill are the so-called "control sections." These sections will be analyzed and recommendations made thereon as a part of the report to be submitted pursuant to Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 136 of the 1968 Regular Session.

These sections, in general, place limitations on the expenditure of certain appropriations, extend the availability of certain specified appropriations, define the authority of the Director of Finance with respect to reductions and transfers within and between categories of expenditures, and contain the usual severability and urgency clauses.