

COLORADO RIVER BOARD

ITEM 265 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 811
Budget line No. 7

For Support of Colorado River Board From the General Fund

Amount requested	\$106,806
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year.....	104,545
Increase (2.2 percent)	\$2,261

Summary of Increase

	Total increase	INCREASE DUE TO		Budget page	Line No.
		Work load or salary adjustments	New services		
Salaries and wages	\$462	\$462	---	811	45
Operating expense	1,085	1,085	---	811	66
Equipment	714	714	---	811	73
Total increase	\$2,261	\$2,261	---		

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$106,806
Legislative Auditor's recommendation.....	106,806
Reduction	None

ANALYSIS

The budget of the Colorado River Board represents an increase of 2.2 percent, or \$2,261 over estimated expenditures for 1951-52. This provides for the same program as approved for 1951-52.

The total increase of \$2,261 represents increased costs for salary and miscellaneous operating expense and replacement of a car.

GENERAL SUMMARY

The Colorado River Board has the duty and responsibility under Chapter 838, Statutes of 1937, of protecting the rights and interests of the State of California, its agencies and citizens pertaining to the waters of the Colorado River system.

The board and its staff prepare legal and engineering material for appearance before congressional committees, and for conferences with interested federal agencies, regarding legislation pending before the Congress affecting California's rights and interests in the Colorado River. Other duties include:

The collection, compilation and analysis of available basic information on the water supply of the Colorado River system and the present and future use thereof; the collection and study of crop data on existing and proposed developments; the making of detailed analyses of the operations of existing and proposed projects to determine effects upon the water supply available to the lower basin and upon the rights of California; and the planning and prosecution of legal and engineering studies needed for possible litigation before the United States Supreme Court.

Serious consideration should be given to reorganizing into a single unit the various state agencies which are concerned with California's interest in water. The State's vital interest in this problem should not be jeopardized by the absence of a clear-cut state policy, emanating from a single agency fully accountable to the people.

Approval of the amount requested is recommended.

BOARD OF HARBOR COMMISSIONERS FOR HUMBOLDT BAY

ITEM 266 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 812
Budget line No. 7*For Support of Board of Harbor Commissioners for Humboldt Bay
From the General Fund*

Amount requested	\$2,854
Estimated to be expended in 1951-52 Fiscal Year	None
Increase	\$2,854

RECOMMENDATIONS

Amount budgeted	\$2,854
Legislative Auditor's recommendation	None
Reduction	\$2,854

ANALYSIS

We recommend that the request for support of the Board of Harbor Commissioners for Humboldt Bay be not approved.

The Legislature, at the 1951 Regular Session, deleted from the Budget the request for support of the Board of Harbor Commissioners for Humboldt Bay for the current year.

Action of the Legislature on the budget request for the board was based on the limited activities of the port and the infrequent meetings held by the board. It was pointed out at the time of consideration of the Budget that prior to enactment of Chapter 179 of the Statutes of 1945, which created the board, the responsibility for the control of these activities had rested within the Department of Public Works and was performed out of a local office of the department located in Eureka. It also was pointed out that, according to an audit report submitted by the Division of Audits, Department of Finance, covering the activities of the board for the period August 1947 to August 1949, only one meeting of the commissioners had been held, and this meeting was held in July of 1949 to pass upon the only application requiring board action received during the two-year period. A subsequent audit report covering the period August 1949 to June 1950 indicates that due to the distance of the office of the board from Sacramento, the small volume of transactions and the fact that transactions consisted only of filing claims for expenditures, an examination of the records of the board was prepared from the records of the State Controller rather than travel to Eureka.

In view of the foregoing and in the interest of economy in State Government, we recommend that (1) the request for support of the Board of Harbor Commissioners for Humboldt Bay be deleted from the Budget, (2) that the responsibility for the activities of the port be placed at the local level of government, and (3) that the act creating the board be repealed at the 1953 Regular Session of the Legislature.