

During the current fiscal year, 5.9 positions were administratively added, and additional funds to the extent of \$13,063 were made available from the Emergency Fund to cover the increased personnel. The Division of Highways contributed approximately \$10,000 additionally for this purpose. Three of these positions were added to the staff of the accounting office, largely due to an increased volume of work necessary for the Water Resources Board. However, no additional assessment was apparently made against the State Water Resources Board in recognition of this fact.

While we recognize the fact that the work of the State Water Resources Board is increasing, we believe that the accounting office work for the Division of Architecture should be decreasing commensurately with a decrease in funds available for construction. Therefore, we question the necessity of having added these three positions. In any case, it appears that a greater reimbursement should be forthcoming from the State Water Resources Board in recognition of the fact that the added positions were largely for its benefit. We recommend that the Department of Finance make a re-evaluation of the division of work load attributable to water resources and architecture in the accounting office function. Since the net increase being requested is only \$6,474, or 5.6 percent, from \$116,141 estimated to be expended during the current fiscal year to \$122,615 proposed for the 1952-53 Fiscal Year, we recommend that the item be approved as requested pending a restudy.

**Department of Public Works  
DIVISION OF ARCHITECTURE**

ITEM 257 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 775  
Budget line No. 31**For Support of Division of Architecture From the General Fund**

Amount requested .....	\$864,028
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year .....	350,693
<b>Increase (3.8 percent) .....</b>	<b>\$13,335</b>

**Summary of Increase**

	Total increase	INCREASE DUE TO		Budget page	Line No.
		Work load or salary adjustments	New services		
Salaries and wages .....	\$1,174	\$1,174	---	779	9
Operating expense .....	6,402	6,402	---	779	10
Equipment .....	5,759	5,759	---	779	11
<b>Total increase .....</b>	<b>\$13,335</b>	<b>\$13,335</b>	---		

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$364,028
Legislative Auditor's recommendation .....	364,028
<b>Reduction .....</b>	<b>None</b>

**ANALYSIS**

To provide the top-level overhead supervision and direction in the process of preparing plans, specifications, and estimates for all state-owned building construction and for supervision of actual construction, either by contract or by direct day labor, and for similar services in connection with major maintenance and repair projects, the Division of

Architecture is proposing to increase its expenditures for the 1952-53 Fiscal Year by \$13,335, or 3.8 percent, from \$350,693 estimated to be expended during the current fiscal year to \$364,028 in the 1952-53 Fiscal Year. This involves no additional positions but, in fact, involves the elimination of one position, that of architectural property analyst which was transferred to the Department of Finance as of January 1, 1952. With this single reduction, the total number of authorized positions will be 54.2. The increased cost of this function is therefore the result of merit salary adjustments, increased operating expenses due both to the anticipated continued rise in the cost of services, materials, and supplies, and additional rent required for new building space to be provided during the 1952-53 Fiscal Year, and increases in equipment purchases due mainly to the necessity to replace certain worn out automotive units.

It should be pointed out that the Division of Architecture employs many more technical and clerical positions than are indicated in its support budget. For instance, as of November 31, 1951, there were 614 employees on the roster of which only 55, or less than 10 percent of this total, were authorized positions shown in the budget for the current fiscal year. The difference between the two figures, or 559, is the number of positions which are supported by assessments made against the various planning and construction projects under way during the fiscal year, the money for which has been transferred to the Architectural Revolving Fund. The Department of Finance does not exercise the position control on this group of positions which it normally exercises over other positions in all other agencies with certain notable exceptions, particularly the Division of Highways and certain positions in the Office of Adjutant General. The same lack of control exists with regard to the operating expenses and equipment, which would be incidental to this group of revolving fund positions.

In this connection, we would also point out certain weaknesses in the accounting procedures used in the Architectural Revolving Fund. The State Controller accounts for the revolving fund as a lump sum total, and claims against this total are processed through the Controller's Office without designating the precise project, or projects, against which claims are being made. Since, in the preliminary estimate upon which an appropriation is based, there is contained, as a general rule, a total of 18 percent to cover preliminary engineering and processing, working drawings, construction supervision, and contingencies, it is obvious that there is a very large pool of funds from which the division may draw its support with very little control being exercised by an outside fiscal agency.

Since the close of World War II, the Division of Architecture has been charged with the responsibility for the construction of capital improvements in excess of \$300,000,000. That a program of such magnitude would be launched during the postwar years was foreseen all during the war period by virtue of the fact that large sums of excess revenue were being impounded for this specific purpose. Nevertheless, it would appear that although some study was made of the postwar needs of all state agencies, no attempt was made to establish broad standards of space utilization and construction types, and little, if any, thought or planning was given to the problem of providing simple, functional, economical buildings, which could have set the pattern for the postwar period, by the agency that was charged with the responsibility for this large, complex, and important

task. When this program was finally under way at the close of the war, it was discovered that the Division of Architecture had insufficient technical and professional capacity to prosecute the planning and design phases of the program as scheduled. Consequently, the division secured the aid of outside private architects on a contractual basis. It would appear that in many instances the division, in its dealings with these private architects, did not protect the interests of the State as zealously as it should and could have. For instance, we cite the cases of the contracts for the architectural design of the northern and southern Youth Authority reception centers and the new Atascadero State Mental Institution. The two reception centers were planned to have an ultimate capacity of 250 in the north and 350 in the south with domiciliary facilities on the basis of dormitories with a capacity of 50 inmates each. This would have meant five dormitories in the north and seven dormitories in the south, or a total of 12 dormitories. These should have been alike, since both institutions were intended to perform exactly the same function. It would naturally be assumed that in such a case both institutions should have been combined into one contract with one firm of architects so that we would have had, first, complete uniformity in both institutions and, secondly, a reduced fee based on the fact that the repetition in the design of the dormitories would have materially reduced the amount of work required by the architect in relation to the ultimate construction cost of both institutions. Instead, two firms of architects were employed.

In the case of Atascadero, since it is a single complete institution, the contract was awarded to one architectural firm. However, apparently no cognizance was taken of the fact that many of the buildings were repetitive in design and that consequently a lower percentage fee should have been negotiated based on this fact. It is our understanding that the various professional associations of architects have established scales of fees which permit an architect to recognize the fact that a large construction job containing many repetitive features would entail less work in proportion to the construction cost upon which the fee is based than a job in which there is no repetition and all units require the maximum of work to produce finished design and working drawings.

In numerous field trips made by the staff of the Legislative Auditor, many construction projects have been examined during and after construction in which many features were noted that seemed to indicate a tenacious clinging to design features, architectural features, and use of materials which were either almost archaic or ill-suited to the use to which the buildings were to be put. We believe this indicates a lack of vision and progressiveness in this agency. Since government does not build its buildings for the purpose of selling them and therefore does not have to consider market conditions, it should be in the forefront of new, progressive, and economical building construction ideas, the more so in the face of an almost phenomenal increase in construction costs that has taken place in the last few years, particularly since the Korean war.

The relationship between the Division of Architecture and any other agency of the State requiring buildings is analogous to the relationship between an architect and a private client in which the private client states his needs and desires and his maximum budget to the architect

and expects to get a building within the sum specified and having somewhere near the space and features desired. However, in the case of the Division of Architecture and any other state agency, the budget for any given project is first of all an upset figure frequently not based on sound estimating factors, and second, it is capable of being increased in amount by asking for additional money from the Public Works Board or from a succeeding legislature rather than having to stay within the original allocation or appropriation. We believe that this has led to a somewhat unhealthy condition in which the using agency insists on getting what it wants in the way of building space without producing supportable standards of space requirements, and the Division of Architecture has insisted on getting what it in turn wants in the way of construction material, design type, and architectural amenities without being pushed first to the limits of its resourcefulness. This situation indicates clearly the need for some form of inter-control, possibly in the form of a properly qualified and unprejudiced referee standing between the two agencies, having no prejudice for either, but being motivated by sound reason and realistic respect for economy and the growing burden on the taxpayer. One agency of the State is now operating on such a principle. The University of California, which has received since the beginning of the postwar period approximately \$120,000,000 for capital improvements, employs a small, highly qualified staff which carries on continuing basic studies on the needs for space in the various departments of the university and which stands between the department heads, acting as clients, and the private contract architects as a controlling influence. Based on this approach, the university has been carrying out its building construction program with significant success.

In view of the foregoing, we make the following recommendations:

1. That the Department of Finance be instructed to study the problem of position, operating expense, and equipment control with respect to expenditures made for these purposes from the Architectural Revolving Fund and to formulate a procedure which will provide a reasonable control without imposing an undue additional burden on the Division of Architecture or the Department of Finance, the study and plan of control to be submitted to the Legislature at the next session.

2. That the Department of Finance, the Office of the Controller, and the Division of Architecture jointly undertake a study of the problem of providing adequate accounting controls in the Office of the Controller to determine whether a procedure can be formulated which will provide the necessary controls with no additional personnel in either of the two agencies.

3. That consideration be given to the establishment of a control point endowed with sufficient authority to make decisions between the Division of Architecture and other state agencies requiring construction, and to carry on studies of space needs, research leading to standardization of space utilization and construction features, and to program the construction needs of the State.

4. That pending these studies, the budget request of this agency be approved as submitted.

**Department of Public Works**  
**DIVISION OF ARCHITECTURE**

ITEM 258 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 780

Budget line No. 34

**For Support of Division of Architecture From the Public Building Fund**

Amount requested .....	\$591,681
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year .....	582,463
<b>Increase (1.6 percent) .....</b>	<b>\$9,218</b>

## Summary of Increase

	Total Increase	INCREASE DUE TO		Budget page	Line No.
		Work load or salary adjustments	New services		
Salaries and wages .....	\$18,090	\$18,090	---	779	74
Operating expense .....	8,170	8,170	---	780	23
Equipment .....	-17,042	-17,042	---	780	32
<b>Total increase .....</b>	<b>\$9,218</b>	<b>\$9,218</b>	---		

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$591,681
Legislative Auditor's recommendation .....	591,681
Reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS**

In addition to its responsibilities for the construction work of the State, the Division of Architecture is charged with the checking and approving of plans and specifications of all new public school construction and all alterations in excess of \$4,000 and the periodic inspection of such buildings during the course of construction in accordance with the Education Code. In order to defray the cost of this service, the Division of Architecture is permitted to make specific percentage-wise plan approval fees which accrue to the Architecture Public Building Fund from which this request would be appropriated.

For the 1952-53 Fiscal Year, it is proposed to increase the expenditures for this purpose by \$9,218, or 1.6 percent, from \$582,463 estimated to be expended during the current fiscal year to \$591,681 in the 1952-53 Fiscal Year. Since no new positions are being requested, this increase is due entirely to merit salary adjustments and operating expenses which are anticipated to increase because of the continued rise in the cost of services, materials, and supplies.

We wish to call attention to the fact that for the current fiscal year the Division of Architecture was permitted an increase of 25 positions to meet the growing work load in this particular function, which was occasioned almost entirely by the \$250,000,000 school bond authorization. Unfortunately, while the need continued to grow, these additional positions could not be filled. The total authorized full time positions for the current year is 94.8, and as of November 30, there were only 63.8 positions on the roster. In other words, in addition to the unfilled new positions, there were six unfilled, previously authorized positions. There appears to be scant hope of filling these positions in the near future since the most urgent requirement is for certificated structural engineers of which there is an acute shortage at this time. The continued pessimism as to the filling

of these positions is indicated by the extremely high estimated salary savings.

We recommend approval of this request as submitted.

**Department of Public Works  
DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS**

Budget page 781

**For Support of Division of Highways From the State Highway Fund**

Amount requested .....	\$31,554,206
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year .....	30,082,177
Increase (4.9 percent) .....	\$1,472,029

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$31,554,206
Legislative Auditor's recommendation .....	31,554,206
Reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS**

The budget of the Division of Highways does not require an appropriation in the Budget Bill, inasmuch as funds for this purpose come from the State Highway Fund, revenues for which are provided from apportionments of Motor Vehicle Fuel Tax, Use Fuel Tax, Motor Transportation Tax Fund, Vehicle Tax Fund, federal aid, and miscellaneous contributions.

By law, the request of the Division of Highways is placed in the Budget in the exact form recommended by the State Highway Commission without budgetary review by the Department of Finance or by this office. We have pointed out in the past that we believe this results in a tendency for operational costs of the Division of Highways to be higher than would be the case if the agency were subject to the same fiscal review as is provided for other state agencies. It has never been entirely clear why budgetary review of the administrative operations of the office would, in any way, interfere with the basic concept that highway user funds should be allocated for highway purposes in accordance with a long-range plan which is set forth in the law, and which should be allocated by the Highway Commission independent of annual executive or legislative considerations.

We would recommend that consideration be given to placing the administration of the Division of Highways under budgetary review of the Department of Finance and the Legislature by an amendment of the Collier-Burns Act at the general session.

**Department of Public Works  
DIVISION OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY TOLL CROSSING**

ITEM 259 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 792  
Budget line No. 18

**For Support of Division of San Francisco Bay Toll Crossing From the  
Highway Fund**

Amount requested .....	\$50,000
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year .....	None
Increase .....	\$50,000

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted .....	\$50,000
Legislative Auditor's recommendation .....	50,000
Reduction .....	None

## ANALYSIS

This item provides for an appropriation to reimburse the Emergency Fund in the sum of \$50,000 from the State Highway Fund.

Funds in the amount of \$750,000 appropriated by Chapter 1473, Statutes of 1951, were not available until September 23, 1951; thus funds were advanced from the Emergency Fund as a loan to provide interim financing from July 1, 1951, pending reimbursement from proposed deficiency appropriation.

The California Bay Bridge Authority is to return this appropriation, or so much thereof as may be used, to the State Highway Fund plus 1½ percent interest per annum, from the proceeds of the first sale of revenue bonds issued for the construction of said toll bridge, or other toll highway crossings, or from revenues in the existing San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, but only after all revenue bonds issued and sold by the California Toll Bridge Authority have been refunded, and all obligations of the bridge have been fully satisfied, including the repayment of any other sums presently required by law to be repaid to the State Treasury.

The contingent restriction in Chapter 1473, Statutes of 1951, with respect to securing a Department of Army permit for construction of the crossing over San Francisco Bay from Marin County to Contra Costa County has been met and construction is expected to be started early in 1953.

**Department of Public Works**  
**DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES**

ITEM 260 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 794  
Budget line No. 55*For Support of Division of Water Resources From the General Fund*

Amount requested .....	\$1,479,169
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year .....	1,403,176
Increase (5.0 percent) .....	\$70,993

## Summary of Increase

	Total increase	INCREASE DUE TO		Budget page	Line No.
		Work load or salary adjustments	New services		
Salaries and wages .....	\$49,530	\$49,530	---	805	36
Operating expense .....	28,116	28,116	---	805	37
Equipment .....	-10,602	-10,602	---	805	38
Reimbursements:					
Salinity sampling U. S. Bureau of Reclamation .....	3,000	3,000	---	805	44
Stream gaging for U. S. Bureau of Reclamation .....	-456	-456	---	805	45
Snow surveys for U. S. Bu- reau of Reclamation .....	2,000	2,000	---	805	46
Increase in Watermaster Service Fund .....	-595	-595	---	805	50
<b>Total increase .....</b>	<b>\$70,993</b>	<b>\$70,993</b>	<b>---</b>		

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted -----	\$1,479,169
Legislative Auditor's recommendation -----	1,479,169
Reduction -----	None

**ANALYSIS**

The amounts requested by function are as follows:

General administration -----	\$310,467
State maps and surveys -----	23,794
Water quality investigations and surveys -----	336,670
Sacramento—San Joaquin water supervision -----	64,898
Water rights and resources -----	250,660
Watermaster service -----	30,641
Regulation of safety of dams -----	103,340
Flood control project maintenance -----	256,885
Review of federal reports -----	45,046
Central Valley Project -----	56,768
<b>Total -----</b>	<b>\$1,479,169</b>

**General Administration**

This office consists of the offices of the State Engineer and other general administration offices, and the reports control sections.

**Salaries and Wages**

Salaries and wages for the 1952-53 Fiscal Year are \$190,667. This is an increase of \$13,200 over \$177,467 estimated to be expended in the 1951-52 Fiscal Year.

The agency is requesting two additional positions; one junior counsel, \$3,900, to assist in the backlog of work and new duties devolved upon the State Engineer by recent legislation, and one junior typist-clerk, \$2,280, in lieu of an equivalent amount of seasonal help.

**Operating Expense**

Operating expense for the Fiscal Year 1952-53 is \$140,947. This is an increase of \$11,210 over the amount estimated to be expended in the Fiscal Year 1950-51. The increase is primarily due to overhaul of a greater number of vehicles in the division's automotive pool, and an increase in rental rates.

**Equipment**

Equipment request for 1952-53 has decreased by \$2,413 from the amount of \$29,641 estimated to be expended in 1951-52.

**State Maps and Surveys**

Chapter 1581, Statutes of 1949, directs the State Engineer to prepare a state base map consisting of complementary planimetric, topographic and mosaic maps and doing related work. Topographic mapping administration is also included in this section.

The increases in this function are \$1,750 in salaries and wages due to salary increases and \$1,777 in operating expense for an increase in traveling expense to permit a review of maps available within the State so that an inventory of usable maps can be compiled and duplication avoided.

We recommend approval.

**Water Quality Investigation and Survey**

Chapter 1552, Statutes of 1949, provides for the following work:

1. Investigations of the quality of all state waters, including saline water (coastal and inland) and as related to all sources of pollution including the improvement and protection of such waters.
2. Surveys, investigations and formulation of plans for the reclamation of waste water for beneficial purposes.
3. Investigation of damage to underground water by reason of abandoned or defective wells, with recommendations for minimum standards for all construction, making available log forms to all water well drillers who are required to file such well logs with the appropriate regional control board. This function also supervises the program of work being carried out for the state and regional water control boards.

The increase of \$30,454 for 1952-53 over the amount of \$306,216 estimated to be expended in 1951-52 is provision for the analysis of water samples in excess of the division's present laboratory facilities and the purchase of additional laboratory equipment.

We recommend approval.

**Sacramento-San Joaquin Water Supervision**

This function performs stream gaging activities and collects hydrological data on the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers in order to provide basic information on water supply and utilization.

This function also carries on similar activities under contract for the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation, for which it is reimbursed. This reimbursement amounts to 55 percent of the total cost of this program.

This function supports two wholly reimbursable projects: (1) for the assembling of factual data on diversions in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, and (2) data on salinity conditions, under contract with the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation.

The program contemplated is on the same level of service as in the current year.

We recommend approval.

**Water Rights and Resources**

This activity is concerned with supervision of the appropriation of waters within the State, the supervision of the adjudications of water rights by court reference and statutory adjudication, the supervision of watermaster service, and the study of southern area water problems. Snow surveys are also handled and supervised by this function.

**Salaries and Wages**

Salaries and wages for 1952-53 have increased by \$8,530 less an increase in salary savings of \$4,423, making a net increase of \$4,107. This increase is due to normal salary increases.

Operating expense and equipment are on the same level of service as in the current year.

We recommend approval.

### Watermaster Service

This function is concerned with the supervision of water distribution within 17 watermaster service areas. It is financed by both state and local contributions.

The amount requested from the General Fund is \$30,641 for the Fiscal Year 1952-53. This is an increase of \$691, or 2.3 percent over the estimated expenditure of \$29,950 in 1951-52.

Chapter 586, Statutes of 1913, provided for the State Water Commission to assume direct control of the appropriation and distribution of irrigation waters in the public interest in order that such waters shall be put to the highest beneficial use with, as far as may be, an avoidance of long, unnecessary and costly suits to determine the rights of various claimants to the use of public waters of the State.

Chapter 804, Statutes of 1921, amended Section 37, Chapter 586, Statutes of 1913. This gave the Water Commission the right to divide the State into watermaster districts and adjust such districts so as to insure the most practical and economical supervision of the distribution of water on the part of the State, and authority to make such reasonable regulations as may be needed to secure distribution of water in accordance with determined rights.

Upon written request of the owners or governing bodies of at least 15 percent of the conduits, ditches, and pipelines and other means of diversion lawfully entitled to directly divert water from the streams or other sources of water supply, in any watermaster service district, the State Water Commission may in its discretion, if the necessity therefor exists, appoint a watermaster, and, if necessary in its discretion, one or more deputy watermasters.

The State Water Commission may from time to time discontinue watermaster service in any watermaster district or revive the same as necessity requires.

Section 37.f provides for the compensation of the watermaster, and it further provides that one-half of the cost of administration of a watermaster district and the distribution of water thereof shall be paid by the State and the other one-half shall be paid by owners of the rights to divert or store water within the respective watermaster districts.

As to the determination of who should pay for the watermaster, there were two questions involved:

1. Whether the State should pay for the entire cost of the watermaster, since the State exercises police powers in the distribution of water, or
2. Whether the water right users should pay the entire cost, since the benefits derived would be essentially local and not participated in by the rest of the State.

It was determined that the State did receive some benefits and, in view of the unfavorable economic situation at that time, the State would pay one-half of the cost and the water right users would pay the other one-half.

We recommend a review of the watermaster service considering the elimination of the State's one-half share in view of the following:

1. That out of the entire number of water rights users in the State, only 973 parties participate in the Watermaster Service Fund.

2. That, although the State gets some advantage from the watermaster service, compared to the total cost of the State's participation, it is very small.

3. The districts are no longer in the same unfavorable financial position which existed at the time the watermaster service was formed and whereby it was advisable for the State to participate in the cost of this service.

**Regulation of Safety of Dams**

This function is charged with the responsibility for maintaining the safety of all dams in California with the exception of three under federal ownership. This responsibility is discharged by means of approving plans and specifications for all proposed new dams and for the repair of existing dams by periodic safety checks of the 727 dams now under state supervision.

No change in the existing level of service is proposed.

We recommend approval.

**Flood Control Project Maintenance**

Activities of this function include maintenance of the Sacramento River flood control and reclamation works and related levee maintenance work under Chapter 1528, Statutes of 1947.

Chapter 1152, Statutes of 1951, added approximately 32 miles of levees and 17 miles of channels to the Sacramento River Flood Control Project.

The amount requested for 1952-53 is \$256,885. This is a decrease of \$6,306, or 2.4 percent under the amount of \$263,191 estimated to be expended in 1951-52.

No expansion of service is proposed other than that added by the above legislation.

We recommend approval.

**Review of Federal Reports**

This function reviews federal reports on proposed reclamation, flood control and conservation projects within the State.

The amount requested for 1952-53 is \$45,046. This is an increase of \$2,829, or 6.7 percent over the amount of \$42,217 estimated to be expended in 1951-52.

The budget is based upon past experience in the number of federal reports referred to the agency.

We recommend approval.

**Central Valley Project**

This function provides the Water Project Authority with the technical assistance required in acting upon the numerous complex, legal and engineering problems involved in representing California in connection with the operation and construction of the Central Valley Project.

No increase in service is anticipated for the Fiscal Year 1952-53.

We recommend approval.

**Department of Public Works  
OTHER CURRENT EXPENSES—DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES**

ITEM 261 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 805  
Budget line No. 84

**For Support of Work in Cooperation With the Federal Government  
From the General Fund**

Amount requested .....	\$464,850
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year .....	471,575
Decrease (1.4 percent) .....	\$6,725

**Summary of Increase**

	Total increase	INCREASE DUE TO		Budget page	Line No.
		Work load or salary adjustments	New services		
Yuba River debris control .....	-\$15,000	-\$15,000	---	805	77
Stream gauging .....	15,775	15,775	---	805	79
Establishment of gauging stations .....	-7,500	-7,500	---	805	81
Total increase .....	-\$6,725	-\$6,725	---		

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$464,850
Legislative Auditor's recommendation .....	464,850
Reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS**

**Yuba River Debris Control**

Chapter 686, Statutes of 1935, provides for control of mining and other debris along the Yuba River. Funds are expended on a matching basis with the Federal Government.

The amount requested for the Fiscal Year 1952-53 is \$30,000. This is a decrease of \$15,000, or 33.3 percent under the amount of \$45,000 estimated to be expended in 1951-52.

We recommend approval.

**Irrigation Investigations**

This function provides for investigations conducted by the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, including the use, transportation and loss of irrigation waters.

The amount of \$7,500 requested in the 1952-53 Fiscal Year is the same as requested in 1951-52.

**Stream Gauging**

This program provides data on water supply and utilization of streams in California not otherwise covered by the Division of Water Resources. This is a cooperative program with the United States Geological Survey.

The amount requested for the 1952-53 Fiscal Year is \$127,350. This is an increase of \$15,775, or 14.1 percent over the amount of \$111,575 estimated to be expended in 1951-52.

We recommend approval.

**Topographic Mapping**

This is a 10-year mapping program in cooperation with the United States Geodetic Survey to provide for basic topographic maps in the

counties and conservation of the natural and economic resources of the State.

The proposed expenditure is \$300,000.

We recommend approval.

**Department of Public Works**  
**DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES**

ITEM 262 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 807  
Budget line No. 57

*For Support of Feather River Project-San Joaquin Delta Diversion Projects*

Amount requested .....	\$800,000
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year .....	None
 Increase .....	 \$800,000

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$800,000
Legislative Auditor's recommendation .....	800,000
 Reduction .....	 None

**ANALYSIS**

The expenditure program, by project, to be financed from this item is as follows:

Surveys and plans for relocation of Highway Route 24 .....	\$175,000
Surveys and plans for relocation of the Western Pacific Railroad .....	125,000
Surveys and plans for relocation of county roads and Feather Falls Railroad .....	50,000
Exploration of Oroville Dam and afterbay sites .....	100,000
Topographic strip maps from Southern San Joaquin Valley to the Mexican border .....	150,000
Negotiations of contracts and preparation of plans and specifications .....	200,000
 Total .....	 \$800,000

Chapter 1441, Statutes of 1951, authorized the Water Project Authority to construct, maintain, and operate as units of the Central Valley Project the units set forth of the State Water Resources Board entitled "Report on the Feasibility of Feather River Project and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Diversion Projects Proposed as Features of the California Water Plan."

The act directs the State Engineer to make certain investigations, studies, and preparation of plans and submit such material for approval by the Water Project Authority.

The amount requested is to provide for preliminary surveys which are scheduled to be undertaken in 1952-53.

The Water Project Authority shall return to the General Fund from the proceeds of the first sale of revenue bonds issued, this appropriation, or so much thereof as may be used, with interest at one and one-half percent (1½%) per annum, to be computed on the total amount withdrawn during any one year.

**Department of Public Works  
DIVISION OF WATER RESOURCES**

ITEM 263 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 795  
Budget line No. 45

**For Additional Support of Watermaster Service From the Watermaster Fund**

Amount requested .....	\$27,265
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year.....	26,670
<hr/>	
Increase (2.0 percent) .....	\$595

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$27,265
Legislative Auditor's recommendation.....	27,265
<hr/>	
Reduction .....	None

**ANALYSIS**

Total proposed expenditure for the Watermaster Service for the Fiscal Year 1952-53 is \$61,282. Of this amount one-half, or \$30,641, is to be appropriated from the General Fund including contributions to the retirement system. The other one-half is obtained as revenue from the water users who are beneficiaries of the Watermaster Service Fund.

The Watermaster Service adjudicates water rights and supervises the distribution of water. In our analysis of the Division of Water Resources we have proposed that additional consideration be given to the elimination of the State's contribution for Watermaster Service. However, since this would require legislation, we are recommending that the request for 1952-53 be allowed as requested.

**AERONAUTICS COMMISSION**

ITEM 264 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 809  
Budget line No. 7

**For Support of Aeronautics Commission From the General Fund**

Amount requested .....	\$112,249
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year.....	112,888
<hr/>	
Decrease .....	\$639

**Summary of Increase**

	Total increase	INCREASE DUE TO		Budget page	Line No.
		Work load or salary adjustments	New services		
Salaries and wages .....	\$2,406	\$2,406	---	809	48
Operating expense .....	-1,370	-1,370	---	809	68
Equipment .....	-1,175	-1,175	---	810	8
Reimbursements:					
Service to other state agencies .....	-500	-500	---	810	13
<hr/>					
Total increase .....	-\$639	\$-639	---		

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

Amount budgeted .....	\$112,249
Legislative Auditor's recommendation.....	101,489
<hr/>	
Reduction .....	\$10,760