

## CAPITAL OUTLAY

### STATE SCHOLARSHIP AND LOAN COMMISSION—Continued

commission establish procedures so that this type of inventory could be accomplished on a continuing basis. We reported and analyzed some of the data resulting from this inventory in our 1971-72 Analysis. Persistent interest in student financial assistance programs warrants further refinements to the inventory and its continuation.

A new research associate position is included in the 1972-73 budget in order to "establish the commission as a student financial aid information center, and to conduct the periodic inventory of student financial aid resources first requested by the Legislature." Our recommendation would insure that a timely report, designed to meet legislative needs, would be provided the Joint Budget Committee on an annual basis.

## CAPITAL OUTLAY

### Summary

#### 1972-73 Program

The Budget Bill now before the Legislature includes \$167 million for capital outlay which is 45 percent greater than the appropriation included in the 1971 Budget Act. Of this amount, \$62.4 million is contingent upon approval by the electorate in November of two bond proposals, one for community college construction and the other for health sciences facilities construction at the University of California.

Only \$2.83 million or about 1.7 percent of the grand total represents appropriations from the General Fund. It provides financing for projects of relatively small significance in the Departments of Corrections, the Youth Authority, and Mental Hygiene as well as minor elements in the California Water Facilities Program and some coverage for future planning under the control of the Department of Finance.

The two major contributors to the total, other than the bonds, are the Education Fee Fund at \$34.2 million for the University of California and the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education at \$39 million of which \$4.5 million is for the University of California and the balance for the state colleges.

The total of Education Fee Funds shown for the University involves the exercise of an experimental technique to increase the actual amount available. It is anticipated that from direct student fees there will be approximately \$20.6 million forthcoming. The regents propose to issue \$10 million in revenue bonds for the repayment of which the Education Fee Fund will be pledged starting with \$1 million in the budget year. In turn, the Federal Health Education Facilities Administration will subsidize interest costs above three percent. It is anticipated that this action will yield an additional net of \$9 million on a one-time basis. However, the \$34.2 million from the Education Fee

Fund is overstated by about \$4.6 million to cover health science facilities, should the bond proposition fail.

The balance of the total capital outlay appropriations of nearly \$9.3 million or over 5½ percent is contributed from the conventional special funds, particularly the motor vehicle account in the new State Transportation Fund which was created in 1971. Over \$5.5 million will be for the Department of Motor Vehicles and the California Highway Patrol. The rest is for the Department of Fish and Game, the Parks and Recreation Acquisition and Development Program and in a minor way, for the District Fair Construction Program.

#### **Higher Education**

The proposed appropriations for the three segments of higher education exceeds \$135.6 million, or over 81 percent of the total capital outlay program. However, almost one-half of the appropriations for higher education is from bond funds contingent upon approval by the electorate at the November election. The balance is from the Education Fee Fund at the University and from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education the bulk of which is for the state colleges, with a portion for the University.

The proposals for the University total over \$51.4 million with \$17.2 million coming from bond sources. This is overstated to the extent of about \$4.6 million in the Education Fee Fund which represents projects included in both bond and fee fund sources on the premise that these are critical health science needs which would have to be met from the Education Fee Fund if the bond proposition fails. Because we are recommending that certain general campus projects be deleted, we believe that the projects which the Governor vetoed in the 1971 Budget Act should be added to the schedule in the Budget Bill to provide the University with the ability to make choices on a priority basis.

The health sciences proposals are dominated by two projects which were included in the 1971 Budget Act on a contingent basis in order to obtain federal commitments. One is the construction of the medical sciences unit 1 at Irvine and the other is the construction of the dentistry building at San Francisco. Between them they account for over \$11 million of the total. The remaining projects include alterations, preliminary plans and working drawings for projects which will require construction funds in future budgets. The most important is the Moffitt Hospital addition in San Francisco which represents an ultimate cost exceeding \$10 million.

For general campuses, the appropriations from the Education Fee Fund and from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education total almost \$38.7 million. Of this, \$1.5 million is for the upgrading of the Langley-Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute adjacent to the San Francisco campus concurrent with a proposal that it will be taken over and operated by the University instead of the Department of Mental

## CAPITAL OUTLAY

### Summary—Continued

Hygiene. The Balance of \$37.2 million is subject to change with respect to the general campuses because in the event the bond proposition passes, the sum will be reduced by \$4.6 million, so that \$29.6 million will be available for general campus purposes. If the bond issue fails then the general campuses will have about \$25.2 million available with the balance going to the identified health sciences facilities.

The general campus program has a substantial segment covering equipment for existing buildings or those under construction and nearing completion. There is included a series of relatively small construction and alterations projects, some of which are for critical utilities and site development. There are four major construction projects totaling over \$14.7 million, two of which predominantly represent graduate and research capabilities but in which there are some undergraduate capacities, one auxiliary facility and one undergraduate capacity facility. These are the life sciences unit 3 at Los Angeles, the marine biology instruction and research building at San Diego, the learning resources center at Santa Barbara, and College No. 7 at Santa Cruz.

The appropriation proposals for the state college system are entirely financed from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education (oil royalties). The total of over \$34.5 million includes some significant elements. Nearly \$9 million is for equipment either in existing buildings or in buildings under construction and nearing completion. In many instances the individual proposals represent increments with more to follow. For example, \$1.3 million is for working drawings for future projects which carry an ultimate cost probably exceeding \$25 million. Over one-fourth is for remodeling, utilities developments, relatively small additions, and the kinds of projects usually classified as minor. Nearly \$13.2 million covers just three major construction projects, the library at Sacramento State College, a classroom office building at Bakersfield, and a classroom office building at Sonoma. The latter two represent significant academic capacities in the form of lecture spaces. The former has no direct capacity but is essential to bring the campus up to its standard complement of such space. However, it replaces an existing building which, when converted as planned, will provide capacity.

The balance of the appropriations is for general planning both for future projects and for intracampus relationships as well as relationships between campus and surrounding communities. Included in this is a significant amount for land acquisition (\$1.4 million) which will complete the long-range acquisition plans for Los Angeles State College and will conclude what has become an unhappy relationship between the state and the property owners.

The program for the state colleges also includes an item with a "zero" appropriation. This is a schedule of seven projects which is

contingent upon receipt of federal grants for projects in the regular schedule which would thereby release an equivalent amount to fund the "zero" item. It should be noted that only one project in the regular schedule would be needed to cover the "zero" item. That is the library at Sacramento which has a potential federal grant of \$1 million. The seven projects contained in the item are all for working drawings and thus carry a potential requirement in excess of \$16 million. With one exception, the working drawings in the schedule are for capacity facilities.

The appropriation proposals for the community college system totals nearly \$45.2 million which together with the district share of over \$33.5 million provides a total construction program of nearly \$78.7 million covering over 150 projects. As previously noted, the state's portion comes from bond funds to be approved by the electorate at the November election. The major emphasis of the proposal, representing over 76 percent of the total is for construction of facilities of many kinds most of which provide direct additional academic capacity. However, included are faculty offices, administration facilities, auxiliary facilities, etc. The balance of the funds is divided among equipment for existing buildings or those under construction and nearing completion, site acquisition, utilities and site development and working drawings for future projects. The latter at nearly \$1.9 million represents a future construction requirement probably exceeding \$31 million.

#### **Space Utilization—Higher Education**

The California Coordinating Council on Higher Education (C.C.H.E.) some years ago established certain standards for the utilization of lecture room and other spaces in institutions of higher education. Based on a five-day week between the hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., the standard called for a room utilization of 34 out of a total of 45 hours with a station utilization of 66 percent. In actual practice few of the state college or University campuses had ever achieved that standard. In 1970, the Legislature adopted a new standard which it directed all systems to implement. This standard quite simply extended the day from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. resulting in an additional 25 potential hours per week. Using the premise that 34 hours represented approximately 75 percent of the 45-hour week, the Legislature directed that the same percentage be applied to the additional evening hours so that the total of 70 hours should result in a standard of 53 hours of utilization per room per week. The percentage of station utilization was not changed. In our understanding, it was not the intent of the Legislature that the 53 hours be in any way evenly distributed through the 70 hours. Merely, that 53 hours of use was to be achieved whether by greater intensification of use during the 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. period or by a combination throughout the 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. period.

**Summary—Continued**

We recognized that this change in utilization standard could not be implemented in the span of one or two years but would take some longer period. No figures as to utilization are yet available for the fall of 1971. However, we have received from the California State Colleges a compilation of comparisons between the 1969 and the 1970 years which indicate that on a systemwide average, room utilization has risen from 39.1 hours to 39.4 hours during the 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. time spans. This is obviously still a long way from the 53 hours proposed. The improvement between the two years, however, is not quite as good as the figure would indicate. The station occupancy has deteriorated between 1969 and 1970 from 74 percent to 72 percent. While the percentages in both years exceed the standard of 66 percent that was established, the fact that there has been a drop in that percentage tends somewhat to offset the improvement in the room-hour utilization.

However, it is interesting to note that on a campus-by-campus comparison the utilization varies widely in both the fall of 1969 and 1970. For example, the campus with the lowest utilization rate was Humboldt State College with 34.3 hours in 1969 dropping to 30.9 hours in 1970 and station occupancy dropping from 72 percent in 1969 to 65 percent in 1970. The campus with the best utilization was Hayward State College where in 1969 it was 40.6 hours and 1970 it was 48.5 hours. Station utilization percentage dropped from 72 percent in 1969 to 70 percent in 1970. The greatest improvement from 1969 to 1970 occurred at Chico where the room use increased from 31.8 hours to 46.6 hours. Unfortunately, the station occupancy percentage in 1969 was 83 percent and in 1970 had deteriorated to 67 percent.

Probably the best way to make comparisons between campuses and the standard is to use the weekly student hours per station, which is a product of the room hours per week multiplied by the station occupancy percentage. Thus, the C.C.H.E. standard of 34 hours multiplied by 66 percent utilization would have resulted in 22.4 hours station utilization. The new standard set by the Legislature of 53 hours multiplied by 66 percent would have resulted in a station utilization of 35 hours. On a systemwide average for the state colleges, this figure was 28.8 hours in 1969 dropping to 28.4 hours in 1970. The campus which has come closest to the new standard as of the fall of 1970 was Hayward with 34 hours. The poorest campus was Sonoma with 21.2 hours. It is interesting to note that the newest campus, Bakerfield, which began operations in the fall of 1970, achieved an 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. room utilization of 39.8 hours with a relatively poor station occupancy of 56 percent resulting in 22.2 hours of station utilization.

It is obvious that many complex factors enter into the utilization of stations. For example, in the fall of any one year when a campus opens a new building it is very often impossible to schedule the building to

its maximum potential which tends to dilute the average for the campus. Other factors such as students dropping out from classes after the first few weeks also tend to distort the results. Nevertheless, as a moving average these figures are revealing.

We have no comparative figures for the University between the fall of 1969 and the fall of 1970. However, the figures for the fall of 1969 which we do have indicate a significantly lower effectiveness than in the state colleges. As previously mentioned in the state colleges, it was 39.1 hours for 1969, and in the University it was 29.2 hours. The percentage of station occupancy in the state colleges was 74 percent, in the University 60 percent, resulting in utilization comparisons of 28.9 hours for the state colleges and 17.5 hours for the University.

#### Laboratory Utilization

The C.C.H.E. standard for laboratory utilization is split between lower division and upper division. For the former, it is 25 hours during the 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. time span with 85 percent station occupancy giving a station utilization rate of 21.3 hours. In the upper division the standard is 20 hours from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. with an occupancy rate 85 percent resulting in a 16-hour station utilization. The Legislature has taken no definitive position on increasing this utilization other than to direct that it be studied and attempts made to improve it where possible. The state colleges have, in fact, extended the utilization of laboratories to 10 p.m. so that for the system as a whole we find that in the fall of 1969, 23.3 hours per week was achieved with an 88-percent occupancy resulting in 20.5 hours per station in lower division. This was improved in the fall of 1970 to 24.5 hours per week with an 89-percent occupancy factor resulting in 21.8 hours per station.

In the upper division, in 1969 we had 21.3 hours with a 92 percent occupancy factor resulting in 19.7 hours per week. In the fall of 1970 this was improved to 22.3 hours per week with the same 92-percent occupancy factor resulting in 20.4 hours per station.

For the University, as previously mentioned, we have no fall of 1970 figures but for the fall of 1969 the indications are poorer than for the state colleges with 19 hours per week in lower division from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m., and a 71-percent station occupancy resulting in 13.5 hours per station. In the upper division this was 16.7 hours per week with a 67-percent occupancy factor resulting in 11.2 hours per station.

Using the previously mentioned C.C.H.E. standard of 25 hours per week, 85-percent station occupancy and 21.3 hours station utilization for the 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. time span and applying the same factor of increase from 5 p.m. to 10 p.m. as was done in the case of the lecture facilities, we would theoretically get approximately 38 hours per week of room utilization which at 85-percent station occupancy would result in about 32 hours of station utilization for lower division. For upper division, applying the same concept we should get 31 room hours per week which at 80-percent occupancy would result in about 24.8 hours

## CAPITAL OUTLAY

### Summary—Continued

per station. We recognize that it is probably not possible to make a direct adjustment in laboratories as it was in lecture spaces because of inherent physical limitations of the laboratory space, particularly with respect to student lockers and because of the fact that laboratory spaces are depended upon for informal use by students who either cannot accomplish their work in the formal hours or who wish to do extra work which obviously can be done nowhere else. Nevertheless, we feel that some improvement can be achieved. It will be noted from the figures cited above that the state colleges in the 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. time span have just barely achieved the standard set by the C.C.H.E. for the 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. time span in the lower division. However, in the upper division, they have exceeded the 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. standard during the 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. period.

We have asked both the University of California and the state college systems to make a study of their laboratory facilities to determine the most economical and effective way of extending the utilization of these spaces. In many instances, this will probably entail the creation of additional student locker facilities either in the laboratory proper or in spaces nearby. Since laboratory space represents the most costly on any campus, with the lowest occupation density, it is essential that every effort be made to maximize the use of available facilities before additional large sums are expended to provide additional laboratory space.

### Other Programs

The major element in the Budget Bill following higher education is concerned with the beach and park program and wildlife enhancement. After giving effect to the 1971 Budget Act, there remains approximately \$8.7 million in the State Beach, Park, Recreation and Historical Facilities Fund (bonds), most of which is earmarked for development and approximately \$48.5 million in the Recreation, Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Fund (bonds, Proposition 20).

The Budget Bill proposes to appropriate slightly more than \$4.7 million from the State Beach, Park, Recreation and Historical Facilities Fund, most of which (\$4 million) is for the development of Point Mugu State Recreation Area. The balance is for some land acquisitions, relatively minor other developments and planning for future projects.

From the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Fund, the proposals total slightly over \$14.6 million of which over \$12.2 million is for development of various reservoirs for recreational purposes. The balance is for relatively small construction projects in fish hatcheries, the purchase of fishing access sites and other related purposes including planning for future projects and minor capital outlay.

Together the two funds provide over \$19.3 million for the purposes

described. In addition, the total program is further enhanced to the extent of nearly \$6 million from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund which provides over \$5.4 million and the Save the Redwoods League which provides nearly \$600,000. These funds, which are counted as a "zero" appropriation, are exclusively for land acquisition of which the most significant is an addition to the Point Mugu State Recreation Area at over \$3 million.

The next most significant special fund program is for construction of facilities for the department of Motor Vehicles and the California Highway Patrol. Over \$6.5 million is proposed from the Motor Vehicle Account in the new State Transportation Fund which was created in 1971. Somewhat more than one-half the total is for the Department of Motor Vehicles principally for working drawings and construction of new facilities or alterations to existing facilities, but also including some land acquisition. For the Highway Patrol the emphasis is on land acquisition for future facilities, radio communications equipment and related construction and some working drawings and construction of conventional Highway Patrol field office buildings.

As previously noted, the General Fund contributes an insignificant amount, slightly over \$2.8 million, which is devoted to alterations, repairs and improvements in the Department of Mental Hygiene with the balance going to the Departments of Corrections and the Youth Authority and a small amount for planning of future projects. There is also included over \$600,000 for land, easement and rights of way for various flood control projects in the Department of Water Resources.

Other special fund proposals provide nearly \$2 million from the Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund principally for the construction of water oriented facilities plus funds for planning of future construction. The Fish and Game Preservation Fund provides slightly over \$200,000 for hatchery purposes.



**UNALLOCATED**Item 300 from the General  
Fund

Budget p. 48 Program p. 183

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$50,000
Recommended for approval .....	50,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS***We recommend approval.*

This item provides funds for preliminary planning for future projects to be financed from the General Fund. Allocations are proposed by the Department of Finance subject to the approval of the State Public Works Board.

The Budget Act of 1970 provided \$50,000 of which less than \$25,000 was expended. No additional funds were provided by the Budget Act of 1971.

The proposed amount, on the basis of 1½ percent of construction cost, would cover a program of about \$3.5 million, which appears reasonable in light of recent expenditures.

**CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL**Item 301 from the Motor Ve-  
hicle Fund

Budget p. 87 Program p. 437

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$2,928,732
Recommended for approval .....	516,106
Recommended for special review .....	2,245,626
Recommended reduction .....	\$167,000

---

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS**

	Amount	Analysis page
1. Delete—Construct two residences, Mt. Reba .....	\$83,500	000
2. Delete—Construct two residences, Peddler Hill .....	\$83,500	000

**GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT**

The Budget Act of 1971 appropriated \$8,350,837 to the California Highway Patrol for construction of a new training academy. In our *Analysis of the 1971 Budget Bill*, we indicated our concern over the academy program with regard to size, flexibility and estimated cost. At that time, we felt that with the review and control afforded through the Public Works Board prior to release of the funds, the problems could be resolved. However, no progress has been made on the building program. Because of this, the Office of Architecture and Construc-

tion has not been able to proceed with preliminary plans for the facilities. We have met with the department in an attempt to resolve differences regarding the scope of the program. The department has indicated in its prepared program statement for the academy that it desires to provide an academy of sufficient size to enable housing of personnel from nonstate agencies requesting training at the academy. This scope requires additional dormitory and classroom space. In our opinion, the academy should be sized to serve only the average needs of the Highway Patrol. The academy should be designed to provide the necessary flexibility to meet reasonably foreseeable training requirements. This flexibility would enable the Highway Patrol to provide training to nonstate, allied agencies on a space available basis. We have requested the department to substantiate its position. However, we have not as yet received any information that would justify the department's program scope. Due to the delay, it is doubtful that construction of the facilities could start before the spring of 1973, placing the project nearly one year behind schedule. We believe the department should submit acceptable data substantiating its position in order that an agreement can be reached regarding the program scope for the academy.

#### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The department's major capital outlay request is for 12 projects totaling \$2,928,732. This includes seven projects for establishing larger area office facilities in five counties. The need for the larger facilities is based on departmental projections for traffic officer requirements at each office based on vehicle miles of travel on the state highway system with traffic congestion and road miles taken into consideration. The department projects an increase in traffic officer strength in the combined five counties of 311 by 1975. This increase represents more than twice the increase of uniformed personnel for the entire department since 1969. We have requested additional information which would justify the projected increase in traffic officer strength in these areas. The information was not available in time for our analysis. It is our understanding that the department is preparing the information and it should be available in time for budget hearings on this item. With this in mind, we have recommended seven area office projects be given special review.

- |  |          |
|--|----------|
| (a) Construct—two residences, Mt. Reba .....     | \$83,500 |
| (b) Construct—two residences, Peddler Hill ..... | \$83,500 |

*We recommend deletion of both projects.*

These projects were initially requested by the department. However, it has subsequently submitted a letter to the agency requesting that the projects be deferred and removed from the 1972-73 budget request. The department has experienced increased responsibilities in these areas but the full effect of changed roadway usage is continuing

**CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL—Continued**

to be measured and the department will continue to assess the needs in this area. We are in agreement with the deletion of these projects.

- (c) Purchase communication equipment ..... \$786,170

*We recommend approval.*

This request is to provide for the purchase of equipment necessary for expansion, maintenance and replacement of the statewide radio and microwave system operated by the department. Examples of the type of equipment to be purchased are the replacement of 32 radio microwave terminals (\$256,000) which have reached the age of unreliability and are incompatible with portions of the system equipped with newer components, replacement of 20 radio base stations (\$100,000), replacement of radio vaults for protection of equipment and purchase of other related communications system equipment.

- (d) Site acquisition and working drawings—area office,  
El Cajon ..... \$200,625

*We recommend special review.*

This proposal is for an additional facility in the San Diego County area. The department projects a need for three area operations in the county, one in Oceanside, another on the west side of the City of San Diego and the El Cajon facility on the east side. The proposed facility would be developed in accordance with standard plans to accommodate 150 traffic officers. The department projects an increase in traffic officer strength of 35 in this county by 1975.

- (e) Site acquisition, working drawings and construction  
—area office, Fairfield ..... \$469,784

*We recommend special review.*

This proposal is for site acquisition and development of a replacement facility to house the Vallejo area office. The existing facility was designed for a capacity of 72 traffic officers. The present strength at this office is 88 traffic officers with a projected increase of 12 by 1975. While the need for a new office at this area seems justifiable, we cannot ascertain the need for the proposed 150-traffic-officer facility. As stated earlier, we hope to receive the necessary information to make the determination in time for budget hearings on this item. In any event we would suggest that this project be funded in the amount of \$215,000 for site acquisition and working drawings only, which is the traditional procedure.

- (f) Working drawings and construction—area office,  
San Diego ..... \$288,314

*We recommend special review.*

This project is for the development of an area office for San Diego to replace the existing leased facility in Mission Valley. The state has acquired property near the interchange of Highways 5 and 8 through negotiations with the City of San Diego. The Mission Valley lease will

be maintained and the San Diego zone office will occupy that space. The proposed facility is for a standard building plan to accommodate 150 traffic officers. The present traffic officer strength in the San Diego County area would justify the need for a building of this size.

The standard 150-traffic-officer facility design, as developed by the Office of Architecture and Construction, provides for a 9,050-gross-square-foot building plus a six-vehicle carport, washrack, outside tire and rain gear storage, and paved parking for state vehicles. The requested funds are based on the department's estimate for building construction and apparently does not include funds for development of the required parking facilities. While the facilities requested are adequate with regard to space, the project cost information is inadequate. Hence, we recommend special review.

(g) Site acquisition, San Juan Capistrano ..... \$107,250

*We recommend special review.*

This project is for site acquisition in the vicinity of San Juan Capistrano to be used for a new area office in the southern portion of Orange County. The department projects a need for a building to accommodate an additional 100 traffic officers.

The existing facilities in this area are designed to accommodate 300 traffic officers. The department projects an increase of 41 traffic officers in the area by 1975 which would result in a total of only 275.

(h) Working drawings and construction—area office,  
Torrance ..... \$345,114

*We recommend special review.*

This request is for the construction of a 200-traffic-officer facility in Torrance in south Los Angeles County. The existing facility is a leased building designed for a traffic officer capacity of 100 with 142 traffic officers presently assigned to this facility. The department has projected a growth for this office of 25 traffic officers by 1975 with a total growth in the Los Angeles area of 185. It is apparent that the current facilities are inadequate. However, as previously stated we have not received information substantiating the increase in traffic officer strength and, hence, cannot recommend construction of a facility of the proposed size.

(i) Site acquisition and working drawings—area office,  
Ventura ..... \$197,625

*We recommend special review.*

This is for acquisition of real property in the vicinity of Ventura and working drawings for a new 150-traffic-officer area office building to replace currently leased facilities. The existing building was designed for 94 traffic officers versus a present traffic officer strength of 87. The department projects an increase of 38 traffic officers in this area by 1975.

(j) Site acquisition and working drawings—area office

**CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL—Continued**

building, West Valley ..... \$348,600

*We recommend special review.*

This is for acquisition of real property in West Valley and for working drawings for a new 200-traffic-officer facility to replace an existing leased building. The present facilities have a capacity for 84 traffic officers versus a present strength of 92 traffic officers. The department projection for traffic officer strength at this facility indicates an increase of 28 traffic officers by 1975 and a total traffic officer strength of 165 by 1985. Without the traffic officer projection information we have requested, we cannot substantiate the need for an office of the proposed size.

(k) Construction program planning ..... \$18,250

*We recommend approval.*

This proposal is to provide funds for preparation of preliminary plans for proposed major and minor projects in the 1973-74 fiscal year. The amount is approximately 1 percent of the anticipated program for that year and should be adequate for the purpose.

**DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES**

Item 302 from the Motor Vehicle Fund

Budget p. 90    Program p. 461

Requested 1972-73.....	\$3,638,160
Recommended for approval .....	1,168,500
Recommended for special review .....	2,469,660
Recommended reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The department is requesting funds for three site acquisition projects, seven construction projects and for program planning for future projects. Of these, nine are related to field office operations and one for central electronic data processing.

Field office construction is based on projected population growth and the increased needs for service to the public in these areas. The department has used as a basis for its population projections information from such sources as chambers of commerce, city and county planning commissions and the Department of Finance. In those areas where other than the Department of Finance projections were used, the department appears to be considerably high in its projections. For instance, in the Santa Cruz area which currently serves 91 percent of the county population, the department projects that by 1995 the Santa Cruz office will serve 132 percent of the Department of Finance

projection for the total population of Santa Cruz County. Also, in the Costa Mesa area in Orange County, the office now serves 17 percent of the county population in an area entirely within Orange County, along the coast from Sunset Beach to South Laguna and inland just past the Orange County Airport. The department projects an increase of 950,000 in population of this service area by 1995. This increase would represent 75 percent of the Department of Finance projected increase for the entire County of Orange. Conversely, in the areas where the department used Department of Finance projections, the field offices anticipate serving approximately the same percentage of county population in 1995 as they do in the current year. *We recommend that the department use Department of Finance population projections for determining its field office needs.* The department is also requesting facilities constructed to accommodate the personnel and public projected for the year 1995. We believe that the construction of oversized facilities to that extent, given the uncertainties in any population projection, is unwise. *We recommend, therefore, that the department purchase sites of suitable size to serve the Department of Finance projected population for 1995 and construct facilities sized for the year 1985.* It is essential that the facilities constructed for the year 1985 be so designed as to facilitate expansion at that time if population developments indicate a requirement for facility expansion. By purchasing sites of suitable size for the projected 1995 need, the department will be able to expand the facilities and still have sufficient parking to serve the public. We have listed below a brief summary of each project and our recommendation:

- (a) Site acquisition for office building and parking facilities, Costa Mesa ..... \$375,000
- (c) Site acquisition for office building and parking facilities, Merced ..... \$325,000
- (e) Site acquisition for office building and parking facilities, Santa Clara ..... \$448,500

*We recommend approval.*

The above three projects are of sufficient size to serve the population projected for the year 1995. However, in the Costa Mesa area the department projects that the office will serve 44 percent of the entire population of Orange County. In our opinion, this figure is unreasonable and should be adjusted downward to the 30-percent area. Hence, we recommend that the site for the Costa Mesa facility be sized for approximately 30 percent of the Department of Finance projections for the County of Orange representing a public service area of approximately 810,000 in population. As we previously mentioned, our recommendation is to size facilities for accommodating the population projection over the next 15 years (1985). For the three area offices for which this site acquisition is requested, the building sizes would be approximately 15,000 square feet, 12,900 square feet and 9,000 square

**DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES—Continued**

feet respectively.

- (b) Remodel—office building, Fresno ..... \$100,000

*We recommend special review.*

This proposal is for the expansion of the Fresno office to accommodate the increased population in this area. It is our understanding that the facility is to be expanded by approximately 2,000 square feet to provide additional public area and interview rooms. This would indicate a cost of \$50 per square foot which is considerably high for this type of work. However, we have received no information indicating the actual scope or need of this project. We hope to receive sufficient information in time for the budget hearings.

- (d) Alterations for Electronic Data Processing, Sacramento ..... \$380,660

*We recommend special review.*

This is for the consolidation of the department's electronic data processing facility. Currently, the system is housed in two separate areas. The project is for remodeling, partitioning, air conditioning and rewiring suitable working space for the consolidation of the future data-processing systems. We have received no information regarding this project and therefore have no basis upon which to make a recommendation. We are hopeful of receiving sufficient information prior to the budget hearings.

- (f) Working drawings and construction—office building and parking facilities, Bell ..... \$351,500  
 (g) Working drawings and construction—office building and parking facilities, Modesto ..... \$455,000  
 (h) Working drawings and construction—office building and parking facilities, Redwood City..... \$272,500  
 (i) Working drawings and construction—office building and parking facilities, Santa Cruz..... \$385,000  
 (j) Working drawings and construction—office building and parking facilities, Santa Rosa ..... \$525,000

*We recommend special review for the above five projects.*

As we stated previously, the department's request for construction of the field offices is for facilities of adequate size to serve the department's projected need in 1995. Our recommendation is to provide facilities to accommodate the need in 1985 with a design and site placement to facilitate future expansion of individual facilities. It is our understanding that sites for these facilities are in the process of being appraised and should be in site acquisition procedures before the end of the current fiscal year. These sites should all be of sufficient size to accommodate the department's projected need in 1995. The building size required in 1985 for the above facilities would be approximately (f) 12,700, (g) 11,150, (h) 11,000, (i) 9,000, and (j) 11,500.

The funds for the five construction projects as indicated in the budget, represent a range in cost per gross square foot, at the total project level, of \$21.13 for the Redwood City facility to \$35.28 for the Modesto facility. These square-foot costs are based on the size of facilities as requested by the department. The cost estimates appear low. For example, in October 1971 the San Leandro field office was presented to the Public Works Board at an estimated square foot cost at total project level of \$40.33. Adjusting that cost to the anticipated construction cost level for July 1972 would indicate that projects of this type will cost approximately \$42.75 per gross square foot at total project level. If this cost were to be used, the budget amount should be adjusted for the respective projects to \$543,000, \$476,750, \$470,250, \$384,750 and \$491,625. The adjusted project costs are for facilities sized to accommodate the department need in 1985 based on Department of Finance population projections. However, we would recommend that the Department of Finance request the Office of Architecture and Construction to prepare preliminary plan packages for these facilities and present a more reliable cost figure before inclusion in the Budget Bill.

(k) Construction program planning ..... \$20,000

*We recommend approval.*

This request is for planning of statewide construction proposals for the 1972-74 fiscal year. Based on the department's projected construction program in that year, the amount requested is reasonable.

## DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Item 303 from the General

Fund	Budget p. 141	Program p. 769
Requested 1972-73.....		\$495,000
Recommended for approval .....		345,000
Recommended for special review .....		150,000
Recommended reduction .....		None

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The inmate population in all the department's institutions and facilities has significantly declined over the past several years. The most dramatic decrease has been in male felon inmates, from 24,152 in May 1970 to 17,696 in January of 1972. This represents an average monthly decline of 323. If this trend continues for another year before leveling off, as the department expects, the anticipated male felon population in institutions and facilities will be approximately 11,882 in July 1973. This would indicate an excess capacity in all male institutions and



**DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS—Continued**

facilities of 8,872 by that date.

Considering those facilities other than the conservation centers, camps and California Men's Colony-West, the institution capacity is 15,977. The population in these institutions has declined by 4,337 during the same time period, representing an average of 217 inmates per month. This trend would indicate a population decrease of an additional 3,906 inmates by July 1973 and an excess capacity in these facilities of 6,255. The population figures we have used are from the department's weekly manpower report, as is the rated capacity of the institutions. We should note that the rated capacity of the institutions does not include hospitals or segregation and isolation areas. These population figures do not correspond to those presented in the budget. For instance, the department projects the population of male felon inmates at 18,785 on June 30, 1972. However, the population of these inmates on December 29, 1971, according to the department's weekly manpower report, is only 17,762.

The department is requesting funds for two construction projects and one planning project.

- |  |           |
|--|-----------|
| (a) Remodel sewage plant, California Correctional Institution, Tehachapi ..... | \$160,000 |
|--|-----------|

*We recommend approval.*

The department operates and maintains its own sewage treatment facilities at this institution. The plant is designed as a primary treatment facility which eventually pumps the effluent onto the ground to be used as irrigation water. The Water Quality Control Board has investigated the situation and concluded that without further treatment there is a real danger of contamination of the underground water and violation of the federal "Clean Water Act." This project will provide a general upgrading of the sewage plant to a secondary treatment capability and spray of the effluent rather than direct runoff.

- |   |           |
|---|-----------|
| (b) Improve—sewage plant in cooperation with the City of Folsom, State Prison at Folsom ..... | \$185,000 |
|---|-----------|

*We recommend approval.*

The department also operates and maintains its own sewage plant at this facility. The existing plant is a primary treatment facility from which the effluent is drained into the American River downstream from the institution. The Water Quality Control Board under mandate of the federal "Clean Water Act," has established a compliance date of July 1, 1973, for all discharging entities to remove such discharge from the American River. This project will provide for the abandonment of existing plants and the carrying of sewage by joint interceptor trunks to the Sacramento County northeast plant for tertiary treatment and disposition. The cost of the entire project is to be shared by the City of Folsom, the County of Sacramento, and the state. It is anticipated that 80 percent of the cost for the total project will qualify

for federal grant funding. The department intends to use the requested funds as a lump sum payment for its share of the net capital cost of the interceptor system. The department will be required to share in the annual net capital cost of the Sacramento County sewage treatment facility. This annual cost will amount to \$7,000 for a 10-year period.

Although the future of this facility is uncertain at this time, we believe the cost of the sewage improvements for this site will more than be offset by the increase in the value of the property.

(c) Preliminary planning—departmentwide ..... \$150,000

*We recommend special review.*

The budget is not specific regarding the preliminary plans proposed for which these funds are requested. It is our understanding that the department intends to prepare preliminary plans for two 400-man maximum security units to be located in southern California. We concur with the concept of having small correctional institutions in metropolitan areas and agree that if such facilities are constructed the location should be in the southern portion of the state. However, as we have pointed out, the inmate population in department institutions, excluding conservation centers, camps and the California Men's Colony-West, is currently 2,349 (December 29, 1971) below capacity and will probably be 6,255 below capacity by July 1, 1973. This would indicate that the closing of some institutions by that date is possible and in our opinion advisable. Many studies concerning the prison system in California have been made over the past several years resulting in repeated recommendations to close both San Quentin and Folsom State Prisons. These facilities are archaic and do not lend themselves to the objectives of the department.

The Governor, in his State of the State Message, indicated a plan to phase out San Quentin by 1974. This is a commendable plan. However, in our opinion San Quentin should be phased out in the budget year and, if the current downward trend in inmate population continues, the department should begin phasing out Folsom prior to July 1973. The rated capacities of these two facilities total 4,616. Considering the current population trend, the department still would have an overcapacity of 1,639 in institutions other than camps and the California Men's Colony-West with both Folsom and San Quentin closed. *We recommend that the requested funds for preliminary plans be appropriated contingent upon: (1) The closing of San Quentin in the budget year, (2) beginning the phase-out of Folsom prior to July 1973, (3) the closing of an additional institution, possibly Deuel Vocational Institute at Tracy or the Correctional Training Facility at Soledad, upon completion of the two 400-man maximum security units, and (4) preparation by the department of a systemwide plan of operation following completion of the two new facilities, said plan to be submitted to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee by December 1, 1972.*

**DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY**

Item 304 from the General

Fund

Budget p. 146 Program p. 800

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$150,000
Recommended for approval.....	None
Recommended for special review.....	150,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT****ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This request is for one construction project at the Preston School of Industry for the replacement of underground steam and condensate piping and the conversion of two of three boilers to interruptible natural gas firing including installation of new controls and equipment necessary for safe operation of the system. This project is phase III of a three-phase project for the replacement of defective direct burial steam distribution lines. Many leaks have occurred throughout this system over a period of years due to corrosive deterioration of the pipe. This final phase would be for the replacement of that section of steam and condensate line which was the least troublesome of the old lines.

The project will also convert the existing boilers from oil fired to combination oil-gas fired. This conversion will enable the department to buy natural gas on an interruptible basis, which is at a rate considerably less than full-time supply. However, since the gas supply can be interrupted after a 24-hour notice is given, the department must have an oil-fired backup capability in order to maintain the boilers in an operative state.

The estimated cost for this phase of the project is \$200,000. However, phases I and II of this project have a balance of approximately \$50,000. The Department of Finance proposes to use these excess funds for phase III. We agree with this proposal and believe the project is necessary if the department is to continue occupancy of the Preston School.

**Special Review**

However, we recommend special review because we have raised the question in our analysis of the support portion of the budget concerning the possibility of closing an institution. In brief, we believe an institution should be closed if the downward trend of Youth Authority wards continues. Based on this trend, the ward population, in

institutions other than reception centers, would be approximately 3,540 in October 1972. The department has already made the administrative decision to close Paso Robles in October 1972, and, if another 400-bed institution were also closed, the capacity in the Youth Authority institutions excluding hospitals, detention and reception centers would be approximately 3,965. With two institutions closed, the excess capacity would then be approximately 400 beds.

If an additional institution is to be closed, the Preston School of Industry should be considered. Preston was opened in 1894 and is one of the oldest institutions in the system. Although there has been some construction since that time, there are many buildings and utility systems which will require an extensive capital outlay program to restore them to a satisfactory condition. The department's five-year major capital outlay program, not including minor capital outlay (projects at \$65,000 and less) indicates a requirement at Preston exceeding \$1 million representing more than 50 percent of the department's projected major capital outlay needs.

## DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HYGIENE

Item 305 from the General

Fund

Budget p. 146 Program p. 891

Requested 1972-73 .....	\$1,500,000
Recommended for approval .....	100,000
Recommended for special review .....	1,400,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This request will provide for three projects, two of a statewide nature and one at Agnews State Hospital. Included are two construction proposals totaling \$1,400,000 and a statewide structural survey for \$100,000.

- (a) Construction—alterations, repairs, and relocation  
of facilities, Agnews State Hospital ..... \$300,000

*We recommend special review.*

This proposal is for the relocation of facilities for supportive services, repair of buildings and the relocation of facilities in connection with the conversion of Agnews State Hospital to a hospital for the retarded on the east campus only. The hospital grounds are currently separated into east and west "campuses". The department is phasing out the older west campus and that facility will be closed. The west campus contains most of the facilities necessary to support the hospital, hence, these facilities must be relocated on the east campus upon closure of

**DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HYGIENE—Continued**

the west campus. The relocated facilities are to be sized to meet the requirements of a hospital having a rated capacity of approximately 1,000 beds.

The project as proposed will provide for new or relocated facilities for a bakery, butchershop and refrigeration unit, commissary warehouse, maintenance shop and warehouse, motor pool and garage, property warehouse, laundry and clothing center, firehouse, central patient rehabilitation, gymnasium and supply, and auditorium. Also to be included will be general environmental improvement work such as lighting, handwashing, bathing and toilet facilities. Although this project is generally justifiable, the need for a bakery and butchershop is doubtful because most state institutions no longer operate such facilities. Instead, they contract for these services. Hence, we recommend the bakery and butchershop not be included in this project. We also have no information regarding the size and anticipated construction materials needs for the new facilities or the possibility of relocating existing facilities from the west campus. Without this information it is impossible to determine the adequacy of the requested funds. We, therefore, recommend special review of this project in anticipation of sufficient information becoming available during committee hearings.

- (b) Construction—statewide improvements to meet accreditation standards..... \$1,100,000

*We recommend special review.*

This proposal would provide for fire safety measures and emergency power sources to supply the vital functions of six hospitals throughout the state. The requested improvements are to meet the recommendations in a report made by a survey team from the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals. The estimated cost for this project is extremely rough and is not based on any preliminary plans or architectural and engineering estimates. As this project is a modification of existing facilities, it will require architectural and engineering investigation to determine exact requirements. Without this type of information, it is not possible to determine the extent of the requested projects or the adequacy of the estimates. Hence, we recommend special review anticipating receipt of the necessary information in time for the budget hearings.

- (c) Statewide—structural survey for earthquake resistance ..... \$100,000

*We recommend approval.*

This request is for a structural survey to determine the earthquake resistance of structures at hospitals for the mentally retarded. The funds will enable the Office of Architecture and Construction to make a structural survey and report, with an estimate of cost, covering corrections necessary to meet earthquake resistance standards for all buildings at Department of Mental Hygiene hospitals that are used for

the care and treatment of patients, housing of medical, administrative and operational staff and services. The Department of Mental Hygiene operates 12 hospitals for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded, 11 of which are located in seismic zone 3, a zone of major damage probability. The other hospital is located in seismic zone 2, a zone of moderate damage probability. Because many of the buildings on the hospital grounds were constructed several years ago, it is reasonable to assume that seismic forces were not considered in the design of a number of these buildings. In view of recent earthquakes in the Los Angeles area, we believe a survey of this nature is advisable.

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Item 306 from the Capital  
Outlay Fund for Public  
Higher Education

Budget p. 195 Program p. 1095

Requested 1972-73.....	\$3,000,000
Recommended for approval .....	3,000,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

#### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

The University is requesting \$3 million for minor construction and

**TABLE 1**  
**SUMMARY OF MINOR CONSTRUCTION PROPOSALS FOR 1972-73**

*Justifications*

<i>Campus</i>	<i>Number of projects</i>	<i>Correct space deficiencies</i>	<i>Improve space utilization</i>	<i>Utilities or mechanical improvements</i>	<i>Correct health and safety deficiencies</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Berkeley .....	10	5	2	2	1	\$408,500
Davis .....	4	1	2	0	1	260,000
Irvine .....	4	2	1	0	1	238,000
Irvine Medical.....	2	1	1	0	0	97,700
Los Angeles .....	9	1	6	2	0	472,000
Los Angeles Medical	1	0	0	0	1	5,800
Riverside.....	11	2	4	2	3	208,000
San Diego .....	8	6	1	0	1	263,000
San Francisco .....	8	3	4	0	1	214,000
Santa Barbara .....	7	2	2	0	3	358,000
Santa Cruz .....	5	4	1	0	0	245,000
Ag Field Stations ...	5	3	0	1	1	230,000
Total (Medical)....	11	4	5	0	2	\$317,500
Total (General) ..	63	26	19	7	11	\$2,682,500
TOTAL .....	74	30	24	7	13	\$3,000,000
	=	=	=	=	=	=

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued**

improvement projects to be expended universitywide. This amount will fund 74 projects as summarized in Table 1.

The University submitted a priority list of 99 projects estimated to cost over \$4 million for its 1972-73 minor capital outlay proposal. This amount was subsequently reduced to the \$3 million figure in the budget. This amount will fund the first 74 projects of the priority list. In our opinion this will cover the most critical needs. While the list is not shown in the budget and the University is not technically required to adhere to it, there is an understanding with the Department of Finance and this office that the University will not deviate from the list, unless prior approval from the Department of Finance is received. This procedure is cumbersome and does not provide the University with the administrative flexibility that would be beneficial for a program of this nature. We recommend that in the future the University be funded by a lump sum appropriation without the priority list requirement, similar to the state colleges, and that the University subsequently submit a list with the respective costs of the projects completed or to be completed prior to the end of the fiscal year.

We anticipate that the University would continue to spend the funds for those projects which would fall in the categories as listed in Table 1. We do not believe that these funds should be used for equipping new, expanding, or developing curricula. Funds for this type of equipment are usually included in the support budget and minor capital outlay funds should not be used for that purpose.

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Item 307 from the Capital  
Outlay Fund for Public  
Higher Education

Budget p. 195    Program p. 1109

Requested 1972-73.....	\$1,500,000
Recommended for approval .....	1,500,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item provides for various improvements to Langley-Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute including remodeling of selected patient care areas. It is contemplated that this institute will be transferred to the University of California on July 1, 1972. Consequently, this facility

is appearing for the first time in the University's capital outlay program.

Anticipating the construction of a new institute, the present facility was allowed to deteriorate by lack of general maintenance. This neglect has produced numerous environmental deficiencies. A portion of the \$1,500,000 proposed in this item will provide for a number of deferred maintenance projects. This includes such things as replacement and repair of water, steam and condensate lines, plumbing fixtures and elements of the heating and ventilating systems.

In addition, the amount will provide for some improvements to selected patient care areas by replacing present dormitory type wards with single- and two-bed rooms and more adequate facilities for nursing services. These alterations will reduce the present 97-bed complement to 75 beds. Limited improvements in the outpatient areas will also be possible in space released by the transfer of some supporting diagnostic and administrative functions to other campus buildings. The alterations portion of this proposal will involve approximately 17,569 assignable square feet of space.

It should be noted that this project is planned as the first increment of a long-range plan to bring Langley Porter facilities up to University standards. At this time, the plan is still being formulated and evaluated so that it is not possible to provide an estimate of ultimate costs.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Item 308 from the Education-  
al Fee Fund

Budget p. 195    Program p. 1092

Requested 1972-73.....	\$34,197,000
Recommended for approval .....	34,197,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	Analysis page
1. Unfunded 1971-72 Projects. Recommend projects proposed for reversion in control section 11.5 be added to this item. ....	1168
2. Reduce Planning Funds. Recommend priority (3), health sciences preliminary planning funds be funded only in Item 333 (bonds). ....	1170
3. Fire Protection. Limit extra fire protection to compliance with Title 19. Recommend deleting (28), (33) and reducing (30), (31), (32) as indicated on Table 7. ....	1173
4. Resources Center. Defer learning resources center (39) at Santa Barbara by deleting construction. ....	1175
5. Reevaluate San Diego needs. Recommend deleting (41) for third college planning and examine alternative of providing permanent administration space. ....	1176



**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued**

- |   |      |
|---|------|
| 6. Reduce Scope of Libraries. Recommend size of Santa Cruz project (47) be limited to 96,500 assignable square feet. ....                                 | 1177 |
| 7. Reexamine Berkeley Priorities. Recommend reallocating funds in (48) to increasing capacity at Richmond or correcting deficiencies in Doe Library. .... | 1178 |

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item proposes to allocate \$34,197,000 from educational fees for a schedule of 51 preliminary planning, working drawings, construction and equipment projects affecting all of the nine general campuses and five health science centers. It should be pointed out that seven of the projects in the schedule are also included in Item 333 which is contingent upon passage of the health science facilities bond issue in November. These projects are critical to the existing health sciences program and should the bond issue fail would be funded under this item. These projects are listed in Table 1.

**Table 1**  
**University of California 1972-73 Capital Outlay Program**  
**Double Funded Projects**

<i>University priority</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount</i>
(3)	All	Health sciences, preliminary planning	\$800,000
(35)	Irvine	Improvements at Orange County Medical Center	282,000
(36)	San Diego	South wing addition to University Hospital	591,000
(42)	San Diego	Improvements to University Hospital	560,000
(43)	San Francisco	Clinics and medical sciences alterations	1,550,000
(45)	San Francisco	Planning for Moffitt Hospital addition	676,000
(46)	Irvine	Planning for health sciences library	97,000
Total			\$4,556,000

**Unfunded 1971-72 Projects**

*We recommend that the projects listed in Table 2 be added to the schedule of projects in Item 308.*

The Governor's Budget indicates that 19 projects authorized in the 1971-72 Budget Act and totaling \$13,207,000 are proposed for reversion in control section 11.5 due to the lack of financing (vetoed by Governor). At the time they were budgeted, these projects were considered high priority by the University. Consequently, we believe that the University's highest priority for the 1972-73 fiscal year is the unfunded portion of its 1971-72 fiscal year program. Adding these projects to the schedule for this item would make them available for funding at the University's discretion. We believe that the savings generated by the following recommendations should be allocated to these high-priority projects. The unfunded portion of the 1971-72 fiscal year program is listed in Table 2.

**Table 2**  
**University of California**  
**Unfunded 1971-72 Capital Outlay Projects**

<i>Budget Act priority</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Phase<sup>1</sup></i>	<i>Amount</i>
(58)	San Diego	Humanities building.....	C	\$4,590,000
(59)	San Diego	Humanities building utilities.....	C	100,000
(60)	Elliott Field Station	Animal holding facilities.....	C	170,000
(61)	Irvine	Administration unit 1.....	C	1,045,000
(62)	Riverside	Social sciences unit 2.....	W	248,000
(63)	Davis	Utilities and site development.....	C	59,000
(64)	Irvine	Utilities and site development.....	C	497,000
(65)	San Diego	Utilities and site development.....	C	168,000
(66)	Irvine	Mathematics and computer instruction	PW	413,000
(67)	Santa Barbara	Engineering unit 2.....	C	5,008,000
(68)	San Diego H.S. <sup>2</sup>	Complete basic science building.....	C	208,000
(69)	Elliott Field Station	Animal services building.....	PW	23,000
(70)	San Francisco	Rural animal facility, step 1.....	PW	14,000
(71)	San Diego H.S.	University Hospital access road.....	PW	12,000
(72)	San Diego H.S.	Utilities and site development.....	C	73,000
(73)	Davis	Biological sciences unit 4.....	E	424,000
(74)	Irvine	Natural sciences unit 1 conversion.....	E	39,000
(75)	San Diego	Third college.....	E	100,000
(76)	Davis	Physics unit 1.....	E	16,000
Total.....				\$13,207,000

<sup>1</sup> Phase symbols indicate: (P) preliminary planning, (W) working drawings, (C) construction, and (E) equipment.

<sup>2</sup> H.S. indicates Health Sciences.

### 1972-73 Fiscal Year Capital Outlay

Table 3 summarizes the capital outlay program proposed in this item for educational fee funding.

**Table 3**  
**University of California Proposed Capital Outlay Program for 1972-73**

<i>Project category</i>	<i>Number of projects</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Percent of total</i>	<i>Analysis table<sup>1</sup></i>
I. Planning and cost-rise reserve.....	4	\$2,451,000	7.2	4
II. Equipment .....	14	4,343,000	12.7	5
III. Utilities and site development.....	9	2,956,000	8.6	6
IV. Fire protection .....	7	2,830,000	8.3	7
V. Hospital improvements .....	5	3,659,000	10.7	8
VI. Program enrichment and expanded research .....	3	13,365,000	39.1	9
VII. Additional instructional capacity	4	2,854,000	3.3	10
VIII. Library expansion .....	5	1,739,000	5.1	11
Totals .....	51	\$34,197,000	100.0	

<sup>1</sup> Contains a listing of the projects included in each category.

As shown in Table 3, the major thrust (39.1 percent) of the University's 1972-73 fiscal year capital outlay proposal is for what we catego-

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued**

size as "program enrichment and expanded research." These are projects which will not generate additional capacity space required to accept future enrollments. The Governor's Budget states that all critical capacity requirements are being met through priority allocation of resources and increased utilization of facilities.

**I. Planning and Cost-Rise Reserve**

*We recommend that priority (3) providing \$800,000 for preliminary planning for the health sciences be deleted from the schedule.*

Table 4  
1972-73 Universitywide Projects

University priority	Campus	Project	Amount
(1)	All	General planning	\$300,000
(2)	General	Preliminary plans	200,000
(3) <sup>1</sup>	Health sciences	Preliminary plans	800,000
(4)	All	Reserve for cost-rise augmentation	1,151,000
Total			\$2,451,000

<sup>1</sup> This project is also included in Budget Bill Item 333.

General planning studies involve the relationships of individual campuses with their surrounding communities. Problems studied include traffic and circulation, utilities, amenities for students, faculty and visitors, as well as the zoning and economic problems of the surrounding private and public community.

Preliminary planning involves the preparation of programs for specific projects as well as preliminary plans and cost estimates for such projects as a segment of a utility system or alteration work involving uncertain conditions. These funds are used for projects to be proposed for inclusion in the 1973-74 and future fiscal year capital outlay programs. Assuming that 1 and one-half percent is a reasonable amount to provide for this purpose, the total requested would provide for a construction program of approximately \$54,660,000.

The University has indicated that the \$800,000 proposed for health sciences planning is needed for the campus hospital and veterinary medicine unit 2 at Davis, alterations at the Sacramento Medical Center and utilities for medical sciences unit 1 at Irvine. These projects are scheduled for bond funding. Consequently, we believe that the planning funds are only necessary if the bond issue passes and should only be included in Item 333.

Inflation in the construction industry in recent years has often been in excess of 1 percent per month. This necessitates the provision of an augmentation reserve to cover the rise in construction costs that may be experienced between the time funds are appropriated and the actual bidding dates. On the assumption that the construction projects are critical and are generally ready to go at an early date (within six months) the \$1,151,000 requested represents a contingency factor of approximately 5 percent and appears to be reasonable in light of current trends.

## II. Equipment

*We recommend approval.*

**Table 5**  
**1972-73 Equipment Projects**

<i>University priority</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Future requirement</i>
(5)	San Francisco	Clinics expansion.....	\$137,000	--
(6)	San Francisco	School of Nursing.....	53,000	--
(7)	Davis	Physics unit 1.....	314,000	--
(8) <sup>1</sup>	San Francisco	Mathematical sciences.....	274,000	--
(9)	Santa Barbara	Physical sciences unit 1.....	102,000	--
(10)	Irvine	Engineering unit 1.....	405,000	--
(11)	Davis	Chemistry addition.....	360,000	--
(12)	Santa Cruz	Applied science.....	105,000	--
(13)	Irvine	Social sciences unit 1.....	337,000	\$752,000
(14)	Santa Cruz	Social sciences.....	394,000	--
(15)	San Diego	Third college.....	150,000	--
(16)	Santa Cruz	Kresge College, academic unit.....	137,000	--
(17)	Davis	Wickson Hall addition.....	242,000	--
(18)	San Diego	Improvements at University Hospital.....	1,327,000	--
Total.....			\$4,343,000	\$752,000

<sup>1</sup> This project is incorrectly identified, it should be for the Berkeley campus.

As indicated in Table 5, there are 14 equipment requests affecting seven campuses. With the exception of priority (13) social sciences unit 1 at Irvine, the amounts requested are the final or only increment and will equip or complete equipping of approximately 908,000 assignable square feet of space. It is estimated that an additional \$752,000 will be required to complete the Irvine project.

## III. Utilities and Site Development

*We recommend approval.*

**Table 6**  
**1972-73 Utilities and Site Development Projects**

<i>University priority</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Budget bill amount</i>	<i>Regents request</i>
(19)	Riverside	Utilities and site development....	\$785,000	\$937,000
(20)	San Diego	Seawater discharge collection....	40,000	40,000
(21)	Los Angeles	Emergency power expansion.....	337,000	397,000
(22)	Santa Barbara	Central control system.....	470,000	470,000
(23)	Los Angeles	Utilities and site development....	385,000	1,140,000
(24)	Los Angeles	Exterior lighting.....	100,000	300,000
(25)	Santa Barbara	Utilities and site development....	70,000	696,000
(26)	Davis	Utilities and site development....	585,000	888,000
(27)	Santa Cruz	Utilities and site development....	184,000	430,000
Total.....			\$2,956,000	\$5,298,000

The utilities and site development projects listed in Table 6 represent critical needs. They are related either directly to the essential utility requirements to make a building operable or to the correction of serious health or safety deficiencies. A detailed review of these

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued**

projects by our office in conjunction with representatives of the Department of Finance and the University prior to inclusion in the Budget Bill resulted in the \$2,342,000 reduction from the regents' request indicated in Table 6. Following is a brief description of the nontypical projects proposed.

*Sea Water Discharge.* Waste sea water from various laboratories and aquaria at Scripps Institution of Oceanography is currently discharged at various locations along the beach where it flows across the beach into the surf. The proposed project provides for collecting the waste sea water in a single outfall line and discharging it at a point approximately 700 feet offshore. This solution is based upon the recommendations of the California Regional Water Quality Control Board. The gross project cost is \$200,000 with federal and state grants making up the \$160,000 difference.

*Emergency Power Expansion.* The expansion of health sciences facilities at Los Angeles coupled with the enormous surge in the range and variety of electrical and electronic equipment needed for treating and sustaining patients as well as code requirements have necessitated the expansion of the emergency electrical power system. It is proposed to increase the emergency generator capacity to supplement that presently available.

*Central Control System.* A review of the heating, ventilating, and air-conditioning systems on the Santa Barbara campus indicated that the installation of a central control system would provide sufficient savings in manpower and purchased utility costs to amortize the cost of the system in three to five years. It is also anticipated that additional savings will be experienced because of extended equipment life, reduced running time, and reduced maintenance costs.

**IV. Fire Protection**

*We recommend that priorities (28) and (33) be deleted and that priorities (30), (31) and (32) be reduced as indicated in Table 7.*

**Table 7**  
**1972-73 Fire Protection Projects**

<i>University priority</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount requested</i>	<i>Analyst's recom- mendation</i>
(28)	Santa Cruz	Fire protection-----	\$325,000	--
(29)	Berkeley	Fire alarm system addition-----	365,000	\$365,000
(30)	Berkeley	Fire protection, Doe library-----	1,000,000	720,000
(31)	Davis	Fire protection-----	499,000	319,000
(32)	San Diego	Fire protection-----	206,000	97,200
(33)	San Francisco	Fire protection-----	80,000	--
(34)	Berkeley	Fire protection, life science build- ing-----	355,000	355,000
Total-----			\$2,830,000	\$1,856,200

*Need for Additional Fire Protection. On September 22, 1971, the University issued a policy on fire protection. Applicable portions of that policy statement are reprinted below:*

#### UNIVERSITY POLICY FIRE PROTECTION

"1. It is University policy to minimize the risk of injury to persons and damage to property from fire at all locations where University operations and activities occur.

"2. Insofar as it is reasonably able to do so and insofar as resources for the purposes are made or become available, the University will acquire, build, and maintain buildings and other facilities which are safe from fire and will provide or obtain for these buildings and other facilities such fire prevention, detection, reporting, and suppression systems as are necessary to protect students, employees, and the public against injury, and University property against loss.

"3. The design and construction of new buildings and other facilities on University premises shall, as a minimum, comply with the regulations of the State Fire Marshal as currently issued in Title 19 of the State Administrative Code.

"4. Provided that funds are made available from the state for state-funded buildings or other facilities, or become available from the appropriate nonstate source for non-state-funded buildings or other facilities:

- a. Presently occupied buildings or other facilities in use on University premises shall, as a minimum, be brought into compliance with the regulations of the State Fire Marshal as currently issued and as amended from time to time in Title 19 of the State Administrative Code;
- b. New or presently occupied buildings which represent severe fire hazard exposure shall be provided with automatic fire extinguishing systems incorporating automatic alarm systems communicating with the fire suppression responding unit or units."

The projects listed in Table 7 are in response to the above policy statement. The justifications for providing the additional protection fall into two separate categories:

- (1) To bring an existing building into compliance with Title 19 and the requirements of the State Fire Marshal, and
- (2) To provide additional automatic fire protection systems where severe fire hazard exposure exists.

The first category is clear in its intent. Title 19 establishes minimum design and construction requirements and establishes fire, explosion and panic safety practices and procedures in various hazardous installations and operations. It emphasizes personal safety rather than property protection.

The second category appears to emphasize property protection and

**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued**

in our opinion represents a program that may be desirable but is not mandatory when considered in the light of limited funds and other needs. Consequently, we recommend funding only those projects or portions of projects that fall into the first category.

In addition to the above, we recommend deletion of the \$80,000 project for San Francisco. This amount is requested for corrective construction to on-campus residences owned by the University and used as temporary offices. The structures are located on the site for the new School of Dentistry which is funded for construction in Item 333. They comply with the code requirements for residences but not office space. Because of the temporary status and low-rise nature of these structures, we do not believe the proposed corrective measures are critical enough to justify the use of scarce funds.

**V. Hospital Improvements**

*We recommend approval.*

**Table 8**  
**1972-73 Hospital Improvement Projects**

<i>University priority</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount requested</i>	<i>Future<sup>1</sup> requirement</i>
(35)	Irvine	Improvements, Orange County Medical Center.....	\$282,000	\$30,000 E
(36)	San Diego	South Wing addition, Univer- sity Hospital.....	591,000	346,000 E
(42)	San Diego	Improvements, University Hospital.....	560,000	--
(43)	San Francisco	Alterations, clinics and medical sciences.....	1,550,000	147,000 E
(45)	San Francisco	Moffitt Hospital addition.....	676,000	<sup>2</sup> 3,213,000 C 2,231,000 E
Total.....			\$3,659,000	\$3,213,000 C \$2,754,000 C

<sup>1</sup> Letter denotes: (C) construction, and (E) equipment.

<sup>2</sup> Total estimated construction cost is \$16,627,000 with loan and other nonstate sources providing \$13,414,000.

The health sciences projects listed in Table 8 represent a minimum program developed to correct existing deficiencies. It does not provide for any expansion to keep pace with the planning goals of the "Ten-Year Health Sciences Plan." Because of the critical nature of the projects, they are included in this item. In the event the health sciences bond issue fails, the projects can be funded out of the 1972-73 fiscal year educational fee income. The following is a brief description of each of the projects.

The proposed improvements at the Orange County Medical Center affect most of the clinical disciplines of the College of Medicine. They include modernization and rehabilitation of office and laboratory facilities to enable the college to more effectively carry out its teaching and research programs.

The proposed south wing addition to the University Hospital of San

Diego County will provide 32,115 assignable square feet to permit expansion of outpatient teaching and clinical faculty facilities.

The hospital improvements project includes correction of deficiencies in the electrical, mechanical and ventilating systems and completes the remodeling of space for diagnostic radiology and radiotherapy.

#### San Francisco

The alterations project proposed for San Francisco is to remodel space which will be vacated when the outpatient department moves to the new medical clinics building in the spring of 1972. This includes space in the existing clinics building, the medical sciences building and the hospital.

The proposed addition to Moffitt Hospital will be a multistory structure of approximately 116,500 assignable square feet abutting the east wing of the hospital. Approximately 71,500 square feet will provide improved inpatient clinical facilities. The remaining 45,000 square feet will replace 180 beds displaced from existing patient areas by other alterations projects.

#### VI Program Enrichment and Expanded Research

*We recommend that priority (39) providing \$2,499,000 for construction of a learning resources center at Santa Barbara be deferred.*

Table 9

#### 1972-73 Program Enrichment and Expanded Research Projects

University priority	Campus	Project	Assignable square feet	Amount requested	Future <sup>1</sup> requirement
(37)	Los Angeles	Life science unit 3.....	45,000	\$5,844,000	\$851,000 E
(38)	San Diego	Marine biology.....	76,600	\$5,022,000	402,000 E
(39)	Santa Barbara	Learning resources.....	29,791	2,499,000	865,000
Total.....			151,391	\$13,365,000	\$2,118,000

<sup>1</sup> Letter denotes: (E) equipment.

<sup>2</sup> Total estimated construction cost is \$9,173,000.

<sup>3</sup> Total estimated construction cost is \$10,271,000.

As previously discussed, the three projects summarized in Table 9 do not generate additional capacity space required for future enrollment growth. In fact, biological sciences at Los Angeles already has space far in excess of the standards established by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. With the completion of life science unit 3, in fiscal year 1974-75, biological sciences will have 67 percent more space than the standards indicate are needed. Without this building, the space assigned will exceed the standard allotment by 36 percent.

In contrast to the Los Angeles project, the proposed marine biology building for San Diego accommodates what is essentially organized research. This function is not included under the standards for capacity instructional space.

Based on the foregoing, we concluded that the need for constructing the life sciences unit 3 and marine biology projects is to provide for enrichment of existing programs through expanded research



## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

capabilities. There is ample justification to move ahead with these projects on that basis when consideration is given to the importance of the study of molecular biology and related cancer research as well as the potential for exploitation of the oceans and the need for expanded oceanographic research.

**Learning Resources Center.** The proposed learning resources center for Santa Barbara primarily provides for enrichment of television, recording and other audiovisual support space. No additional functions would be added by this facility, rather it is justified on the basis of providing better service to the faculty and students. The Department of Learning Resources has been able to expand its services within existing space although its operations are scattered throughout the campus. This proposal will provide for relocation and expansion of some of the services along with minimal consolidation. We do not believe this is a critical priority in terms of benefits received and in relation to the needs of other campuses in the system.

## VII. Additional Instructional Capacity

*We recommend that: (1) Priority (41) providing \$218,000 for preliminary plans and working drawings for the third college academic unit at San Diego be deferred and, (2) the University examine the feasibility of providing permanent space for the San Diego campus administrative functions and assigning all Mathews campus facilities for third college use.*

Table 10  
1972-73 Additional Instructional Capacity Projects

Univer- sity priority	Campus	Project	Assignable square feet	Capacity	Amount requested	Future <sup>1</sup> requirement
(40)	Santa Cruz	College No. 7 ---	104,480	700	\$1,408,000	\$154,000 E
(41)	San Diego	Third college academic unit 1-----	60,000	765	218,000	3,875,000 C
(44)	Davis	Roadhouse Hall alterations----	23,251	270	1,125,000	75,000 E
(51)	Berkeley	Alterations-----	--	--	103,000	--
Total-----			187,731	1,535	\$2,854,000	\$3,875,000 C 987,000 E

<sup>1</sup> Letter denotes: (C) construction, and (E) equipment.

<sup>2</sup> Academic office space.

The alterations project proposed for Berkeley is to correct deficiencies in the life sciences building animal facility to comply with federal legislation involving the care of laboratory animals. The project does not fall within the project categories enumerated in Table 3. However, we have included it in category VII for discussion purposes.

The Santa Cruz campus has indicated that without the construction of college No. 7 it will not be able to adequately accommodate the enrollment growth projected beyond fiscal year 1972-73. Based upon the approved space standards mentioned earlier, the Santa Cruz campus capacity is estimated to be at 95 percent of need in fiscal year

1974-75 with completion of college No. 7. We have reviewed the projected space needs and believe they are realistic.

*Excess Capacity at San Diego.* The proposed third college academic unit 1 is primarily laboratory space for engineering and the sciences. Our analysis of space needs in fiscal year 1975-76, when this facility is projected for completion, indicates the campus instructional capacity will be at approximately 125 percent of need. This represents an excess of 129,303 assignable square feet. We believe this project could be deferred without serious detriment to the campus academic programs.

In the course of our review of third college planning, we noted some uncertainty as to the eventual direction of the academic program. We believe the college should be allowed more time to develop before permanent buildings are constructed to house the programs. Construction of permanent facilities to house the campus administrative functions now located in 44,487 assignable square feet at Mathews, and reassignment of the space to third college would give the college its own identifiable buildings and facilitate program development. We believe the University should consider this alternative in lieu of constructing more lab space, particularly considering the lower cost associated with constructing administrative office space as opposed to science and engineering laboratories.

*Adequacy of Academic Office Space at Davis.* It is anticipated that, the proposed alteration project for Roadhouse Hall at Davis will provide an additional 70 academic offices in the fall of 1973. Projections of need based on the currently budgeted student-faculty ratio indicate the campus will have faculty office space in fiscal year 1973-74 to accommodate 94 percent of the academic staff. This will still leave the campus with a shortage of 73 offices.

## VII. Library Expansion

*We recommend that: (1) The scope of the University library unit*

Table 11

### 1972-73 Library Expansion Projects

University priority	Campus	Project	Assignable square feet	Amount requested	Future <sup>1</sup> requirement
(46)	Irvine	Health sciences library--	25,000	\$97,000	\$471,000 C 93,000 E
(47)	Santa Cruz	Library unit 2-----	138,000	338,000	7,634,000 C 644,000 E
(48)	Berkeley	Doe library addition....	200,000	545,000	9,815,000 C 584,000 E
(49)	Santa Barbara	Library addition-----	95,600	371,000	6,391,000 C 425,000 E
(50)	Santa Cruz	Applied sciences building completion-----	23,529	388,000	--
Total-----			482,129	\$1,739,000	\$24,311,000 C \$1,710,000 E

<sup>1</sup> Letter denotes: (C) construction and (E) equipment.

<sup>2</sup> Total estimated construction cost of \$1,646,000 with loan and other nonstate sources providing \$1,175,000.

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

2, priority (47), proposed for Santa Cruz be limited to 96,500 assignable square feet, and (2) the University be directed to reallocate the \$545,000 proposed for the Berkeley Doe Library addition, priority (48), to increasing the capacity of the Richmond facility or correcting deficiencies in Doe Library.

Current standards are to plan libraries around the projected space needs two years beyond occupancy. For the 1972-73 fiscal year proposals listed in Table 11, the target year would be fiscal year 1977-78. Our analysis of the book acquisition rates and related space needs indicates that two of the library expansion projects proposed provide for growth in excess of this standard. This approach is desirable during periods of rapid expansion because the excess can be utilized to relieve other space shortages on an interim basis. We believe this approach is unrealistic in times of scarce resources and limited growth. Our calculations indicate that the additional space proposed for Santa Cruz would probably not be fully utilized until 1981. In terms of the Berkeley proposal, the additional space would not be fully utilized until 1995. Consequently, we recommend the planning goal for Santa Cruz library unit 2 be reduced to 96,500 assignable square feet and the Doe Library addition for Berkeley be limited to 80,000 assignable square feet.

The Berkeley proposal requires additional comment. The regents' original program for fiscal year 1972-73 included a \$400,000 proposal to increase the lesser used book storage in Richmond by approximately 1,250,000 volumes. The Richmond facility provides intercampus storage for books from Berkeley, Davis, San Francisco and Santa Cruz. This project was not included in the Governor's Budget because of insufficient funds. In addition, a request for \$668,000 to correct deficiencies and improve the efficiency of the existing Doe Library, included in the Berkeley alterations project priority (51), was not included for the same reason. Both of these problems should be corrected before planning commences on the Doe Library addition.

*Interim Book Storage for Santa Cruz.* It should be pointed out that the proposed completion of space in the applied sciences building at Santa Cruz will provide 20,000 assignable square feet of restricted access stack space. This will provide the means to accommodate library volume growth until University library unit 2 is ready for occupancy.

**CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES**

Item 309 from the Capital  
Outlay Fund for Public  
Higher Education

Budget p. 205 Program p. 1146

Requested 1972-73.....	32,257,000
Recommended for approval.....	31,226,100
Recommended for special review.....	232,000
Recommended reduction .....	\$798,900

<b>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Analysis Page</i>
1. Eliminate General Planning Studies. Recommend delete (c) —\$100,000		1180
2. Defer Demolition. Recommend reduce (f) to \$23,100.....	—\$42,900	1181
3. Require Additional Information. Recommend special review (rr) life science conversion .....	(\$232,000)	1185
4. Scope Change. Recommend reduction in planned size of Humboldt and Sonoma libraries. ....		1188
5. Defer San Francisco Project. Recommend delete (oo) to complete music-speech building .....	—\$406,000	1191

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item proposes the appropriation of \$32,257,000 in a schedule of 72 projects affecting all of the 19 state college campuses. The various project development phases represented include preliminary planning, working drawings, construction and equipment. Table 1 outlines the proposed program.

**Table 1**  
**California State Colleges Proposed Capital Outlay Program for 1972-73**

<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of projects</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Percent of total</i>	<i>Analysis table<sup>1</sup></i>
I. Statewide planning projects.....	3	\$355,000	1.1%	2
II. Land acquisition.....	2	1,661,000	5.1	3
III. Safety projects.....	2	117,000	0.4	4
IV. Equipment.....	31	8,968,000	27.8	5
V. Utilities and site development.....	10	3,444,000	10.7	6
VI. Conversion projects.....	9	1,462,000	4.5	7
VII. Library expansion projects.....	4	9,192,000	28.5	8
VIII. Addition instructional capacity projects.....	5	5,736,000	17.8	10
IX. Support facilities.....	6	1,322,000	4.1	13
Total.....	72	\$32,257,000	100.0%	

<sup>1</sup> Provides a breakdown of the projects in each category.

## CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES—Continued

## I. Statewide Planning Projects

*We recommend that (c) for general studies be deleted for a savings of \$100,000.*

Table 2  
1972-73 Statewide Planning Projects

<i>Schedule</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount</i>
(a)	All	Preliminary planning-----	\$50,000
(b)	All	Campus master planning-----	205,000
(c)	All	General studies-----	100,000
Total-----			\$355,000

The \$50,000 requested for preliminary planning is to develop supporting data for uncomplicated projects such as site development and utility extensions or small projects (under \$1 million) proposed for construction in the 1973-74 fiscal year. Assuming the amount requested represents one and one-half percent of the estimated construction cost, it is sufficient to plan a \$3,330,000 program. This appears to be a reasonable estimate of need if the amount provided for this type of project in the 1973-74 fiscal year is no greater than proposed in the budget year.

Developing budget requests to accommodate the demand for facilities necessitated by enrollment growth and changing program needs coupled with budget pressures to increase utilization of existing facilities requires flexible planning. This necessitates frequent evaluation and readjustment of campus masterplans to maximize the use of campus facilities at the least cost. The \$205,000 requested for master planning is to provide \$10,000 for each of the existing 19 campuses and \$5,000 for each of the three new campus sites. The trustees' original request was for \$35,000 for each of the existing campuses. We suggest that the \$5,000 provided for the undeveloped sites would be better spent solving the space and circulation problems of the existing campuses. In any event, we support the concept of ongoing campus masterplanning as a prudent and necessary investment.

The \$100,000 requested for general studies is to be used for topographic surveys, engineering studies, utility studies, traffic studies and other miscellaneous investigations. It is our understanding that \$104,000 is currently available from prior year appropriations for this purpose. Based on prior year expenditures, we believe the \$104,000 is adequate and no additional appropriation is justified.

## II. Land Acquisition

*We recommend that (d) for special land acquisition be deleted for a savings of \$250,000.*

The \$250,000 requested for special land acquisition represents an emergency or opportunity fund for relatively small land purchases. The concept of providing funds for this purpose was implemented in the Budget Act of 1965 at the same level as is now being proposed. However, the practice was discontinued after the Budget Act of 1967 due to the availability of unexpended balances. In recent years, funding limitations precluded reestablishment of the practice.

When opportunity acquisition funds were provided in prior budget acts, language was attached to the appropriation item delineating the conditions under which the funds could be expended. Purchases were restricted to those of an emergency or opportunity nature involving parcels located within approved campus masterplan boundaries. Although there is no such control language in the Budget Bill, we assume the trustees intend to apply the same criteria.

The \$1,411,000 proposed for land acquisition at Los Angeles will correct two problems. First, it will alleviate a number of hardship situations involving the owners of single family residences to be acquired. Secondly, it will provide additional land critically needed for a major arterial access and surface parking. A total of 57 parcels with a net acreage of 6.6 acres will be acquired with the amount requested.

## III. Safety Projects

*We recommend that (f) be reduced to \$23,100.*

**Table 4**  
**1972-73 Safety Projects**

<i>Schedule</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount<sup>1</sup> requested</i>	<i>Future<sup>1</sup> requirement</i>
(e)	San Diego	Arts and sciences rehabilitation-----	\$51,000 W	\$626,000 C
(f)	Chico	Demolition of hazardous buildings-----	66,000 C	--
Total-----			\$117,000	\$626,000 C

<sup>1</sup>Letter denotes: (W) working drawings, and (C) construction.

The proposal for the San Diego arts and sciences building is necessary to bring the building up to post-Field Act standards. In addition to structural rehabilitation, some electrical circuitry will be replaced, the heating and ventilation system will be modernized, and some lecture space will be converted into faculty offices. It is estimated that the campus will be deficient by 79 faculty offices in 1974. This project will provide an additional 14 offices.

**CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES—Continued****Unnecessary Demolition**

The \$66,000 demolition proposal for Chico may be separated into two elements. The first involves structures in the core of the campus including World War II surplus buildings and the old industrial arts building which was declared unsafe in 1967. It is estimated that demolition of these facilities will cost \$9,800.

The remaining portion of this proposal is to demolish old residences, currently used as temporary faculty and administrative office space. This is estimated to cost \$56,200 and will eliminate 213 faculty offices. The campus recently converted leased classroom space with a capacity of 2,217 F.T.E. students to faculty and administrative offices. Considering that decision, it is difficult to justify demolishing similar space even though it is makeshift. However, the demolition of some of these residences will provide for relocation of an existing campus building currently on the site of the library expansion project at a cost of \$13,000.

In summary, we recommend limiting approval to \$23,100 to demolish the core structures and the residences required to permit relocation of the applied arts building.

## IV. Equipment

*We recommend approval.*

**Table 5**  
**1972-73 Capital Outlay Program Summary of Equipment Requests**

<i>Campus</i>	<i>Number of projects</i>	<i>Initial complement</i>	<i>Incremental request</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Future requirement</i>
Bakersfield.....	2	2	0	\$419,000	\$88,000
Chico.....	3	1	2	1,000,000	200,000
Dominguez Hills.....	3	1	2	1,255,000	845,000
Humboldt.....	1	1	0	425,000	--
Kellogg-Voorhis.....	2	1	1	300,000	--
Los Angeles.....	2	1	1	600,000	1,470,000
San Bernardino.....	3	1	2	449,000	--
San Fernando.....	1	1	0	400,000	700,000
San Jose.....	2	1	1	660,000	1,400,000
Stanislaus.....	2	2	0	280,000	230,000
Fullerton.....	1	0	1	200,000	--
Hayward.....	2	0	2	610,000	--
Long Beach.....	4	0	4	1,145,000	--
San Francisco.....	3	0	3	1,225,000	1,400,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>\$8,968,000</b>	<b>\$6,333,000</b>

As indicated in Table 5, there are 31 requests scheduled in this item to equip new facilities nearing completion or recently completed on 14 campuses. Of the \$8,968,000 requested, \$3,203,000 is the initial complement of equipment for 12 projects. Of the \$6,333,000 that will be required in future budgets to complete equipping 11 of the projects, \$4,398,000 is for six projects for which an initial complement of equipment is funded in this item.

## V. Utilities and Site Development

*We recommend approval.*



**Table 6**  
**1972-73 Utilities and Site Development Projects**

<i>Schedule</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Category</i>	<i>Amount requested</i>	<i>Future<sup>1</sup> requirement</i>
(ll)	Sacramento	Utilities 1972	1	\$45,000	\$763,000 C
(mm)	Fresno	Central plant addition	1	150,000	2,650,000 C
					15,000 E
(nn)	Fresno	Utilities 1973	1	40,000	520,000 C
(yy)	Kellogg-Voorhis	Utilities 1972 (electrical)	2	800,000	--
(zz)	Long Beach	Utilities 1972 (sewage and water)	2	76,000	--
(aaa)	Sacramento	Site development (roads)	3	512,000	--
(bbb)	San Luis Obispo	Site development (access roads)	3	804,000	--
(ccc)	Fresno	Utilities 1972 (drainage)	2	400,000	--
(ddd)	San Diego	Utilities 1972 (electrical)	1 & 2	325,000	--
<b>Total</b>				<b>\$3,444,000</b>	<b>\$3,953,000 C</b> <b>\$15,000 E</b>

<sup>1</sup> Letter denotes: (C) construction, and (E) equipment.

<sup>2</sup> See text for description of each category.

The justifications for the utility projects listed in Table 6 fall into three general categories to:

- (1) Provide essential utility extensions or capacity to service new buildings funded for construction,
- (2) Correct capacity deficiencies and eliminate unsafe conditions, and
- (3) Eliminate traffic hazards by improving campus vehicular circulation and access.

As indicated in Table 6, an additional \$3,968,000 will be required in future budgets to construct and equip the utility extensions and central plant addition proposed for Sacramento and Fresno.

#### **VI. Conversion Projects**

*We recommend special review of (rr) convert life science building at Chico (\$232,000).*

## CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES—Continued

**Table 7**  
**1972-73 Conversion Projects**

<i>Schedule</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>FTE<sup>2</sup> capacity</i>	<i>Amount requested</i>	<i>Future<sup>1</sup> requirement</i>
(qq)	San Luis Obispo.....	Convert science I.....	- 6	\$171,000	\$109,000 E
(rr)	Chico.....	Convert life science.....	- 193	232,000	214,000 E
(ss)	Bakersfield.....	Convert initial buildings.....	--	176,000	--
(tt)	San Bernardino.....	Convert initial buildings.....	--	170,000	40,000 E
(uu)	Dominguez Hills.....	Convert initial buildings.....	--	344,000	70,000 E
(vv)	Fresno.....	Convert lab school.....	--	175,000	10,000 E
(ww)	San Luis Obispo.....	Convert science II.....	- 12	18,000	175,000 E
(xx)	Humboldt.....	Convert lab school.....	--	42,000	658,000 C
(ttt)	San Jose.....	Remodel Centennial Hall.....	- 212	134,000	70,000 E
		Total.....	- 423	\$1,462,000	\$658,000 C
					\$708,000 E

<sup>1</sup> Letter denotes: (C) construction, and (E) equipment.

<sup>2</sup> Minus sign indicates a reduction in capacity.

The projects listed in Table 7 are required either to:

- (1) Convert to its planned ultimate use space temporarily assigned to another department while permanent facilities were under construction or
- (2) Convert specialized space vacated by one department for permanent use by another department.

The proposed conversion of initial buildings at Bakersfield, San Bernardino, and Dominguez Hills involves space used by another department on an interim basis and recently vacated. At Bakersfield, temporary science labs will be remodeled for fine arts and psychology. At San Bernardino, interim library stack space will be partitioned for use by student services, admissions and records and business functions. At Dominguez Hills, interim library space will be available for the planned expansion of food services. In addition, student services, admissions and records will expand into space vacated by the departments of social sciences and natural sciences.

The two projects proposed for San Luis Obispo involve the conversion of three 24-station lower division botany laboratories to three, 16-station upper division and graduate chemistry laboratories. The biology laboratories were recently vacated when the new biological sciences building was completed. The capacity reduction is based on current space planning standards recommended by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. These standards are:

- (1) 55 square feet per student station for lower division biological sciences laboratories, and
- (2) 120 square feet per student station for physical sciences graduate laboratories.

The remodeled spaces will provide a chemistry instrumentation laboratory, a physical chemistry and instrumental analysis laboratory, and a biophysics and inorganic chemistry laboratory.

The lab schools at Fresno and Humboldt were designed and constructed as small-scale elementary schools to be used for teacher training. The termination of this program released the space for other purposes. The remodeling funds requested are to upgrade and modernize these facilities to accommodate other college programs. The project proposed for Fresno primarily involves improvements in the heating and ventilating system and rehabilitation of restroom facilities. In contrast, the program outlined for Humboldt includes physical modifications to accommodate a speech and hearing clinic, the nursing program and the instructional media center. Some revamping of the existing heating and ventilating systems is also anticipated.

The space to be remodeled in Centennial Hall at San Jose was formerly occupied by the campus audiovisual service. It is currently counted as temporary classroom space with a capacity of 219 F.T.E. students. However, it is proposed to convert this space into critically needed small animal quarters for the psychology department and a

**CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES—Continued**

20-station upper division laboratory with a rated capacity of seven F.T.E. students. Currently, the animal laboratory facilities are located in an old house and store scheduled for demolition. The arrangement is makeshift and inconvenient for the psychology department in Centennial Hall and hampers the incorporation of small animal experiments in the curriculum. This campus has the largest enrollment in psychology in the system.

**Additional Justification Needed**

It is proposed to convert old biology laboratories in the life science building at Chico into art and nursing laboratories. In reviewing the project, we had some difficulty understanding the rationale for sizing the nursing laboratories. It is proposed to convert 20- and 24-station upper and lower division biology laboratories into 8-station lower division nursing laboratories. Examination of the plans indicates that the capacity of some of the biology laboratories is overrated for the amount of space involved. However, planning an 8-station laboratory for these same rooms is an inefficient use of space. Because of time limitations, we have not been able to adequately resolve this problem. Hopefully, that situation will be rectified by the time committee hearings start.

**VII. Library Expansion Projects**

*We recommend: (1) a reduction in the scope of the library addition at Humboldt to 55,000 assignable square feet, and (2) a reduction in the scope of the library administration building for Sonoma to 61,000 assignable square feet.*

**Table 8**  
**1972-73 Library Expansion Projects**

<i>Schedule</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Capacity<sup>2</sup></i>	<i>Assignable square feet</i>	<i>Amount requested</i>	<i>Future<sup>1</sup> requirement</i>
(eee)	Sacramento-----	New library-----	(10,000)	155,000	\$8,600,000	\$1,440,000 E
(fff)	Bakersfield-----	Initial library addition-----	(2,880)	21,570	70,000	1,185,000 C
						189,000 E
(ggg)	Sonoma-----	Library administration building-----	(8,350)	85,916	307,000	5,708,000 C
						737,000 E
(hhh)	Humboldt-----	Library addition-----	(8,000)	66,650	215,000	4,185,000 C
						650,000 E
<b>Total-----</b>				<b>329,136</b>	<b>\$9,192,000</b>	<b>\$11,078,000 C</b>
						<b>\$3,016,000 E</b>

<sup>1</sup> Letter denotes: (C) construction, and (E) equipment.

<sup>2</sup> Indicates planned F.T.E. capacity of campus library facilities upon completion of the project. The capacity needed is determined by the projected enrollment two years beyond occupancy.

**CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES—Continued**

As indicated in Table 8, \$14,094,000 will be required in future budgets to complete the projects. With the exception of the new library proposed for Sacramento, the remaining projects represent additions to existing facilities. With respect to Bakersfield, the proposal represents an interim solution to accommodate campus needs until such time as permanent library facilities can be constructed.

Table 9 illustrates the capacity deficiencies of existing campus libraries.

**Table 9**  
**FTE Capacity of Campus Libraries Compared to**  
**FTE (8-10) Enrollment Projections Showing Major Deficiencies**

State college	Design capacity <sup>2</sup>	1972-73		1975-76	
		Projected enrollment	Coverage <sup>1</sup>	Projected enrollment	Coverage <sup>1</sup>
Bakersfield-----	1,250	1,700	----	3,400	36.8%
Chico-----	12,000	11,100	----	13,500	--
Dominguez-----	8,000	3,940	----	6,850	--
Fresno-----	5,500	14,200	38.7%	16,800	32.7%
Fullerton-----	10,000	13,100	----	16,700	--
Hayward-----	12,800	12,400	----	15,900	--
Humboldt-----	3,500	6,200	----	7,400	47.3%
Long Beach-----	15,530	20,500	----	23,300	--
Los Angeles-----	16,800	18,000	----	20,800	--
Sacramento-----	5,000	14,200	35.2%	17,100	29.2%
San Bernardino-----	8,500	3,400	----	5,000	--
San Diego-----	20,000	22,000	----	25,900	----
San Fernando-----	17,740	20,000	----	23,900	--
San Francisco-----	16,000	15,200	----	17,300	--
San Jose-----	8,500	21,500	39.5%	24,600	34.5%
Sonoma-----	3,500	4,600	----	6,850	51.1%
Stanislaus-----	2,000	3,600	----	5,400	37.0%
Kellogg-Voorhis-----	8,000	9,500	----	12,300	--
San Luis Obispo-----	6,000	12,000	----	13,500	44.4%

<sup>1</sup> Design capacity as a percentage of projected enrollment where enrollment exceeds capacity and identifying only campuses with most critical deficiencies (less than 50 percent coverage).

<sup>2</sup> Capacity based on approved space standards.

**Library Planning Goals**

Current library planning is based on a standard of 40 volumes per F.T.E. student and reader station capacity for 25 percent of the projected campus enrollment. However, the current systemwide acquisition rate is approximately 30 volumes per F.T.E. student.

In our analysis of the state colleges' support budget request we are recommending that the 40-volume acquisition rate not be achieved until 1985 (Analysis page 000). Consequently, we believe the current acquisition rate is a more realistic capital outlay planning goal for the 1970's, particularly in light of scarce resources. Application of this criteria to the projects listed in Table 8 that are still in the planning stages led to the proposed reductions in scope. The fiscal affect of this proposal would be to reduce the amount required for construction in

future budgets.

If the Humboldt and Sonoma campuses were facing critical shortages in other types of space, we would support the library projects as proposed. However, Humboldt's situation is not critical due to the recent termination of the college elementary school program which released 23,240 assignable square feet of space for other purposes. Sonoma's situation will be improved considerably with completion of classroom office building No. 2. It is proposed for construction funding in this item and will provide 31,400 assignable square feet of instructional space.

#### **VIII. Additional Instructional Capacity Projects**

*We recommend deletion of (oo) to complete the music-speech building at San Francisco for a savings of \$406,000.*



Table 10  
1972-73 Additional Instructional Capacity Projects

<i>Schedule</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>FTE capacity</i>	<i>Amount requested</i>	<i>Future<sup>1</sup> requirement</i>
(oo)	San Francisco	Complete music-speech building	90	\$406,000	--
(pp)	Hayward	Convert science and fine arts	1,163	250,000	--
(qqq)	Bakersfield	Classroom office building No. 1	1,590	2,311,000	\$179,000 E
(rrr)	Sonoma	Classroom office building No. 2	1,229	2,245,000	210,000 E
(sss)	San Luis Obispo	Engineering west addition	13	524,000	140,000 E
Total			4,085	\$5,736,000	\$529,000 E

<sup>1</sup> Letter denotes: (E) equipment.

**Table 11**  
**Capacity Breakdown 1972-73 Instructional Capacity Projects**

Campus	Project	F.T.E. capacity		Faculty office	Assignable square feet
		Lecture	Lab		
San Francisco	Complete music-speech building	90	--	--	10,000
Hayward	Convert science and fine arts	1,100	63	50	25,475
Bakersfield	Classroom office building No. 1	1,514	76	96	33,000
Sonoma	Classroom office building No. 2	1,192	37	103	31,400
San Luis Obispo	Engineering west addition	--	13	--	10,135
Total		3,896	189	249	110,010

As indicated, all of the projects listed in Table 10 are proposed for construction funding. It is anticipated that the additional capacity generated by these projects will be available in 1974-75. Table 11 indicates the type of capacity provided by each project. Comparison of this table with the instructional deficiencies identified in Table 12 gives a good indication of how critical the projects are.

**Table 12**  
**FTE (8-10) Capacity Needs in 1974-75 Compared to Available<sup>1</sup>**

State college	Lecture			Lab			
	Available	1974-75		Available	1974-75		Percent <sup>2</sup> deficient
		projected need	Deficiency (excess)		projected need	Deficiency (excess)	
Bakersfield	1,806	2,395	589	155	292	137	88.4%
Chico	10,205	10,406	201	1,080	1,455	375	34.7
Dominguez	5,125	4,914	(211)	536	599	63	11.8
Fresno	11,176	12,764	1,588	904	1,710	806	89.2
Fullerton	10,969	13,472	2,503	947	1,273	326	34.4
Hayward	11,387	13,074	1,687	594	1,029	435	73.2
Humboldt	6,575	5,403	(1,172)	706	1,040	334	47.3
Kellogg-Voorhis	9,025	9,557	532	1,135	1,270	135	11.9
Long Beach	17,819	18,688	869	1,578	2,159	581	36.8
Los Angeles	17,950	17,373	(577)	1,787	1,464	(323)	--
Sacramento	13,661	14,030	369	990	984	(6)	--
San Bernardino	3,846	3,593	(253)	208	438	230	110.5
San Diego	19,451	19,837	386	1,526	2,373	847	55.5
San Fernando	16,280	19,586	3,306	1,048	1,821	773	73.7
San Francisco	15,725	13,212	(2,513)	1,393	1,784	391	28.0
San Jose	20,322	19,769	(553)	1,842	2,430	588	31.9
San Luis Obispo	9,974	10,162	188	1,551	2,292	741	47.8
Sonoma	4,544	5,075	531	339	560	221	65.1
Stanislaus	3,774	3,964	190	247	483	236	95.5
Total	209,614	217,274	12,939 (5,279)	18,566	25,456	7,219 (329)	38.9%

<sup>1</sup> Does not include the effect of projects proposed for construction funding in fiscal year 1972-73.

<sup>2</sup> Indicates how much of an increase in lab space is required to correct the deficiency.

**CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES—Continued****Increased Lab Utilization**

A review of the deficiencies identified in Table 12 points to a significant shortage of laboratory space. On a systemwide basis, it would require a 38.9-percent increase in space to eliminate the shortage projected for the 1974-75 fiscal year. In terms of individual campuses, the situation is much worse.

Extending the hours for scheduling class laboratories to 10 p.m. would technically increase the capacity of existing space by 55-percent. This approach would be similar to the increase in classroom utilization required by ACR No. 151 of the 1970 Regular Session. However, in contrast to the classroom situation, it is contended that there are program and built-in physical barriers to achieving the full 55 percent increase in utilization. In some instances, the practice of assigning students a permanent lab station is an essential component of the instructional program. Consequently, it would be difficult to increase utilization without adversely affecting the instructional program.

In an attempt to identify specific limitations, we requested the University and state colleges to develop some information as to the magnitude of the problem and to identify corrective measures. The University indicated the requested information would be transmitted by February 15, 1972. The state colleges response was to indicate that they are moving in the direction of more intensive utilization of laboratories in the evening hours and that the specific data we requested was not currently available. However, it should be pointed out that the establishment of an increased utilization standard for class laboratories would primarily affect future, rather than present, state college and community college capital outlay programs.

**Defer Music-Speech Project**

The project proposed for the music-speech building at San Francisco contains three separate elements. The combined cost of two of these elements is estimated at \$343,000 which represents 84.5 percent of the total project cost. That amount is to upgrade 3,050 square feet currently occupied by the film department and 3,776 square feet occupied by broadcast communication arts. This represents an expenditure of approximately \$50.24 per square foot with no increase in the rated capacity.

The remaining element is estimated to cost \$63,000 and involves completion of unfinished space to provide permanent administrative space for the School of Creative Arts. This administrative function is currently accommodated in converted classroom space. The net effect of this proposal would be to gain a conference room and return a 40-student classroom to general use. As indicated in Table 12, the campus has an excess of classroom space. Consequently, we believe:

- (1) The project cost for the first two elements is too high in relation to the benefits received, and
- (2) The benefits of relocating the School of Creative Arts administrative function are marginal.

#### IX. Support Facilities

*We recommend approval.*

**Table 13**  
**1972-73 Support Facilities Projects**

<i>Schedule</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount requested</i>	<i>Future<sup>1</sup> requirement</i>
(iii)	Long Beach	Administration III.....	\$267,000	\$4,933,000 C 285,000 E
(kkk)	Bakersfield	Outdoor P.E. facilities.....	427,000	
(lll)	Bakersfield	Initial P.E. facilities.....	58,000	997,000 C 54,000 E
(mmm)	Stanislaus	Cafeteria.....	86,000	
(nnn)	Bakersfield	Initial corporation yard.....	334,000	16,000 E
(ppp)	Sonoma	Corporation yard addition.....	150,000	
Total.....			\$1,322,000	\$5,930,000 C \$335,000 E

<sup>1</sup> Letter denotes: (C) construction, and (E) equipment.

The projects listed in Table 13 are required to correct deficiencies in noninstructional support space. In general, the proposals are not related to additional campus growth. They are required to more adequately accommodate the needs of existing students and faculty.

The 72,500-square-foot administration building proposed for Long Beach is sized to accommodate an enrollment of 20,000 F.T.E. students. Current projections are for a campus enrollment of 20,500 F.T.E. students in fiscal year 1972-73. It is also planned to convert existing administrative space to provide 97 faculty offices, lecture capacity for 600 F.T.E. and 30 F.T.E. in upper division labs. A comparison of available campus capacity with 1972-73 fiscal year enrollment projections indicates that construction of administration building III would essentially round out the campus at the 20,500 level. We believe the major policy considerations regarding appropriate campus size should be resolved before any space is constructed to permit growth beyond this level.

The Bakersfield projects provide initial facilities for a campus with a current enrollment of 1,750 F.T.E. students. A basic complement of outdoor physical education facilities will be provided along with a 16,847 assignable square foot multipurpose facility containing two activity rooms, showers, lockers and four faculty offices. The campus currently has only one small locker facility. The initial corporation yard proposed will accommodate activities currently operating in a portion of the central plant. A project to expand the capacity of the central plant has been funded and the corporation yard activities must be relocated.

Stanislaus students and staff are currently served by a 225-seat snackbar occupying 4,000 assignable square feet in the library. There

**CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES—Continued**

is only one small oven and grill to serve 2,355 students and a staff of approximately 381. Stanislaus is a commuter campus in a rural location with very limited food service facilities in the vicinity. Furthermore, no public transportation is available to Turlock, three miles away.

The existing corporation yard space at Sonoma is insufficient to adequately service a campus with 4,670 F.T.E. students. When the proposed addition is occupied, the campus enrollment is projected to be 6,100 F.T.E. students. This enrollment would justify a 15,000-square-foot corporation yard based on current standards. This project will add 8,000 square feet to the existing 6,200-square-foot facility.

**CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES**

Item 310 from the Capital

Outlay Fund for Public

Higher Education

Budget p. 205 Program p. 1146

Requested 1972-73.....	\$2,300,000
Recommended for approval .....	2,300,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This request represents a lump sum appropriation to the Trustees of the California State Colleges to be allocated for minor construction and improvements at the 19 state college campuses. Specific projects for which these funds are required have not been submitted and are not required. In appropriating the lump sum, the trustees are given the administrative flexibility to fund the highest priority projects throughout the statewide system during the budget year. It is our understanding that the Trustees program will be reviewed on a post-audit basis. We agree with this procedure and recommend approval.

The state colleges have a considerable backlog of projects which fall into the category of minor construction and improvements. We would stress that in our opinion, the trustees should use the funds for those projects related to critical utility needs or for the correction of space deficiencies and improvement of space utilization.

**CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES**

Item 311 from the Capital  
 Outlay Fund for Public  
 Higher Education

Budget p. 205    Program p. 1146

---

Requested 1972-73 (Federally Reimbursed) .....	\$962,000
Recommended for approval .....	962,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend that the Trustees: (1) reevaluate the scope of the Hayward, San Bernardino and San Diego projects, and (2) reprogram the projects to more adequately reflect campus capacity needs.*

This is a zero appropriation item in the Budget Bill. Its funding is contingent on the receipt of federal grants for construction projects funded in the Budget Act of 1971 and in Item 309 of this bill. All of the funds allocated by this item are for preliminary planning and the preparation of working drawings. As indicated in Table 1, \$22,767,000 would be required in future budgets to construct the projects listed.

**Table 1**  
**California State Colleges**  
**Proposed Capital Outlay Program for 1972-73**  
**(Zero Appropriation)**

Schedule	Campus	Project	F.T.E. capacity			Amount	Future <sup>1</sup> requirement
			Lecture	Lab	Faculty office		
(a)	Hayward	Classroom building No. 2	3,177	117	194	\$94,000	\$5,300,000 C 725,000 E
(b)	Bakersfield	Science building II	419	168	27	188,000	3,291,000 C 625,000 E
(c)	San Fernando	Business and economics building	3,791	108	220	282,000	5,472,000 C 565,000 E
(d)	Humboldt	Marine laboratory addition	96	27	2	18,000	307,000 C 60,000 E
(e)	San Diego	Humanities classroom building	2,819	--	141	130,000	3,804,000 C 230,000 E
(f)	San Luis Obispo	Faculty office building	--	--	150	90,000	1,553,000 C 35,000 E
(g)	San Bernardino	Classroom building	1,340	69	60	160,000	3,040,000 C 305,000 E
Total			11,642	489	794	\$962,000	\$22,767,000 C \$2,450,000 E

<sup>1</sup> Letter denotes: (C) construction, and (E) equipment.

The FTE capacity generated by the projects listed in Table 1 would be available in the 1975-76 fiscal year if construction funds are appropriated in the 1973-74 fiscal year. Table 2 indicates the projected instructional capacity deficiencies on each of the campuses in fiscal year 1975-76.

**Table 2**  
**California State Colleges**  
**F.T.E. (8-10) Capacity Needs in 1975-76**  
**Compared to Available <sup>1, 3</sup>**

State college	Lecture			Lab			Percent <sup>2</sup> deficient
	Available	1975-76 projected need	Deficiency (excess)	Available	1975-76 projected need	Deficiency (excess)	
Bakersfield.....	3,320	2,808	512	231	342	111	48.0
Chico.....	10,092	10,890	798	1,070	1,523	453	42.3
Dominguez.....	5,125	5,657	532	536	690	154	28.7
Fresno.....	11,176	13,319	2,143	904	1,784	880	97.3
Fullerton.....	10,969	14,330	3,361	947	1,354	407	43.0
Hayward.....	12,487	13,858	1,371	657	1,091	434	66.0
Humboldt.....	6,575	5,711	(864)	706	1,099	393	55.7
Kellogg-Voorhis...	9,025	10,223	1,198	1,135	1,358	223	19.6
Long Beach.....	17,819	19,439	1,620	1,578	2,246	668	42.3
Los Angeles.....	17,950	17,800	(150)	1,787	1,500	(287)	--
Sacramento.....	13,848	14,629	781	990	1,026	36	3.6
San Bernardino.....	3,846	4,130	284	208	504	296	142.3
San Diego.....	19,451	21,588	2,137	1,526	2,582	1,056	69.2
San Fernando.....	16,280	20,442	4,162	1,048	1,900	852	81.3
San Francisco.....	15,725	13,937	(1,788)	1,393	1,882	489	35.1
San Jose.....	20,103	19,769	(334)	1,849	2,430	581	31.4
San Luis Obispo ..	9,974	10,553	579	1,552	2,380	828	53.4
Sonoma.....	5,736	5,699	(37)	376	630	254	67.6
Stanislaus.....	3,774	4,460	686	247	544	297	120.2
Total.....	213,275	229,242	19,140 (3,173)	18,740	26,865	8,412 (287)	44.9

<sup>1</sup> Includes the effect of projects proposed for construction funding in fiscal year 1972-73.

<sup>2</sup> Indicates how much of an increase in lab space is required to correct the deficiency.

<sup>3</sup> Italicizing identifies campuses affected by the projects listed in Table 1.

Note: This table while similar to Table 12 included in analysis of Item 309 covers a period one year later.

### Need to Reprogram

The need to plan additional projects for the campuses listed on Table 1 is evident from the data in Table 2. However, it appears that the projects planned for Hayward, San Bernardino and San Diego are over designed in terms of lecture space. In addition, the San Bernardino and San Diego proposals fail to come to grips with the laboratory facilities deficit. We concur with the need for space on these campuses. However, we believe the facilities programmed should provide space that is more consistent with the needs identified in Table 2.

Technically, the Humboldt proposal presents the same problem as discussed above. The difference lies in the fact that it involves providing critically needed lecture and lab space contiguous with the marine laboratory located approximately 17 miles north of the campus at Trinidad. The facility is for the oceanography program and the ar-



**CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES—Continued**

rangement proposed will facilitate access to nearshore and offshore study areas and reduce travel time.

Data accompanying the trustees proposed capital outlay program for 1972-73 indicates that the San Luis Obispo campus will be deficient by 223 faculty offices in 1974-75. In addition, 101 existing faculty offices are located in old dormitories that will have to be demolished when construction commences on the new library. This project has been assigned a high priority in the state colleges program for future construction funding.

**Department of Agriculture****DISTRICT FAIR CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM**

Item 312 from the Fair and  
Exposition Fund

Budget p. 54 Program p. 205

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$74,530
Estimated 1971-72 .....	72,437
Actual 1970-71 .....	72,290
Requested increase \$2,093 (2.9 percent)	
Total recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS***Approval is recommended.*

This item reappropriates the sum of \$74,530 from the \$2.25 million continuing statutory appropriation payable from the Fair and Exposition Fund for county and district agricultural fairs or citrus fruit fairs. The money is used for engineering services performed by the Division of Fairs and Expositions of the Department of Agriculture. The services cover construction supervision on projects financed under Business and Professions Code Section 19630 for (1) permanent improvements for fair purposes, (2) the purchase of equipment for fair purposes, and (3) the acquisition or purchase of real property, including cost for appraisal and incidental costs.

**DISTRICT FAIR CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM**Item 313 from the Fair and  
Exposition Fund

Budget p. 54 Program p. 215

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$194,100
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS***Analysis*  
*Page*

We recommend Item 313 be revised to read, "The sum of \$194,100 of the money appropriated by Section 19630 of the Business and Professions Code for district agricultural fairs or citrus fruit fairs and expositions, is hereby reappropriated from the Fair and Exposition Fund during the 1972-73 fiscal year for capital outlay at the 1-A District Agricultural Association."

1201

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

This item appropriates the sum of \$194,100 from the Fair and Exposition Fund to the 1-A District Agricultural Association, the Cow Palace. This sum is for payment to the Cow Palace of about 67 percent of the repair costs stemming from a fire which occurred there on June 14, 1970. The fire destroyed a portion of one of the barn structures. The repairs cost about \$288,000 and were financed out of Cow Palace operating revenues. As a state agency, the Cow Palace is self-insured, necessitating payment for repairs out of operating revenues or other available state funds.

Section 19630 of the Business and Professions Code annually appropriates the sum of \$2.25 million from the second balance of the Fair and Exposition Fund. These funds are available on allocation by the Director of Agriculture for permanent improvements at designated fairs as well as purposes such as purchase of equipment or acquisition of real property.

After this allocation and certain other statutory allocations are made from the Fair and Exposition Fund, the General Fund receives its share. This share is the residual or remainder left in the Fair and Exposition Fund.

The Cow Palace may not receive funds under the language of Section 19630 from this \$2.25 million by *allocation* of the Director of Agriculture. However, the Legislature may *appropriate* funds from this capital outlay source to the Cow Palace. Allocations from these moneys have been made in the past for fire or similar losses at fairs which normally receive these capital outlay funds.

Under the language we recommend, the payment to the Cow Palace would be financed as a fair capital expense from the \$2.25 million capital outlay allocation. The result of appropriating \$194,100 from the

**DISTRICT FAIR CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM—Continued**

second balance of the Fair and Exposition Fund for capital outlay is to reduce the amount which may be allocated by the Director of Agriculture. The Governor's Budget proposes to leave \$2.25 million for capital outlay to be allocated by the Director of Agriculture and secure the \$194,100 from the Fair and Exposition Fund. Amendment of Item 313 as recommended will take the \$194,100 from the fixed amount of \$2.25 million rather than from the Fair and Exposition Fund revenues which go to the General Fund.

**DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME**

Item 314 from the Fish and  
Game Preservation Fund

Budget p. 105 Program p. 613

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$210,000
Recommended for approval .....	100,000
Recommended for special review.....	110,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item provides for the funding of six projects, one for site acquisition, four for working drawings and one for construction.

(a) Land acquisition—wildlife habitat..... \$10,000

*We recommend approval.*

In January 1972, the department released a report which identifies endangered and rare fish and wildlife within California and recommends protective measures for preserving each species. In this report, the department has identified the California bighorn sheep as a rare species and recommends the state purchase private lands that are essential for survival of this species.

This project is for the purchase of private property in northeastern San Bernardino County identified, by the department, as essential for survival of the bighorn sheep and likely to be developed if not acquired by the state.

(b) Working drawings—expansion of region I office.... \$20,000

*We recommend approval.*

The present facilities for this regional office consist of a 2,400-square-foot office building constructed in 1954 and several older buildings which are obsolete and substandard. This project proposes expansion of the existing office building to an 8,850-gross-square-foot facility, alterations to existing office space and demolition of the older facilities.

- (c) Working drawings—replacement of hatchery pond, Darrah Springs ..... \$30,000

*We recommend approval.*

This project is for the design of 60 standard concrete raceway ponds (100 feet x 10 feet x 3½ feet) to replace existing dirt ponds. The erosion problems arising from the dirt construction of the existing ponds has caused the raceway action to be destroyed. Replacement of the dirt ponds and installation of a recirculating system to provide five cubic feet per second (CFS) allows for automation and will produce up to 20 percent more fish.

- (d) Construct—replacement of hatchery ponds, Moccasin Creek ..... \$110,000

*We recommend special review.*

This request is for rebuilding 12 concrete ponds (100 feet x 10 feet 8 inches x 3½ feet) and modifying existing head and discharge flumes where necessary. The need for this project is justified.

However, the cost estimate for this project is not based on engineering drawings or current construction cost, therefore, the adequacy of the requested funds is uncertain. In order to ascertain the project needs, we recommend that the Office of Architecture and Engineering prepare a preliminary plan package, including a cost estimate. We believe this can be accomplished in time for budget hearings on this item, hence, we recommend special review.

- (e) Working drawings—replacement of hatchery ponds, San Joaquin Hatchery ..... \$30,000

*We recommend approval.*

This request will provide working drawings for construction of 48 standard concrete ponds and the necessary pumps and pipeline to recirculate up to 10 CFS of water. The proposed project is similar to the Darrah Springs project in that it is for the replacement of badly eroded dirt raceway ponds. In this case, also, the replacement will allow for automation and will produce up to 20 percent more fish.

- (f) Working drawings—operations building, Fillmore Hatchery ..... \$10,000

*We recommend approval.*

This request is for working drawings for construction of a 4,000-square-foot operations building to house office facilities, shop, storage, garage stalls and a refrigerated ice storage room. A separate public restroom facility of adequate size to accommodate the many hatchery visitors during the year will also be included in this project.

The existing facilities were constructed in 1944 and are inadequate for the needs of the department and are in such a state of deterioration that costly repairs would be required if they were to remain in use.

**UNALLOCATED**

Item 315 from the Harbors &  
Watercraft Revolving Fund

Budget p. 109 Program p. 633

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$40,000
Recommended for Approval .....	40,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

*We recommend approval.*

This item provides funds from the Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund for preliminary plans and specifications to be used as supporting data in requests for working drawings or construction appropriation in succeeding budgets. The Department of Finance, upon the approval of the State Public Works Board, allocates these funds. The projects generally include boating facilities as a part of a general recreational development project. As the reservoirs on the California Water Project near completion, there will be an increased level of activity.

**DEPARTMENT OF  
NAVIGATION AND OCEAN DEVELOPMENT**

Item 316 from the Harbors  
and Watercraft Revolving  
Fund

Budget p. 109 Program p. 632

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$1,952,000
Recommended for approval .....	None
Recommended for special review .....	\$1,952,000

---

**GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT**

One of the program objectives of the Department of Navigation and Ocean Development is to develop and improve boating facilities in the state. This objective is mainly accomplished through grants and loans to local agencies, but the department is also authorized to construct facilities.

The administration's reorganization plan of 1969 placed the responsibility for planning and developing boating facilities for the state park system within this department. This effort is financed by the Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund which derives its revenues from boat registration fees and a transfer from the Motor Vehicle Fund for fuel taxes.

Coordination with the Department of Parks and Recreation is required to integrate the boating plan into the overall area recreation plan.

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend special review.*

The budget requests \$1,952,000 for plans, working drawings and construction work on eight projects. The proposals appear reasonable, but the detail project plans and cost estimates of the Office of Architecture and Construction are not available.

We are deferring recommendation on all eight projects until the OAC plans and estimates are available.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

Item 317 from the funds accumulated under various budget acts, General Fund

Budget p. 114 Program p. 648

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$300,000
Recommended for approval .....	None
Recommended for special review .....	\$300,000

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend special review.*

This item proposes to appropriate \$300,000 for major capital outlay projects at Hearst Castle from reserves in the General Fund which were established by legislative action in prior budget bills. The reserves consist of the surplus of operating revenues over operating expenses at Hearst Castle.

To date no information regarding this project has been received from the department. Therefore, it is recommended that the \$300,000 requested be placed under special review.

## DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 318 from the State Park  
Contingent Fund

Budget p. 114 Program p. 646

Requested 1972-73 (project cost-fully reimbursed) .....	\$5,968,250
Recommended for approval .....	None
Recommended for special review .....	\$5,968,250

### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend special review.*

This item proposes to authorize through the State Park Contingent Fund the acquisition of nine projects on a fully reimbursed "no state cost basis." The proposed expenditure would consist of \$5,408,250 in reimbursements from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Act plus \$560,000 in reimbursements from the Save-the-Redwoods League. The acquisition costs shown in the item are half the estimated current market value of the property. The funds labeled as reimbursements are to be matched by a contribution from the current property owners or other parties.

The department introduced this concept of financing land acquisition during the last session. It has enabled the state to acquire extensive new park system lands. However the cost is not actually "zero" as is sometimes stated. The federal funds can be used for other purposes and therefore the true costs of these acquisitions are the alternative costs foregone. The lack of a comprehensive master park system plan does not permit evaluating these acquisitions against other alternative uses of the federal money for other acquisitions or for development purposes.

These land purchases are unusable in their present condition and generally lack utilities, access roads, and landscaping. They will require General Fund money to provide such facilities at a later date or some new source of financing. The result is to add to the backlog of undeveloped and unused units of the park system.

It should be noted that recent appraisals have shown a reduction in land values as shown in Table 1.

Table 1  
Changes in Appraised Values

<i>Project</i>	<i>Budgeted amount</i>	<i>Acquired cost</i>
Mt. Tamalpais .....	\$875,000	\$720,000
Annadel Farms .....	2,500,000	2,050,000
Big Basin Redwoods .....	500,000	500,000
Los Osos Oaks .....	254,000	240,000

To date no details have been received from the department on the scope, cost data, park values or intended use for the projects submitted in this item. We recommend that the entire item be placed under special review.

Experience to date with the acquisition program contained in Item 313.1, Budget Act of 1971, which used a format similar to Item 318, has shown deficiencies in the structure of the item. We believe that Item 318 needs to be redrafted to overcome these deficiencies and will recommend modification of it in our completed analysis.

### RECLAMATION BOARD

Item 319 from the General Fund      Budget p. 116      Program p. 661

Requested 1972-73.....	\$637,000
Recommended for approval .....	None
Recommended transfer .....	\$637,000

#### SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED TRANSFERS

	Amount	Analysis page
1. Delete this item and transfer the funds to the Department of Water Resources.....	\$637,000	1207

#### GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT

This item appropriates the capital outlay funds for the acquisition of lands, easements and rights-of-way for U.S. Corps of Engineers flood control projects in the central valley.

#### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend that this item be deleted and the funds transferred to the Department of Water Resources by a new capital outlay Item 319.1.* By language in the 1969 Budget Act, the Legislature declared that these funds were to be appropriated to the Department of Water Resources in order to achieve as nearly as possible an integrated, statewide flood control program administered and executed by the Department of Water Resources. The Legislature has consistently supported this position, through the Budget Acts of 1970 and 1971, and by the rejection of bills to return the funds to the Reclamation Board. The administration again proposes to reverse the Legislature's decision to have an integrated, statewide flood control program administered and executed by the Department of Water Resources. We recommend the item be deleted and the funds returned to the Department of Water Resources.



**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES**

Item 320 from the State Construction Program Fund

Budget p. 208 Program p. 1195

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$45,164,875
Recommended for approval.....	40,696,035
Recommended for special review.....	3,882,920
Recommended reduction .....	\$585,795

---

<b>SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS</b>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Analysis page</i>
1. Delete working drawings, construct and equip nursing addition, Shasta College, Shasta-Tehama-Trinity Community College District .....	\$77,686	1217
2. Delete construct and equip science building remodel, City College of San Francisco, San Francisco Community College District .....	\$508,109	1217

**SUMMARY OF MAJOR ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

	<i>Page</i>
1. Recommend revising priority listing of projects to reflect higher priority of instructional capacity and critical utility projects.	1210
2. Recommend state share of cost of offsite utility projects be based on campus volumetric demand on utility services.	1214
3. Recommend instruction resource centers be counted as capacity space and that the Coordinating Council for Higher Education establish a standard space allocation per station for this type space.	1216
4. Recommend equipment standards be established by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in cooperation with the community colleges.	1218

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Junior College Construction Bond Act of 1968, as approved by the electorate, authorized the sale of \$65 million in bonds for community college construction programs. The Budget Act of 1971 appropriated \$34,286,956 from the construction program fund established by the sale of the 1968 bonds, and this depleted the balance of the 1968 bond funds. The expenditure of these funds has financed a total construction program of approximately \$150 million including district and federal funds.

The community college capital outlay program for the budget year is based on the contingency that the "Community College Construction Program Bond Act of 1972," for \$160 million will be passed by the electorate in the November 1972 general election. Appropriations

from the General Fund or other special funds have not been requested. It should also be noted that the bond act, if passed, is to be used only for funding the state's share of the various projects, which in this request represents approximately 57 percent of the total program. All other funding must come from either the districts or the federal government. The community colleges are required to apply for federal funds in all applicable cases. In the event federal funds are granted for any particular project, that amount is deducted from the total project cost and the state's share is then based on the remaining amount. However, due to a dearth of federal funds, little or no federal grants are anticipated for the proposed program.

The state's participation in community college construction projects is based on a formula established by Chapter 1550, Statutes of 1967. This statute provides that financial sharing between the state and the district is to be based on a formula in which the ratio of total weekly student contact hours (WSCH) to assessed valuation of the district is compared with the ratio of statewide total WSCH to statewide assessed valuation of all districts. Where the district ratio is less than the statewide ratio, the state's share is proportionately reduced and conversely if the district ratio exceeds the state average, the state's share is proportionately increased. Where the ratio is on a par, the state and district share equally. As mentioned previously, the state's share for the requested program represents an average of 57.4 percent. This ranges from a low of 18.7 percent for the Los Angeles Community College District to a high of 91.2 percent for the Santa Clarita Junior College District.

As indicated in Table 1, the proposed program is composed of several definitive categories of construction projects totaling 154 projects at 42 districts. The state's share for these projects amounts to \$45,164,845 with the district's share of \$33,526,414 providing a total construction program of \$78,691,289. All projects included in the program are estimated at an "Engineering News Record" construction cost index of 1700, the projected level for July 1972 as proposed by the Department of Finance. The projects as listed in the Budget Bill are in priority order as submitted by the Board of Governors of the Community Colleges.

The first three projects in the priority listing were previously funded by the Budget Act of 1971. However, due to the shortage of capital outlay funds in the current year, it does not appear that cash for these projects will be available. In order to facilitate the completion of these projects, they have been included in the proposed program. In the event the funds become available in the current year, these projects will be deleted from the proposed program and funded from the 1971-72 funds. On the other hand, if the funds are not available, the 1971-72 appropriations for the projects will be reverted by Sections 11.3 and 11.7 in this bill in order to avoid double funding.

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES—Continued**

The next 31, (d) through (hh), projects in this priority listing are those which were initially approved for inclusion in the 1971-72 budget submittal but were subsequently not funded in the Budget Act of 1971. These projects generally, are noncapacity facilities and were at the lowest priority in the list approved for submittal in fiscal year 1971-72. The community colleges have taken the position that these "carryover" projects should have a relatively higher priority than current year requests due to the one-year delay. We do not agree with the placing of noncapacity projects high in the priority list simply because of carryover from the prior year request. For example; in the proposed list priority (ii) for phase I utilities (offsite) at Cerro Coso College in Kern County is a critical project in that if it is not funded the campus cannot operate. We believe therefore, it should be placed ahead of noncapacity projects from the prior year. There are also many projects for the equipping of capacity facilities such as the science center and forum at Cuesta College, the business education building at Saratoga campus and several others which in our opinion are of a much higher priority than the noncapacity facilities. *Hence, we recommend that the priority listing be changed to reflect the realities of high priority needs for critical utility, equipment and instructional capacity type projects.*

Preliminary plans, outline specifications, equipment lists and cost estimates were made available to the Department of Finance and the Legislative Analyst's office prior to inclusion of these projects in the Governor's Budget. We have reviewed this material with both the Department of Finance and the Chancellor's office. Several projects were adjusted downward in cost from the original community college proposals, and some projects were deferred due to the lack of justifiable need. During our review of these projects, an attempt was made to include, in the case of academic instructional facilities, only those facilities which were justified on the basis of weekly student contact-hour instructional demand versus existing campus capacity. The attempt was to not allow capacity to exceed demand in the anticipated year of occupancy. In most cases, the campus capacity will be at approximately 90 to 97 percent of the projected need. In the case of noncapacity facilities such as libraries, administrative offices, etc., only those projects meeting basic needs are included in the budget. The adjustments in cost are a reflection of current construction costs and elimination of some areas which the state does not support (i.e., single purpose auditoriums, excessive space above standard, student centers, etc.). With the exception of two building projects and two offsite utility projects, we are in agreement with the projects and amounts as shown in the budget. We are also concerned with the equipment costs, hence, we have recommended special review of that category.

**TABLE 1**  
**SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY COLLEGES**  
**1972-73 CAPITAL OUTLAY PROGRAM**

<i>Category</i>	<i>Community college district</i>	<i>Number of projects</i>	<i>Amount of state funds requested</i>	<i>Amount of district funds required</i>	<i>Total cost for requested project</i>
<b>I. Site acquisition</b>					
	Grossmont .....	1	\$939,064	\$282,800	\$1,221,944
	Los Angeles .....	1	112,948	491,052	604,000
	San Diego .....	1	622,920	537,080	1,160,000
	West Valley .....	1	1,476,100	1,392,900	2,869,000
	Subtotal .....	4	\$3,151,032	\$2,703,832	\$5,854,864
<b>II. Utilities and/or site development</b>					
	Contra Costa .....	1	\$216,878	\$256,654	\$473,532
	Fremont-Newark .....	1	274,443	90,508	364,951
	Kern .....	1	218,779	214,019	432,798
	Marin .....	2	598,284	929,901	1,528,185
	San Jose .....	1	185,132	264,763	449,895
	Santa Clarita .....	1	168,860	17,849	186,709
	Ventura .....	2	517,019	514,955	1,031,974
	Subtotal .....	9	\$2,179,395	\$2,288,649	\$4,468,044
<b>III. Working drawings</b>					
<b>A. Utilities and/or site development</b>					
	Los Angeles .....	1	\$10,554	\$45,887	\$56,441
	San Jose .....	1	5,957	8,520	14,477
	Ventura .....	1	26,004	25,901	51,905
	Subtotal .....	3	\$42,515	\$80,308	\$122,823
<b>B. Facilities</b>					
	Butte .....	3	\$104,607	\$46,450	\$151,057
	Cerritos .....	1	62,320	40,858	103,178
	Coast .....	5	134,038	60,783	194,821
	Glendale .....	1	39,678	36,261	75,939
	Los Angeles .....	1	7,707	33,507	41,214
	Los Rios .....	3	274,292	125,842	400,174
	Marin .....	8	93,695	145,599	239,294
	Napa .....	1	78,016	38,426	116,442
	North Orange County....	2	143,292	86,159	229,451
	Peralta .....	2	94,224	76,316	170,540
	Saddleback .....	1	84,942	82,266	167,208
	San Diego .....	1	61,323	52,873	114,196
	San Francisco .....	1	71,762	149,043	220,805
	San Joaquin Delta .....	2	312,973	223,859	536,832
	San Jose .....	1	18,089	25,870	43,959
	San Luis Obispo County .....	2	68,524	60,280	128,804

## CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES—Continued

TABLE 1—Continued

Category	Community college district	Number of projects	Amount of state funds requested	Amount of district funds required	Total cost for requested project
	Santa Barbara .....	2	73,594	62,943	136,537
	State Center .....	2	46,582	39,362	85,944
	Ventura .....	1	14,996	14,935	29,931
	Yuba .....	1	28,821	21,565	50,386
Subtotal .....		41	\$1,813,475	\$1,423,197	\$3,236,672
IV. Construction-facilities					
	Allan Hancock .....	1	\$58,273	\$30,019	\$88,292
	Butte .....	3	2,031,789	902,203	2,933,992
	Coast .....	2	1,404,713	637,022	2,041,735
	Contra Costa .....	3	1,738,044	2,056,811	3,794,855
	Fremont-Newark .....	4	2,012,208	663,601	2,675,809
	Grossmont .....	1	78,612	23,681	102,293
	Kern .....	5	774,650	757,795	1,532,445
	Lassen .....	1	521,198	55,987	577,185
	Long Beach .....	1	126,559	109,119	235,678
	Los Angeles .....	1	517,278	2,248,912	2,766,190
	Los Rios .....	2	647,442	297,040	944,482
	Marin .....	2	313,478	487,233	800,711
	Merced .....	2	239,975	85,415	325,390
	Mt. San Antonio .....	1	164,134	139,817	303,951
	North Orange County .....	2	3,053,825	1,836,207	4,890,032
	Oceanside-Carlsbad .....	1	149,095	94,525	243,620
	Pasadena .....	1	91,434	56,878	148,312
	Peralta .....	1	915,692	741,669	1,657,361
	Rancho Santiago .....	1	1,179,054	1,169,659	2,348,713
	Redwoods .....	1	1,022,840	403,715	1,426,555
	San Bernardino .....	2	435,104	356,715	791,819
	San Francisco .....	1	508,109	1,055,302	1,563,411
	San Jose .....	2	2,430,361	3,475,741	5,906,102
	San Luis Obispo County .....	1	1,132,560	996,312	2,128,872
	Santa Barbara .....	1	1,073,687	918,311	1,991,998
	Santa Clarita .....	5	6,580,092	676,685	7,256,777
	Santa Monica .....	1	125,677	41,114	166,791
	Shasta-Tehama-Trinity .....	1	77,686	56,952	134,638
	Solano .....	1	764,522	485,719	1,250,241
	State Center .....	6	2,180,522	1,842,581	4,023,103
	Sweetwater .....	1	920,354	328,430	1,248,784
	Ventura .....	1	991,181	987,225	1,978,406
	West Valley .....	2	351,185	331,390	682,575
	Yuba .....	1	86,986	65,087	152,073
Subtotal .....		62	\$34,698,319	\$24,414,872	\$59,113,191

TABLE 1—Continued

Category	Community college district	Number of projects	Amount of state funds requested	Amount of district funds required	Total cost for requested project
V. Equipment					
	Butte .....	4	\$366,841	\$162,894	\$529,735
	Contra Costa .....	2	418,962	495,803	914,765
	Fremont-Newark .....	7	602,004	198,533	800,537
	Hartnell .....	2	119,061	128,983	248,044
	Kern.....	1	127,385	124,612	251,997
	Los Rios .....	1	21,936	10,064	32,000
	Marin.....	1	141,527	219,973	361,500
	Merced .....	1	51,461	18,317	69,778
	Mt. San Jacinto .....	1	12,754	38,672	51,426
	North Orange County....	1	14,597	8,777	23,374
	Peralta.....	1	18,014	14,591	32,605
	Saddleback .....	1	221,603	214,624	436,227
	San Diego.....	1	50,982	43,956	94,938
	San Joaquin Delta .....	1	403,779	288,809	692,588
	San Luis Obispo County .....	2	165,565	145,647	311,212
	San Mateo .....	1	69,953	110,337	180,290
	Santa Barbara .....	1	2,728	2,334	5,062
	Solano.....	1	139,344	88,528	227,872
	State Center .....	3	131,076	110,761	241,837
	West Valley .....	2	200,567	189,261	389,828
	Subtotal.....	35	\$3,280,139	\$2,615,476	\$5,895,615
	TOTAL .....	154	\$45,164,875	\$33,526,414	\$78,691,289

A detailed description of each project would require a prohibitive amount of space in this analysis. Consequently, we have grouped the projects into five definitive categories to coincide with Table 1. In each category we described one or more projects chosen at random, except for the four projects for which we have recommended either special review or deletion. The total shown for each category is the state's share only.

(a) Site acquisition ..... \$3,151,032

*We recommend approval.*

This category covers four projects in four districts. The largest single request is for \$1,476,100 for acquisition of the new Mission campus site in the West Valley Joint Community College District. The proposed site is 145.55 acres and is located in the northern portion of the district, north of the Bayshore Freeway, east of Coffin Road, and is completely within the district. The total planned site is to be 164.30 acres of which the district presently owns 18.75 acres. The site is flat, well drained, and preliminary soil investigations have shown that adequate load-bearing qualities are present. The site is also easily accessible, being served by the Bayshore Freeway from the south and east, and the Lawrence Expressway on the west. The 10-year program for this dis-

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES—Continued**

trict projects that the Mission campus in fiscal year 1974-75 will have approximately 18,000 WSCH, and by fiscal year 1979-80 in excess of 54,000 WSCH. This project was funded by Item 301.9, Budget Act of 1971 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education. However, due to the uncertainty of these funds, the community colleges have placed this project in the Bond Act of 1972. The funds provided by the 1971 Budget Act are to be reverted under Section 11.3 of this bill. We are in agreement with both the reversion of the funds and the inclusion of this project in this request.

The smallest project in this group is for the acquisition of approximately 1.7 acres for the Los Angeles Trade-Technical College in the Los Angeles Community College District. The college currently owns 0.67 acre adjacent to the new site, bringing the total area on this block to 2.37 acres. This acquisition will allow for expansion to the east of the campus improving accessibility and circulation. The new site has several small buildings which will be used, as they become available, for expansion of instructional programs in sign painting, flexographic printing, metal finishing, and building and grounds management. The ultimate use for this site, as indicated in the 10-year plan, will be for the construction of the technical building.

(b) Utilities and/or site development ..... \$2,179,395

*We recommend special review of \$602,781.*

This category contains nine projects at seven separate districts. They are for general site development, onsite utility projects and offsite utility projects. We recommend approval of all projects except two which are for offsite utility construction. For these two, one in the Kern Community College District and one in the Ventura Community College District, we recommend special review.

The offsite utility work in the Ventura Community College District is at Oxnard College and is for the installation of a sanitary sewer on Oxnard city property. The cost of installation is to be shared equally between the district and the city. We do not believe this to be an equitable sharing basis as the college does not contribute to 50 percent of the use demand on the sewage line. For example, the largest sewerline anticipated on campus will be eight inches in diameter, while the offsite sewage line is to be a 12-inch-diameter pipe. This additional size pipe is necessary due to the anticipated future development in this area. The increase in pipe size represents a volume capacity increase of 125 percent at full flow. Hence, the college campus demand on the 12-inch pipe is only 44 percent of the total if the eight-inch line carries a full flow. *We recommend the state's share for this project be based on the volumetric demand and not a 50-50 sharing.*

The offsite project in the Kern Community College District is for the Cerro Coso campus and covers the installation of a main waterline and sanitary sewerline. In this case, the cost of installation is to be

shared with the Ridgecrest Sanitary District for the sewerline only. The proration of sharing cost to be determined by the Ridgecrest district at some future date. The cost for the waterline installation is to be borne by the district and state alone. Again, on this campus the maximum anticipated size for the on-campus sewage line is an 8-inch-diameter pipe. However, the offsite installation proposes a line consisting of an 8-inch-, 10-inch-, 12-inch- and 18-inch-diameter line, increasing as it nears the City of Ridgecrest. This sewerline is obviously increased in size to meet future demands of the Ridgecrest Sanitary District. The main waterline, although no size is indicated, is certainly sized to provide for future needs in the water district. It is understandable that the districts would want the underground utilities sized to meet future needs. However, we do not believe the state should share in this increased initial cost. We recommend, therefore, that the state's share in this project be based on the campus volumetric demand in the case of a sewage line and usage demand in the case of the waterline, and further that the community colleges submit the revised costs for the respective utility projects prior to inclusion in the budget act.

Another point that should be mentioned in regard to the Cerro Coso project is the cost for plan checking by the Ridgecrest Sanitation District. This fee is to be 3½ percent (\$5,000) of the sewer construction cost. This type of installation does not include structural problems and should not require extensive checking. Also, the plans of the community colleges must be prepared by an engineer licensed to practice in this state. While the need for close coordination is certainly necessary, it should not involve a cost of 3½ percent of the construction cost. *Hence, we recommend the state share for this project not include any portion of this plan check fee.*

(c) Working drawings ..... \$1,855,990

*We recommend approval.*

This category consists of 44 projects in 20 separate districts. As indicated in Table 1, three of these projects (\$42,515) are working drawings for utilities and/or site development and 41 projects (\$1,813,475) are working drawings for building construction. These include both capacity and noncapacity projects. The capacity type space would include such projects as the paramedical building at Cerritos, business-law enforcement-home economics building at Butte, and the business-English-math-technical building at San Luis Obispo-Cuesta College. Noncapacity space includes such facilities as the library at Yuba College and the men's gymnasium at North Orange County-Cypress campus.

The paramedical building at Cerritos is proposed at 47,040 gross square feet at an estimated construction cost level of approximately \$40 per gross square foot and a total project cost of \$50.50 per gross square foot. The building will provide space for 12 disciplines and a total of 16,275 WSCH in 1974, the anticipated year of occupancy. An



**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES—Continued**

exceptional feature in this building is the proposal to design laboratories for use by multiple departments, where necessary, to assure 100 percent utilization of the laboratory space. We certainly encourage this effort, as we have continually stressed the need to increase the utilization of laboratory space. In 1974 this project will provide 100 percent of the campuswide space needs for classrooms and teaching laboratories. However, due to anticipated increased enrollment the percentage drops to 94 percent by 1976.

The library project at Yuba College is for an addition of 19,401 assignable square feet to the existing library and for remodeling 3,027 assignable square feet (ASF). The project will provide for an additional 649 study stations of which 85 stations are in a listening/viewing language laboratory. The laboratory will serve as an "instructional materials center" rather than strictly traditional library space. The lab is 3,200 ASF of the new facility, and the use of this space is of an instructional nature. Hence, we believe the space should be counted as capacity. We, therefore, recommend that this space and similar space in other districts be counted as capacity and included in the campus capacity charts. *We further recommend that the Coordinating Council for Higher Education establish a standard space allocation per station for this type of space to assure uniform application throughout the system.*

The project at Yuba provides for 107 percent of the total library needs in the year of occupancy (1974), and due to increased enrollment drops to 96 percent by 1976. In the year prior to occupancy, the current library space provides only 59 percent of need, and without the addition the capacity would be at 54 percent of need in 1974.

(d) Construction ..... \$34,698,319

*We recommend reduction in the amount of \$585,795.*

This category proposes construction funds for 62 projects at 34 separate districts. It includes projects for which working drawings and construction or working drawings, construction and equipment, or construction only have been requested. The projects range in estimated cost from \$44,884 for an administration addition at Golden West College in the Coast Community College District to \$2,218,257 for a humanities building at Cypress College in the North Orange County Community College District. We reiterate our recommendation that all facilities which contain instructional materials or resources centers should count that type of space as capacity. The inclusion of this space in the capacity tables would not change the current campus needs for these facilities. However, it could have a direct bearing on the needs for future buildings. The following covers our recommended reduction.

The nursing building at Shasta College in the Shasta-Tehama-Trinity District is planned to provide a 4,923 ASF addition to the existing

building. The new area will provide 3,173 ASF of student capacity space and 1,750 ASF of noncapacity space. However, the state's support for this project is only for the 1,900 assignable square foot laboratory portion. The basis for state support of the laboratory only is due to overcapacity of other types of space on this campus. For example, comparing capacity to need, the campus in 1974 (the year this facility would be occupied) the classroom and seminar space would be at 110 percent of need, class laboratories at 86 percent, faculty offices at 122 percent and library space at 115 percent. On the other hand, if the facility is not constructed, the capacities would be 105 percent, 82 percent, 114 percent and 115 percent respectively. While the need for additional space for nursing appears justified, it is our contention that better utilization of existing space will provide the capacity to meet that requirement. *Hence, we recommend deletion of this project, reducing the request by \$77,686.*

The science building remodeling project at City College of San Francisco is proposed in order to update and expand laboratory facilities for biological sciences, chemistry and physics and, to a lesser extent, for engineering. We have reviewed this proposal in detail and cannot recommend approval at this time.

The project as now contemplated will decrease the space for classrooms by 5,099 ASF (7,610 WSCH) and faculty office space by 1,523 ASF (11 FTE) reducing campus capacity to 80 percent and 57 percent of need respectively. The project will provide for increased laboratory space of 12,171 ASF (3,471 WSCH) increasing the campus class laboratory capacity from 91 percent to 97 percent of need.

We have reservations regarding several aspects of the scope of this project. For example, the work contains several items which normally would be considered maintenance and special repairs such as \$5,200 for cleaning and repairing venetian blinds, \$1,800 to refinish existing laboratory tables, and \$44,000 for new tabletops on existing bases. Also included in the work are what appear to be extravagant and nebulous costs such as \$76,000 for hold-open hardware for operable casement windows, \$79,000 for miscellaneous incidentals, and \$59,000 for replacement of existing fixed tablet-arm seating with new tablet-arm seating. While some of these proposals may be desirable, they could hardly be classified as necessary or critical. Hopefully, the campus will rescope this project not only to reduce the cost but also to redesign the remodeling in such a way that loss of classroom and faculty space is not so significant. *Hence, we recommend deletion of this project for a reduction of \$508,109.*

(e) Equipment..... \$3,280,139

*We recommend special review.*

This category covers requests for equipping 35 facilities in 20 separate districts. The proposals are based on historical standards as applied to the state colleges, in areas of common construction (i.e.,

**CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES—Continued**

biology, chemistry, etc.). In technical trade areas and two-year terminal areas, which are unique to community colleges, a standard equipment requirement has not been established, and therefore it is not possible to evaluate actual needs or uniform application throughout the districts. In the case of construction areas common to state colleges, it is apparent that the state college equipment requirements are greater than the community college districts due to the offering of upper division and graduate level work which is not the case at the community college level. However, the equipment cost difference due to the higher level instruction has not been determined and requires considerable study. The areas of instruction unique to community colleges also need to be studied to determine the basic needs for equipment to provide the educational experience related to such specialties. *We, therefore, recommend that the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, in cooperation with the Board of Governors of the Community Colleges, prepare standards for basic equipment needs for all areas of instruction at the community college level.*

*We further recommend that the equipment funds requested in this item not be released for expenditure until the equipment standards are established and further that when the new standards are established, the funds be adjusted to reflect the changes.*

This recommendation should not cause a hardship on the community colleges as the requested funds cannot become available prior to the November general election, and then only if passed by the electorate. We believe the coordinating council and the community colleges should have the standards established by that time.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

Item 321 from the State Beach,  
Park, Recreational and His-  
torical Facilities Fund.

Budget p. 114 Program p. 641

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$84,048
Estimated 1971-72 .....	88,820
Actual 1970-71 .....	81,622
Requested decrease \$4,772 (5.4 percent)	
Total recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item appropriates \$84,048 from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund for the cost of administering the local grant projects financed from the same fund. This money is reim-

bursed to Item 211 which is the main support item for the Department of Parks and Recreation.

## DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 322 from the State

Beach, Park, Recreation and  
Historical Facilities Fund

Budget p. 114 Program p. 646

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$388,200
Recommended for approval .....	None
Recommended for special review .....	\$388,200

---

### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend special review.*

This item proposes three major acquisitions to expand existing park units. These acquisitions are proposed to be financed by the use of remaining money in the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Fund plus anticipated federal reimbursements from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund.

No information on these acquisitions has been received from the department, and we are placing them in the category of special review.

The State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Fund was created by Chapter 5, Statutes 1965, to provide \$85,000,000 for acquisition of land and beaches for inclusion within the state park system. Normally appraisal and acquisition activity is accomplished through the property acquisition service in the Department of General Services based upon property selections made by the Department of Parks and Recreation. These proposed acquisitions have not been appraised in this manner. In addition there is no evidence that these projects have been processed in the manner prescribed in the bond act for expenditures that are not augmentations to authorized projects.

Table 1 brings up to date the status of acquisitions under the 1964 Park Bond Acquisition Program. It also illustrates the lack of progress in obtaining those properties previously selected by the department as being desirable additions to the park system and approved by the Legislature. The acquisition at Calaveras Big Trees State Park, for example, has been delayed again. Other acquisitions such as Delta Meadows, Old River Islands, Coyote River Parkway and Huntington Beach have lagged although the department assured the Legislature last session that these acquisitions would be expedited. As a practical matter, meeting the time schedules of the land donors involved in the matched fund acquisitions has displaced most of these long-standing appropriations from acquisition priority. It is now doubtful that some

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION—Continued**

of them will ever be acquired. On the other hand it should be noted that at least one acquisition, the Topanga Canyon Project, has proceeded well.

Table 1

**State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Fund Acquisition  
Appropriations and Expenditures as of November 30, 1971**

Project appropriations	Amount available	Expenditures	Balance	Acres	
				Acquired to date	To be acquired
Calaveras Big Trees S.P. (Item 423/66) <sup>1</sup> -----	448,500	23,508	424,992 <sup>1</sup>	--	981
Cardiff S.B. (Item 313/71)-----	510,000	330	509,670	--	--
Carpinteria S.B. (Item 377.1/68) <sup>1</sup> -----	191,000	7,062	183,938 <sup>1</sup>	--	7.5
Coyote River Parkway (Item 423/66) <sup>1</sup> -----	2,500,000	1,496,829	1,003,171 <sup>1</sup>	357	18
Delta Meadows (Item 362/65) <sup>1</sup> -----	765,000	81,509	683,491 <sup>1</sup>	--	710
(Item 343.7/67) <sup>1</sup> -----	320,000	--	320,000 <sup>1</sup>	--	--
Doheny S.B. (Ch. 1223/71, Item 313A)-----	2,100,000	--	2,100,000	--	8
El Presidio de Santa Barbara S.H.P. (Item 422/69) <sup>1</sup> -----	450,000	120,256	329,744 <sup>1</sup>	--	0.5
Emma Wood S.B. (Item 422/69) <sup>1</sup> -----	1,425,000	1,020,984	404,016 <sup>1</sup>	21	12
(Item 313/71)-----	387,500	--	387,500	--	--
Gaviota Refugio S.B. (Item 423/66) <sup>1</sup> -----	4,519,559	4,274,893	244,666 <sup>1</sup>	2,665	379
Huntington S.B. (Item 362/65) <sup>1</sup> -----	2,518,000	35,053	2,482,947 <sup>1</sup>	--	45
MacKerricher S.P. (Item 423/66) <sup>1</sup> -----	62,500	20,537	41,963 <sup>1</sup>	.51	.49
Montana de Oro S.P. (Item 423/66) <sup>1</sup> -----	1,784,700	1,336,042	448,658 <sup>1</sup>	1,326.71	510
(Item 313/71)-----	950,000	--	950,000	--	--
Montgomery Woods S.R. (Item 343.7/67) <sup>1</sup> -----	65,500	58,000	7,500 <sup>1</sup>	--	27.5
Old River Islands (Item 423/66) <sup>1</sup> -----	790,150	9,971	780,179 <sup>1</sup>	--	980
Old Sacramento S.H.P. (Item 423/66) <sup>1</sup> -----	1,223,000	403,649	819,351 <sup>1</sup>	1.7	7.3
Pfeiffer Big Sur S.B. (Item 343.7/67) <sup>1</sup> -----	100,000	--	100,000 <sup>1</sup>	--	26
Picacho S.R.A. (Item 313/71)-----	186,000	62	185,938	--	51
Pismo S.B. (Item 313/71)-----	2,750,000	971	2,749,029	--	1,100
Santa Monica Mountains (Item 423/66) <sup>1</sup> -----	8,000,000	6,626,497	1,373,503 <sup>1</sup>	2,025	105
Sugarloaf Ridge S.P. (Item 313/71)-----	285,000	1,191	283,809	--	470
Torrey Pines S.R. (Item 343.6/67) <sup>1</sup> -----	900,000	772,585	127,415 <sup>1</sup>	93.24	108.76
Twin Lakes S.B. (Item 378.3/68) <sup>1</sup> -----	300,000	111,509	188,491 <sup>1</sup>	4	2
Statewide (Item 362/65)-----	845	--	845	--	--
(Item 422/69)-----	958,000	--	958,000	--	--
	34,490,254	16,401,438	18,088,810	--	--
Less:					
Reimbursements from Federal Land & Water Conservation Fund (Item 313/71)-----	-3,092,880	--	-3,092,880	--	--
Net total-----	31,397,374	16,401,438	14,995,936	4,483	5,522

<sup>1</sup> These items are proposed for reappropriation in Item 325.

Item 322

CAPITAL OUTLAY

1221

66 13 4 425

## DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION—Continued

## DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 323 from the State  
 Beach, Park, Recreational  
 and Historical Facilities  
 Fund

Budget p. 114 Program p. 646

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$4,112,500
Recommended for approval .....	none
Recommended for special review .....	112,500
Recommended reduction .....	\$4,000,000

---

## ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATION

*We recommend special review for Pendleton Beach and tentatively recommend deletion of La Jolla Valley development at Point Mugu.*

This item is the department's capital outlay request for minimum development financed from the \$20,000,000 established for that purpose in the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Act. Restrictions in that act limit minimum development to public access, water and sanitary facilities, and public safety on lands acquired with bond funds. Only a preliminary plan outlining some general details of the proposed Point Mugu project for 1972-73 have been received.

Despite the lengthy hearings devoted to discussion of the Point Mugu project during the last legislative session, the project still has problems. For example, Item 318(i) proposes the acquisition of the Danielson property which is a large parcel adjacent to the existing park boundary on the northeast. Such an acquisition will affect the general development for the present Point Mugu property.

Development of the present property is not a separate problem from the acquisition and development potential of the Danielson property. The two parcels integrate logically to enhance the entire park. The department has not acknowledged this interrelationship and apparently does not feel that the development of each parcel affects the rest of the property. We would submit that the problem of roads, water supply and sewage treatment are prime examples of close interrelationships.

A recent onsite inspection at Point Mugu revealed that the information presented last session on the alignments and elevation of the access road to La Jolla Valley was not correct. From a topographical and engineering standpoint there are three alternatives for the access road to terminate at or enter La Jolla Valley. The department's proposal involves the greatest intrusion of the road into the valley. Fur-

thermore, preliminary plans show that the 1972-73 scale back of the general development plan that was denied approval last session still involves significant intrusion of major development into La Jolla Valley. We are tentatively recommending deletion of the funds for development at Point Mugu based on preliminary information and subject to further analysis.

No specific information, drawings, or cost details have been submitted on the Pendleton Beach project. Substantial use of the three miles of beach is now being accomplished despite the lack of facilities or access. We recommend special review for this project.

### DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 324 from the State Beach,  
Park, Recreational and His-  
torical Facilities Fund

Budget p. 114 Program p. 655

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$119,500
Estimated 1971-72 .....	135,000
Actual 1970-71 .....	119,864
Requested decrease \$15,500 (11.5 percent)	
Total recommended reduction .....	None

---

### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

This item will finance departmental planning costs for minimum development projects funded by the \$20,000,000 in the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Facilities Bond Act. These development funds can be utilized only on land acquired by this same bond act. This appropriation is a reimbursement to support Item 211 of the Department of Parks and Recreation.



**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Item 325 Reappropriations**  
 from the State Beach, Park,  
 Recreational and Historical  
 Facilities Fund

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend special review and in addition reversion of \$1,802,000 appropriated for Cardiff Beach last session.*

This item proposes to reappropriate funds for 18 acquisitions and 4 minimum development projects financed from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Fund. The citation and title of each of these projects is shown below. Details on the status of augmentation is shown under Table 1, Item 322.

Nearly all of these acquisition items were proposed for reappropriation during the last session and approval was granted. At that time, we pointed out the lack of acquisition progress on most of these appropriations, many of which date back to 1965 and 1966. The department indicated it would expedite acquisition but only limited progress has been made.

The acquisitions being reappropriated are:

Item 362 (a, b, c.): Budget Act of 1965—Delta Meadows, Huntington Beach, Pfeiffer Big Sur

Item 423(a): Budget Act of 1966—Montana de Oro, Calaveras Big Trees

Item 423(c): Budget Act of 1966—Coyote River Parkway

Item 423(f): Budget Act of 1966—Gaviota Refugio

Item 423(h): Budget Act of 1966—Old Sacramento

Item 423(i): Budget Act of 1966—Picacho, SRA

Item 423(m): Budget Act of 1966—Old River Islands

Item 423(q): Budget Act of 1966—12 miscellaneous projects

Item 423(r): Budget Act of 1966—Augmentation to the 12 projects

Item 423(t): Budget Act of 1966—Santa Monica Mountains

Item 343.7(b) Delta Meadows, Budget Act of 1967

Item 343.7(c) Pfeiffer Big Sur, Budget Act of 1967

Item 377.1(a): Budget Act of 1968—Carpinteria State Beach

Item 422(a): Budget Act of 1969—Emma Wood State Beach

Item 422(b): Budget Act of 1969—El Presidio de Santa Barbara

The minimum development projects being reappropriated are:

Item 424(c): Budget Act of 1966—Point Mugu, \$3,002,150, initial appropriation.

Item 378(a): Budget Act of 1968—Old Sacramento, \$375,000, initial appropriation.

Item 423(a): Budget Act of 1969—San Diego Old Town, \$250,000, initial appropriation.

Item 423(c): Budget Act of 1969—Gaviota Refugio, \$225,000, initial

appropriation.

#### Recommended Reversions

In Item 313, Budget Act of 1971, an acquisition request of \$510,000 for Cardiff State Beach was approved. We recommend that this item be reverted along with accompanying development funds in Item 314(ax), Budget Act of 1971, in the amount of \$1,292,000. The restrictions in the 1964 State Beach, Park, Recreation and Historical Facilities Act do not allow the minimum development money to be used on any property not acquired with bond funds.

The Cardiff acquisition involved a complex transaction in which the department was to acquire certain beach property. As part of the exchange transaction the department was to contribute \$1,292,000 to fill a portion of a lagoon behind the property as partial payment for the beach property. The project was not detailed at the time of legislative hearings and its deficiencies were not discernable. There is no apparent legal basis for the project to proceed. We recommend that all funds be reverted.

Because of lack of acquisition progress on several projects, we plan to review them for possible recommendation of reversion of funds. As stated under Item 323, we are also tentatively recommending reversion of the access road and water supply funds for Point Mugu.

### Department of Fish and Game WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD

Item 326 from the Recreation  
and Fish and Wildlife En-  
hancement Fund

Budget p. 106 Program p. 616

Requested 1972-73.....	\$1,480,000
Recommended for approval .....	60,000
Recommended for special review .....	775,000
Recommended reduction .....	\$645,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS	Analysis	
	Amount	page
Delete (c) Fishing access sites—state water facilities .....	\$645,000	1226

#### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATION

This item would finance construction projects for the modernization and expansion of two fish hatcheries, development of fishing access sites at state water facilities in cooperation with local government, and wildlife habitat development projects along the California aqueduct. The Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Bond Act of 1970 provided \$6 million to the board for the design and con-

**WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD—Continued**

struction of fish and wildlife enhancement projects and fishing access sites in connection with the State Water Project. This item is a portion of the \$6 million.

- (a) Construction—expansion, Phase II, Black Rock Rearing Ponds ..... \$200,000
- (b) Construction—modernization and expansion, Fish Springs Hatchery ..... \$500,000

*We recommend special review.*

These projects are a portion of a total construction project for the expansion and/or reconstruction of seven fish hatcheries throughout the state. The projects are necessary to increase fish production to accommodate additional recreational facilities in the State Water Project and as provided by the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Bond Act of 1970.

The project at Black Rock is for one large production pond approximately 200 feet x 600 feet constructed of dirt with a concrete fish flume 100 feet x 10 feet and the necessary water pumping equipment. It is anticipated that the construction of the pond and flume will increase the trout production at this facility by approximately 500,000 catchable trout per year. Due to the expansion of this facility, it will be necessary for a new position to be established for the increased workload. As this is a remote area, a new residence will be required. Hence, this project also includes the construction of a standard Department of Fish and Game three-bedroom residence.

The project at Fish Springs Hatchery is proposed to rebuild the entire hatchery pond system which includes the filling of existing dirt ponds and the replacement with 60 standard concrete raceway ponds with the necessary aerators and water pump system. After modernization and expansion of this hatchery, catchable trout production will be increased between 600,000 to 1,200,000 per year.

The 1971 Budget Act provided \$180,000 to finance the preparation of preliminary and working drawings for the seven fish hatcheries in this program. Preliminary or working drawings have not been prepared for these projects, hence, we have no information to substantiate the adequacy of the amount requested. Therefore, we recommend special review of these projects in anticipation of receiving further information prior to budget hearings on this item.

- (c) Fishing access sites—state water facilities ..... \$645,000

*We recommend that this item be deleted.*

This request is for development of fishing access sites as proposed by the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Bond Act of 1970. As previously stated, the bond act requires that access sites be developed in order to realize the recreational benefits from the State Water Project facilities. It is anticipated that access facilities to the California aqueduct will be located in Stanislaus, Fresno, Kings, Kern,

Lös Angeles and San Bernardino Counties, and that additional facilities will be constructed at state reservoirs in Butte County. These facilities are all to be developed cooperatively with and maintained by local government. However, access site locations have not been determined nor have any specific project information or cost estimates been developed. The access sites should be closely coordinated with the respective local governments and with other state departments that are also developing the reservoirs under this bond program. Specific budget detail should be developed in order to determine the adequacy of the requested funds. We, therefore, recommend deletion of this item until the necessary information is developed in cooperation with the local governments.

(d) Wildlife habitat development ..... \$60,000

*We recommend approval.*

This request is for a project which consists of two segments. The first segment is for the development of approximately 180 miles of right-of-way along the California aqueduct. This development will consist of planting trees and shrubbery and providing an irrigation ditch for maintaining the plantings. The plantings will provide year-long cover for wildlife in areas where very little cover is presently available due to intensive agricultural practices and disturbances resulting from construction of the aqueduct. Previous experimental plantings have been quite successful in attracting various species of wildlife. As a side effect, once established, the plantings act as a barrier to keep Russian thistle and other annual weeds from entering the aqueduct. The estimated cost for this segment of the project is \$35,000. The second segment of the project is a development program at Silverwood Lake. This is actually the first stage of wildlife habitat development at the lake and will include the planting of trees and shrubs for wildlife cover over approximately 100 acres. The project also will include planting wildlife food plots and the installation of minimal irrigation to maintain the plantings.

(e) Anadromous fish enhancement—Feather River .... \$75,000

*We recommend special review.*

This proposal is the initial phase of a project to satisfy the requirements of Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 72 passed during the 1971 session of the Legislature. The resolution proposed that the Department of Fish and Game prepare plans to improve salmon and steelhead production in and along the Feather River in conjunction with operational development of the Oroville Division of the State Water Facility. The resolution further states that the department is to identify in its 1972-73 budget request those funds necessary to accomplish the aforementioned improvements and that such funds are to be payable from the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Fund.

The department proposed a three-phase project to satisfy the requirements of the resolution. In the initial fiscal year 1972-73, the

**WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD—Continued**

department plans to obtain a legal description and map of the areas necessary to anadromous fish production. This would involve identification of the state lands and other claims, contracting with survey crews and appropriate record search and delineating. However, we have no information as to the amount of area necessary to search nor information regarding what is currently known concerning ownership of land in this area. Hence, we have no basis for determining the adequacy of the requested funds. The department plans for the second year to continue surveys if required, to complete identification of state lands, investigate methods of acquiring control of other lands and develop management plans. The cost for the second year is unknown. The third and final year for this program would be the initiation of management in key areas and continued acquisition as necessary. The cost in this year is also unknown.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

Item 327 from the Recreation,  
Fish and Wildlife Enhance-  
ment Fund

Budget p. 114 Program p. 646

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$10,426,500
Recommended for approval.....	None
Recommended for special review.....	\$10,426,500

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend special review.*

This item proposes the development of recreational features at seven reservoirs of the State Water Project. The electorate approved Proposition 20 in November of 1970 which designated \$54,000,000 from the Recreation, Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Act for development of reservoir recreation. Because of the timing of the proposition, the sudden availability of this substantial amount of funds found the Department of Parks and Recreation unprepared to submit projects for appropriation in 1971-72. In the 1972-73 budget we are confronted with essentially the same situation of no project information in complete form and again recommend special review.

**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

Item 328 from the Recreation,  
Fish and Wildlife Enhance-  
ment Fund

Budget p. 114 Program p. 650

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$758,112
Estimated 1971-72 .....	947,728
Actual 1970-71 .....	None
Requested decrease \$189,616 (2.0 percent)	
Total recommended reduction .....	Pending

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend special review.*

This item proposes to appropriate \$758,112 from the Recreation, Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Bond Fund to be used as a reimbursement to the Department of Parks and Recreation support Item 211. These funds are to be used for planning on reservoirs of the State Water Project.

From the data submitted so far it seems apparent that the department is placing too heavy an emphasis on this funding to finance its planning positions. Any conclusions reached at this time will probably be modified by revisions resulting from the funding being made available by Chapter 1 of the First Extraordinary Session, Statutes of 1971. We therefore recommend special review.

**DEPARTMENT OF NAVIGATION AND OCEAN DEVELOPMENT**

Item 329 from the Recreation  
and Fish and Wildlife En-  
hancement Fund

Budget p. 108 Program p. 621

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$120,700
Recommended for approval .....	120,700
Recommended reduction .....	None

---

**ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

*We recommend approval.*

This item appropriates \$120,700 from the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Fund to finance four minor capital outlay boating developments at State Water Project reservoirs. The proposed projects include ramp grading and installation of a boarding dock at the Loafer Creek and Spillway Areas of Lake Oroville and miscellaneous loading floats, boarding docks and navigational aids at other water

project reservoirs.

## DEPARTMENT OF NAVIGATION AND OCEAN DEVELOPMENT

Item 330 from the Recreation,  
Fish and Wildlife Enhance-  
ment Fund

Budget p. 109 Program p. 632

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$1,757,200
Recommended for approval .....	None
Recommended for special review .....	\$1,757,200

---

### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend special review.*

This item proposes to appropriate \$1,757,200 from the Recreation, Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Fund to finance the construction of boating facilities at the reservoirs of the State Water Project. As a result of the Governor's Reorganization Plan No. 2 in 1969, the Department of Navigation and Ocean Development has the responsibility for the design and construction of boating facilities at units of the park system. It is important that this department coordinate with the Department of Parks and Recreation to insure that an integrated, comprehensive recreation plan is developed at each unit.

We have received no plans, specifications and cost estimates from the Office of Architecture and Construction on the projects in this item. We recommend special review.

## DEPARTMENT OF NAVIGATION AND OCEAN DEVELOPMENT

Item 331 from the Recreation  
and Fish and Wildlife En-  
hancement Fund

Budget p. 109 Program p. 634

---

Requested 1972-73.....	\$54,900
Recommend for approval .....	None
Recommended reduction .....	\$54,900

---

### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend disapproval.*

This appropriation would provide \$54,900 from the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Fund to support the department's planning work on boating facilities at State Water Project facilities. The amount and source of funding, however, do not appear in the

department's support budget.

The project planning work is already financed through the department's support appropriation in Item 203. This request in Item 331 duplicates funding included in Item 203.

Consistent with our recommendations last year that the boaters' fund should finance planning work for boating facilities at water project facilities and because this duplicates funding in Item 203, we recommend this item be deleted.

### UNALLOCATED

Item 332 from the Recreation,  
Fish and Wildlife Enhancement  
Fund

Requested 1972-73.....	\$17,500
Recommended for approval .....	17,500
Recommended reduction .....	None

#### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

This item provides funds from the Recreation, Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Fund for preliminary plans and specifications to be used as supporting data in requests for working drawings or construction appropriation in succeeding budgets. The Department of Finance, upon the approval of the State Public Works Board, allocates these funds. The projects generally include boating facilities as a part of a general recreational development project.

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Item 333 from the Health  
Sciences Facilities Construction  
Program Fund

Budget p. 195 Program p. 1105

Requested 1972-73.....	\$17,211,000
Recommended for approval .....	17,211,000
Recommended reduction .....	None

#### ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

*We recommend approval.*

This item includes a schedule of 16 projects totaling \$17,211,000 which constitutes the University's 1972-73 fiscal year program for the



**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued**

health sciences. Funding for the item is contingent on passage of the Health Sciences Facilities Construction Program Bond Act of 1971 next November. Seven of the projects scheduled in this item are considered crucial to the University's existing health sciences program and are also included in Item 308 which is financed from University educational fees. These projects are identified and discussed in the analysis of Item 308. The remaining projects are listed in Table 1.

**Table 1**  
**University of California 1972-73 Health Sciences**  
**Capital Outlay Program<sup>1</sup>**

<i>Uni- versity priority</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project</i>	<i>Amount<sup>2</sup> requested</i>	<i>Future<sup>2</sup> Require- ment</i>
(2)	All	Reserve for cost rise	\$400,000	--
(5)	Irvine	Medical sciences unit 1	<sup>3</sup> \$5,504,000 C	\$3,626,000
(6)	San Francisco	School of Dentistry	<sup>4</sup> \$5,674,000 C	3,008,000 E
(7)	San Francisco	Heating Plant No. 2	88,000 PW	1,745,000 C
				15,000 E
(12)	San Francisco	Clinical faculty facilities at San Francisco General Hospital	78,000 PWCE	--
(13)	San Diego	Animal service building at University Hospital	447,000 CE	--
(14)	San Diego	Equip nursery/delivery suite	92,000 E	--
(15)	San Francisco	Relocate experimental animal surgery	162,000 PWCE	--
(16)	San Francisco	Rural animal facility	210,000 C	56,000 E
		Subtotal	\$12,655,000	\$1,745,000 C
				6,695,000 E
		Double funded projects	4,556,000	\$3,684,000 C
				2,847,000 E
		Total	\$17,211,000	\$5,429,000 C
				\$9,542,000 E

<sup>1</sup> Double funded projects are listed in Table 1 of the analysis of Item 308.

<sup>2</sup> Letter denotes: (P) preliminary planning, (W) working drawings, (C) construction, and (E) equipment.

<sup>3</sup> Total estimated construction cost is \$18,131,000.

<sup>4</sup> Total estimated construction cost is \$23,642,000.

As indicated in Table 1, the major construction projects proposed for Irvine and San Francisco account for the bulk of the funds requested. Medical sciences unit 1 at Irvine will provide 206,100 assignable square feet of office and instructional space for the basic sciences. The Governor's Budget indicates that this project will facilitate an increase in the School of Medicine class size from 64 to 128 students. The building is also programmed to accommodate 135 FTE faculty.

The School of Dentistry building will contain 167,500 assignable square feet of classrooms, laboratories, offices, outpatient clinics and support facilities. The existing program will be relocated to the new facility and subsequently expanded. The proposed heating plant No.

2 is required to accommodate this new facility because the present plant will be fully loaded with completion of the School of Nursing building and the clinics' expansion.

As footnoted in Table 1, the total estimated construction cost of the Irvine and San Francisco projects is \$41,773,000 with nonstate and federal grant funds augmenting the state's contribution of \$11,178,000. However, the University has indicated that additional federal funding for these projects may become available under the Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971.

The remaining projects listed in Table 1 primarily involve the correction of deficiencies in existing programs:

1. The project to construct and equip clinical faculty facilities at San Francisco General Hospital is the third step in a planned conversion and modernization program. It is required to provide adequate laboratory and office facilities for faculty and staff who conduct the School of Medicine clinical teaching program at the hospital.

2. Relocating the experimental animal surgery at San Francisco will provide an adequate facility contiguous to present department of surgery space on the fifth floor of the east health sciences instruction and research tower. The present facility is poorly planned and lacks a surgery preparation room.

3. The construction of a rural animal facility for San Francisco will augment the overcrowded facilities on campus and permit the use of larger experimental animals in education and research.

4. The proposed animal service building for San Diego will be located adjacent to the animal holding areas at the Elliott field station. It will essentially be a veterinarian's administration and laboratory building. Service space of this type is not currently available and is required to adequately service the animals, maintain prophylactic programs, diagnose disease and develop new health methods.

### CONTROL SECTIONS

Sections 4 through 36 of the Budget Bill are the so-called "control sections" which place limitations upon the expenditure of certain appropriations, extend or terminate the availability of certain specified prior appropriations, define the authority of the Director of Finance with respect to reductions and transfers within and between categories of expenditure and contain the usual severability and urgency clauses.

Although significant fiscal policy is contained in these sections, particularly with respect to extending the availability of prior appropriations, these sections have not been received by us in time to permit adequate review for purposes of recommendations to be incorporated in this analysis. These control sections will be analyzed and a recommendation thereon made to the committees in hearings on the Budget Bill.