

Department of Justice—Continued

We recommend disapproval of this request reducing the appropriation \$172,000.

This request represents an increase of 150 percent in special agent positions requested for this function in the first two years of operation.

The agency states this is to insure maximum protection in supervising the parolees under the jurisdiction of the Department of Corrections. In that department's budget request for 1966-67 we recommended approval of 91 additional parole agent positions for the experimental work unit caseload for the purpose of providing increased supervision for the 5,825 parolees assigned to this reduced caseload program.

The special agents' activities, according to the preliminary information submitted by the department, are as follows:

	<i>Percent of work week</i>
Intelligence and criminal investigations.....	24.2
Fugitive investigations	12.4
Surveillance (organized and violent crime control).....	19.9
Miscellaneous investigations—special assignments	39.3
Liaison and training	4.2
	100.0

No information has been submitted to indicate any deficiencies in the operations of the presently authorized special service unit. Furthermore, if local law enforcement does not provide sufficient staff to maintain surveillance and control of organized and violent crime in the areas for which it is responsible, then it would appear this deficiency will have to be corrected in each local jurisdiction that is deficient.

MILITARY DEPARTMENT

ITEM 195 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 729

**FOR SUPPORT OF MILITARY DEPARTMENT
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested	\$3,336,915
Estimated to be expended in 1965-66 fiscal year	3,973,946
Decrease (16 percent)	<u>\$637,031</u>
Increase to improve level of service.....	\$44,247

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION..... \$40,935

Summary of Recommended Reductions

	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Page</i>	<i>Line</i>
Major; operations and training staff officer.....	\$11,964	730	61
Major; operations and military support.....	11,964	730	69
Weekend training phase.....	14,461	732	36
Members of National Guard on active duty.....	2,546	732	38

GENERAL PROGRAM STATEMENT

This department is basically the militia of the State of California and as such it has two major missions. The first is to make available to the Governor a body of trained and armed men to be used at his discretion for the general good and welfare of the state during civil dis-

Military Department—Continued

turbances, or natural disaster emergencies such as floods, fires, earthquakes, etc., to maintain order and preserve life and property. The second major mission concerns its relationship with the national military establishment as a reserve force in trained readiness to augment federal field forces in any national emergency, both within and without the country.

The organization is established principally in two major forces functioning under the immediate control of the Adjutant General and his special staff. The first major force is the Army National Guard or army division which functions under a brigadier general as Deputy Adjutant General. This force is further broken down into an army organization and training branch which is responsible for the field training of about 21,500 personnel comprising 239 units throughout the state and operating out of 125 installations or armories of which 10 are leased and the balance are state owned. The second important subdivision of the army division is the Army Facilities Branch which is responsible for the physical operation of the armories, both owned and leased.

The second major force is the Air National Guard or air division which also functions under a brigadier general acting as a Deputy Adjutant General. This force is also divided into branches which provide for the field training of an estimated 5,100 personnel, both flying and ground support, comprising 41 units operating out of four flying bases and three support bases which are owned only in part by the state with the rest of the facilities being supplied by the federal government.

The overall organization has other subdivisions to handle general administrative services, military personnel problems and general military administration.

The Military Department also is responsible for its own officer recruitment and training which is an essential part of maintaining an effective, disciplined and well trained force. This is accomplished by what is called the California Military Academy which has no special facilities but functions in existing armories as required.

The field forces, both army and air, are paid and otherwise sustained by federal funds for their weekend drills and summer training encampments. The federal funds provided for drill pay and general operational field support are anticipated to run at something over \$36 million during the current fiscal year and at about the same level in the budget year. The headquarters staff and the permanent field employees at armories, air bases, and Camp San Luis Obispo total about 385 positions of which 70 are military and the balance are nonmilitary, civil service positions. These positions in the aggregate are mostly supported by state funds with some federal participation. The funding runs about 86 percent state and 14 percent federal.

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The proposed General Fund support level for the budget year would appear to indicate a substantial reduction of \$637,031 or 16 percent below the \$3,973,946 estimated to be expended in the current fiscal year.

Military Department—Continued

However, this is misleading. The Budget Act of 1965 appropriated \$3,094,620 from the General Fund for support of the department. To this was added an allocation of \$77,410 from the Salary Increase Fund and a further addition was made from the Emergency Fund amounting to \$807,689 to cover the emergency situation in Los Angeles last August which required the intervention of the National Guard. This emergency expenditure was a one-time expense for a highly special situation (it should be remembered that the last time the National Guard was used in a civil disturbance was in 1934), which should not be considered part of the normal annual expenditure for purposes of comparison on a year-to-year basis. Therefore, in order to provide a proper base for comparison, the emergency allocation should be deducted to arrive at a normal annual expenditure. (Actually a very small part of the emergency allocation was unexpended, about \$5,700.) This deduction would then provide a current year expenditure base of \$3,171,946 as compared with the proposal for the new year of \$3,336,915, actually an increase of \$164,969 or slightly over 5 percent rather than the decrease of 16 percent as shown in the printed budget.

The bulk of this true increase is attributable to increased costs of operation of the armories of which there will be in the budget year 125 units, one more than the current year. The balance is attributable to the proposal to add certain new positions to the headquarters staff, to increase officer training and to general salaries and wages merit adjustments.

The increase in headquarters staff positions is in two categories: one involves the upgrading of a position in each of the two major divisions, army and air. As previously mentioned, each division is in command of a brigadier general and in the present table of organization neither one of these positions has a formal deputy or executive officer. Both of these generals are required, by the nature of their far-flung commands, to spend a considerable amount of time in the field. When they are away from headquarters they have heretofore been designating a senior officer, a lieutenant colonel, heading one of the branches under the general, as temporary deputy or executive officer. It is now proposed to formalize this arrangement whereby one lieutenant colonel position in each division will be upgraded to full colonel and he will then have two responsibilities. One is as chief of the particular branch which he commands and the other is as executive officer or a deputy to the brigadier general commanding the division. This entails a total increase in annual salary of \$1,656 in each case or \$3,312 for both positions. *We believe this proposal is based on sound management principles and we would recommend approval of this upgrading.*

The second category of personnel increase involves the establishment of two new positions, again one in each of the two major divisions. In the army division a major is proposed as operations and training staff officer in the Army Organization and Training Branch at \$11,964 and in the air division a major as operations and military support

Military Department—Continued

staff officer in the Air Plans and Operations Branch, again at \$11,964 annually, making a total of \$23,928 for the two new positions.

The army organization and training branch is currently staffed, at headquarters, with six military positions and two civil service clerical positions. A lieutenant colonel, one of the six military positions, is chief of the branch, and is the position to be upgraded to colonel to act as executive deputy to the commanding general of the division. The premise is that his activities as executive officer would tend to reduce his ability to carry out all of the duties involved in organization and training and the additional position would provide needed backup. We do not feel that this additional staff capacity is critical enough to justify the additional cost. *Consequently, we recommend disapproval of the additional officer at a savings of \$11,964 plus staff benefits and operating expenses.*

The position proposed for the air plans and operation branch is on a similar basis although in this case it would not be backup for the position to be upgraded as deputy to the commanding air general. *In this instance, the desirability of the position is, in our estimation, even less urgent than in the case of the army division, and again we recommend disapproval of the additional officer at a savings of \$11,964 plus other expenses.*

Other personnel increases are involved in the establishment of an additional armory custodian which parallels the availability of the new Los Angeles Federal Avenue armory and is obviously a straight-line workload requirement since a custodian is absolutely essential not only to take care of the armory but to safeguard its property and general area. *We recommend approval of the armory custodian grade I at \$5,049 plus overtime at \$1,250.*

There is also a proposal to expand the capability of the so-called California Military Academy at a total cost of \$17,007. At present, the academy consists of three units, one in Stockton, another in Pomona and the third in Long Beach each operating in regular armory facilities but scheduled on the weekends when the regular activities do not take place. The bulk of the cost, consisting of the weekend pay for the trainees, a substantial portion of the teaching force and other operating expenses, is defrayed by the federal government. Heretofore, these three companies have been included in the budget at an unrealistic cost for the state's share which has been augmented each year simply by shifting savings from other operations as they became available.

The present proposal does two things: first it will place the operation, insofar as the state's share is concerned, on a more realistic basis and secondly it will establish a fourth unit in San Diego. The San Diego area has a great potential for officer material which has been inhibited by the fact that the candidates must travel at their own expense and on their own time to Long Beach or Pomona in order to participate in the program. This has been a considerable deterrent and the area has not produced the number of candidates that its overall enrollment would have suggested. Also the San Diego area has the

Military Department—Continued

greatest officer vacancy factor. By establishing this fourth unit it is anticipated that many more candidates will volunteer for the training. The training of officers for the National Guard is an important function if the entire organization is to function at top efficiency. *Consequently, we recommend approval of this increase in the level of service, but suggest that it be financed by reductions in other areas of the entire operation.*

As mentioned earlier, the bulk of the additional expenditures for the National Guard occurs in the armory operation, substantially as a result of increased operating expenses required to maintain the growing roster of armories as well as the fact that many of these are aging and require increased maintenance, repairs, painting, etc. In addition, various kinds of equipment from time to time need to be replaced because of aging and the new armory in Los Angeles requires some initial complements, portions of which are at state expense.

With the exception of the two positions mentioned above, we recommend approval of the balance of the Military Department budget.

MILITARY DEPARTMENT

ITEM 196 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 729

**FOR SUPPORT OF MILITARY RETIREMENT
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested -----	\$68,942
Estimated to be expended in 1965-66 fiscal year -----	61,452
<hr/>	
Increase (12.2 percent) -----	\$7,490

TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION ----- None

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Prior to the enactment of Chapter 2174 of the Statutes of 1961, which became operative on October 1, 1961, the state was obligated to provide military retirement pay for full-time members of the California National Guard in accordance with the then existing statutes. Up to that time the number of retirements under the Military Retirement System was of such a relatively minor magnitude that the amounts for the purpose were contained in the regular support budget of the Military Department.

Commencing with October 1, 1961, all full-time military members entering the service of the state were required to become members of the regular State Employees' Retirement System. However, those military employees already on duty as of that date had the choice of remaining with the Military Retirement System or joining the State Employees' Retirement System. There are about 70 full-time military employees who are still eligible under the old Military Retirement System and depending upon the rate at which they accept retirement and based upon life expectancy periods, each year the state will be required to provide the retirement pay for those who have retired or are contemplating retirement within the budget year. It is difficult to

Military Department—Continued

estimate the long-term total cost of this system until all the remaining military retirements shall have been completed but one such estimate was on the order of a total of \$3 million.

The Budget Act of 1965 provided \$64,321 for this retirement item, but it has now been estimated that the actual expenditure will be less by almost \$3,000 indicating that an expected retirement did not take place. The amount proposed for the budget year again is based on those retirees still alive plus expectations for additional retirements. *On this basis, the proposal seems reasonable and we recommend approval.*

MILITARY DEPARTMENT

ITEM 197 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 729

**FOR SUPPORT OF CAMP SAN LUIS OBISPO
FROM THE GENERAL FUND**

Amount requested	\$163,223
Estimated to be expended in 1965-66 fiscal year	119,571
Increase (36.5 percent)	\$43,652
TOTAL RECOMMENDED REDUCTION	None

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Camp San Luis Obispo, which comprises about 5,800 acres, has been owned by the state and for many years been under lease to the federal government so that the state has had no direct responsibility for its operation and maintenance. In December of 1964 the Army announced a list of bases that would be declared surplus and disposed of by one means or another. One of these was Camp San Luis Obispo. However, at that time no specific date was mentioned for its return to the state. The date of July 1 was finally resolved in May of 1965, which led to a request by the Department of Finance that the budget be augmented to permit taking over the full operation of the facility. At that time there was still no clear understanding as to just which state agency would have the full operating responsibility or "landlord" function. Temporarily the function was assigned to the Military Department and as of this moment it is our understanding that it has not yet been entirely resolved. Nevertheless, the facility must be kept running and annual appropriations are necessary for this purpose.

The Budget Act finally included \$139,788 for the operation of the base and the estimate of actual expenditures for the current year has dropped by about \$20,000 to \$119,571.

During the initial operation which commenced July 1, 1965, there has been an opportunity to evaluate the magnitude of the task of maintaining and operating the facility. It was started with 10.5 positions as compared to the more than 36 positions which the federal government had used to perform essentially the same kind of caretaker functions. The indications are now that this staff is too small to do an adequate job particularly with respect to fire safety since this includes a very large number of wood frame buildings scattered