

000 and \$220,000 when the program ends. These latter funds have not been reported as savings and are not included in the General Fund surplus. Our recommendation would apply these savings to fund the previously discussed deficiencies in the scholarship program.

9. Real Estate Scholarship Program (Item 371)

This new program was established by Chapter 1173, Statutes of 1973. It provides that interest earned from an endowment of \$200,000 from the Real Estate Fund be used for "worthy and disadvantaged students enrolled in a real estate career oriented program in institutions in the California State University and Colleges." The commission estimates \$5,000 will be available for award during 1974-75.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Summary

The Budget Bill includes a total of approximately \$243.6 million for capital outlay. This amount is 41 percent less than the appropriation included in the Budget Act of 1973.

General Fund

Approximately \$16.5 million (6.8 percent) of the total appropriation is from the General Fund. This represents a decrease of nearly 87 percent from the General Fund appropriation in the Budget Act of 1973. This difference is mainly due to the 1973 Budget Act General Fund transfer of \$42 million and \$41.5 million into the Capitol Improvement Fund and the Bagley Conservation Fund respectively. The amount in the 1973 Budget Bill provides financing for the Departments of Agriculture, General Services, Corrections, Health, Water Resources and minor assessments in Parks and Recreation, Youth Authority and the Maritime Academy. It should be noted that the proposal for the Department of Corrections includes \$2.5 million for expenditure at San Quentin State Prison, which represents a change from the administration's stated policy to close this facility.

Higher Education Summary

The major portion of the proposed capital outlay program is in higher education. Of the grand total \$179.6 million (73.7 percent) is for the University of California (UC), California State University and Colleges (CSUC) and the California Community Colleges. Included in this total is \$10 million from the COFPHE fund for construction cost-rise augmentation of UC and CSUC projects which are funded from this source.

University of California

The program for the University of California totals nearly \$93 million and is proposed from four funding sources. The major portion (53 percent) is from the Health Sciences Facilities Construction Program Fund (bonds). The remainder is from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education (COFPHE-oil royalties) (13 percent); the COFPHE (from Chapter 1, Statutes of 1971, First Extraordinary Session) (17 percent); and the Educational Fee Fund (student fees) (17 percent).

The proposals for the general campuses total \$43,887,000 representing 47 percent of the total University capital outlay program. The major portion of the general campus request is related to library construction and alteration work to correct life safety hazards. Library construction requests total \$14,678,000 for library additions at Berkeley and Santa Barbara and a new library at Scripps Institute of Oceanography, San Diego. The Berkeley and Santa Barbara library proposal consists of a lump sum appropriation of \$12 million without specific amounts for either project. This appropriation is inadequate to fund both libraries as proposed by the University. The life safety projects are also funded by a lump sum appropriation for allocation to unspecified Universitywide projects. The remainder of the general campus program consists of equipment for previously funded buildings, planning, utilities and site development and construction of new buildings or alterations of existing buildings. None of the construction projects will provide additional instructional capacity. The University has adequate instructional space to satisfy systemwide enrollment demand and funding of only those projects which do not add instructional capacity is appropriate.

The health science construction program is a continuation of the University's reduced program based on no federal support. The amount proposed in the Budget Bill totals \$48,882,000 for 20 projects. Over \$40 million of this is for construction projects at Berkeley, Davis, Irvine and San Francisco. These projects are related to (1) an optometry addition (\$3.8 million), Berkeley, (2) veterinary medicine unit 2 and medical science unit 1 (\$12.7 million), Davis, (3) medical science unit 1, (\$4.6 million), Irvine and (4) dentistry school and Moffitt Hospital modernization (\$19.6 million), San Francisco. It should be noted that many of these projects are not ready to proceed and are therefore prematurely funded. Also \$2.6 million of the total request is related to additional costs for hospital construction due to the enactment of Chapter 1130, Statutes of 1972 (SB 519), which requires increased structural strength of buildings for increased seismic safety. The remainder of the request is for construction cost-rise augmentation reserve, planning, equipment and alterations.

California State University and Colleges

The proposal for the State University and Colleges totals \$32,812,000 from the COFPHE fund. Nearly 45 percent of this amount is for four projects on three campuses. These projects are (1) art building (\$5.7 million), San Diego, (2) science building II and initial cafeteria (\$5.1 million), Bakersfield and (3) industrial technology building (\$3.9 million), Long Beach. The remainder of the program consists of planning, equipment, utilities and site development, working drawings and several small projects related to alterations of existing buildings.

Community Colleges

The proposal for the community colleges system totals \$44,054,600 from bonds funds and represents the state's share in a total program of \$88,301,008. The remainder of the total program is to be provided by the local districts. The total program will provide 157 projects affecting 45 districts

throughout the state. Approximately 60 percent of the projects are for construction of general academic, science and vocational technology facilities. The remainder of the proposal provides for site acquisition, utilities and site development, and facilities for libraries, resource material centers, physical education, administration, drama-theater, maintenance, etc.

Enrollments in Higher Education

Enrollments in higher education during the 1960's were increasing at a high rate. At the turn of the decade enrollments began increasing at a lesser rate but are now expected to decrease in actual numbers in the early 1980's and then stabilize through the mid and late 1980's. It is interesting to note that the Department of Finance provisional projections for high school graduates indicates a 1.5 percent decline in actual numbers of graduates in 1973. This is the first decline indicated in the projections, which date back to 1960. In 1984, the last year in the projection table, the Department of Finance indicates that high school graduates will be only 0.5 percent higher than the 1969 level. This represents 7.9 percent fewer graduates than the actual 1972 level. In our opinion, these projections of decreased enrollment and increased campus and systemwide utilization must be considered when reviewing and evaluating the need for construction of facilities in the higher education system.

Other Programs

The program for the Department of Parks and Recreation totals nearly \$19.4 million from four sources. Over 50 percent of this request (\$10.8 million) is from the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Bond Act, for development of recreation areas at reservoirs in the State Water Project. Approximately \$4.1 million is proposed from the 1974 State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Act. This \$250 million bond issue will be placed before the electorate in June 1974. It should be noted that nearly \$45 million of this proposed bond issue has been previously appropriated by the Budget Act of 1973 and two subsequent bills. Since these projects cannot proceed until the outcome of the bond issue is known, the \$45 million is indicated in the Governor's Budget as a 1974-75 expenditure. The remainder of the program is from other special funds for planning and acquisition costs associated with development of Bolsa Chica State Beach.

Appropriation requests from the Motor Vehicle Account in the State Transportation Fund total approximately \$8.8 million. About \$4.2 million is for the Department of Motor Vehicles for land acquisition, working drawings and construction related to new field offices. The balance of approximately \$4.6 million is for the California Highway Patrol, principally for construction of new field offices but also for purchase of both communications equipment and leased facilities.

The Budget Bill also proposes \$19,942,000 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education for working drawings, construction and equipment for construction of new schools for the deaf, blind and multihandicapped. The new facilities are to replace the present Berkeley facilities.

The balance of the program is from a variety of special funds. The Department of Fish and Game proposes to utilize \$300,000 from the California Environmental Protection Program Fund for acquisition of ecological reserves, and over \$1.2 million from the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Bond Act is proposed for improvements to fish hatcheries, purchase of fishing sites, construction of boat launching facilities and minor projects related to the state water project.

Chapter 1, Statutes of 1971 (First Extraordinary Session)

Enactment of this statute established a \$150 million appropriation for capital outlay purposes from the one-time nonrecurring revenue produced by state income tax withholding. Of this amount \$80 million was allocated to the COFPHE fund for programs at the University of California, California State University and Colleges and community colleges; \$40 million was allocated to the Bagley Conservation Fund for natural resource projects including \$5 million for miscellaneous capital outlay construction; \$30 million was allocated to the School Building Safety Fund for replacement or repair of local schools for compliance with Field Act (earthquake) requirements. The total amount was to be appropriated and approved by the State Public Works Board by the end of the 1974-75 fiscal year and was to be in excess of the amount which would have normally been committed to capital outlay from the General Fund during fiscal years 1971-72 through 1974-75 inclusively. The normal amount is defined as a total of \$75 million. If this amount is not appropriated and approved by the State Public Works Board the sales and use tax on tangible personal property will be decreased by 0.5 percent for the 1975 calendar year.

It appears that the proposed capital outlay program in the Budget Bill would complete the appropriations of the above mentioned funds. However, many of the projects funded in prior years and those proposed in the Budget Bill will not proceed through the State Public Works Board prior to the end of the 1974-75 fiscal year.

UNALLOCATED CAPITAL OUTLAY

Item 372 from the General
Fund

Budget p. 49 Program p. I-251

Requested 1974-75	\$150,000
Recommended for approval.....	150,000

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend approval.

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

Based on 1½ percent for preliminary planning, the proposed amount would provide for approximately \$10 million in construction cost. A pro-

gram of this amount appears reasonable.

UNALLOCATED CAPITAL OUTLAY

Item 373 from the Capital Out-
lay Fund for Public Higher
Education

Budget p. 49 Program p. I-251

Requested 1974-75	\$10,000,000
Recommended for approval.....	10,000,000

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This proposal is for a lump-sum appropriation to be allocated by the Department of Finance to the University of California (UC) and the California State University and Colleges (CSUC) in accordance with Section 16352 of the Government Code. This allows augmentation of funds for land acquisition, equipment and construction projects subject to approval of the State Public Works Board. Augmentations from this source are limited to amounts required because of construction cost increases. For the 1974-75 Budget Bill all UC and CSUC projects are based on an Engineering News Record (ENR) cost index of 2080. The current index is 1941.6 and is expected to be 2080 near the beginning of the budget year. Hence, many of the proposed projects will, in all probability, require some augmentation. The amount requested appears reasonable based on the proposed program.

DEPARTMENT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE

Item 374 from the General
Fund

Budget p. 55 Program p. I-290

Requested 1974-75	\$826,400
Recommended for special review	726,400
Recommended reduction	\$100,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	Amount	Analysis Page
(a) Construct—Chemistry Laboratory, Davis	\$826,400	979

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend a reduction of \$100,000 and special review of the remaining \$726,400.

This request will provide a new chemistry laboratory and office building for the Department of Agriculture. The total estimated project cost is \$1,652,800 of which one-half or \$826,400 is to be from the General Fund. The remaining \$826,400 is from the Agriculture Building Fund. These special funds are appropriated without regard to fiscal year and therefore are not shown in the Budget Bill. They are actually a loan to the General

DEPARTMENT OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE—Continued

Fund, to be repaid through lease payments for occupancy of the new laboratory. Such lease charges must be approved by the Department of General Services.

The proposed facility will be a 24,505-gross-square-foot, single-story building constructed on leased property at the University of California, Davis Campus. The building will be constructed of concrete block, concrete and metal panel exterior walls and concrete block and gypsum board interior nonbearing walls and a truss-joist and plywood deck roof. The estimated construction cost of \$46 per gross square foot is reasonable for a laboratory building of this type.

Currently, the chemistry function occupies space on three floors in the Agriculture Building in Sacramento. This space, which was originally designed for office space, is overcrowded, inefficient and unsafe for this laboratory function. The space vacated by the department will be remodeled for office use.

The Department of General Services is in the process of negotiating a lease agreement for the University site. Until the terms of this agreement are certain, we believe approval of construction funds would be premature. This agreement should be finalized prior to budget hearings. It should also be pointed out that the Budget Act of 1973 appropriated \$100,000 for a feasibility study, working drawings and/or relocation costs for this project. As of January 1974 a feasibility study has been completed and none of the \$100,000 had been expended. The requested amount includes \$116,500 for working drawings. Hence, the request should be reduced by the prefunded amount of \$100,000. Relocation costs are normally part of the support budget and should be budgeted in 1975-76.

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES

Item 375 from the General

Fund

Budget p. 65 Program p. I-420

Requested 1974-75	\$1,899,435
Recommended for approval.....	25,000
Recommended for special review	477,935
Recommended reduction	1,396,500
Recommended augmentation	1,525,000
Net recommended for approval	\$1,550,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Analysis Page</i>
1. Augment—Working drawing and study for new state office complex, Sacramento.....	\$1,500,000	981
2. Delete—Construct fire and life safety improvements, Agriculture Building, Sacramento.....	298,500	982
3. Delete—Variable capacity chiller, central heating and cooling		

plant, Sacramento.....	558,000	982
4. Delete—Additional boiler, central heating and cooling plant, Sacramento.....	540,000	982
5. Special review—Construct, recaulk exterior resources building ..	327,935	982
6. Augment—Condensing water evaluation, central heating and cooling plant, Sacramento (+25,000)	50,000	982
7. Special review—Construct alterations to state buildings, statewide	150,000	983

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Department of General Services is requesting a total of six projects consisting of five construction projects and one planning study. In addition to this request we recommend an augmentation in the amount of \$1.5 million for working drawings and a study for construction of an office building complex in Sacramento.

Construct New Office Building Complex.

We recommend an augmentation of \$1.5 million for working drawings and a study for construction of 600,000 gross square feet (gsf) of state office space in Sacramento.

At the present time the State of California is leasing 1,326,678 net square feet (nsf) of office space within the greater Sacramento area. The annual cost for leasing this space is \$5,733,766. Within the total amount of leased space 479,128 nsf is occupied by legislative functions, Franchise Tax Board (Aerojet) and the Department of Motor Vehicles (temporarily displaced because of fire damage to the headquarters building). This space should be deducted from the total when determining the amount of space that could be considered for consolidation into a state-owned building. The amount of space remaining totals 847,550 nsf at an annual cost of \$4,026,708.

Assuming construction of a new legislative building, approximately 286,000 nsf of state-owned space will become available in the Capitol Annex. This would still leave 561,550 nsf of lease space at a cost of approximately \$2,668,488. However, the Department of General Services has indicated that there is a continual backlog of requests for additional space totaling approximately 90,000 nsf. Therefore, it would be safe to assume that construction of a complex of buildings similar to office buildings Nos. 8 and 9 or 600,000 gsf total (at 80 percent efficiency this would provide 480,000 nsf) would not overbuild the state needs in Sacramento. The Department of General Services should immediately initiate a study to determine which agencies should occupy these buildings (and when) based on existing lease terms. We suggest that \$50,000 of the recommended augmentation be used for this study.

In order to expedite this construction and provide a savings in both construction and lease costs we suggest that the plans for office buildings Nos. 8 and 9 be reused with perhaps some changes for architectural appearance, interior modifications and site conditions. The remaining \$1.45 million should be adequate to provide site tests and revised working drawings.

The following is a discussion and our recommendation for each of the requested projects.

- (a) Construct—fire and life safety improvements, Agricul-

DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES—Continued

ture Building, Sacramento	\$298,500
---------------------------------	-----------

We recommend deletion.

The total estimated cost of this request is \$486,000. Funding is proposed to be from the Agriculture Building Fund (\$187,500) and the General Fund (\$298,500). The Agriculture Building Fund is continually appropriated without regard to fiscal year and therefore this funding source is not in the Budget Bill. The proposed split funding recognizes separate ownership of the main Agriculture Building (state) and the Annex (Agriculture). The respective amounts reflect the estimated construction cost to correct fire and life safety code deficiencies in each building.

Although we recognize the need to correct these deficiencies it would be more appropriate to delay this work until the Department of Agriculture's chemistry laboratory is relocated to the new Davis building. At that time considerable remodeling will be necessary in order to provide office space in existing laboratory areas. The remodeling work and fire and life safety work could and should be done at the same time to assure code compliance for remodeled areas and to avoid duplication of work.

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| (b) Variable capacity chiller—central heating and cooling plant, Sacramento | \$558,000 |
| (c) Additional boiler—central heating and cooling plant, Sacramento | 540,000 |

We recommend deletion of the above two items.

Both these requests will provide excess heating and cooling capacity in the central plant. In fact, the capacity of the existing plant exceeds the current connected heating and cooling load.

Because of the current energy crisis the administration has ordered building thermostat settings to be lower in the winter and higher in the summer. These changes will reduce the historical demand in the central plant equipment and lessen the need for additional equipment. In view of this and in light of the energy crisis we believe the addition of the requested equipment is premature. In our discussion of subitem (e) below we recommend a complete study of the future needs of the central plant.

- | | |
|--|-----------|
| (d) Construct—recaulk exterior, Resources Building, Sacramento | \$327,935 |
|--|-----------|

We recommend special review.

This request is to protect against water damage to the Resources Building. In the past year over \$16,000 in water damage occurred due to water leakage through exterior joints.

The extent of recaulking and estimated costs have not been thoroughly reviewed by the Office of Architecture and Construction. Hence, we cannot recommend the adequacy of the requested amount. This information should be available during budget hearings.

- | | |
|---|----------|
| (e) Condensing water evaluation—central heating and cooling plant, Sacramento | \$25,000 |
|---|----------|

We recommend an augmentation of \$25,000 for a total of \$50,000.

This request will provide an evaluation of the best method to provide adequate condensing water for the central plant cooling system. At the

present time there is an inadequate amount of water for the cooling equipment and an evaluation of the most economical method of providing water should be undertaken. However, because there will be a significant increase in state space served by the central plant (i.e., legislative building and proposed office building complex) this evaluation should include a study of the most economical and energy conserving method for meeting the heating and cooling needs of the additional and future space. In order to accomplish a complete study we recommend an augmentation of \$25,000 for a total of \$50,000.

(f) Construct—alterations to state buildings, statewide \$150,000

We recommend special review.

This request is for a lump sum appropriation for alterations to various state buildings. We have not received any program or justification for this request. Hopefully, this information will be available during budget hearings.

CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

Item 376 from the Motor Vehicle Account, State Transportation Fund

Budget p. 108 Program p. I-661

Requested 1974-75	\$4,589,585
Recommended for approval.....	1,957,550
Recommended for special review	2,593,535
Recommended reduction	\$38,500

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	Amount	Analysis Page
1. Reduce—communication equipment program, statewide (\$-9,000)	\$1,179,900	983
2. Special Review—Los Angeles communication upgrade (phase II)	2,451,501	985
3. Reduce—construct area office, Marin, Golden Gate (\$-29,500)	417,900	984
4. Special review—purchase leased facility, Susanville	74,315	984
5. Special review—purchase leased facility, Hanford	67,719	984

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The California Highway Patrol's capital outlay request is for two communication projects totaling \$3,631,401, one construction project for \$417,900, three requests to purchase leased facilities totaling \$522,534 and \$17,750 for planning.

(a) Radio equipment and construction, statewide \$1,179,900

We recommend a reduction of \$9,000.

This request will provide for the purchase of communication equipment required for replacement (\$697,000) and for expansion of radio and microwave systems (\$482,900). General Services Communications Division has established a replacement schedule for this equipment based on expected equipment life. To be replaced are two 150 MHZ radio stations, 22-42 MHZ radio stations, 42 microwave RF terminals, 42 multiplex termi-

CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL—Continued

nals, four radio vaults and six emergency generators. Also included in the replacement request is \$25,000 for the patrol's share in replacement of the operational dial telephone system switchboard in the Water Resources Building, Sacramento. This system is shared by numerous state agencies and the existing switchboard must be replaced for proper compatibility.

The request for new equipment consists of 26 radio frequency terminals, 11-42 MHZ radio stations, 32 multiplex terminals, six emergency generator housings and five complete mountaintop radio equipment vaults. We concur with all requests except the six emergency generator housings. The housings are requested for enclosure of existing weatherproof standby emergency electrical equipment. The equipment is specifically designed for exposure to the weather. Therefore, the housing would be superfluous, and we recommend deletion of the \$9,000 requested for this purpose.

(b) Construction program planning—statewide \$17,750

We recommend approval.

This request is for construction planning for projected proposals in the 1975-76 fiscal year. Assuming 1½ percent for such planning, the requested amount would be adequate for a program of approximately \$1.2 million.

(c) Construct—area office, Marin-Golden Gate \$417,900

We recommend a reduction of \$29,500.

The present Marin-Golden Gate area office is located in leased facilities which are undersized for the current traffic officer strength of 79. This request will be a standard 100 traffic officer facility near U.S. Highway 101 in the general area of the existing office.

The requested amount reflects the Office of Architecture and Construction estimate which indicates a building construction cost of \$291,800 or \$32.47 per weighted square foot. The estimated cost is reasonable for a facility of this type. However, the Budget Act of 1973 appropriated working drawing funds for this project. The requested amount should be reduced by \$29,500 to reflect this.

(d) Purchase leased facility—Santa Fe Springs \$380,500

We recommend approval.

This facility was constructed for the state under a lease-purchase agreement. The state's first option to purchase is two years after occupancy, which occurs during the budget year. The requested amount includes \$375,000 for the building and \$5,500 for administrative charges. It would be to the state's economic advantage to purchase this facility at the initial option. Therefore we recommend approval.

(e) Purchase leased facility—Susanville \$74,315

(f) Purchase leased facility—Hanford \$67,719

We recommend special review of these two items.

These facilities are currently leased by the department under a normal lease agreement. The owner of each facility has offered to sell them for \$72,815 and \$66,219 respectively. The remainder of each request is for administrative charges.

The market value of these facilities has not been established nor has

General Services prepared an economic analysis for either facility. Until these things have been done, we cannot recommend approval.

- (g) Upgrade Los Angeles Communication Center (phase II) \$2,451,501

We recommend special review.

This request was originally presented as a \$4.4 million portion of a total \$11 million communication consolidation project. A revised program was received in January 1974 and we have not had sufficient time to review the new request.

DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES

Item 377 from the Motor Vehicles Account, State Transportation Fund

Budget p. 113 Program p. I-684

Requested 1974-75	\$4,204,150
Recommended for approval.....	31,500
Recommended for special review	70,000
Recommended reduction	\$4,102,650

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	Amount	Analysis Page
1. Delete—All field office construction projects should be deferred pending analysis of impact of field office operational changes.....	\$4,102,650	985
2. Special review—Construct, additional parking, San Mateo.	\$70,000	986

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Department of Motor Vehicles capital outlay request consists of five construction projects for new field offices totaling \$4,102,650, one \$70,000 construction project for additional parking, and \$31,500 for planning funds.

The five field offices projects are:

- (a) Construct—office building and parking facilities, Oxnard \$793,600
- (b) Construct—office building and parking facilities, Placerville 386,000
- (c) Construct—office building and parking facilities, San Diego (north metropolitan area) 1,022,650
- (d) Construct—office building and parking facilities, San Fernando 790,600
- (e) Construct—office building and parking facilities, West Covina 1,109,800

We recommend deletion.

Before any further field office construction is undertaken, three program changes in field operations must be considered. First, by January 1974, the department is expecting to implement year-round vehicle registration. The effect of this program on field office needs and design has not

DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES—Continued

been determined, and it may be significant. Current design of field offices takes into account the unusually high public demand during seasonal vehicle registration. Under year-round registration the field office workload will level out and the design will no longer need to consider this seasonal demand.

The other two changes are reflected in our discussion of the department's support budget request in Item 225 page 460 where we have recommended that the department develop and submit to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee by December 15, 1974, a plan for (1) providing computer terminals at field offices for direct issuance of vehicle registrations and drivers licenses and (2) integrating vehicle inspection with vehicle registration at field offices. Incorporation of either or both of these recommendations will require significant redesign of field office buildings.

Until the effect of these programs is thoroughly analyzed we recommend deferral of field office construction.

(f) Working drawings and construct—additional parking,

San Mateo \$70,000

We recommend special review.

We have not received any information concerning this project. We anticipate that adequate information will be available during budget hearings.

(g) Project planning \$31,500

We recommend approval.

This request is to fund planning for the department's statewide construction program. These funds should be used for planning necessary design changes to accommodate the field office operational changes discussed above.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION

Item 378 from the General

Fund

Budget p. 127 Program p. I-749

Requested 1974-75	\$2,345,365
Recommended for approval.....	1,992,525
Recommended for special review	350,440
Recommended reduction	\$2,400

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	Amount	Analysis Page
1. Special Review—Construct and equip—South Sierra Headquarters Office Expansion, Fresno	\$350,440	987
2. Reduce—Construct Office Building Mt. Bullion Conservation Camp	—2,400	988

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The department's major capital outlay request includes seven acquisition projects totaling \$172,500 and 10 construction and equipment projects totaling \$2,172,865. A discussion of the projects and our recommendation for each follows.

(a) Land acquisition—Konocti Lookout	\$25,500
(c) Land acquisition—Corralitos Forest Fire Station.....	35,000
(f) Land acquisition—Yorba Linda Forest Fire Station	30,000

We recommend approval of the above three projects.

These requests are for sites the department considers necessary for adequate fire control. The Konocti site is approximately five acres and will double the area of visible coverage in the Lake County area. Purchase of the other two sites, three acres and two acres respectively, will allow the department to vacate inadequate leased space. Construction funds for facilities at the new sites will be requested in the future.

(b) Land acquisition—Sterling City Forest Fire Station....	\$9,000
(e) Land acquisition—San Bernardino Ranger Unit Headquarters	45,000
(d) Land acquisition—San Jacinto Forest Fire Station	23,000

We recommend approval of the above three projects.

These requests are for the purchase of land and/or improvements at sites currently leased by the department. The department believes the location and condition of the sites and improvements are excellent.

(g) Land Acquisition Opportunity purchases—statewide..	\$5,000
--	---------

We recommend approval.

This request is for a lump sum amount for the purpose of purchasing inholding (landlocked) parcels or lookout sites which may become available during the budget year. In the past, small parcels of desirable land has unexpectedly become available and the department has not been able to take advantage of the opportunity to purchase due to a lack of funds. The amount of funds requested should be adequate for this purpose.

(l) (m) Construct and equip—South Sierra Headquarters, office expansion, Fresno	\$350,440
---	-----------

We recommend special review.

This proposal is for a 5,400-gross-square-foot addition to the existing office building. The present structure constructed in 1958 houses both the Division of Forestry and Department of Fish and Game. The total staff has nearly doubled in the past 14 years and the present space is entirely inadequate. The existing building plus proposed addition will provide adequate space for both Forestry and Fish and Game.

However, the addition as proposed by the Office of Architecture and Construction (OAC) does not meet the functional needs of the occupants and has not been approved by the respective departments. In our review of the OAC schematic plans it appears that OAC was more concerned with aesthetics than the functional operation of the occupants. We believe the state should provide aesthetically appealing facilities; however, the buildings must be functional. The Department of Finance has recently provided OAC with an additional \$2,000 (total \$4,300) to prepare new

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION—Continued

schematic plans. Until we have received the new plans and have had an opportunity to review them, we cannot recommend approval of the request.

(h) (i) Construct and equip—Mattole Forest Fire Station	195,830
(j) (k) Construct and equip— Coarsegold Forest Fire Station	284,445
(n) (o) Construct and equip—Tularcitos Forest Fire Station	162,490
(p) (q) Construct and equip—Almaden Forest Fire Station	206,035
(r) (s) Construct and equip—Beaumont Forest Fire Station	230,760
(t) (u) Construct and equip—Ramona Forest Fire Station	216,405
(v) (w) Construct and equip—Yucaipa Forest Fire Station	238,570
(y) (z) Construct and equip—Office Building, Mt. Bullion	\$172,090

We recommend approval of seven of the above projects and a reduction of \$2,400 in Subitem 378(y)

Although we recommend approval of these projects, it should be pointed out that the schematic budget packages as prepared by OAC do not reflect the department's requirements, and modifications are therefore necessary. In a recent meeting with OAC the department resolved these problems and subsequently submitted a list of agreed changes for each project. These changes will be incorporated in the working drawings and should not affect the estimated cost.

The seven fire station projects will replace either inadequate leased space or old state-owned facilities which have become too costly to repair or maintain. For example, the Yucaipa station was constructed in 1936 and 1938 and is located on a small parcel in the middle of Yucaipa. The Ramona station is a converted prison camp which was constructed in 1936. The new stations will be standard forest fire stations of the size necessary to continue the current program.

The Mt. Bullion request will provide additional office space for the existing staff of the department and the Youth Authority. Present office space is inadequate and partially in dormitory bedrooms. This addition will provide adequate space in accordance with state standards. However, the OAC site plan for Mt. Bullion provides for site development and parking in excess of the department's needs. Therefore, we recommend Subitem 378(y) be reduced by \$2,400.

The estimated building construction cost for these projects ranges from \$22 to \$31 per gross square foot. The variation in cost is mainly due to location and size. These costs are reasonable and the changes discussed above should not, except at Mt. Bullion, affect these estimates. Because the costs are reasonable and the department has resolved their problems with the OAC plans, we recommend approval.

(x) Construct Seed Storage Testing Building, Davis Headquarters Nursery	\$115,800
---	-----------

We recommend approval.

This project will replace an existing 3,000-square-foot facility which was constructed in 1937 and is completely inadequate for the needs of the

department. The new facilities will be a 3,200-square-foot metal building containing refrigerated storage boxes, seed laboratory, toilet facilities, general storage and work area. Each aspect of the new building will provide existing functions with larger spaces as required for proper operation of the nursery.

The estimated construction cost totals \$97,100, of which \$46,100 is for the building, \$45,000 for refrigerated boxes and \$6,000 for utilities. The remaining portion of the request is for architectural and inspection costs plus \$850 for work to be done by the agency. The estimated costs are reasonable and we recommend approval.

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME

Item 379 from the California

Environmental Protection

Program Fund

Budget p. 132 Program p. I-786

Requested 1974-75	\$300,000
Recommended for approval.....	300,000
Recommended reduction	None

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend approval.

The Department of Fish and Game is requesting \$300,000 from the Environmental Protection Program Fund for the purchase of ecological reserves. This is the third year the Resources Agency has used this funding source (revenues from personalized vehicle license plates) for the purchase of such reserves. To date, there have been five reserves purchased at a total cost of approximately \$230,000.

The department has indicated a desire to purchase 10 ecological reserves. The Budget Bill lists these without specific costs assigned to each site. We understand the department estimates that approximately \$670,000 would be necessary to purchase all 10 sites and it prefers to purchase the first five sites (\$385,000 estimate). In the event any of the first five cannot be purchased or if any funds remain after the purchase of all five then the department would attempt to purchase one or more of the remaining reserves.

The following is a description of each reserve.

1. *Sweet Springs Marsh Ecological Reserve* is located in San Luis Obispo County on the southern edge of Morro Bay. It contains 27 acres of an ecologically unique combination of freshwater-saltwater marsh.

2. *Marble Hot Springs Ecological Reserve* is located near Beckwourth, Plumas County. It is a hot springs-marsh area of 280 acres which provides a habitat for a total of 39 species of waterfowl and water-associated birds. It also provides a wintering habitat for bald and golden eagles.

3. *La Grange Bald Eagle Ecological Reserve* encompasses approximately 420 acres of bluff and river bottom along the Tuolumne River in Stanislaus County. It is important as a roosting and feeding area for bald eagles, an endangered species.

DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME—Continued

4. *Macklin Creek Native Fish Ecological Reserve* contains 50 acres of stream and streamside habitat in Nevada County. Macklin Creek is the only known stream which provides habitat for the rare and endangered Lahontan cutthroat trout.

5. *Morro Bay Native Plant and Animal Ecological Reserve* is located adjacent to Morro Beach State Park, in San Luis Obispo County. It encompasses 50 acres and provides habitat for native plant and animal species including the endangered Morro Bay kangaroo rat.

6. *Fish Slough Ecological Reserve addition* will add approximately 80 acres to the existing reserve near Bishop, Inyo County. This is a marshy area providing habitat for the endangered Owens pupfish. The existing reserve has partially assured preservation of the species, and the addition will further aid in this preservation.

7. *Holmes Ranch Ecological Reserve*, approximately 400 acres located in the Sutter Bypass, Sutter County, is a prime riparian habitat and sustains a high population of wildlife.

8. *Manila Dunes Ecological Reserve* contains approximately 250 acres dune and marsh lands near Arcata, Humboldt County. It contains a variety of native plant species and over 95 species of birds have been observed on or near the site.

9. *Skedaddle Springs Ecological Reserve* is a spring and marsh area of 447 acres in Lassen County near the California-Nevada border. It provides an important habitat for a variety of wildlife species including sage grouse, doves, raptors, deer and antelope.

10. *Pismo Lake Ecological Reserve* is a freshwater marsh area of approximately 45 acres located partially within the City of Pismo Beach, San Luis Obispo County. Numerous shorebirds, songbirds and waterfowl inhabit the area.

DEPARTMENT OF NAVIGATION AND OCEAN DEVELOPMENT

Item 380 from the Harbors and
Watercraft Revolving Fund

Budget p. 135 Program p. I-807

Requested 1974-75	\$20,000
Recommended for approval.....	20,000
Recommended reduction	None

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend approval.

The department requests \$20,000 for preparing preliminary plans and specifications to be used as supporting data in requests for working drawings or construction appropriations in succeeding budgets. Although there are no capital outlay projects to be funded from the Harbors and Watercraft Revolving Fund in the budget year, the department indicates that it will have such projects in 1975-76.

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 381 from Funds accumulated under specified budget items.

Budget p. 140 Program p. I-829

Requested 1974-75	\$315,000
Recommend for approval	315,000
Recommended reduction	None

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend approval.

This item proposes to appropriate \$315,000 for capital outlay at the Hearst Castle from reserves established by legislative action in prior Budget Acts. The reserves consist of the surplus of operating revenues over operating expenses at the Hearst Castle.

The specific work to be accomplished includes continued restoration of art, repairs to "A" House and Roman Pool plus a variety of preventive maintenance tasks.

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 382 from the State Park
Contingent Fund

Budget p. 140 Program p. I-825

Requested 1974-75	— ^a
Recommended for special review	\$1,020,000

^a Reimbursement item.

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend special review.

This item proposes to authorize through the State Park Contingent Fund the acquisition of two projects on a fully reimbursed (no state cost) basis. The reimbursements would be \$1,020,000 from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund. The cost of this type of acquisition is not actually zero because the available federal grants are used as reimbursements instead of being used for other purposes. Therefore, the true costs of acquisition are the alternatives foregone. No justifying documentation has been received from the department on these projects. We recommend that the entire item be placed under special review.

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 383 from the Bagley Conservation Fund

Budget p. 140 Program p. I-825

Requested 1974-75	\$2,071,275
Recommend for approval	185,000
Recommend for special review	1,886,275

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Special review of Bolsa Chica project pending completion of Bolsa Bay study \$417,700
2. Special review of minor capital outlay due to a lack of justification material \$1,468,575

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 1, First Extraordinary Session of 1971, created the Bagley Conservation Fund and placed \$40 million in it for beach, park and land acquisitions, including wildlife areas and for coastline planning and development of recreational facilities. Section 19.3 of the 1973 Budget Act transferred \$41,500,000 from General Fund surplus into the Bagley Conservation Fund. Item 350 of the same act appropriated \$58,297,791 of the augmented balance. This item appropriates most of the unappropriated balance in the fund.

- (a) Bolsa Chica State Beach, development \$417,700

We recommend special review.

This project is the same development that the Legislature delayed last year pending completion of a comprehensive study of Bolsa Bay by the Resource Agency. Pending receipt of the report in February, we recommend special review.

- (b) Project planning \$120,000

We recommend approval

This money is handled as a reimbursement to the department's general support budget in Item 273. It provides for the department's construction liaison on Bagley Conservation Fund projects.

- (c) Acquisition costs \$65,000

We recommend approval.

This money covers the costs of the Property Acquisition Division of the Department of General Services in acquiring new park lands.

- (d) Minor capital outlay \$1,468,575

We recommend special review.

The department uses this money to provide statewide certain replacement equipment and improvements which cost less than \$65,000. No substantiation has been received from the department for this request.

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Item 384 from the General
Fund

Budget p. 145 Program p. I-852

Requested 1974-75	\$3,163,000
Recommended for approval.....	2,163,000
Recommended for special review	1,000,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount Analysis
Page

- | | | |
|--|-------------|-----|
| 1. Recommend the Fairfield Flood Control Project receive special review..... | \$1,000,000 | 000 |
|--|-------------|-----|

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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.

We recommend approval of the following projects as requested in the Governor's Budget:

- | | |
|---|-----------|
| (a) Sacramento River and Tributaries Flood Control project | \$165,000 |
| (c) Chester, North Fork Feather River Flood Control project | 558,000 |
| (d) San Joaquin River and Tributaries Flood Control project..... | 11,000 |
| (e) Fresno River Flood Control project | 15,000 |
| (f) Chowchilla River Flood Control project..... | 14,000 |
| (g) Sacramento River Bank Protection project..... | 1,400,000 |

We recommend special review for:

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| (b) The Fairfield Flood Control Project | \$1,000,000. |
|---|--------------|

The Fairfield Flood Control Project has not yet been authorized for state participation by the Legislature. However, the department expects (and the Department of Finance concurs) that AB 690 (Dunlap), an emergency bill, will authorize the project now that the cost-sharing problems have been solved by Chapter 893, Statutes of 1973. According to the department, the \$1 million in the budget is a very preliminary estimate of the relocation costs which would be incurred in the budget year. The department further states that engineering cost estimates should be available in May 1974. To assure that the project is funded at the appropriate level and in accord with the authorizing legislation when enacted, we recommend that the Legislature await submission of the department's engineering cost estimates.

Government Code Section 16304

During budget hearings on the 1973 Budget Act, the Senate Finance Committee and the Assembly Ways and Means Committee requested the Legislative Analyst to review whether Government Code Section 16304 permitted the department to ignore the Budget Act language in this item

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES—Continued

and previous similar items which limit the availability of appropriated funds to one year. We have received Legislative Council opinion No. 21662 which concludes that moneys appropriated by this item are subject to the one-year limitation on availability as stated in the item.

DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

Item 385 from the General
Fund

Budget p. 151 Program p. I-870

Requested 1974-75	\$385,000
Recommended for approval.....	110,000
Recommended for special review	180,000
Recommended reduction	\$95,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	Amount	Analysis Page
1. Special review—construct Sutter bypass bridges.....	\$180,000	994
2. Reduce—construct improvements to Sutter maintenance building (\$-95,000)	\$205,000	994

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The department is responsible for operation and maintenance of certain portions of the Sacramento River Flood Control Project. The two projects requested are related to their responsibility in the Sutter bypass area.

(a) Construct—Sutter bypass bridges..... \$180,000

We recommend special review.

This request is for the construction of one reinforced concrete bridge to replace two existing timber bridges. The proposed bridge will be one lane wide (18 feet) and approximately 190 feet long. We have requested additional justification for this request. This justification should be available before budget hearings.

(b) Construct—improvements to Sutter maintenance building..... \$205,000

We recommend a reduction of \$95,000.

This project is for a new structure to replace the shop building constructed in the 1940's and an assembly building constructed in the 1930's. The proposed building will be a single structure housing the assembly and shop areas. It will be a 3,600 gross square foot (gsf) building, constructed of prefabricated metal on a concrete slab floor. The requested amount indicates a cost of \$57 per gsf. A building of this type should not exceed \$30 per gsf. Therefore, we recommend a reduction of \$95,000 to reflect the more reasonable cost.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Item 386 from the General
Fund

Budget p. 168 Program p. II-107

Requested 1974-75	\$4,708,500
Recommended for approval.....	4,199,500
Recommended for special review	509,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	Amount	Analysis Page
1. Special review—sewage interceptor, Napa	\$250,000	995
2. Special review—remodel office space to laboratory space, public health building, Berkeley	\$259,000	996

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Department of Health currently operates 11 hospitals for the care and treatment of mentally disordered and developmentally disabled patients. In December 1973, the facilities had a capacity of 8,399 for mentally disordered and 11,349 for the developmentally disabled. In December 1973, patient population totaled 6,341 mentally disordered and 10,033 developmentally disabled. Departmental projections indicate a population of 6,050 and 10,219 by June 1974.

The department's capital outlay request is for eight construction projects totaling \$4,708,500.

- (a) Improvements to primary electrical system, Atascadero \$276,100

We recommend approval.

This project will increase the electrical load capability and flexibility of the primary distribution system. The work will also correct a number of electrical code infractions. The improvement work is based on an Office of Architecture and Construction (OAC) survey of the electrical distribution system.

- (b) Improvements to electrical distribution system, Napa \$110,000

We recommend approval.

This is the initial step in modernization of the primary electrical distribution system. The work will increase system flexibility and facilitate locating and isolating trouble areas within the system. The project does not increase capacity and any significant growth in electrical load requirements will require additional upgrading. The work to be accomplished reflects recommendations from an OAC survey of this system.

- (c) Sewage interceptor—Napa..... \$250,000

We recommend special review.

This request is for the state's share of engineering and construction costs to consolidate and improve waste management in the Vallejo-Napa area. The proposed consolidated regional sewage plant will serve an area of approximately 70 square miles. However, we understand there has been no written agreement for the state's share in this project and therefore, the terms of the agreement and actual funds required are not known at

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH—Continued

this time. This information should be available for budget hearings.

- (d) Improvements to electrical distribution system, Stockton \$244,300

We recommend approval.

This request will complete the modernization of the primary electrical distribution. The completed project will increase system capacity and flexibility and will facilitate locating and isolating trouble areas. This represents Phase II of a project to incorporate recommendation from an OAC survey of the system.

- (e) Air condition ward buildings, phase II, Stockton..... \$639,600

We recommend approval.

This project will provide additional chiller capacity in the central plant, install underground chilled water distribution and provide air conditioning in ward building E. This two-story building has a capacity for 319 patients. The building is in good condition and is expected to be occupied by patients for the foreseeable future.

- (f) Install ward service elevators in buildings 51 and 52, Agnews..... \$383,200

We recommend approval.

Buildings 51 and 52 are two-story residential units for the developmentally disabled. Each structure has a capacity of 234 patients. Both structures are in good condition and will continue to house patients for the foreseeable future.

The proposed project will provide one service and one patient elevator in each building. Neither building has an elevator and this work will bring them into conformance with California Administrative Code requirements for elevators in buildings of this type. The work will include installation of hydraulic elevators, service loading dock, soiled linen room, passage and ramp to each building.

- (g) Remodel office space to laboratory space, public health building, Berkeley \$259,000

We recommend special review.

It is our understanding that this request is to convert approximately 3,000 square feet of office space into laboratory space. The requested amount indicates a cost of \$86 per square foot which appears high for providing laboratory space in an existing building. However, we have not received any detailed information concerning the type of laboratory space needed or a cost estimate. Apparently OAC is working on this project and the information should be available during budget hearings.

- (h) Improvements for correction of fire and safety hazards, statewide \$2,546,300

We recommend approval.

This request is the third phase of a program, started in 1972, to bring the state hospitals into conformance with state fire and life safety standards. The project will provide fire protection and standby emergency electrical power to life support functions in patient-occupied buildings. State hospi-

tals included in this project are Agnews, Metropolitan, Patton and Stockton. Upon completion all operational state hospitals will comply with current fire and life safety standards.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS

Item 387 from the General
Fund

Budget p. 185 Program p. I-241

Requested 1974-75	\$2,715,500
Recommended for approval.....	215,500
Recommended reduction	\$2,500,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	Amount	Analysis Page
1. Long-range plan—department to prepare a long-range plan for institutional needs. Plan to be submitted to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee by October 1, 1974, and annual updates submitted each successive October.	—	997
2. Delete—renovation, south block, San Quentin	\$2,500,000	998

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Long-Range Planning

We recommend the Department of Corrections prepare a long-range plan for institutional need to be submitted to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee by October 1, 1974, and annual updates submitted each successive October.

The department has experienced a steady increase in inmate population from a low of 19,595 in December 1972 to 22,189 in December 1973. The increase in male felon inmates during this time rose 10.4 percent from 17,082 to 19,656. The department projects a male felon inmate population of 20,305 in June 1974 and 21,175 in June 1975. This represents a 3.3 percent increase in the last half of the current year and a 4.3 percent increase in the budget year. The department's long-range population projection indicates a leveling off in male felon population at approximately 24,200 in 1978 and 1979.

Institutional capacity for male felons, as indicated by the department, is 19,711 in 1973 rising to 20,595 in 1975 and continuing at that capacity through the 1970's. The only changes in capacity are (1) reactivation, in 1973, of a 400-bed unit at the California Training Facility, Soledad, (2) reactivation, in 1974, of 548 beds at the California Conservation Center, Susanville, and (3) deactivation, in 1974, of the 64-bed Conservation Camp at Clear Creek. Assuming the final capacity of 20,595, there would be a deficit in 1979 of approximately 3,560 beds for male felon inmates. It should be pointed out that the 20,595 capacity does not include approximately 370 beds which were indicated as capacity for male felons in the department's 1970 summary of institution capacity. However, if this space is accounted for, and if the department's projections hold, there will be a deficit of over 3,000 beds by 1979.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS—Continued

It is apparent that if the department is to house prison inmates adequately, there must be a long-range plan. Such a plan should, at a minimum, indicate (1) number of existing beds by institution and security classification, (2) existing inmate population by institution location, security classification and inmate's home county, (3) projected inmate population at each institution including probable mix of security classification and inmate's home county, (4) contingency plans in the event inmate population decreases, increases and/or changes in security classification mix from that anticipated, (5) plans for providing additional beds if required and (6) plans for deactivation of units as required. Such a plan should be reviewed and updated annually.

The department's capital outlay request includes three construction projects totaling \$2,710,500 and one planning project for \$5,000.

(a) Reroof Building Number 1, Folsom..... \$125,500

We recommend approval.

This item is for replacement of the roof on cell building No. 1. The roof was installed over 60 years ago and damage due to leaks and cost of repairs has become excessive. The Office of Architecture and Construction has inspected the roof and their report indicates the roof should be replaced. The new roof will consist of new or existing sheathing as required and new base felt and cement asbestos rigid roof shingles.

(b) Construct—water system booster, California Men's Colony, San Luis Obispo \$85,000

We recommend approval.

Water pressure at this institution varies from 10 to 28 psi. This is a very low pressure and has resulted in wastage of water and excessive maintenance on toilet flushometer valves. Also of concern is the insufficient pressure for fire protection.

The Office of Architecture and Construction (OAC) has investigated this situation. OAC's recommendation is to install a booster pumping station and hydropneumatic tank. This installation will provide adequate pressure for fire protection purposes and correct the valve maintenance problem. The requested funds reflect OAC's estimate for this work.

(c) Renovate South Block, San Quentin \$2,500,000

We recommend deletion in the amount of \$2,500,000.

This request is for the renovation of the 100-year-old south block which has a capacity to house 939 inmates. The interior contains four separate units. Each unit consists of five open tiers of inside cells. This building, as are nearly all the buildings at San Quentin, is archaic and, while modifications would be an improvement, we question the advisability of continued long-range operation of this institution.

Many studies have been made on the California prison system. These studies have recommended repeatedly the closing of both San Quentin and Folsom. The following quote is taken directly from the State Board of Corrections report dated July 1971:

"Manifestly, San Quentin and Folsom should be abandoned. Several recommendations calling for improvements in these institutions are

made in this report. These were included only because there seems little certainty that these facilities will be closed in the near future. They should be closed. So long as they exist, they impede California's correctional efforts and tarnish its image.

"They are immense, yet do not have adequate space for modern programs. They are not secure or safe. Decent living conditions are almost unattainable in them, and they are ugly and depressing.

"Any major remodeling, in either facility, would cost many millions of dollars. If there is a choice between remodeling and a new facility, the latter choice is by far the better."

We concur with this conclusion.

The proposed renovation project includes complete demolition of the south block interior and roof and reconstruction within existing exterior walls. A structural investigation of the exterior walls has indicated structural stability of these walls. However, the department has not developed a program for the request and therefore the actual requirements and costs have not been determined. It is our understanding that the requested \$2.5 million is the department's estimate for renovation of one-quarter of the south block. In our opinion, this estimate is merely a guess and based on past experience is probably low. Assuming, however, that \$2.5 million is adequate, the total construction cost for renovation of the south block will be \$10 million excluding construction cost rise. This does not include any costs for additional security requirements during a construction project of this nature.

If this amount is to be expended for the south block it should be recognized that similar renovation will be requested for the north and west blocks. Hence, for cell modification only, over \$30 million will be required. The department also plans a new 150-bed hospital at this institution. We estimate the cost of such a structure would exceed \$10 million. Demolition of existing condemned buildings and modification to other buildings will also be required at a cost of perhaps \$2 million to \$5 million. The total long-range facility cost at San Quentin, therefore, can be expected to exceed \$45 million.

We estimate that a new 2,400-bed institution would cost approximately \$65 million. Such an institution could be constructed on state-owned land at Otay Mesa, San Diego County. This land was originally purchased as a site for a new correctional institution. This location is appropriate in view of the fact that 82 percent of the male felon inmate bed capacity is in the north portion of the state while nearly 57 percent of all male inmates are from the southern portion.

In light of (1) the recognized archaic conditions at San Quentin, (2) the fact that the cost to renovate San Quentin is nearly 70 percent of the cost of a new modern institution and (3) present maldistribution of institution beds with respect to location of inmate families, we recommend deletion of this item.

(d) Preliminary planning—chapel, California Institution for Women, Frontera	\$5,000
---	---------

We recommend approval.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS—Continued

This institution was constructed in 1953. The original plans included a chapel building. However, due to a lack of funds, the building was deleted. During the intervening 20 years, religious programs have been accommodated in the gymnasium. The construction of a more appropriate single multidomination chapel would be appropriate. The requested \$5,000 for preliminary planning should be adequate.

DEPARTMENT OF THE YOUTH AUTHORITY

Item 388 from the General
Fund

Budget p. 190 Program p. II-288

Requested 1974-75	\$150,000
Recommended for special review	150,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	Amount	Analysis Page
1. Special review—construct water and sewer system improvements, Preston School of Industry	\$50,000	1000
2. Special review—rehabilitate fire and industrial water system	\$100,000	1000

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- (a) Construct water and sewer improvements, Preston School of Industry \$50,000

We recommend special review.

The department has indicated that this request will provide the state's share in a regional sewage treatment improvement program. The Water Quality Control Board has notified the department that "... it would be in the best interest of all concerned ..." if the Preston School would consolidate its waste water with that of the City of Ione. Upon completion of the project the existing Preston sewage treatment plant would be abandoned.

We have not received any information which would indicate that the present plant does not meet current water quality standards, nor have we received a copy of the proposed agreement for state participation. Until this information is available we cannot recommend approval of this item.

- (b) Rehabilitate fire and industrial water system, Preston School of Industry \$100,000

We recommend special review.

Planning funds for this project were appropriated by the Budget Act of 1973. Information concerning the progress of this planning and the need for the requested amount has not been received. We understand the department expects to have this information available before budget hearings.

EDUCATION

Item 389 from the Capital Out-
lay Fund for Public Higher
Education

Budget p. 201 Program p. II-398

Requested 1974-75	\$19,942,000
Recommended reduction	\$19,942,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Analysis Page</i>
1. School for the Deaf. Planning for this school should not continue. Students should be returned to local districts and School for the Deaf—Riverside.	—	1001
2. School for the Blind. Establish building program parameters. ..	—	1002
3. Delete—working drawings, construct and equip Schools for the Blind, Deaf and Multihandicapped	\$19,942,000	1002

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The existing state Schools for the Deaf and Blind in Berkeley have been surveyed by the State Fire Marshal and the State Office of Architecture and Construction (OAC). The surveys revealed that these schools were unsafe from both a fire and life safety and a structural viewpoint. In fact, a portion of both schools is constructed astride a known earthquake fault. According to the "Field Act" these facilities should not be used for school purposes after June 30, 1975 (Education Code Section 15516) unless rehabilitated to meet code requirements. In 1972 OAC estimated the cost to rehabilitate would exceed \$7 million. We believe these schools should be closed at the earliest possible time. However, it must be recognized that if new state schools are to be constructed the probable occupancy date would be fall 1977.

School for the Deaf

We recommend deletion of planning and construction for the School for the Deaf.

The State Board of Education recently adopted a new Master Plan for Special Education. This plan requires all local districts to develop a comprehensive master plan that specifies how every exceptional child within the boundries of the master plan will be served. If necessary, the district must join with other districts to provide a viable program to serve the exceptional child. This is a commendable plan and in our opinion its implementation will enhance school programs for the exceptional child. However, such an increase in local programs will reduce the need for two state schools for the deaf.

The State School for the Deaf at Riverside has a capacity for 540 resident and 60 day students. The total 1973-74 enrollment for the Berkeley and Riverside School is 829. If approximately one-third of these students are provided local programs, the Riverside school could adequately serve the needs for a state school for the deaf. Therefore, we are recommending deletion of construction for the new school for the deaf in Northern California. We have discussed this further in our analysis of Item 331.

EDUCATION—Continued

If it is determined, however, that the school for the deaf *should* be constructed, we would recommend that the State Allocation Board standards be used in developing this building program. These standards would allow approximately 60,000 gsf for 400 deaf and multihandicapped deaf. Allowable costs would be \$33.40 per gsf or \$2 million. Allowance should be made for the same areas mentioned below for the School for the Blind. However, shared use of facilities should be made where possible, i.e., administration, maintenance, purchasing, storage, and health and food services.

School for the Blind

We recommend continued effort to provide a new School for the Blind.

The state School for the Blind is presently serving less than 10 percent of the state's blind students. All others are in local programs. In our opinion, because of the low incidence of multihandicapped blind it is unreasonable to expect a significant decline in this school's population. Therefore, we recommend a continued effort to provide a new state School for the Blind.

Construction of Facilities for the Blind

We recommend establishment of parameters for the new school for the blind, deletion of this appropriation \$19,942,000, and reappropriation of the 1973 Budget Act item to include working drawings for the School for the Blind only.

The Department of Education has recently completed a descriptive building program for both the School for the Deaf and School for the Blind. In our opinion, these programs do not provide adequate information to enable an architect to design a facility which would satisfy the educational program requirements. We recommend that the Office of Architecture and Construction (OAC) work with the Department of Education to develop a meaningful building program. A portion of the \$300,000 appropriated for preliminary planning, by the Budget Act of 1973, could be used to finance OAC's participation.

We also recommend that parameters for the School for the Blind be established in order to assure that a realistic program is developed. The State Office of Local Assistance, aided by the Department of Education, has established allowable school building areas and costs for facilities for exceptional children. These parameters have been adopted by the State Allocation Board and are used in determining state aid to local districts. Using the allowable area for blind students the state School for the Blind could justify approximately 20,000 gross square feet (gsf). This area includes classrooms, multiuse rooms, administrative space and subsidiary facilities. The allowable cost for schools of this type is \$32.30 per gsf or \$646,000. Because the school for the blind is a residential school, some allowance for other areas should be made. For example, the food preparation area will necessarily be larger, additional recreation space may be needed and the standards do not apply to dormitory areas. However, for basic parameters for the school facilities, we recommend the use of State

Allocation Board standards.

The Budget Act of 1973 appropriated \$1.8 million for site acquisition and \$300,000 for preliminary plans for the schools for the blind, deaf and multihandicapped. Chapter 1120, Statutes of 1973 (SB 1009), added \$1 million to this amount for site acquisition, preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment. As of January 1974, a site has not been selected. In view of this and since preliminary plans have not been started, we believe appropriation of construction funds are premature. Also, there are adequate funds available in the Budget Act of 1973 and Chapter 1120, Statutes of 1973, to provide for preliminary planning and working drawings. Therefore, we support deletion of this appropriation and reappropriation of Item 356 (b) Budget Act of 1973 for the purpose of preliminary plans and working drawings for a School for the Blind.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Item 390 from the Capital Out-
lay Fund for Public Higher
Education

Budget p. 214 Program p. II-467

Requested 1974-75	\$12,000,000
Recommended for approval.....	None
Recommended for special review	6,443,000
Recommended reduction	5,557,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	Amount	Analysis Page
1. Delete—language restricting legislative review and lump-sum ap- propriation	—	1003
2. Delete—construction of Doe library addition, Berkeley	\$5,557,000	1004
3. Special review—construct Santa Barbara library addition	\$6,443,000	1004

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend deletion of restrictive language and lump-sum appropriation concept.

This proposal is for a lump-sum appropriation of \$12 million to be allocated by executive order of the Department of Finance upon agreement by the Department of Finance and the University of California as to the proper scope and estimated cost of the proposed library additions at Berkeley and Santa Barbara. Allocation of these funds would be subject to State Public Works Board approval. This language and method of budgeting restricts legislative review and we do not believe it to be a proper procedure. Therefore, we are recommending deletion of the restricting language and the lump-sum appropriation concept. A discussion of the two projects and our recommendations follow.

The University's request for the two library additions totals \$16,542,000. This includes \$10,099,000 for Doe Library addition, Berkeley, and \$6,443,000 for the Santa Barbara Library addition. Hence, the \$12 million in this item is not adequate to fund both projects.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

Berkeley

We recommend deletion of the request for Doe Library addition.

This project would provide an additional 126,670 gross square feet (gsf) to the Doe Library. The entire three-level addition is proposed as an underground addition east of Doe Library annex. The building will be 75 percent efficient, thereby providing 95,000 assignable square feet (asf). The estimated cost indicates a building cost of \$67.23 per gsf. This is unusually high for a library structure and reflects in part the additional cost (\$11.61 per gsf) for the proposed underground construction. However, the remaining \$55.62 per gsf is approximately \$19 per gsf higher than the State University and Colleges system cost guidelines.

The planning documents indicate that 80,000 asf will be for Doe Library use and 15,000 asf for temporary relocation of branch libraries displaced by construction to correct seismic deficiencies. However, in discussing this project with campus officials, they indicated they now intend to use the entire 95,000 asf as a staging area for temporary relocation of departments and libraries displaced by such construction. The area would apparently be used for staging well into the 1980's.

Current library facilities on the Berkeley campus provide a total of approximately 3.5 million volumes or 132 volumes per student at the steady state enrollment of 26,100. In addition, there are 700,000 volumes currently housed at the Richmond Field Station. Thus, the total volumes available to the Berkeley campus represents 159 volumes per student.

There is adequate space at the Richmond Field Station to add a second level inside the existing building. This would allow capacity for at least an additional 700,000 volumes, which could be used for housing less active volumes. The University has frequent shuttle runs to this facility to return and pick up volumes and, therefore, the volumes housed there are relatively accessible to the students and faculty. We suggest the University submit a project to provide additional space at the Richmond Field Station in lieu of constructing an addition to Doe Library.

Santa Barbara

We recommend special review of the Santa Barbara library addition.

This proposal is for an addition of 122,500 asf with an efficiency of 74 percent resulting in 91,000 asf. The estimate project costs indicates a building construction cost of \$51.46 per gsf, which is nearly \$15 above the State University and Colleges building cost guidelines. If an addition is constructed the gsf cost should be reduced to a more reasonable amount of perhaps \$40 per gsf.

There is an apparent need for additional library space at Santa Barbara. Current volume holdings total approximately 1.1 million providing 88 volumes per student in 1976, compared to current state standards for university campuses of 100 volumes per student. Existing library facilities have a design capacity of only 740,000 volumes which provides a capability of housing an additional 185,000 volume. The remainder of existing volumes is housed in temporary facilities outside of library facilities. However, the project planning documents for the addition do not provide

adequate detail regarding the activities and associated space to be housed in the existing library and library addition. Until clarifying information is available, we cannot recommend approval of this project.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Item 391 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education, Chapter 1, Statutes of 1971 (First Extraordinary Session)

Budget p. 214 Program p. II-467

Requested 1974-75	\$1,197,000
Recommended for approval.....	1,097,000
Recommended for special review	100,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	Amount	Analysis Page
1. Special review—Hastings College of Law, academic service structure.	\$100,000	1006

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item contains \$1,197,000, 3 percent of the total \$38,887,000 proposed for major capital outlay at the University general campuses. The amount in this item is for one universitywide planning project, two campus construction projects and one campus planning project.

- (1) Preliminary planning, general campuses universitywide..... \$400,000

We recommend approval.

This request will provide planning funds for projects to be proposed in the 1975-76 fiscal year. The requested amount will provide for approximately \$26 million in construction costs based on 1½ percent for preliminary planning.

- (2) Working drawings and construct—steam plant automation steps 1 and 2, Riverside..... \$530,000

We recommend approval.

This request will provide for the installation of specialized equipment in the central plant and the 17 major buildings on this campus. Upon completion the mechanical and electrical systems in these buildings will be centrally monitored and controlled. The University estimates that this system will provide a 12-percent saving in both fuel consumption and operation and maintenance. This represents an estimated total savings of \$180,000 in the first year of operation, increasing by approximately \$17,000 each year thereafter.

- (3) Working drawings and construct—utilities and site development 1974-75, San Diego..... \$167,000

We recommend approval.

This proposal is for water system improvements for fire protection re-

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

quirements at Scripps Institute of Oceanography and at four locations on the central campus. The proposal also includes approximately \$70,000 for the University's share in improvement work to be accomplished by the City of San Diego at the Mt. Soledad laboratories. The improvement work consists of increasing city water capacity and widening a city road, both of which serve the Mt. Soledad laboratories. The University's share represents approximately 13 percent of the total project cost.

- (4) Preliminary plans for academic/service structure, Hastings College of Law \$100,000

We recommend special review.

The University is preparing a building program planning guide for this project. Until we receive this document and an inventory of existing space we cannot recommend approval of this request.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Item 392 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education, Chapter 1, Statutes of 1971 (First Extraordinary Session)

Budget p. 214 Program p. II-467

Requested 1974-75	\$5,000,000
Recommended for approval.....	5,000,000

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend approval.

This request represents a lump-sum appropriation to the University to be allocated for minor construction and improvements at each of the general and health science campuses and agricultural field stations. The specified projects for which these funds are proposed have not been submitted and are not required. In appropriating a lump sum, the University is given the administrative flexibility to fund the highest priority projects throughout the universitywide system during the budget year. The program will be reviewed on a postaudit basis. We agree with this procedure and recommend approval.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Item 393 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education—Chapter 1, Statutes of 1971 (First Extraordinary Session)

Budget p. 214 Program p. II-467

Requested 1974-75	\$10,000,000
Recommended for approval.....	10,000,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	Amount	Analysis Page
1. Addition of Budget Bill language requiring legislative approval of scope and costs of projects to be funded under this item.	—	1007
2. Addition of specific list of projects to be funded under this item.	—	1007

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend addition of (1) budget language requiring legislative approval of scope and costs of projects to be funded and (2) a list of projects within the Budget Bill.

This proposal is for a lump sum of \$10 million for universitywide preliminary plans, working drawings and construction of alterations to correct earthquake and fire hazards in existing buildings. These funds would be allocated by the Department of Finance upon agreement by the Department of Finance and the University as to the proper scope and estimated cost of each project. Allocation of funds would be subject to State Public Works Board approval. This language does not provide legislative review of scope or estimated costs. In our opinion, the Legislature should not be excluded from normal budgetary review and approval of these elements. Therefore, we recommend incorporation of appropriate language in the budget.

We believe that in this specific case the appropriation of a lump sum for major capital outlay is appropriate. The University has identified those buildings considered to be the most urgently in need of life safety rehabilitation. The life safety projects requested by the University are necessary and should proceed without undue delay. However, because of the complexity of this type of project, the University has not determined the total work required or associated costs. In order to properly identify the most urgent needs, these projects should be listed in the Budget Bill under this item without a specific appropriation for each as follows:

Berkeley Campus

- (1) Life Sciences Building, correct seismic deficiencies
- (2) Wheeler Hall, correct seismic deficiencies
- (3) Nonstructural changes, correct seismic deficiencies
- (4) Campus buildings, fire protection

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued**Davis Campus**

- (5) Correct seismic deficiencies, 1974-75
- (6) Alterations for the handicapped
- (7) Campus building, correct life safety deficiencies

Los Angeles Campus

- (8) Kinsey Hall, life safety and rehabilitation

San Diego Campus

- (9) General Campus Step 1, correct life safety deficiencies
- (10) University Hospital of San Diego County, correct safety deficiencies, Step 1

San Francisco Campus

- (11) Old Clinic Building, correct seismic deficiencies
- (12) Moffitt Hospital fire protection, 1974-75

Santa Barbara Campus

- (13) Various buildings, correct seismic deficiencies
- (14) Campbell Hall, correct seismic deficiencies
- (15) North Hall, correct seismic deficiencies

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Item 394 from the Educational
Fee Fund

Budget p. 214 Program p. II-467

Requested 1974-75	\$15,690,000
Recommended for approval.....	13,978,200
Recommended for special review	1,400,000
Recommended reduction	311,800

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Analysis Page</i>
1. Reduce—Equip, Webber Hall addition, Riverside (—\$311,800) ..	\$680,000	1009
2. Recommend study to determine appropriate rate of use for electron microscopes.....	—	1010
3. Special review—Construct, physical activities facilities, Santa Cruz	\$1,400,000	1012

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This request is for \$15,690,000 from the Educational Fee Fund (student fees) for a total of 27 projects at the eight general campuses and Scripps Institute of Oceanography. This item represents 40 percent of the total \$38,887,000 provided for major capital outlay projects at the University's general campuses. The remaining 60 percent is proposed from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education under Items 390, 391 and 393. Also, under Item 409, there is \$48,882,000 proposed from the Health Sciences Facilities Construction Program Fund for capital outlay in the

Health Sciences. Therefore, the Budget Bill provides for a total University major capital outlay program, including general and health science campuses, of \$87,769,000.

In our discussion of this item we have separated the projects into four descriptive categories. A description of each category and our recommendations follow.

Universitywide Planning

We recommend approval.

This category includes one project, Item 394(1), for general planning studies in the University system. The proposed \$500,000 will provide for preparation of master plans, updating of campus long-range development plans, preparation of environmental impact statements and studies concerning the relationships of individual campuses with their surrounding communities.

Equipment

We recommend a reduction of \$311,800 in Item 395(3), for the Webber Hall addition, Riverside request of \$680,000.

This category contains equipment requests for new building space in the campuses. As noted in Table 1, the University has indicated a future equipment need, for these projects, of \$797,000. It should be pointed out that the Budget Bill contains language to limit the availability of equipment funds to two years. In prior years these funds were available for three years. We concur with this change.

Table 1
Equipment

Item No.	Project title	Campus	Budget Bill amount	Legislative Analyst recommendation	Future ^a requirement
(2)	Humanities building	San Diego	\$314,000	\$314,000	\$205,000
(3)	Webber Hall addition	Riverside	680,000	368,200	—
(4)	Academic office building 4	Davis	59,000	59,000	—
(5)	Learning resources center	Santa Barbara	917,000	917,000	—
(6)	Alterations 1972-73	Berkeley	32,000	32,000	—
(7)	Library alterations ..	Irvine	200,000	200,000	—
(8)	Fire station	Santa Cruz	35,000	35,000	—
(9)	Service yard expansion	Los Angeles	27,000	27,000	—
(10)	Marine biology instruction and research building	San Diego (Scripps)	142,000	142,000	212,000
(11)	Third College academic unit 1	San Diego	425,000	425,000	300,000
	Total		\$2,831,000	\$2,519,200	\$717,000

^a Proposed in University five-year capital outlay program

The requested equipment funds for Webber Hall addition is the second

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

and last equipment phase for this project. The Budget Act of 1973 provided \$900,000 for equipping this building. The procedure for determining adequate equipment funds for a new building is to use a cost-per-square-foot guideline and subtract the value of existing equipment. The remainder represents normal funding requirements. The Webber Hall addition request follows this basic procedure. However, deducted from the existing equipment value is a substantial amount of equipment designated "to be released." In effect, the requested funds would equip areas other than Webber Hall addition. The proposal also includes a request for additional computer capacity. It is apparently the University's intent to sell a portion of its existing computer equipment and purchase additional computer equipment from this request. This item should be reduced to reflect the amount realized from the sale. The University data indicate that the amount of computer center equipment "to be released" totals \$298,489.

Electron Microscopes

We recommend the Coordinating Council for Higher Education (Commission on Postsecondary Education effective April 1, 1974) conduct a study to determine the appropriate rate of use for electron microscopes.

At the present time the University has approximately \$5.8 million invested in electron microscopes. These scopes were purchased with state, federal and grant funds. Electron microscopes are large expensive specialized equipment items which require individualized rooms and darkrooms. The University has indicated that usage of these scopes ranges from zero hours per week to 65 hours per week. Because of the high cost of both the equipment and the area required to house them, we believe existing units should be used at a maximum rate. Therefore, we recommend the Coordinating Council for Higher Education conduct a study to determine the proper rate of use for electron microscopes. Until the recommended study is completed we suggest no additional electron microscopes be purchased.

Utilities and Site Development

We recommend approval.

This category of projects includes seven projects affecting six campuses as shown in Table 2. Four of these projects are for utility and site development work to improve (1) vehicular circulation, (2) pedestrian and bicycle access and (3) drainage and erosion control. The Santa Cruz project also includes \$50,500 for an additional 30,000-gallon storage tank for fuel oil standby for the central heating plan. Addition of this capacity will allow the campus to operate for 12 to 15 days if natural gas service is interrupted. With present fuel oil storage capacity, the campus could operate for approximately six days.

The request for utilities to Third College, San Diego, will provide the necessary utility services and access road to Third College academic unit 1. Working drawings for academic unit 1 are almost complete and construction is expected to begin before the end of the current fiscal year.

The sewage disposal request at Irvine represents a portion of a long-term contractual agreement between the University and the Irvine Company. In 1963, the University entered into a contractual agreement to

Table 2
Utilities and Site Development

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Project title</i>	<i>Phase^a</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Budget Bill amount</i>	<i>Legislative Analyst recommendation</i>
(12)	Third College utilities 1974-75	c	San Diego	\$1,847,000	\$1,847,000
(13)	Sewage disposal facilities..	c	Irvine	102,000	102,000
(14)	Utilities and site development 1974-75	wc	Santa Cruz	532,000	532,000
(15)	Utilities and Site development 1974-75	wc	Davis	222,000	222,000
(16)	Utilities and site development 1974-75	wc	Irvine	230,000	230,000
(17)	Utilities and site development 1974-75	wc	Santa Barbara	330,000	330,000
(18)	Full storage facility	wc	Los Angeles	321,000	321,000
Total				\$3,584,000	\$3,584,000

* Phase symbol indicates:
w-working drawings
c-construction

share in the costs of providing sewage treatment and collection facilities for the Irvine area. This request represents the University's share of Phase III, which provides extension of the collection facilities. The University will not directly perform construction or contract for construction.

The Los Angeles fuel storage request will provide a 420,000 gallon underground fuel oil storage tank. This addition will provide the campus with sufficient standby fuel oil to operate for approximately 11 days, in the event natural gas service is interrupted.

Alterations

We recommend approval.

Proposals in this category consist of alterations to existing buildings for new occupancies and/or adaption to changing instructional or service needs as shown in Table 3.

Table 3
Alteration Projects

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Project title</i>	<i>Phase^a</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Budget Bill amount</i>	<i>Legislative Analyst recommendation</i>	<i>Future requirements^b</i>
(19)	Alterations 1974-75	wc ^c	Berkeley	\$592,000	\$592,000	—
(20)	King Hall basement development	wc ^c	Davis	445,000	445,000	—
(21)	Alterations related to engineering	wc ^c	Santa Barbara	532,000	532,000	—
(22)	Campus service building alterations	wc	Los Angeles	999,000	999,000	\$22,000
(23)	Alterations for changed occupancy	wc	San Diego	112,000	112,000	—
(24)	Alterations 1973-74 step 2	c	Riverside	562,000	562,000	255,000
Total				\$3,242,000	\$3,242,000	\$277,000

* Phase symbol indicates: w—working drawings, c—construction

^b Proposed in University five-year capital outlay program.

^c Equipment funds provided in Budget Bill amount. Bill should be changed to reflect equipment funding.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

For example, alterations at Santa Barbara will adapt existing space to meet engineering needs and thereby eliminate the need for new construction. Alterations at Riverside are related to reassignment of space as a secondary effect of constructing Webber Hall addition. Development of unfinished space in King Hall will provide adequate space for supporting services at the Davis Law School. Since there is adequate systemwide instructional capacity space to serve enrollment needs, we believe it is essential that the University continually evaluate existing space and provide alteration as required to meet enrollment demands and changing instructional program requirements.

New Buildings

We recommend special review of Item 394(27) physical activities facilities, Santa Cruz.

This category contains three construction projects for new buildings at three campuses as shown in Table 4. The requested projects do not provide additional instructional capacity space. We continue to support a policy of meeting increasing enrollment demands through utilization of existing space. As we have discussed elsewhere in our analysis, enrollments in higher education are increasing at a lesser rate and are expected to decline in actual numbers in the early 1980's and then stabilize during the mid and late 1980's. Because the University has adequate instructional capacity space to satisfy systemwide enrollment demand, we believe it is appropriate to fund only those projects which do not add instructional capacity space.

Table 4
New Building Construction Projects

Item No.	Project title	Phase ^a	Campus	Budget Bill amount	Legislative Analyst recommendation	Future requirement ^b
(25)	Fire and police station	c	Davis	\$1,455,000	\$1,455,000	\$102,000
(26)	Library building	c	San Diego (Scripps)	2,678,000	2,678,000	250,000
(27)	Physical activities facilities	ce	Santa Cruz	1,400,000	Special Review	80,000
Total				\$5,533,000	\$4,133,000	\$432,000
Total special review				—	\$1,400,000	—

^a Phase symbol indicates: c—construction, e—equipment.

^b Proposed in University five-year capital outlay program.

Davis

The Davis fire and police station will provide a 26,600-gross-square-foot building. The new structure will replace existing inadequate space, and will be more centrally located to facilitate quick response to fire alarms.

San Diego

The new library at the Scripps Institution of Oceanography will replace an existing small library building which has been declared unsafe from a structural standpoint. The new building will contain 47,000 gross square feet, providing space for 150,000 bound volumes, approximately 300,000 documents, maps, charts, microfilm and pamphlets, plus 130 student reader stations and 10 faculty studies. Included in the estimated cost is \$50,000 to demolish the existing structure.

Santa Cruz

We recommend special review of Item 394(27) physical activities facilities.

The proposed project will provide physical activity facilities in two areas of the campus near existing instructional and residential facilities. One area in the western portion of the campus will include locker and shower facilities, multipurpose activity room, offices and development of outdoor areas. However, the campus has not determined the extent of outdoor area development and until this information is available we recommend special review.

The other area to be developed is an addition to the existing small gymnasium in the east area. This addition will be approximately 4,400 assignable square feet and contain a dance studio and multipurpose room.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

Item 395 from the Capital Out-
lay Fund for Public Higher
Education

Budget p. 223 Program p. II-534

Requested 1974-75	\$10,505,000
Recommended for approval.....	7,332,000
Recommended reduction	\$3,173,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Analysis Page</i>
1. Scope change, San Diego—construct art building.....	—	1024
2. Delete, Bakersfield—construct science building II	\$3,173,000	1024
3. Scope change, Long Beach—construct industrial technology building	—	1027

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item proposes \$10,505,000 for three projects at three campuses. The California State University and Colleges major capital outlay program is contained in this item and Item 397. In order to provide a presentation of the complete program we have included our discussion of the projects in this item under Item 397.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

Item 396 from the Capital Out-
lay Fund for Public Higher
Education, Chapter 1, Statutes
of 1971 (First Extraordinary
Session)

Budget p. 223 Program p. II-534

Requested 1974-75	\$4,000,000
Recommended for approval.....	4,000,000

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend approval.

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

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

Item 397 from the Capital Out-
lay Fund for Public Higher
Education, Chapter 1, Statutes
of 1971 (First Extraordinary
Session)

Budget p. 223 Program p. II-534

Requested 1974-75	\$18,307,000
Recommended for approval.....	17,691,000
Recommended for special review	158,000
Recommended reduction	458,000
Recommended for augmentation	316,000
Net recommended for approval	\$18,007,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Analysis Page</i>
1. Scope change, San Jose—old science rehabilitation for psychology, Item 397 (7)	—	1020
2. Delete, Sonoma—boiler plant addition, Item 397 (11)	\$340,000	1022
3. Delete, Bakersfield—central plant III, Item 397 (12)	37,000	1022
4. Scope change, Sacramento—existing library conversion, Item 397 (31)	—	1022

Item 397

CAPITAL OUTLAY / 1015

5. Delete, Sacramento—science building conversion, Item 397 (33)	6,000	1022
6. Delete, Fullerton—science building conversion V, Item 397 (34)	75,000	1023
7. Special review, Bakersfield—utilities and site development 1973, Item 397 (42)	158,000	1023
8. Scope change, Stanislaus—physical education facility, Item 397 (50)	—	1024
9. Scope change, San Diego—art building, Item 395 (1) and Item 397 (52)	—	1024
10. Delete, Bakersfield—science building II, Item 395 (2)	3,173,000	1024
11. Scope change, Long Beach—industrial technology building, Item 395 (3)	—	1024
12. Augment, San Luis Obispo—life science building ^a	\$316,000	1027

^a Propose funding in Item 397.

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The California State University and Colleges (CSUC) major capital outlay program is proposed for funding from two sources in two separate items. Item 395 proposes \$10,505,000 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education (COFPE) for three projects at three campuses. This item proposes \$18,307,000 from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education, Chapter 1, Statutes of 1971 (First Extraordinary Session), (COFPE-ES) for 52 projects affecting 17 campuses. In order to provide a presentation of the complete program, we have included those projects in Item 395 within our discussion of this item. The separation of projects into two items is for accounting purposes only. A summary of the proposed program and our recommendation is provided in Table 1.

Table 1
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
SUMMARY—ITEMS 395 AND 397 CAPITAL OUTLAY PROJECTS
AND LEGISLATIVE ANALYST RECOMMENDATIONS

Item No.	Project title	Phase ^a	Campus	Budget Bill amount	Legislative Analyst recommendation	Analysis page
397 (1)	Home economics building rehabilitation	c	San Jose	\$1,300,000	\$1,300,000	1019
397 (2)	Convert old library for faculty offices	c	Chico	606,000	606,000	1019
386 (3)	Modernize auditorium building	c	Chico	821,000	821,000	1019
397 (4)	Little theater rehabilitation	ce	San Diego	225,000	225,000	1019
397 (5)	Life sciences rehabilitation	pw	San Diego	26,000	26,000	1019
397 (6)	Crandall gymnasium and natatorium rehabilitation	pw	San Luis Obispo	20,000	20,000	1019
397 (7)	Old science rehabilitation for psychology	pw	San Jose	152,000	152,000 (Rescope)	1020
397 (8)	Project planning for 1974-75		Statewide	100,000	100,000	1020
397 (9)	Campus master planning		Statewide	205,000	205,000	1020

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES—Continued

397 (10)	Utilities 1973.....	c	Dominguez Hills	526,000	526,000	1021
397 (11)	Boiler plant addition	c	Sonoma	340,000	—	1022
397 (12)	Central plant III.....	pw	Bakersfield	37,000	—	1022
397 (13)	Classroom office building I	e	Bakersfield	229,000	229,000	1021
397 (14)	Initial library addition	e	Bakersfield	134,000	134,000	1021
397 (15)	Initial P.E. facility.....	e	Bakersfield	46,000	46,000	1021
397 (16)	Conversion of initial buildings	e	Dominguez Hills	115,000	115,000	1021
397 (17)	Industrial arts building.....	e	Fresno	440,000	440,000	1021
397 (18)	Engineering building	e	Fresno	400,000	400,000	1021
397 (19)	Science building conversion.....	e	Sacramento	70,000	70,000	1021
397 (20)	Engineering west addition	e	San Luis Obispo	159,000	159,000	1021
397 (21)	Scene shop	e	Stanislaus	11,000	11,000	1021
397 (22)	Cafeteria	e	Stanislaus	103,000	103,000	1021
397 (23)	Library.....	e	Chico	450,000	450,000	1021
397 (24)	Natural science building.....	e	Dominguez Hills	185,000	185,000	1021
397 (25)	Physical science building	e	Los Angeles	500,000	500,000	1021
397 (26)	Library building	e	Northridge	164,000	164,000	1021
397 (27)	Library building	e	Sacramento	500,000	500,000	1021
397 (28)	Life science building	e	San Francisco	250,000	250,000	1021
397 (29)	Physical science building	e	San Francisco	400,000	400,000	1021
397 (30)	Science 2 phase II.....	e	San Jose	500,000	500,000	1021
397 (31)	Existing library conversion	c	Sacramento	1,412,000	1,412,000 (Rescope)	1022
397 (32)	Science building conversion	w	Long Beach	8,000	8,000	1021
397 (33)	Science building conversion II.....	w	Sacramento	6,000	—	1022
397 (34)	Science building conversion V.....	wc	Fullerton	75,000	—	1023
397 (35)	Old administration building conversion	pw	Long Beach	68,000	68,000	1021
397 (36)	Biological science building conversion	pw	Los Angeles	25,000	25,000	1021
397 (37)	Air condition engineering building	wc	Pomona	83,000	83,000	1023
397 (38)	Remove architectural barriers to the handicapped.....	pw	Statewide	1,000,000	1,000,000	1023
397 (39)	Utilities 1974.....	wc	San Francisco	329,000	329,000	1023
397 (40)	Utilities 1974.....	w	San Diego	8,000	8,000	1023
397 (41)	Utilities 1974.....	wc	San Jose	275,000	275,000	1023
397 (42)	Utilities and site development 1973.....	c	Bakersfield	158,000	Special Review	1023
397 (43)	Site development 1975.....	w	Pomona	8,000	8,000	1023

Item 397

CAPITAL OUTLAY / 1017

397 (44)	Site development						
	1974.....	c	Sonoma	736,000	736,000	1023	
397 (45)	Site development						
	1974.....	w	Los Angeles	195,000	195,000	1023	
397 (46)	Site development						
	1974.....	w	San Bernardino	9,000	9,000	1023	
397 (47)	Outdoor P.E.	c	Dominguez Hills	410,000	410,000	1025	
397 (48)	Initial cafeteria		Bakersfield	1,880,000	1,880,000	1025	
397 (49)	Physical education facility	pw	Dominguez Hills	198,000	198,000	1025	
397 (50)	Physical education facility	pw	Stanislaus	117,000	117,000	1024	
					(Rescope)		
397 (51)	Outdoor physical education facility II	pw	Bakersfield	41,000	41,000	1026	
397 (52)	Art building	c	San Diego	2,252,000	2,252,000	1024	
					(Rescope)		
395 (1)	Art building	c	San Diego	3,462,000	3,462,000	1024	
					(Rescope)		
395 (2)	Science building II	c	Bakersfield	3,173,000	—	1024	
395 (3)	Industrial technology building	c	Long Beach	3,870,000	3,870,000	1024	
					(Rescope)		
	Life science building	pw	San Luis Obispo	—	316,000 ^b	1027	
	Total (COFPHE-ES)			\$18,307,000	\$18,007,000		
	Special Review (COFPHE-ES) ..			—	158,000		
	Total (COFPHE)			10,505,000	7,332,000		
	Total.....			\$28,812,000	\$25,497,000		

* Phase symbols indicate: p—preliminary planning
w—working drawings
c—construction
e—equipment

^b Propose funding from the Capital Outlay Fund for Public Higher Education, Chapter 1, Statutes of 1971 (First Extraordinary Session) (COFPHE-ES), Item 397.

Instructional Capacity

The need for new instructional capacity space is directly related to the need to meet enrollment increases. Enrollment in the higher education area has been increasing at a less rapid rate and is expected to decrease in actual numbers in the early 1980's and then stabilize through the mid and late 1980's. The CSUC system is expected to experience this trend. In fact, the enrollment projections in the trustee's 1973-74 five-year major capital outlay program indicated an enrollment of 230,260 for 1973-74. This was later revised to 226,200 and has recently been revised again to 219,750. Thus, in approximately one year's time enrollments for 1973-74 were revised downward by nearly 5 percent. During this same time period projected enrollments for 1980-81 were revised downward by 12 percent.

It is also interesting to note that the Department of Finance provisional projections for high school graduates indicates a decline in actual numbers of graduates in 1973. These projections indicate a 1973 level of 287,075 graduates compared to 291,496 in 1972. This represents a decrease of 1.5 percent and is the first decline of actual numbers in the projections which

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES—Continued

date back to 1960. The projections also indicate a steady decline beginning in 1980 and continuing through 1984, the last year for projections. The 1984 projection of 268,500 graduates is only slightly higher (0.5 percent) than the 1969 level.

In view of these projections and the uncertain enrollments in higher education, we believe it would be unwise to fund projects which provide excess capacity in the year of occupancy. As instructional programs and methods change, existing campus space should be evaluated and altered if required. Table 2 compares current instructional capacity space to projected space needs in 1976-77, the probable year of occupancy for construction projects. The space need indicated in this table are based on the trustee's revised projections dated November 13, 1973. It should be recognized that the Coordinating Council for Higher Education^a is in the process of establishing class laboratory utilization rates for an 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. scheduling period (current scheduling period is 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.). Therefore, the class laboratory capacities in Table 2 will increase under the new standard.

^aTo be replaced by the California Postsecondary Commission effective April 1, 1974.

Table 2
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES
FTE Capacity Needs in 1976-77 Compared to Available

<i>Campus</i>	<i>Classrooms (FTE)</i>			<i>Class laboratories (FTE)</i>		
	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Need 1976-77</i>	<i>Deficit (-) Excess (+)</i>	<i>Existing</i>	<i>Need 1976-77</i>	<i>Deficit (-) Excess (+)</i>
Bakersfield	2,761	3,136	-375	332	310	+22
Chico	10,511	10,105	+406	1,220	1,411	-191
Dominguez Hills	5,760	4,844	+916	545	175	+370
Fresno	12,330	11,351	+979	1,442	1,509	-67
Fullerton	14,739	12,890	+1,849	1,060	1,353	-293
Hayward	12,943	8,142	+4,801	611	646	-35
Humboldt	6,016	5,338	+678	761	959	-198
Long Beach	19,387	18,886	+501	1,598	2,247	-649
Los Angeles	18,931	13,494	+5,437	1,803	1,108	+695
Northridge	16,153	15,922	+231	1,111	1,228	-117
Pomona	10,578	8,310	+2,268	1,304	1,110	+194
Sacramento	13,665	14,518	-853	1,064	1,009	+55
San Bernardino	3,700	3,040	+660	276	153	+123
San Diego	19,902	19,516	+386	1,707	2,340	-633
San Francisco	15,139	13,838	+1,301	1,490	1,734	-244
San Jose	19,485	18,004	+1,481	2,037	2,353	-316
San Luis Obispo	10,067	10,700	-633	1,797	2,261	-464
Sonoma	5,474	4,549	+925	338	451	-113
Stanislaus	3,565	2,343	+1,222	271	81	+190
Total	221,106	198,926	+22,180	20,767	22,438	-1,671

In the following discussion we have divided the requested program into six descriptive categories. These categories are identical to the ones used by the trustees in their 1974-75 capital outlay program. The categories are also presented in the trustees priority order.

Table 3
PROJECTS TO CORRECT STRUCTURAL DEFICIENCIES

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Project title</i>	<i>Phase^a</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project new instructional capacity additive to table 2 (FTE)</i>			<i>Budget Bill amount</i>	<i>Future requirement^b</i>
				<i>Lecture</i>	<i>Lab</i>	<i>Faculty</i>		
397(1)	Home economics building rehabilitation	c	San Jose	—	—	—	\$1,300,000	\$67,000
397(2)	Convert old library for faculty offices.....	c	Chico	—	—	50	606,000	20,000
397(3)	Modernize auditorium building	c	chico	—	—	—	821,000	—
397(4)	Little Theater rehabilitation	ce	San Diego	116	—	—	225,000	—
395(5)	Life science rehabilitation	pw	San Diego	—	—	—	26,000	314,000
397(6)	Crandall gym and natatorium rehabilitation	pw	San Luis Obispo	—	—	—	20,000	245,000
397(7)	Old science rehabilitation for psychology.....	pw	San Jose	161	62.5	85	152,000	2,738,000
TOTAL (COFPHE)							\$3,150,000	
TOTAL—future requirements								\$3,284,000

^a Phase symbol indicates: p—preliminary planning, w—working drawings, c—construction, e—equipment.

^b Proposed by trustees in five-year construction program.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES—Continued**Correct Structural Deficiencies**

We recommend rescoping Item 397(7), San Jose old science rehabilitation for psychology.

This category includes projects to renovate existing buildings which are structurally deficient according to current building codes. Because of the nature of the renovation work most of the projects include a limited amount of interior remodeling and modernization.

The San Diego little theater rehabilitation project includes 116 FTE lecture capacity. Although this campus has an excess capacity in lecture space, this project should proceed. The little theater houses the entire department of television and films and the large seating space is necessary to provide the necessary instructional program. Since the project is unique in this respect it should proceed. However, we suggest the campus evaluate existing lecture space for conversion into needed laboratory space.

Rescope—San Jose, Old Science Rehabilitation for Psychology

As can be seen in Table 2 the San Jose campus will have an excess lecture capacity of 1,481 FTE and a need for 316 FTE class laboratory capacity. It should also be noted that with existing space the campus will have 25 excess faculty office stations in 1976. We recommend the old science rehabilitation project be rescoped to include class laboratory space only.

Statewide Planning

We recommend approval.

Table 4
Statewide Planning

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Project title</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Budget Bill amount</i>
397(8)	Project planning for 1974-75	Statewide	\$100,000
397(9)	Campus master planning	Statewide	205,000
	Total (COFPHE)		\$305,000

The funds requested for project planning are to provide for schematic and preliminary planning for site development, utility services and alterations projects proposed for funding in 1975-76. The requested funds will provide for approximately \$6.5 million of working drawings and construction projects.

Changing instructional program needs coupled with the necessity to increase utilization of existing facilities, requires evaluation and readjustments of campus master plans. The requested funds will provide for this evaluation and readjustment. However, the trustees have indicated that each operating campus will receive \$10,000 and the three undeveloped campuses \$5,000 each. The need to develop the new campuses is not apparent and we recommend that none of these funds be allocated for those sites. Also, since the needs at each campus differ, it would seem appropriate to provide the campuses master planning money on an "as needed" basis rather than a lump sum to each campus.

Table 5
PROJECTS TO MAKE EXISTING AND FUNDED PROJECTS OPERABLE

Item No.	Project title	Phase ^a	Campus	Project new instructional capacity additive to Table 2 (FTE)			Budget Bill amount	Future requirement ^b
				Lecture	Lab	Faculty		
397 (10)	Utilities 1973	c	Dominguez Hills	—	—	—	\$526,000	—
397 (11)	Boiler plant addition	c	Sonoma	—	—	—	340,000	—
397 (12)	Central Plant III	pw	Bakersfield	—	—	—	37,000	\$613,000
397 (13)	Classroom office building I	e	Bakersfield	—	—	—	229,000	—
397 (14)	Initial library addition	e	Bakersfield	—	—	—	134,000	—
397 (15)	Initial physical education building..	e	Bakersfield	—	—	—	46,000	—
397 (16)	Conversion of initial building	e	Dominguez Hills	—	—	—	115,000	—
397 (17)	Industrial arts building	e	Fresno	—	—	—	440,000	—
397 (18)	Engineering building	e	Fresno	—	—	—	400,000	—
397 (19)	Science building conversion	e	Sacramento	—	—	—	70,000	—
397 (20)	Engineering west addition	e	San Luis Obispo	—	—	—	159,000	—
397 (21)	Scene shop	e	Stanislaus	—	—	—	11,000	—
397 (22)	Cafeteria	e	Stanislaus	—	—	—	103,000	—
397 (23)	Library	e	Chico	—	—	—	450,000	—
397 (24)	Natural science building	e	Dominguez Hills	—	—	—	185,000	—
397 (25)	Physical science building	e	Dominguez Hills	—	—	—	500,000	—
397 (26)	Library building	e	Northridge	—	—	—	164,000	—
397 (27)	Library building	e	Sacramento	—	—	—	500,000	—
397 (28)	Life science building	e	San Francisco	—	—	—	250,000	—
397 (29)	Physical science building	e	San Francisco	—	—	—	400,000	—
397 (30)	Science building 2 phase II	e	San Jose	—	—	—	500,000	200,000
397 (31)	Existing library building conversion	c	Sacramento	+783	+38	+32	1,412,000	300,000
397 (32)	Science building conversion	w	Long Beach	—	—	—	8,000	115,000
397 (33)	Science building conversion II	w	Sacramento	-329	+25	—	6,000	164,000
397 (34)	Science building conversion V	wc	Fullerton	—	—	+20	75,000	—
397 (35)	Old administration building conversion	pw	Long Beach	—	+24	+112	68,000	1,234,000
397 (36)	Biological science building conversion	pw	Los Angeles	—	—	—	25,000	347,000
397 (37)	Air condition engineering building	wc	Pomona	—	—	—	83,000	—
TOTAL (COFPHE-ES)							\$7,236,000	
TOTAL future requirement								\$2,973,000

^a Phase symbols indicate: p—preliminary planning
w—working drawings
c—construction
e—equipment

^b Proposed in Trustees' five-year construction program.

Item 397

CAPITAL OUTLAY / 1021

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES—Continued**Projects to Make Existing and Funded Buildings Operable**

We recommend deletion of (1) Item 397(11) Sonoma, boiler plant addition, (2) Item 397(12) Bakersfield, central plant III, (3) Item 397(33) Sacramento science building conversion, (4) Item 397(34) Fullerton, science building conversion V and rescoping Item 397(31) Sacramento, existing library conversion.

This category contains projects for equipment of new building, utilities to building under construction and conversion of existing space. We recommend approval except for those projects discussed below.

It should be pointed out that the Budget Bill contains language to limit the availability of equipment funds to two years. In prior years these funds were available for three years. We concur with this change.

Sonoma

We recommend deletion of 397(11) boiler plant addition, a reduction of \$340,000.

The requested boiler plant addition is for an additional 1,000-ton chiller for the air conditioning system. The existing system has a 1,220-ton capacity and is of adequate size to serve existing and funded buildings. The need for a new chiller is based on additional buildings which cannot be justified at this time.

Bakersfield

We recommend deletion of Item 397(12) Central Plant III, a reduction of \$37,000.

This request is for preliminary plans and working drawings for the addition of a 700-ton chiller and a 200-boiler-horsepower boiler. The existing chiller and boiler capacity is adequate to serve existing and funded buildings. Additional capacity will be required upon construction of the proposed Science Building II. We recommend deletion of the appropriation for this building and correspondingly recommend deletion of the central plan proposal.

Sacramento

We recommend rescoping Item 397(31) existing library conversion and deletion of Item 397(33) science building conversion II, a reduction of \$6,000.

As is noted in Table 5, conversion of the existing library will provide an FTE capacity of 783 lecture, 38 class laboratory and 32 faculty. In 1976, this campus will have an excess of 55 FTE class laboratory capacity and a deficit of 853 FTE lecture capacity. We recommend this project be re-scoped to delete the class laboratory space. In faculty space the campus has 633 FTE capacity in permanent facilities and 223 in leased and "other" temporary space. Faculty space needs in 1976 will be 882, therefore, the need for additional faculty space is apparent. However, the campus should discontinue use of temporary space when permanent space becomes available.

The science building conversion project will convert 329 FTE lecture space to 25 FTE class laboratory space. The space needs for this campus are for lecture space and not class laboratory. Therefore, we recommend deletion of this proposal.

Fullerton

We recommend deletion of Item 397(34), conversion of Science Building V.

This request is to convert approximately 3,400 assignable square feet of vacated health service space into 20 faculty offices and other office space. The Fullerton campus has 877 faculty office spaces with a need in 1976 of only 800. The addition of more faculty space would be inappropriate. However, in 1976, the campus will have a deficit of 293 FTE in class laboratories. We suggest the campus evaluate this space for alteration to provide the needed class laboratories.

Projects to Fully Utilize Existing Campus

We recommend special review of Item 397(42) utilities and site development, Bakersfield.

Table 6
Projects to Fully Utilize Existing Campus

Item No.	Project Title	Phase ^a	Campus	Budget Bill Amount	Future Requirement ^b
397(38)	Removal of architectural barriers for the handicapped	pwc	Statewide	\$1,00,000	—
397(39)	Utilities 1974	wc	San Francisco	329,000	—
397(40)	Utilities 1974	wc	San Diego	8,000	\$182,000
397(41)	Utilities 1974	wc	San Jose	275,000	—
397(42)	Utilities and site development 1973	c	Bakersfield	158,000	—
397(43)	Site development 1974	w	Pomona	8,000	202,000
397(44)	Site development 1974	c	Sonoma	736,000	—
397(45)	Site development 1975	w	Los Angeles	195,000	5,624,000
397(46)	Site development 1974	w	San Bernardino	9,000	705,000
	Total (COFPHE-ES)			\$2,718,000	—
	Total future requirements ..			—	\$6,713,000

^a Phase symbols indicate: p—preliminary planning
w—working drawings
c—construction

^b Proposed in trustees five-year construction program.

This category includes a statewide project for removal of architectural barriers to the handicapped and eight utilities and/or site development projects. The statewide project is necessary to meet state code requirements concerning access to public buildings by handicapped persons. A similar project was funded last year in the amount of \$300,000. At that time federal assistance on a four-to-one financing basis was anticipated. This assistance did not develop and we have been advised that no federal assistance can be expected for the proposed project. The utility and/or site development projects primarily consists of upgrading and replacement of various campus utility systems and improvements to campus access.

The Bakersfield project includes utility services and vehicular access to

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES—Continued

the proposed science building II. We have recommended deletion of funding for construction of this building. Therefore, we recommend this request be reduced by the amount required to install the utilities and vehicular access.

Projects to Provide for a Balanced Campus

We recommend rescoping of Item 397(50) physical education facility, Stanislaus.

The Stanislaus campus currently has 172 FTE faculty offices in permanent facilities. The projected 1976 need for faculty offices is 146. Additional faculty office space is not justifiable and we recommend the project be rescoped to delete the proposed faculty office space.

Projects to Provide for Enrollment Growth

We recommend rescoping of (1) Items 395(1)–397(52) San Diego, art building and (2) Item 395(3) Long Beach, industrial technology building, deletion of Item 395(2) and addition of life science building, San Luis Obispo.

San Diego

We recommend rescoping of Items 395(1)–396(52), art building.

With existing and funded buildings operable this campus in 1976 will have an excess of lecture space and a deficit in class laboratory and faculty office space. If the proposed art building is constructed as presently scoped there will be an excess of 632 FTE lecture capacity and a deficit of 83 FTE class laboratory and 20 FTE faculty capacities. We recommend the project scope be realigned by deleting the lecture space and providing more class-laboratory and office space.

Bakersfield

We recommend deletion of Item 395(2), science building II, a reduction of \$3,173,000.

This campus has a significant 1976 deficit of 375 FTE lecture capacity. However, in the same year the existing class laboratory space provides an excess of 22 FTE and even as late as 1978–79 class laboratory would be in deficit by only 29. Construction of this project as presently scoped would provide an excess capacity of 1976 of 44 FTE and 101 FTE in lecture and class laboratory space respectively. Any new project on this campus should relieve the shortage of lecture space and not overbuild class laboratory space.

Long Beach

We recommend rescoping of Item 395(3) industrial technology building.

The proposed building will provide an FTE capacity of 209 lecture, 228

Table 7
Projects to Provide for a Balanced Campus

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Project title</i>	<i>Phase^a</i>	<i>Campus</i>	<i>Project new instructional capacity additive to Table 2 (FTE)</i>			<i>Budget Bill amount</i>	<i>Future requirement^b</i>
				<i>Lecture</i>	<i>Lab</i>	<i>Faculty</i>		
397(47)	Outdoor physical education facility	c	Dominguez Hills	—	—	—	\$410,000	—
397(48)	Initial cafeteria	c	Bakersfield	—	—	—	1,880,000	\$102,000
397(49)	Physical education facility	pw	Dominguez Hills	—	—	—	198,000	4,205,000
347(50)	Physical education facility	pw	Stanislaus	—	—	10	117,000	2,211,000
347(51)	Outdoor physical education facility II	pw	Bakersfield	—	—	—	41,000	668,000
	Total (COFPHE-ES)						\$2,646,000	
	Total future requirements							\$7,186,000

^a Phase symbol indicates: p—preliminary plans
w—working drawings
c—construction

^b Proposed in trustees five-year construction program.

Table 8
Projects to Provide for Enrollment Growth

Item No.	Project title	Phase ^a	Campus	Project new-instructional capacity additive to Table 2 (FTE)			Budget Bill amount	Future requirement ^b
				Lecture	Lab	Faculty		
397 (52)	Art building	c	San Diego	246	550	42	\$2,252,000	\$406,000
395 (1)	Art building	c	San Diego	—	—	—	3,462,000	—
395 (2)	Science building II	c	Bakersfield	419	123	11	3,173,000	372,000
395 (2)	Industrial technology building	c	Long Beach	209	228	55	4,000,000	644,000
	Total (COFPHE-ES)						\$2,252,000	—
	Total (COFPHE)						10,635,000	—
	TOTAL						\$12,887,000	\$1,422,000

^a Phase symbol indicates: c—construction

^b Proposed in trustees five-year construction plan.

class laboratory and 55 faculty. In 1976, without this building, this campus will have an excess of 501 FTE lecture capacity and a deficit of 649 FTE class laboratory capacity. Faculty office space on this campus consists of over 170 leased offices and 88 "other" temporary offices. Even with the proposed alterations for the old administration building, Item 397 (35), this campus will require 95 leased or "other" office space. We recommend rescoping this project to delete the lecture space and provide more class laboratory and/or faculty offices.

San Luis Obispo

We recommend addition of preliminary plans and working drawings for the life science building, an augmentation of \$316,000.

This campus is the only one in the CSUC system where there is an apparent deficit in both lecture and class laboratory space in 1976. The deficit is 633 FTE and 464 FTE respectively. The proposed life science building would be approximately 76,000 gross square feet and provide an FTE capacity of 524 lecture, and 205 class laboratory. This project was priority 73 in the trustees total requested capital outlay program which included 110 project. In our opinion, the project is justifiable and should proceed. We suggest using funds from the COFPHE-ES, Item 397.

CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY

Item 398 from the General
Fund

Budget p. 225 Program p. II-580

Requested 1974-75	\$75,000
Recommended for special review	75,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	Amount	Analysis Page
1. Special Review—Working drawings and construct, modification and upgrade of primary electrical distribution system	\$75,000	1027

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

(a) Working drawings and construct—modification and upgrade of primary electrical distribution system	\$75,000
---	----------

We recommend special review.

The Maritime Academy is located at Vallejo on approximately 67 acres. Permanent facilities consist of four instructional buildings, library, administration building, cafeteria, residence hall and a gymnasium with a pool. The average enrollment in fiscal year 1974-75 is expected to be 260 students.

We have not received any information concerning the requested project. We understand the Office of Architecture and Construction is evaluating the electrical needs and that project and cost information should be available during budget hearings.

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Item 399 from the State Construction Program Fund

Budget p. 227 Program p. II-593

Requested 1974-75	\$44,054,600
Recommended for approval.....	44,054,600

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The "Community College Construction Program Act of 1972" provided \$160 million for state participation in community college capital outlay programs. Approximately \$99.3 million has been appropriated. Thus, if the proposed 157 projects under this item are funded as requested there will be approximately \$16.7 million remaining in the bond issue fund.

The state's participation (sharing ratio) in approved community college capital outlay projects is based on a formula established by Chapter 1550, Statutes of 1967, which takes into account the ratio of weekly student contact hours and assessed valuations districtwide and statewide. The 157 projects in the schedule under this item represent a total community college capital outlay program of \$88,301,008, affecting 45 of the 69 districts throughout the state. Of this amount the state's share is the \$44,054,600 in the Budget Bill with the remaining \$44,246,408 required to be funded by the individual districts.

As we have indicated, the total number of projects in this item is 157, which would require a prohibitive amount of space if each one were to be discussed individually in this analysis. Consequently, we have grouped the projects into three broad categories and provided a discussion of each category. The cost estimates for projects in each category are in line with similar projects experienced on State University and Colleges campuses. The totals shown for each category represent the state's share only.

- (1) Site acquisition, site development and utility services \$4,332,500

We recommend approval.

This category represents 10 percent of the proposed state share. Included is one site acquisition project at Santa Barbara City College for \$1,714,000, and \$2,618,500 for site development, utilities and/or heating-cooling plant facilities at 11 districts. These projects will provide necessary utility services and heating-cooling plants to make new buildings operable. Site development will also improve campus access and erosion control.

- (2) Instructional capacity facilities \$26,020,700

We recommend approval.

The category contains working drawings, construction and/or equipment projects for general academic, science and vocational technology facilities representing 59 percent of the proposed state's share. The need for projects in this category is determined, in part, by comparing existing campus instructional space with projected weekly student contact hours (WSCH). Capacity of existing space is determined by using current statewide higher education standards which are based on a scheduling period of 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. It should be pointed out that Chapter 936, Statutes

of 1973, (SB 618) allows the community colleges to include in WSCH those students enrolled in graded and ungraded classes during the 8:00 and 10:00 time period. The expressed legislative intent in passage of this legislation was for the community colleges to increase space and utilization standards. Prior to this legislation the WSCH enrollment indicated only graded students enrolled in classes during an 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. period. Accordingly, utilization rates and standards were based on an 8:00-to-4:30 period. The projects in this category are based on the increased standard and the total WSCH for the 8:00 to 10:00 scheduling period.

(3) Noninstructional academic and auxiliary facilities \$13,701,400

We recommend approval.

This category is rather broad and includes working drawings, construction and/or equipment projects for libraries, resource materials centers, physical education facilities, administration, drama-theater, warehouses, etc. The amount represents 30 percent of the proposed state share. The proposed projects will provide new facilities or expansion of existing buildings to provide adequate space to support the campus program.

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 400 from the State Beach,

Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund of 1964

Budget p. L-35 Program p. I-817

Requested 1974-75	\$64,300
Recommended for approval.....	64,300

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend approval.

This item provides \$64,300 from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund of 1964 to the Department of Parks and Recreation for the review of the plans and specifications of the projects resubmitted by local government under the grant provisions of the 1964 Parks Bond Act. These funds will also provide for administering the projects now under way.

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 401 from the State Beach,
Park, Recreational and His-
torical Facilities Fund

Budget p. I-140 Program p. 813

Requested 1974-75	\$2,414,337
Recommended for approval.....	60,500
Recommended for special review	2,353,837

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item is the major capital outlay program being financed from the balance of the \$20 million available for minimum development from the 1964 State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund.

(a) Bolsa Chica State Beach\$2,353,837

We recommend special review.

This item would fund the major part of the continuing development at this beach. This same project was not approved by the Legislature in 1973-74 pending completion of a comprehensive study of Bolsa Bay by the Resources Agency. The study is to be submitted to the Legislature in February. Pending receipt of the study, we recommend special review.

(b) Design and Construction Liaison \$60,500

We recommend approval.

This subitem appropriates money for reimbursement to the department's general support Item 273. It provides for those continuing design and construction costs for liaison with OAC for the minimum development projects under construction which are financed from the 1964 State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Fund.

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 402 Reappropriations from
the State Beach, Park, Recrea-
tional and Historical Facilities
Fund of 1964

Budget p. 140 Program p. I-813

This item proposes to reappropriate funds for acquisitions and minimum development projects financed from the State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Fund.

The citation and title of each of 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—Montaña 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 (m): Budget Act of 1966—Old River Islands

- Item 423 (q): Budget Act of 1966—12 miscellaneous projects
 Item 423 (t): Budget Act of 1966—Santa Monica Mountains
 Item 343.7 (b): Budget Act of 1967—Delta Meadows
 Item 377.1 (a): Budget Act of 1968—Carpinteria State Beach
 Item 422 (a): Budget Act of 1969—Emma Wood State Beach
 Item 313 (g): Budget Act of 1971—Montaña de Oro State Park (augmentation)
 Item 313 (h): Budget Act of 1971—Picacho State Recreation Area (augmentation)
 Item 313A (a): Budget Act of 1971 (added by Chapter 1223, Statutes of 1971)—Doheny State Beach
 The minimum development projects being reappropriated are:
 Item 424 (c): Budget Act of 1966—Point Mugu, appropriation for development of a water system only
 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 development
 Item 314 (d): Budget Act of 1971—Old Sacramento State Historical Park
 Item 314 (f): Budget Act of 1971—Refugio State Beach

In our Analysis last year and for several prior years we have been pointing out a continuing lack of acquisition progress on the remaining 1964 state beach, park, recreational and historical facilities projects. The status of these and other acquisition appropriations is shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Acquisition Status
Appropriations and Expenditures as of October 31, 1973
Funding provided by the State Beach, Park, Recreational
and Historical Facilities Fund, the Bagley Conservation Fund, and
the State Park Contingent Fund

<i>Project appropriations</i>	<i>Amount available</i>	<i>Expenditures</i>	<i>Balance</i>	<i>Acres</i>	
				<i>Acquired to date</i>	<i>To be acquired</i>
Allensworth S.H.P. (Item 318.2/72)	\$200,000	\$62,086	\$137,914	10.5	229.50
Anza-Borrego Desert S.P.					
(Item 318/72)	122,400	—	122,400	—	2,560.00
* (Item 349/73)	234,600	—	234,600	—	3,852.00
* Bear Harbor Ranch (Item 350/73)	2,000,000	21	1,999,979	—	3,800.00
Big Basin Redwoods S.P. (Item 318/72)	191,250	—	191,250	—	160.00
* Bodega Bay (Bodega Head)					
(Item 350/73)	500,000	653	499,347	—	269.00
Bothe-Napa Valley S.P. (Item 318/72)	350,000	—	350,000	—	441.00
* Candlestick Park (Item 350/73)	10,000,000	21	9,999,979	—	269.00
Carmel River S.B. (Item 318/72)	884,000	—	884,000	—	150.00
Carpinteria S.B. (Item 377.1/68)	191,000	60,955	130,045	—	7.50
Castle Rock S.P. (Item 318/72)	26,300	—	26,300	—	80.00
* Century Ranch (Item 318/72)	5,700,000	—	5,700,000	—	2,630.00
Coyote River Parkway (Item 423/66) ..	2,500,000	1,521,512	978,488	358.19	108.59
Delta Meadows (Item 362/65)	765,000	91,444	673,556	—	710.40
Doheny S.B. (C. 1223/71, Item 313A) ..	2,100,000	13,623	2,086,377	—	3.27
El Presidio de Santa Barbara S.H.P.					
(Item 322A/72)	33,000	502	32,498	—	1.00

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION—Continued

* Elk Creek Beach (Item 350/73)	100,000	21	99,979	—	60.00
* Empire Mine (Item 350/73)	1,500,000	1,003	1,498,997	—	1,122.00
* Encinal Beach (Item 350/73)	650,000	21	649,979	—	5.00
* Fort Ross S.H.P. (Item 350/73)	750,000	21	749,979	—	600.00
* Caviota-Refugio (Item 423/66)	4,519,559	4,294,543	225,016	2,778.82	200.00
* Gualala River (Ch. 983/73)	55,000	—	55,000	—	100.00
* Henty Woods S.P. (Ch. 983/73)	300,000	—	300,000	—	200.00
Humboldt Redwoods S.P.					
(Item 318/72)	306,000	—	306,000	—	147.20
(Item 318.1/72)	490,000	—	490,000	—	1,202.00
* (Item 349/73)	489,600	—	489,600	—	700.00
* Huntington S.B. (Item 350/73)	8,100,000	3,018	8,096,982	—	80.10
* Inverness Ridge (Item 350/73)	1,000,000	—	1,000,000	—	1,240.00
* Jedediah Smith Redwoods					
(Item 349.1/73)	30,000	—	30,000	—	18.00
* Kings Beach (Item 350/73)	780,000	7,392	772,608	—	6.98
Little River S.R. (Item 318.2/72)	75,000	2,826	72,174	—	55.00
* MacKerricher S.P. (Item 350/73)	175,000	21	174,979	—	100.00
* Manchester Beach (Item 350/73)	350,000	21	349,979	—	263.00
* Mendocino County (Ch. 983/73)	200,000	—	200,000	—	80.00
(Schooner Gulch & Bowling Ball Beach)					
Mendocino Headlands					
(Item 350/oo)/73)	100,000	21	99,979	—	25.00
Montaña de Oro S.P. (Item 423/66)	1,783,649	1,337,478	446,171	1,326.71	510.00
Montara S.B. (307B/71)	630,000	—	630,000	—	54.00
* (Item 350/73)	65,000	21	64,979	—	9.10
* Monterey County (Ch. 1082/73)	1,800,000	—	1,800,000	—	155.00
Morro Bay S.P. (Item 318.2/73)	357,500	354,591	2,909	5.73	8.27
* Mount Diablo S.P. (Item 350/73)	1,000,000	21	999,979	—	1,330.00
* Newport & Laguna Beach					
(Ch. 1121/73)	7,600,000	—	7,600,000	—	1,500.00
Old River Island (Item 423/66)	783,950	10,034	773,916	—	980.00
* Old Sacramento S.H.P.					
(Item 367/73)	185,000	250	184,750	—	6.90
* Old Town San Diego (Item 350/73)	297,000	422	296,578	—	1.10
Picacho S.R.A. (Item 423/66)	256,800	254,409	2,391	240.12	1.72
Pismo S.B. (Item 313/71)	2,750,000	1,628,979	1,121,021	83.84	851.35
* Point Lobos S.R. (Ch. 958/72)	2,000,000	1,156	1,998,844	—	48.81
* Red Rock Canyon (Item 350/73)	350,000	833	349,167	—	9,554.00
Rincon Point (Item 318/72)	65,000	1,398	63,602	—	2.50
* Russian Gulch S.P. (Item 350/73)	350,000	21	349,979	—	110.00
Rustic-Sullivan (Item 313.1/71)	750,000	478,000	272,000	87	229.29
* Santa Cruz Mtns. (Hoover Ranch)					
(Ch. 1423/72)	2,500,000	1,586	2,498,414	—	2,300.00
* Santa Monica Pacific Ocean					
(Item 350/73)	1,800,000	401	1,799,599	—	3.00
Serrano Canyon (Item 350/73)	1,235,000	6,509	1,228,491	—	1,123.00
* Simi Valley (Item 350/73)	3,000,000	3,336	2,996,664	—	3,383.00
Sonoma Coast S.B. (Item 318.2/72)	350,000	180,478	169,522	11.80	28.00
* (Item 350/73)	3,925,000	21	3,924,979	—	1,500.00
* South Carlsbad (Item 350/73)	1,500,000	3,029	1,496,971	—	33.00
Topanga Canyon (Item 322/72)	459,000	1,968	457,032	—	27.35
Torrey Pines S.R. (Item 343.6/67)	1,074,000	1,071,753	2,247	164.37	36.63
* Wilder Ranch (Item 350/73)	6,000,000	221	5,999,779	—	3,900.00
* Willow Creek (Ch. 983/73)	750,000	—	750,000	—	393.00
TOTAL	\$90,134,608	\$11,402,192	\$78,732,416	5,067.08	49,554.00

* New projects not included in Table I of 1973 Analysis, page 928. Appropriations effective after October 31, 1973, not included. Source: Department of Parks and Recreation.

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 403 from the Reversion,
State Beach, Park, Recreation-
al and Historical Facilities
Fund of 1964

Budget p. 140 Program p. I-813

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend approval.

Item 403 would revert the unencumbered balance from the \$102,000 appropriation made for development of an access road at Annadel Farms in Item 323 (b) Budget Act of 1972, from the 1964 State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Fund. The department has decided to relocate the road.

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD

Item 404 from the Recreation
and Fish and Wildlife En-
hancement Program Fund

Budget p. 133 Program p. I-792

Requested 1974-75	\$596,900
Recommended for approval.....	496,900
Recommended for special review	100,000
Recommended reduction	None

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	Amount	Analysis Page
1. Special Review—construct, Oroville Wildlife Area7	\$100,000	1034

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Bond Act of 1970 provided \$6 million for design and construction of fish and wildlife enhancement projects and fishing access sites in connection with the State Water Project. A total of \$4,372,910 has been appropriated from this source since fiscal year 1971-72. This request is for one construction project for hatchery expansion at an estimated cost of \$340,900 and three projects related to fish and wildlife enhancement at a total estimated cost of \$356,000. If this item is approved as requested approximately \$1,096,900 of the \$6 million will remain.

Hatchery Expansion

- (a) Construct—facilities enlargement and modernization,
Mt. Whitney Hatchery \$340,900

We recommend approval.

This proposal would replace several irregular-shaped broodstock ponds

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD—Continued

with 12 standard (100' × 10' × 12") concrete ponds and necessary aerators, pumps and appurtenances. Two spawning houses of approximately 750 gross square feet each will also be provided.

Enlargement and modernization of this facility is necessary to supply additional eggs for the increased trout production scheduled for the State Water Project. This project and the Mt. Shasta Hatchery Project, funded in the Budget Act of 1973, will provide the necessary broodstock for this program.

Fish and Wildlife Enhancement

- (b) Fish and wildlife habitat development..... \$56,000

We recommend approval.

This request will provide one project in Region IV and two in Region V. The Region IV project will provide planting, weed control and irrigation along the California Aqueduct right-of-way and severance parcels. Approximately 120 miles between O'Neil Forebay and Kettleman City will be covered by this project at an estimated cost of \$13,000. In Region V approximately 300 acres of aqueduct right-of-way between Myrick Siphon and Avenue S in Palmdale will be developed with tree and shrub plantings. Also included will be the development of a 25-acre wetland marsh near Palmdale. Total estimated cost of this project is \$33,000. The second project in Region V at Lake Perris will provide wildlife water devices, improvement of a spring and tree and shrub plantings of 50 acres. Estimated cost of this portion is \$10,000.

- (c) Construct—Oroville wildlife area..... \$100,000

We recommend special review.

This request is for construction of a 960-square-foot headquarters and checking station, 4,000-square-foot shop and equipment shed and 25 picnic tables. Also included is the purchase of four vehicles.

Working drawing funds in the amount of \$10,000 were appropriated for this project in the Budget Act of 1973. However, preparation of working drawings has not begun and we have no construction cost estimates or preliminary plans from the Office of Architecture and Construction. In addition, the department has not indicated the need for or the types of vehicles required. Without this information we cannot assess the adequacy of the requested amount.

- (d) Fishing access sites..... \$100,000

We recommend approval.

This request is for the development of access sites in Merced, San Joaquin, Kern, and Fresno Counties. Each site will be developed cooperatively with and maintained by local government. Development will be similar to those sites recently established in other areas of the state and will provide paved fishing paths, sanitary facilities, parking areas, fencing and power and water supplies.

Resources Agency

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 405 from the Recreation
and Fish and Wildlife En-
hancement Bond Fund

Budget p. 140 Program p. I-813

Requested 1974-75	\$10,766,129
Recommended for approval.....	632,040
Recommended for special review	6,559,884
Recommended for deletion	3,574,205

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The approval of Proposition 20 by the electorate in 1970 created the Recreation and Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Bond Fund to provide \$60 million for the development of recreational facilities along the California Water Project.

Item 405 proposes development at eight reservoirs and would be partially reimbursed by \$385,000 available from the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund.

(a) Bethany Reservoir \$603,900

We recommend special review.

This request proposes construction of access facilities, bike paths, a drinking water system, a parking lot and other initial day-use features. Because of certain costly features of this project and the need to coordinate it with a complementary appropriation to the Department of Navigation and Ocean Development, we recommend special review.

(b) Del Valle Reservoir for development, phase III \$313,869

We recommend special review.

Development funds for phase I of this project were appropriated in 1971. Phase II development was appropriated in 1972. To date, only the working drawings for phases I and II have been completed. Construction approval was given by the State Public Works Board in December 1973. The phase I and II appropriations will provide almost \$3 million for construction which is not scheduled to be completed until July 1975. Until it is determined how the schedule for phase III can be matched with phases I and II, we recommend special review.

(c) Lake Oroville State Recreation Area \$1,093,600

We recommend special review.

This project proposes the expansion of the overnight camping facilities at the Loafer Creek area and the construction of an access road to the remote Craig Recreation Area. Additional hiking and riding trails would be constructed plus the addition of four employee trailer pads. This project has several problems and is recommended for special review.

(d) Peace Valley \$2,279,871

We recommend deletion.

This project is the request for initial development funds at an aquatic recreation reservoir especially constructed near Gorman along Interstate

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION—Continued

5 and adjacent to the California Aqueduct. It proposes construction of wayside campsites, family campsites, group camp, picnic units, swimming pool, irrigated turf and other features. Last year the Legislature deleted funds for the construction of the special reservoir. We therefore recommend deletion of the appropriation.

(e) Perris Reservoir \$3,728,215

We recommend special review.

This project follows a 1973 appropriation of more than \$7 million for development of phase II. The scheduling and scope of this additional funding need special review in the light of current conditions.

(f) Ritter Canyon..... \$1,294,334

We recommend deletion.

This project proposes the impoundment of water for aquatic recreation and day-use facilities alongside the California aqueduct west of Palmdale. The money by the Department of Water Resources to construct the reservoir was not included in the 1974-75 budget. We therefore recommend deleting this request by the Department of Parks and Recreation for the onshore recreation facilities.

(g) San Luis Reservoir State Recreation Area..... \$788,300

We recommend special review.

This project is the construction of camping facilities in the Basalt area and is the continuing expansion of this facility. While this is a generally desirable project, it has certain questionable features.

(h) Silverwood Lake State Recreation Area \$417,000

We recommend special review.

This project is a continuing development of family and other camping facilities in the Mesa area. While this is a desirable project it is not clear how this construction will be coordinated with the \$1.2 million appropriated for initial development of the Mesa in West Fork areas in 1973-74.

(i) Repayment to Department of Water Resources..... \$12,040

We recommend approval.

This request would repay the cost of some minor tree removal and we recommend approval.

(j) Design and Development..... \$620,000

We recommend approval.

This request is a reimbursement to the department's support budget in Item 273. The money would be used for the preparation of construction plans and construction liaison with the Office of Architecture and Construction at reservoir recreation projects.

DEPARTMENT OF NAVIGATION AND OCEAN DEVELOPMENT

Item 406 from the Recreation
and Fish and Wildlife En-
hancement Fund

Budget p. 134 Program p. I-797

Requested 1974-75	\$65,000
Recommended for approval.....	None
Recommended reduction	\$65,000

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend deletion.

This item would appropriate \$65,000 for a permanent restroom facility to replace existing chemical toilet units at the Spillway Boat Launching Ramp, Oroville Lake, Butte County. The planned facility includes a restroom, septic tank, lift station and leach field. The department has not made necessary tests to determine whether the soil for the proposed leach field has satisfactory drainage characteristics for this usage. Unsatisfactory soil conditions are common in this area and their presence may cause a large future augmentation request to finance an alternate sewage disposal technique. The department should make the required soil tests before requesting funds.

DEPARTMENT OF NAVIGATION AND OCEAN DEVELOPMENT

Item 407 from the Recreation
and Fish and Wildlife En-
hancement Fund

Budget p. 135 Program p. I-806

Requested 1974-75	\$544,000
Recommended for special review	192,000
Recommended for deletion	352,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Analysis Page</i>
1. Recommend special review of \$192,000 for boat launching facility at Bethany Reservoir	\$192,000	1037
2. Delete \$352,000 for boat launching facility and marine basin, O'Neill Forebay, San Luis Reservoir	\$352,000	1038

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This item is for the major capital outlay of the Department of Navigation and Ocean Development, funded from the Recreation, Fish and Wildlife Enhancement Fund. The proposed expenditures would cover two projects.

(a) Bethany Reservoir \$192,000

We recommend special review.

In order to coordinate this project with complementary construction being proposed by the Department of Parks and Recreation, we recom-

DEPARTMENT OF NAVIGATION AND OCEAN DEVELOPMENT—Continued

mend special review. This project would consist of a two-lane concrete launching ramp boarding float, parking area and temporary restroom facilities.

(b) O'Neill Forebay, San Luis Reservoir..... \$352,000

O'Neill Forebay, located about 15 miles west of Los Banos, was constructed in 1967 as part of the California Aqueduct. The forebay serves as an auxiliary facility to the major reservoir, San Luis Reservoir, nearby. This project would include a four-lane concrete launching ramp, parking area, boat basin for privately operated marina, and temporary restroom facilities. No sewage facilities are included.

The Department of Water Resources indicates that there would almost certainly be an algae growth problem in the proposed marina which could affect the ecology of the entire forebay, and that water recirculation equipment requiring a future budget augmentation would probably be required. The department is budgeting \$5,000 for an algae study as part of the project, but such a study should properly be done before requesting an appropriation and should have been included in the environmental impact report. The plans for the marina, as prepared by the Office of Architecture and Construction, include the possible need for extensive rock riprap at the marina entrance, but the cost of the riprap is not included in the requested appropriation. In addition, no economic feasibility study has been made for the proposed marina, only a cost-benefit analysis. The project is not located near any large metropolitan areas, which makes such a study especially important.

Resources Agency**DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION**

Item 408 from the Recreation
and Fish and Wildlife En-
hancement Bond Fund

Budget p. 139 Program p. I-813

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend deletion.

This item proposes appropriation of any undisbursed balances remaining from the \$2,902,400 appropriated in Item 327, Budget Act of 1971. The Department of Parks and Recreation reports a zero balance in the original appropriation. The item was included in the Budget Bill in error.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Item 409 from the Health
Sciences Facilities Construc-
tion Program Fund

Budget p. 214 Program p. II-491

Requested 1974-75	\$48,882,000
Recommended for approval.....	18,931,000
Recommended for special review	8,460,000
Recommended reduction	21,491,000
Recommended augmentation	3,360,000
Net recommended for approval	\$22,291,000

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	Analysis	
	Amount	Page
1. Reduce—Optometry Building, Berkeley (\$—3,683,000)	\$3,813,000	1040
2. Reduce—Veterinary Medicine Unit 2, Davis (\$—8,755,000)	9,060,000	1040
3. Special review—Utilities and site development, Medical Science Unit 1, Davis	2,427,000	1041
4. Delete—Utilities and site development, Veterinary Medicine Unit 2, Davis	1,227,000	1041
5. Special review—Medical Science Unit 1, equipment, Davis.....	533,000	1041
6. Augment—Radiology/Nuclear Medicine Addition, Sacramento Medical Center (Davis)	3,360,000	1042
7. Special review—Medical Science Unit 1, Irvine	3,184,000	1043
8. Delete—Utilities and site development, Medical Science Unit 1, Irvine	1,381,000	1043
9. Special review—HSIR—East 15th floor completion for School of Medicine (Genetics), San Francisco	216,000	1045
10. Special review—Moffitt Hospital modernization, new service facilities and related alterations, SB 519 deficiencies, San Francisco	2,100,000	1045
11. Delete—Replacement facilities for UC Hospital inpatient care areas, part of Moffitt Hospital modernization.....	6,445,000	1045
12. Hospital Reserve Fund—Recommend all projects proposed for funding from this source be submitted for review and approval by the Legislature.....	—	1046

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The electorate in the 1972 general election approved a \$155.9 million Health Science Facilities Construction Program Fund to provide expansion, development and construction of health science facilities at the University of California. The University's original program anticipated approximately \$97.7 million from federal grants and \$71.3 million other nonstate sources for a total program of nearly \$325 million. Because of a reduced level of federal grants and elimination of revenue bond financing for clinical facilities, the University revised its program in 1973. The revised program is based on full funding from the bond issue and minor amounts from nonstate sources. For more detail of the revised program refer to our *Analysis of the Budget Bill 1973-74*, page 937.

This item proposes \$48,882,000 from the Health Sciences Facilities Construction Program Fund for 17 projects at five campuses and three projects for universitywide allocation. If the item is approved in the

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

proposed amount there will be approximately \$33.2 million remaining in the fund. However, several of the working drawing and/or construction projects under this item are prematurely funded. On a timing and planning basis, these projects could not proceed through either or both phases. In fact, because of these factors, the University had not requested construction funds and has agreed to defer full funding of the various projects. We believe the projects should proceed without undue delay but should not proceed with such haste that adequate review by the Legislature is precluded. In our discussion of the campus projects we have identified those which are in this category and have recommended deletion of a portion or all of the proposed amount. A discussion of the proposed projects and our recommendations follow.

Table 1
Universitywide

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Project title</i>	<i>Budget Bill amount</i>
409(1)	Reserve for cost-rise augmentation	\$5,000,000
409(2)	Preliminary planning	356,000
409(3)	General planning studies	100,000

The projects proposed for funding under Item 409 are estimated at an Engineering News Record (ENR) construction cost index of 2080 (base year is 1913 and index of 100). The current index is 1941.6 and is expected to reach 2080 near the beginning of the budget year. Since the construction projects will not go to bid until sometime after July 1, most of the projects will probably require augmentation.

The two planning requests will provide (1) general planning studies related to master planning, community interface, patient resources and off-campus facilities and (2) preliminary planning for projects to be proposed in 1975-76. The planning is for the existing health science campuses only. The amount requested is reasonable and we recommend approval.

Berkeley Campus

We recommend working drawings only for Item 409(4) optometry building addition, a reduction of \$3,683,000.

This proposal will provide construction of a 30,000-assignable-square-foot (asf) addition to Minor Hall (optometry) as well as remodel the 14,000 asf in Minor Hall. The School of Optometry also occupies 8,000 asf in Carvell Hospital and other campus buildings. Thus, upon completion of the proposed project, the School of Optometry would occupy 52,000 asf. The completed project will modernize the existing obsolete and inadequate space plus provide adequate space to increase the first-year class size to 67, an increase of nine. Graduates in physiological optics and post O.D.'s will increase by a total of 25.

The project request is within University space standards and the estimated costs are reasonable for this type of space. However, even under the best conditions, construction of this project could not begin in the budget year. In fact, the University request was for working drawings

only. Hence, we recommend an appropriation of \$130,000 for working drawings only.

Davis Campus

The proposal for the Davis health sciences campus includes three construction and two equipment projects. In addition we have recommended an augmentation for a construction project at the Sacramento Medical Center. This proposal and our recommendations are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2
Davis Health Sciences—Capital Outlay Proposals

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Project title</i>	<i>Phase^a</i>	<i>Budget Bill amount</i>	<i>Legislative Analyst recommendation</i>
409(5)	Medical Surge Unit 5	e	\$360,000	\$360,000
409(6)	Veterinary Medicine Unit 2	wc	9,060,000	305,000
409(7)	Utilities and site development Medical Science Unit 1.....	c	2,427,000	Special review
409(8)	Utilities and Site development Veterinary Medicine Unit 2	wc	1,227,000	—
409(9)	Medical Science Unit 1	e	533,000	Special review
	Radiology/Nuclear Medicine building addition, Sacramento Medical Center	wc	—	3,360,000
Total.....			<u>\$13,607,000</u>	<u>\$4,025,000</u>
Total special review.....			—	\$2,960,000

^a Phase symbols e—equipment
 w—working drawings
 c—construction

The proposal for Medical Surge Unit 5 is for equipping a 17,500 asf building which was constructed on the campus under a lease-purchase contract and financed from the operating budget. The items in the list appear justifiable and we recommend approval.

There are two proposals for the School of Veterinary Medicine. Item 409(6) provides working drawings and construction for Veterinary Medicine Unit 2 and Item 409(8) provides working drawings and construction for utilities and site development for Unit 2. The proposed unit will provide nearly 90,000 asf. This additional space will allow the school to increase class size by 34 students to a total of 128, beginning in 1976. The spaces requested appear to be within University space standards for Veterinary Medicine. However, the University does not anticipate completing preliminary plans for this project until January 1974 and working drawings until January 1975. Construction funds are therefore premature and we recommend an appropriation of \$305,000 for working drawings only. Correspondingly the proposed funding for utilities and site development are premature by one year. The University anticipates beginning preliminary plans in April 1975 and working drawings in October 1975. Therefore, the entire appropriation for this project should be deleted.

Items 409(7) and 409(9) are related to the Medical Sciences Unit 1 facility. This facility is presently planned for construction on the Davis campus. However, the Joint Committee on the Siting of Teaching Hospitals has scheduled a hearing on January 21, 1974, to consider the proper

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

location for the Davis Medical School. *Because at the time of this writing the outcome of this hearing is not known, we recommend special review of these items.*

Davis Campus—Sacramento Medical Center

We recommend an augmentation of \$3,360,000 for working drawings and construction of a Radiology/Nuclear Medicine building addition at the Sacramento Medical Center.

The University's proposed 1974-75 capital outlay program for health sciences included a \$4,175,000 request for improvements at the Sacramento Medical Center (SMC). This project was not included in the Governor's Budget for 1974-75. As proposed by the University this request consisted of two separable portions. One portion would add a 36,350 asf, three-story addition for radiology, nuclear medicine, clinical diagnostic laboratories and teaching space at an estimated cost of \$3,360,000. The second portion would provide approximately \$818,000 for alterations and equipment for various intensive care areas in the hospital and housestaff on-call quarters in another building. In our opinion the radiology/nuclear medicine building addition should not be delayed. However, additional information concerning the alterations portion is required and we cannot, at this time, recommend approval of the alterations.

Prior to University ownership of the SMC, the county had provided funds in its 1972-73 budget for schematic and preliminary planning for a similar building. With some changes to the county's schematic plans, the University should be able to complete working drawings and advertise for construction bids in the budget year. The new building will provide space for diagnostic radiology, nuclear medicine, radiotherapy, clinical diagnostic laboratories and facilities to be shared by all departments. The structure will be designed to enable addition of two floor levels at some future date.

The present diagnostic radiology facilities total 7,854 asf consisting of six X-ray rooms and other patient and staff areas. This area is inadequate to provide the proper level of patient care necessary to accomodate the current 80,000 annual patient examinations. The proposed building will provide 11,743 asf for diagnostic radiology consisting of 15 X-ray rooms and adequate space for 30 medical staff, (an increase of 12), 10 clerical (an increase of 5) and one 400 asf research laboratory. This space will be adequate to handle up to 85,000-90,000 annual patient examinations.

Nuclear medicine is presently located in two former five-bed wards in a patient care wing of the hospital. This space is inadequate and the function should be relocated. Approximately 11,800 asf in the proposed addition will provide patient care, teaching and departmental support areas for the nuclear medicine department. This space will enable the department to increase the present 5,500 maximum annual procedures to 7,200. In 1973, because of the lack of adequate facilities, approximately 25 percent of the requested procedures were referred elsewhere. With this addition, the department will be able to accomodate over 90 percent of the anticipated procedures.

The remaining areas consist of a clinical diagnostic laboratory (7,780 asf), radiotherapy (310 asf) and shared facilities (4,720 asf). The shared facilities will provide a 60-station lecture room, conference room, lounge and shower areas for faculty and staff and storage space.

Irvine Campus

We recommend special review and an \$830,000 reduction of Item 409(10), construct and equip medical science unit 1 and deletion of Item 409(11) utilities and site development medical sciences unit 1, a reduction of \$1,381,000.

In June 1973, the Joint Committee for the Siting of Teaching Hospitals released a report concerning a proposed teaching hospital at this campus. The recommendations of this report were (1) construction of 250-bed on-campus hospital, (2) development of at least two community primary care clinics and transportation system and (3) capital improvements for Orange County Medical Center. Although the proposed 167,350 gsf Medical Sciences Unit 1 (Item 409(10)) facility is not part of these recommendations, the scope and design of it is affected by the elements of the recommendation. The University is in the process of developing an integrated development plan which will indicate the interrelationship and scope of each element. Until this plan is developed and reviewed we cannot recommend approval of this request. It should also be pointed out that, in any case, equipment funding is premature and the requested amount under item 409(10) should be reduced by \$830,000.

The proposal for utilities and site development for Medical Science Unit 1 is also premature. This project will not be bid for construction in the budget year and the requested amount of \$1,381,000 under item 409(11) should be deleted.

San Diego Campus

The request for San Diego Health Science campus includes one construction augmentation request and three equipment items. Table 3 summarizes this request and our recommendation for each project.

Table 3
San Diego Health Science—Capital Outlay Proposals

Item No.	Project title	Phase ^a	Budget Bill amount	Legislative Analyst recommendation
409(12)	South wing addition, University Hospital of San Diego County, SB 519 deficiencies	c	\$500,000	\$500,000
409(13)	Clinical teaching facility, University Hospital of San Diego County	e	235,000	235,000
409(14)	Library expansion, University Hospital of San Diego County	e	77,000	77,000
409(15)	Clinical Teaching Facility, University Hospital of San Diego County, Step 2	e	323,000	323,000
Total.....			\$1,135,000	\$1,135,000

^a Phase symbols: c—construction
e—equipment

Chapter 1130, Statutes of 1972, (SB 519) requires all new hospital and

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

specific hospital alteration construction projects to meet more stringent earthquake safety code requirements. Item 409 (12) requests an additional \$500,000 for the construction of south wing addition, University Hospital of San Diego County. This amount is in augmentation of the \$2,991,000 appropriated for construction of this project in the Budget Act of 1973. The requested amount will provide for the additional structural requirements to meet the new code.

The requested equipment items are for projects funded for construction in the Budget Act of 1973. The requested amounts are reasonable and we recommend approval.

San Francisco Campus

The proposal for the San Francisco campus includes four construction projects and one construction augmentation project. This proposal and our recommendations are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4
San Francisco Health Sciences—Capital Outlay Proposals

<i>Item No.</i>	<i>Project title</i>	<i>Phase^a</i>	<i>Budget Bill amount</i>	<i>Legislative Analyst recommendation</i>
409 (16)	School of Dentistry	c	\$11,000,000	\$11,000,000
409 (17)	HSIR—East 15th floor completion for School of Medicine (Genetics)	wc	545,000	545,000
409 (18)	UC clinics "C" level interior completion for campus services Step 1	wc	216,000	Special review
409 (19)	Moffitt Hospital modernization, new service facilities and related alterations, SB 519 deficiencies	c	2,100,000	Special review
409 (20)	Replacement facilities for UC Hospital inpatient care areas, part of Moffitt Hospital modernization	wc	6,445,000	—
Total			\$20,306,000	\$11,545,000
Total special review				\$2,316,000

^a Phase symbols: c—construction
w—working drawings

Chapter 1001, Statutes of 1973, (AB 350) appropriated \$435,000 for planning and working drawings for a dental education facility at this campus. This act limits the size of this facility to 68,000 assignable square feet (asf) and requires preliminary plans for no less than two additional off-campus clinical teaching facilities before State Public Works Board approval of construction funds for the campus building.

The proposed campus facility contains 68,000 asf and will provide space for 176 chairs for D.D.S. students, plus laboratories, laboratory service areas and storage. The structure is to be constructed of reinforced concrete and will not exceed a height of 47 feet. It will be located on the northeast portion of the block bounded by 4th, 5th, and Parnassus Avenue and Kirkham Street. The cost estimate indicates a building cost of \$84.64 per gross square foot. This cost and the proposed building efficiency of 60 percent is reasonable for a specialized laboratory building of this type.

To fully accommodate the expansion of the entering class size from 88

to 108, the University proposes the requested structure plus retention of 67,000 asf on-campus and 3,000 asf off-campus and construction of two off-campus clinical facilities totaling 24,000 asf. Upon completion of this program the amount of space will total 162,000 asf.

The scope of this project is within the parameters established by the Legislature and the total amount of space is within University space standards. Therefore we recommend approval.

Item 409(17) will provide alterations of 7,850 asf on the 15th floor of HSIR for the Department of Genetics. The completed space will provide eight faculty offices and 14 research laboratories and laboratory service areas. This area will allow the department to consolidate and expand on this campus. It is anticipated that a basic course in genetics will be offered to each class of students in the Schools of Medicine and Pharmacy. Also, the enrollment of graduate academics is expected to grow to 12 within three years and gradually increase to a maximum of 25.

Item 409(18) is a request to complete approximately 12,000 asf in the "C" level of the UC Clinics Building. The University is currently preparing a revised planning document for this project. This document should be available in time for budget hearings. Until we have received and reviewed the revised program we cannot recommend approval of this request.

Two of the proposals for the San Francisco campus are related to Moffitt Hospital. Item 409(19) proposes a \$2.1 million augmentation to the \$15,324,000 appropriated for working drawings and construction for Moffitt Hospital modernization. The additional funds are required to meet the seismic safety requirements of Chapter 1130, Statutes of 1973 (SB 519). The request is identical to Item 409(12) for the University Hospital of San Diego County. It is our understanding that the University has made significant program changes to the Moffitt Hospital modernization project. However, we have not received detailed information regarding these changes. The University should provide complete details of this project for review prior to budget hearings. Until we have received and reviewed this information we recommend special review of Item 409(19).

The second project related to Moffitt Hospital is Item 409(20). This proposal represents the first of a two-phase project to replace UC Hospital. This phase would replace patient areas and the second phase, to be proposed in 1976-77, would replace nonpatient areas and demolish UC Hospital.

The UC Hospital, San Francisco, was designed in 1917 and structurally strengthened to a minor degree on 1957. A 1973 seismic evaluation report concerning this structure indicated that the structure does not meet current seismic safety codes and rehabilitation would cost approximately 85 percent of the cost for a replacement structure.

Therefore, the plan is to construct a five-story addition to the five-story Moffitt Hospital service block (Item 409(19)). The first two floors of this addition (6th and 7th floors) to be constructed as vacant space under another project using hospital reserve funds. The 8th and 9th and 10th floors would be constructed under this project using health science bond funds. The space on these three floors would provide 40,629 asf consisting

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA—Continued

of 28,329 asf of bed area (108 beds) and 12,300 asf for related diagnostic, treatment and supporting service areas. These areas would then replace patient areas currently occupying UC Hospital. The overall plan, exclusive of the 6th and 7th floors, is to maintain the current 560-bed total complement of the existing hospitals. The number of beds or the nature of development in the two vacant floors has not been determined. The University has indicated it will attempt to attract private endowments or gift funds as a supplemental source of funding to complete the proposed vacant areas. We believe this request does not represent a prudent appropriation of available funds and we are recommending deletion of the item. We also suggest that, because of the total number of hospital beds in the San Francisco Bay area, reconsideration should be given to the need to replace the beds in UC Hospital.

Hospital Reserve Funds

We recommend that all projects proposed for funding from hospital reserve funds be submitted for review and approval of the Legislature.

The University five-year major capital outlay program for health sciences at the San Francisco campus indicates a proposed 1974-75 expenditure of approximately \$1.6 million (exclusive of the Moffitt Hospital project discussed above) from hospital reserves. These funds are generated from depreciation charges to hospital operations. The same document indicates an estimated 1973-74 expenditure for major capital outlay of \$1.7 million from the same source. In our discussion of Moffitt Hospital, Item 409 (20) on the preceding page, it is apparent that projects proposed for funding from hospital reserves should be closely coordinated with projects funded from the bond issue. Hence, we are recommending that all projects proposed for funding from this source be submitted for review and approval by the Legislature.

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 410 from the 1974 State

Beach, Park, Recreational and
Historical Facilities Fund

Budget p. 140 Program p. I-813

Requested 1974-75	\$4,124,962
Recommended for Approval	593,619
Recommended for Special Review	3,531,343

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend special review.

Item 410 would appropriate funds for three development projects to the Department of Parks and Recreation. The item would be funded from the \$250 million bond issue being placed before the electorate in June 1974. Prescribed amounts of money will become available upon approval of the

Bond Act for acquisition, development, historical restoration, and other purposes somewhat similar to those provided in the 1964 Bond Act.

Sufficient time has not been available to review the two new development projects at Allensworth and Border Field in detail. The request for construction money at San Gregorio State Beach has difficulties because the department has not resolved problems in the project to permit the expenditure of the 1973-74 appropriation for working drawings. Finally, the request for \$593,619 to finance departmental planning and construction liaison with OAC will result in serious problems for the department and require a reduction in force if the Bond Act is not approved by the voters next June. For these reasons we recommend special review.

DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Item 411 from the 1974 State

Beach, Park, Recreational and
Historical Facilities Fund

Budget p. L-35 Program p. I-813

Requested 1974-75	\$55,823
Recommended for approval.....	55,823

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend approval.

In June 1974 the electorate will vote on the \$250 million State Beach, Park, Recreational and Historical Facilities Bond Act. This item would reimburse Item 273 in the Department of Parks and Recreation for review of applications for local grant projects which would be funded from this source.

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.