

1 *Informal application reviewer*----- \$4,980

We recommend deletion of the new position of informal application reviewer in the permits and fees section, Budget page 809, line 37. This position is for extending the authorized program of informal conferences with license applicants to include radial highway common carriers and highway contract carriers, and is to be assigned to Los Angeles. A request for a similar position was made a year ago and denied by the Legislature.

We recommend approval of the intermediate stenographer-clerk, Budget page 809, line 38, and the intermediate typist-clerk, Budget page 809, line 39, as being justified on a work load basis.

The three additional intermediate stenographer-clerk positions in the field section, Budget page 809, line 41, are requested for the field offices in Redding, Bakersfield and San Bernardino, where there are at present no clerical positions, in order that the offices may be kept open during business hours and to relieve field men of clerical work. At the present time, these offices are closed during most of the business hours due to the fact that technical personnel are out on investigations, and there have been complaints from the transportation industry on this point.

It should be noted that several other state agencies have offices in these three cities and a pooling of state field services could probably eliminate not only the need for these three clerks but perhaps several additional in the other agencies as well.

We are not prepared to recommend against these three positions, however, until more comprehensive studies have been made of the whole problem of state field services, but point to this situation as an additional indication of the continuing need for such studies.

Revenue for the Transportation Rate Fund is derived from a fee of one-quarter of 1 percent of the gross operating revenue earned by carriers for the transportation of property and from other fees. Revenues were slightly less than expenditures for this activity for 1951-52 but are expected to exceed expenditures for 1952-53 and 1953-54 by a narrow margin.

**Department of Public Works**  
**DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION**

ITEM 248 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 812

Budget line No. 9

*For Support of Departmental Administration From the General Fund*

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Amount requested -----                                | \$156,706 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year ----- | 127,705   |
| Increase (22.7 percent) -----                         | \$29,001  |

## Summary of Increase

|                                | Total<br>increase | INCREASE DUE TO                    |                 | Budget<br>page | Line<br>No. |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
|                                |                   | Work load or<br>salary adjustments | New<br>services |                |             |
| Salaries and wages -----       | \$33,679          | \$33,679                           | ---             | 814            | 9           |
| Operating expense -----        | 2,996             | 2,996                              | ---             | 814            | 10          |
| Equipment -----                | -573              | -573                               | ---             | 814            | 11          |
| Less:                          |                   |                                    |                 |                |             |
| Increased reimbursements ----- | -7,101            | -7,101                             | ---             | 814            | 14          |
| Total increase -----           | \$29,001          | \$29,001                           | ---             |                |             |

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Amount budgeted .....                      | \$156,706 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation ..... | 156,706   |
| Reduction .....                            | None      |

**ANALYSIS**

The budget for the departmental administration function in the Department of Public Works for the 1953-54 Fiscal Year provides essentially the same level of service as that which was allowed for the current fiscal year. However, since the cost of this function is divided between the General Fund operations of the Department of Public Works and the Division of Highway operation, it was determined that a more realistic division of costs was desirable on the basis of recommendations made in prior years.

A study of the operations of the Division of Departmental Administration indicated that six positions which were wholly allocated to and supported by the Division of Highways were actually functioning for other divisions of the Department of Public Works. Consequently, it was determined that these six positions would be transferred to the Division of Departmental Administration. In addition, the study indicated that approximately 20 percent of the total work load of the Division of Departmental Administration was concerned with the General Fund activities of the department and 80 percent with the Division of Highways. This is in contrast to the previous allocation which assumed one-twelfth for the General Fund agencies and eleven-twelfths for the Division of Highways. Therefore, the increase in the General Fund share of the administrative function results from a reallocation of existing positions and the reduction of the share chargeable to the State Highway Fund from approximately 92 percent to 80 percent. We believe these changes are justifiable. Consequently, we recommend approval of this item as submitted.

**Department of Public Works  
DIVISION OF ARCHITECTURE**

ITEM 249 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 815  
Budget line No. 30

*For Support of Division of Architecture From the General Fund*

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Amount requested .....                                | \$379,171 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year ..... | 375,356   |
| Increase (1.0 percent) .....                          | \$3,815   |

**Summary of Increase**

|                             | Total<br>increase | INCREASE DUE TO                    |                 | Budget<br>page | Line<br>No. |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
|                             |                   | Work load or<br>salary adjustments | New<br>services |                |             |
| Salaries and wages .....    | \$4,807           | \$4,807                            | ---             | 819            | 9           |
| Operating expense .....     | 658               | 658                                | ---             | 819            | 10          |
| Equipment .....             | -1,650            | -1,650                             | ---             | 819            | 11          |
| <b>Total increase .....</b> | <b>\$3,815</b>    | <b>\$3,815</b>                     | <b>---</b>      |                |             |

## RECOMMENDATIONS

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Amount Budgeted .....                      | \$379,171 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation ..... | 379,171   |
| Reduction .....                            | None      |

## ANALYSIS

The General Fund support function of the Division of Architecture provides for top level administration, for supervision of design and planning and for surveys of the maintenance needs of the State's plant which are not practical for allocation to the individual construction projects. A comparatively small permanent staff of approximately 54 positions controls the activities of 600 or more positions of all kinds, the cost of which is allocated proportionately to various projects which are authorized and under way.

The activities of this fixed staff are proposed to be maintained during the 1953-54 Fiscal Year at approximately the same level as authorized for the current fiscal year. The comparatively small increase in costs proposed for the 1953-54 Fiscal Year is the result of minor adjustments in salaries and wages and operating expenses. Staffing will remain at the same number of positions authorized for the current fiscal year.

In our analysis of the budget presented for 1952-53 Fiscal Year, we pointed out the fact that the large number of positions whose salaries and wages and other expenses were allocated to the individual construction project did not appear to be under sufficient control by the Department of Finance. We recommended that the Department of Finance undertake a study of the problem in order to determine a sound procedure for control. So far as we know, such a study has not yet been undertaken, and we would therefore repeat the recommendation. Furthermore, it has come to our attention that there are a number of these unbudgeted positions which appear to be engaged in duties and functions not commensurate with their classifications. Consequently, we would broaden our recommendation to include a "desk audit" to determine whether all positions being employed out of construction funds are functioning reasonably within the various job descriptions and classifications under which these positions are established.

In our prior analysis we also pointed out the fact that there was a strong tendency in the Division of Architecture to cling to traditional and often archaic designs, methods and materials. At this time we wish to report that while there are signs of an awakening realization of the need for more modern and more economical approaches to the problems of design and construction, we believe that there still exists in the Division of Architecture a great reluctance to change, which can only result in unnecessary burdens on the general taxpayer.

Referring again to the prior analysis, we recommended the need for a control point between the Division of Architecture and the various using agencies as a means of eliminating friction and assuring more economical construction both as to cost of the project and allocation of space. In the Budget Act of 1952 the Legislature provided a section designated as 7.5 which required that all projects for which construction funds were appropriated in that act and all projects for which construction funds had been appropriated in prior budget acts and which had not yet reached the working drawing stage must first be approved

as to preliminary plans by the Department of Finance and the Public Works Board before any money could be allocated or expended for actual construction. While this section has been in effect only a short time, there is already clear evidence of its beneficial effect. We would recommend that this section be repeated in the Budget Act of 1953.

In view of the fact that the budget request for the General Fund portion of the activities of the Division of Architecture represents no increase in level of service, we recommend approval of the item as requested.

**Department of Public Works  
DIVISION OF ARCHITECTURE**

ITEM 250 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 820  
Budget line No. 23

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

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Amount requested .....                                | \$610,397 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year ..... | 555,665   |
| <hr/>   |           |
| Increase (9.8 percent) .....                          | \$54,732  |

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Amount Budgeted .....                      | \$610,397 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation ..... | 610,397   |
| <hr/>                                      |           |
| Reduction .....                            | None      |

**ANALYSIS**

To carry out its responsibilities in connection with the planning and design of nonstate-owned public buildings, such as public schools, the Division of Architecture is proposing an expenditure for the 1953-54 Fiscal Year which is approximately 9.8 percent, or \$54,732 in excess of the expenditures estimated for the current fiscal year. This proposal does not contemplate any increased staffing, but it does include certain major increases in operating expenses.

A change in office facilities in Los Angeles necessitates an increase in rent of approximately \$13,000. The item for printing is increased from the estimated expenditure for 1952-53 of approximately \$755 to a proposal to spend \$10,000 in the 1953-54 Fiscal Year. This is based on the need to reprint a handbook of school construction regulations. It would appear that this item of increase is justified. The third major increase is for what may be considered an entirely new service. This involves the sum of \$35,000 for research work in cooperation with the Forest Products Laboratory at Madison, Wisconsin which is operated by the U. S. Department of Agriculture. The research is aimed primarily at developing and establishing standards and criteria for timber wall stresses which would be used primarily in the checking of schoolhouse plans since most of the schoolhouses being constructed in California at the present time are of timber framing and sheathing. We believe that this approach to the establishment of much needed criteria is very sound and that the choice of the Forest Products Laboratory of the United States Department of Agriculture is probably the best that can be made. We recommend the approval of this new item of expenditure.

This phase of the work of the Division of Architecture is supported by fees charged for the examination and approval of plans for school and other public buildings. For some years the revenue from this source has been steadily exceeding the expenditures of this section of the Division of Architecture so that it is estimated that as of June 30, 1954 there will be an accumulated surplus in the Architecture Public Building Fund of approximately \$1,801,521. Consequently, we recommend approval of this request as submitted.

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

ITEM 251 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 833

Budget line No. 53

*For Support of Division of Water Resources From the General Fund*

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Amount requested .....                                | \$1,622,799 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year ..... | 1,507,302   |
| Increase (7.6 percent) .....                          | \$115,497   |

## Summary of Increase

|   | Total<br>increase | INCREASE DUE TO                    |                 | Budget<br>page | Line<br>No. |
|---|-------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------|
|   |                   | Work load or<br>salary adjustments | New<br>services |                |             |
| Salaries and wages .....                          | \$85,086          | \$50,706                           | \$34,380        | 844            | 9           |
| Operating expense .....                           | 9,350             | 9,350                              | ---             | 844            | 10          |
| Equipment .....                                   | 26,831            | 26,831                             | ---             | 844            | 11          |
| Less:   |                   |                                    |                 |                |             |
| Reimbursements .....                              | —5,227            | —5,227                             | ---             | 844            | 14          |
| Increase from Water-<br>master Service Fund ..... | —543              | —543                               | ---             | 844            | 23          |
| Total increase .....                              | \$115,497         | \$81,117                           | \$34,380        |                |             |

## RECOMMENDATIONS

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| Amount budgeted .....                      | \$1,622,799 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation ..... | 1,585,419   |
| Reduction .....                            | \$37,380    |

## Summary of Reductions

| <i>Item of reduction</i>                         | <i>Amount</i> | <i>Budget<br/>page</i> | <i>Line<br/>No.</i> |
|--|---------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| <b>General Administration</b>                    |               |                        |                     |
| 2 Assistant counsels .....                       | \$9,960       | 835                    | 59                  |
| 2 Junior counsels .....                          | 8,184         | 835                    | 60                  |
| 1 Intermediate stenographer-clerk .....          | 2,772         | 835                    | 62                  |
| <b>Water Quality Investigation</b>               |               |                        |                     |
| 2 Junior civil engineers .....                   | 8,184         | 837                    | 59                  |
| 2 Laboratory assistants .....                    | 5,280         | 837                    | 60                  |
| <b>Central Valley Project</b>                    |               |                        |                     |
| Reduce attorney and special representative ..... | 3,000         | 843                    | 43                  |
| Total reductions .....                           | \$37,380      |                        |                     |

**ANALYSIS**

The amounts requested by function are as follows:

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| General Administration -----                   | \$436,117   |
| State Maps and Surveys -----                   | 19,953      |
| Water Quality Investigation -----              | 382,257     |
| Sacramento-San Joaquin Water Supervision ----- | 59,913      |
| Water Rights and Resources -----               | 221,309     |
| Watermaster Service -----                      | 30,946      |
| Regulation of Safety of Dams -----             | 101,502     |
| Flood Control Project Maintenance -----        | 245,399     |
| Review of Federal Reports -----                | 54,625      |
| Central Valley Project -----                   | 70,778      |
| Total -----                                    | \$1,622,790 |

**General Administration**

This activity includes the Office of the State Engineer and the various administrative functions of the division, including the legal, stenographic, library, files, equipment, purchasing, auditing, automotive, budgeting and fiscal control, and reports sections. It also includes the administration of public districts coming under the Office of the State Engineer.

**Salaries and Wages**

The division has requested \$285,657 for salaries and wages for this function during the 1953-54 Fiscal Year, which is an increase of \$30,415, or 11.9 percent. Most of the increase is the result of a request for two assistant counsels, two junior counsels, one intermediate stenographer-clerk to assist the new counsels, and one senior legal stenographer to assist the two senior attorneys approved in the 1952-53 Budget.

We recommend that the request for one senior legal stenographer be approved in order to provide stenographic assistance to the two senior attorneys added to the staff last year.

However, in view of the fact that the Water Project Authority now has its own legal staff, the legal work that the division has been doing for the Water Project Authority has decreased considerably. This should enable the legal staff to devote more of its time to pending litigation in which the division is either directly or indirectly interested, since it has had insufficient staff time available in the past to participate in some of these cases. In further justification of its request the division indicates that considerable time of the legal staff is consumed in collecting the expenses of the reference in cases in which the State Engineer is appointed by the court as referee. Any cost of a reference, including the cost of collection, should be paid by the parties involved in the litigation, so that this does not appear to be a sound basis for requesting additional legal personnel.

*We recommend that the request for two assistant counsels, two junior counsels, and one intermediate stenographer-clerk be disapproved, saving \$20,916.*

**Operating Expense**

Operating expense for the 1953-54 Fiscal Year is \$153,048. This is an increase of \$11,084, or 7.8 percent. This increase is due primarily to added cost of automobile operation and maintenance.

**Equipment**

The estimated expenditure for equipment during the 1952-53 Fiscal Year is \$27,258. The 1953-54 request is \$49,102, which is an increase of \$21,844, or 80.1 percent. Approximately one-half of this increase is due to automobile replacement. While the replacement of these automobiles during 1953-54 appears to be justified on the basis of accumulated mileage, consideration should be given prior to the 1954 Session of the Legislature to the feasibility of bringing the automobiles assigned to the division's Sacramento office into the centralized automotive pool. We recommend, therefore, that the Management Analysis Section of the Department of Finance make such a study and report its findings to the Legislature in 1954.

**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 to make surveys of mapping available to other public agencies. The supervision of topographic mapping is also included under this function.

This activity is projected at the current year level. The 1953-54 request provides for an increase of \$752 in salaries and wages and \$138 in operating expense, and a decrease of \$1,066 in equipment.

We recommend approval.

**Water Quality Investigation**

The activities of this unit include: (1) investigation of the quality of all water, including saline water (coastal and inland), and as related to all sources of pollution, together with recommendations as to improvement or protection of the quality of such waters; (2) surveys, investigations, and formulation of plans for the reclamation of waste waters for beneficial purposes; (3) investigation of damage to ground water by reason of abandoned or defective wells, together with recommendations for minimum standards for well construction. This function also supervises the work being done for the state and regional water pollution control boards.

Approximately one-half of the increase in salaries and wages of \$26,268, or 10.2 percent, is due to normal salary adjustments. The balance is the result of four proposed new positions.

Two junior civil engineers are requested to perform field checks on the location of wells. Sections 7076, 7077 and 7078 of the Water Code were added by Chapter 1552, Statutes of 1949. These require that:

“Every person who hereafter digs, bores or drills a water well, or who deepens or re-perforates any such well, shall file with the appropriate regional water pollution control board a report of completion of such well within 30 days after its construction or repair has been completed.

“The report shall be made on forms furnished by the Division of Water Resources \* \* \*”

Under provisions of the law the division has no responsibility other than to prepare and furnish the forms. When this program became effective in October, 1949, the division proposed to the state and regional

water pollution control boards that the reports be filed first with the division, which would process the reports, assign a state well number, and distribute copies of the reports with the original going to the proper regional board. At the time it was envisioned that the only work required of the division in this matter would be office work in processing the reports, assigning numbers, and distributing the copies.

Subsequently the experience of the division has shown that the descriptions of locations of the wells as furnished by the drillers are, in most cases, quite incomplete and inaccurate. According to the division, the log is meaningless unless the location of the well is known to at least the proper 1/16th section. As a result of its experience, the division has now made it a practice to field locate all wells before the report is finally processed and well numbers assigned.

Illustrative of the magnitude of the task involved is the fact that from June, 1950, to December, 1951, 8,102 water well drillers' reports were filed with the Division of Water Resources. Of this number the division was able to field locate only 1,781 during that period. The division states that there is now on hand a large number of these reports awaiting field checking before a state number can be assigned. It should be noted that the division considers the task of field locating wells to be of low priority relative to its total work program, except in cases where the division is conducting investigations. In such areas one of the first steps in an investigation is the field location and the checking of all wells for which it has logs.

Because of the desirability of providing the regional water pollution control boards with accurate data on water wells, and because the division considers well logs to be the best information available concerning underground formations, two positions of junior civil engineer have been requested to permit more complete field checking of well locations.

The field location of water wells represents an extension of the activity of the division beyond the responsibility assigned to it by Section 7076 of the Water Code, which provides only that the division shall furnish forms on which water well information shall be provided by the owners. For this reason it appears to us to be a policy decision whether or not the Legislature considers accurate well log data to be of sufficient importance to justify this extension in the division's activities. In the absence of any existing legislative authorization for this expanded activity, and insufficient information to indicate any real necessity for it, *we recommend that the two positions of junior civil engineer be deleted from the budget.*

The division has also requested two laboratory assistants, one to be assigned to the Sacramento mobile laboratory and one to the laboratory at San Bernardino. *We recommend that the additional positions of laboratory assistants not be granted because of the fact that insufficient work load data has been presented to support the request.* This will result in a saving of \$5,280.

Operating expenses are estimated to decrease during 1953-54 by \$775, or 0.9 percent. The increase in equipment is \$2,391, or 20.9 percent.



**Sacramento-San Joaquin Water Supervision**

The primary activity of this function is to perform stream gauging work and to collect hydrological data on the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers to provide basic information on water supply and utilization. This function is carrying on similar activities under contract for the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation for which reimbursement is received. In addition, it supervises two wholly reimbursable projects: the assembly of factual data on diversions in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valley and salinity conditions.

No change in the existing level of service is proposed during 1953-54, and we recommend approval of the amount requested.

**Water Rights and Resources**

This activity is concerned primarily with the supervision of the appropriation of water within the State, the supervision of the adjudication of water rights by court reference and statutory adjudication, the supervision of watermaster service, studies of water problems in the Southern California area, and the supervision of snow surveys.

The expenditures proposed for the function during 1953-54 are projected on the basis of a continuation of the present work program.

We recommend approval.

**Watermaster Service**

This function is responsible for the supervision of water distribution within the watermaster service areas, of which there are 16 at the present time. The cost is financed by equal contributions from the State and from local interests. The staff and expenses proposed are based upon a continuation of the present level of service.

We reaffirm the position that we took in our analysis of the budget bill for the 1952-53 Fiscal Year, in which we recommended a review of the watermaster service considering the elimination of the State's one-half share. In view of the extremely small percentage of the irrigated land of the State that falls within the several watermaster service areas, it is questionable whether the State as a whole benefits sufficiently from this activity to justify an annual state expenditure of approximately \$30,000.

While we do not recommend against the amount requested for 1953-54, we do recommend that a study be made prior to the 1954 Session of the Legislature to determine the desirability of continuing this as a partially state-supported activity.

**Regulation of the Safety of Dams**

This function is charged with responsibility for the safe condition of all dams in California except those federally owned. This duty is discharged by means of approving plans and specifications for all proposed new dam construction and the repair of existing dams and by maintaining a periodic safety check of the 747 dams now under the State's supervision.

No change from the present program is proposed.

We recommend approval.

**Flood Control Project Maintenance**

This function is responsible for the maintenance of the Sacramento-San Joaquin Flood Control Project. Expansion in this activity is due to the addition of about 32 miles of levees and 17 miles of channels to the project by Chapter 1152, Statutes of 1951, and the addition of new responsibilities in connection with the inspection of levees on Deer Creek, the Merced Stream Group, and Littlejohn Creek Group in Fresno County.

The division requests the addition of one flood control construction foreman in order to complete semiannual physical inspections of the levees. In addition, one subforeman, flood control maintenance and construction, is requested for work in the Sacramento area, primarily necessary because of increased responsibilities under Chapter 1152, Statutes of 1951.

The following table indicates the personnel in relation to work load over the past few years:

|                               | 1949-50 | 1950-51 | 1951-52 | 1952-53 | 1953-54 |
|-------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Levee miles to be inspected:  |         |         |         |         |         |
| Once a year -----             | 725     |         |         |         |         |
| Twice a year -----            |         | 725     | 825     | 1,000   | 1,000   |
| Levee miles to be maintained: |         |         |         |         |         |
| State responsibility -----    | 90      | 90      | 132     | 132     | 132     |
| For districts -----           | 37      | 40      | 40      | 40      | 40      |
| Personnel:                    |         |         |         |         |         |
| Superintendent -----          | 2       | 2       | 2       | 2       | 2       |
| Foreman -----                 | 2       | 2       | 2       | 2       | 3       |
| Subforeman -----              | 8       | 9       | 9       | 9       | 10      |

The work load data appears to justify the additional positions.

There is no significant change in the request for operating expenses and equipment.

We recommend approval.

**Review of Federal Reports**

Federal law provides that the various states be given an opportunity to review federal reports on proposed reclamation, flood control, and water conservation projects within their boundaries. Analysis of and recommendations on such projects are prepared by the Division of Water Resources.

Since the work load is dependent upon projects referred to the State, the budget is based upon the average level of activity for the past. No change is proposed in the number of positions assigned to this activity or in the amounts of money available for operating expenses and equipment during the Fiscal Year 1953-54.

We recommend approval.

**Central Valley Project**

This function provides the Water Project Authority with technical assistance required in acting upon the legal and engineering problems involved in representing California in connection with the operation and construction of the Central Valley Project. The division proposes to continue this activity at its present level.

Although the Water Project Authority will employ its own staff during the Fiscal Year 1953-54, it will be concerned only with the problem

of state acquisition of the Central Valley Project. It will still be necessary to continue certain state activities connected with the Central Valley Project which are not directly related to the question of its acquisition.

This function lists 0.2 of a position for attorney and special representative. The position was established to provide the Water Project Authority with legal representation in Washington, D. C., and this special representative is paid on a per diem basis. During the 1952-53 Fiscal Year the per diem payments to this law firm were increased from \$100 a day to \$150 a day. The civil service schedule includes the position of consulting attorney, with a salary range from \$10-100 per diem. Although the position in question is exempt from civil service, it is not clear why the maximum amount set up in the civil service schedule should be exceeded in this case. *We recommend that this item be reduced by \$3,000.*

With this exception we recommend approval of the budget as submitted.

**Water Problems**

In our analysis last year we pointed to the need for a reorganization of state water agencies if the State is to meet its expanding responsibilities in the field of conservation, development, and control of water resources. We indicated that the numerous boards and agencies that have been created in the past to cope with particular problems provide antiquated and inadequate administrative machinery for the solution of the complex water problems facing the State at the present time.

Confusion of responsibility and duplication of effort are the natural consequences of having 10 state agencies, whose primary concern is with water resources, dealing with separate and distinct phases of the over-all water problem. The magnitude of such tasks as construction of the Feather River Project and possible acquisition by the State of the Central Valley Project make the need for a reorganization of the existing water agencies even more urgent.

We repeat our recommendation of last year to the effect that the Legislature "consider the enactment of legislation which would eliminate duplication and confusion among existing agencies and create an administrative organization responsible for dealing with all major water problems, in which there would be clearly defined lines of authority."

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

ITEM 252 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 844  
Budget line No. 59

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

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Amount requested -----                                | \$491,525 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year ----- | 464,850   |
| Increase (5.7 percent) -----                          | \$26,675  |

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Amount budgeted -----                      | \$491,525 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation ----- | 491,525   |
| Reduction -----                            | None      |

**ANALYSIS**

**Yuba River Debris Control**

This item provides the sum of \$15,000 for restoring, impounding, and controlling debris along the Yuba River in cooperation with the United States Army Engineers. The amount requested for the Fiscal Year 1953-54 is \$15,000 less than the amount estimated to be expended in the current fiscal year. Funds are expended on a matching basis with the Federal Government.

We recommend approval.

**Irrigation Investigations**

These activities are conducted by the Soil Conservation Service of the United States Department of Agriculture. It is proposed to continue this activity at its present level, at a cost to the State of \$7,500 per year.

We recommend approval.

**Stream Gauging**

This function is performed in cooperation with the United States Geological Survey, and it provides data on water supply, runoff, and utilization of streams in California not otherwise covered by the Division of Water Resources.

The estimated expenditure for this function in the 1952-53 Fiscal Year is \$127,350. The 1953-54 request is for \$155,025, which represents an increase of \$27,675, or 21.7 percent. The increase results from the net addition of 22 stream gauging stations.

We recommend approval.

**Topographic Mapping**

The following statement appeared in our 1947-48 Analysis:

“The State in cooperation with the United States Geological Survey has for years been conducting topographical mapping in California. In recent years the State contribution has been \$5,000. Based on a report made by the Reconstruction and Reemployment Commission, a bill was introduced in the Legislature requesting a \$6,000,000 10-year mapping program, for which the State was requested to appropriate \$3,000,000. This proposed appropriation was cut by the Legislature in Chapter 1424, Statutes of 1945, to \$300,000, with no commitment made as to future amounts.”

With the exception of the 1945-46 Fiscal Year, during which time the program was being established, the State has expended approximately \$300,000 a year for topographic mapping in cooperation with the United States Geological Survey. The program has been financed on a matching basis with the Federal Government.

Since 70 percent of the time originally specified for completion of the mapping program has elapsed, we requested the division to prepare an estimate of the percentage of the work already finished. The division indicated that mapping of 31,305 square miles has been completed, which is approximately 20 percent of the area of the State.

The topographic mapping program has proven to be more costly and time-consuming than was anticipated. Because it will be impossible to complete the project in the 10-year period, we recommend that the division present a revised estimate to the Legislature of the total future cost

of the program. Any such report should also make clear the value that the State receives in return for this sizable expenditure and the uses that are made of the maps.

We recommend approval of the amount requested for 1953-54.

**Establishment or Reconstruction of Stream Gauging Stations**

No funds were budgeted for this item in 1952-53. The sum of \$14,000 is requested for 1953-54 to construct one new gauging station and reconstruct six existing stations in cooperation with the United States Geological Survey.

We recommend approval.

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

ITEM 253 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 845  
Budget line No. 26

*For Support of Feather River Project From the General Fund*

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| Amount requested .....                                | \$750,000 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year ..... | 800,000   |
| Decrease (6.3 percent) .....                          | \$50,000  |

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Amount budgeted .....                      | \$750,000 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation ..... | 750,000   |
| Reduction .....                            | None      |

**ANALYSIS**

By Item 262 of the 1952-53 Budget there was appropriated to the Division of Water Resources the sum of \$800,000 "for necessary investigations, surveys, and studies, and preparation of plans and specifications for (1) the construction of the works, referred to as the Feather River Project and Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta Diversion Projects, authorized by Section 11260 of the Water Code, and (2) a Feather River-Sacramento exchange canal north of the Marysville Buttes in connection with the consideration by the Water Project Authority of a modification pursuant to Chapter 1441, Statutes of 1951, of the Feather River Project to include such a canal \* \* \*."

An expenditure of \$750,000 is proposed for the Fiscal Year 1953-54 in order to complete the required work and the final report.

The amount requested will provide for the following:

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| Field surveys and topographic maps for conduit routes .....  | \$200,000 |
| Preparation of plans, designs and cost estimates of project features .....   | 200,000   |
| Negotiation of contracts with persons and agencies whose properties would be affected by the construction of the project ..... | 175,000   |
| Negotiation of contracts for water delivery and disposal of electric power .....   | 125,000   |
| Preparation and printing of report to Water Project Authority .....  | 50,000    |
| Total .....  | \$750,000 |

We recommend approval of the amount requested.

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

ITEM 254 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 834  
Budget line No. 12

*For Support of Putah Creek Cone Investigation From the General Fund*

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Amount requested .....                                | \$15,000 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year ..... | 25,000   |
|   | <hr/>    |
| Decrease (40.0 percent) .....                         | \$10,000 |

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Amount budgeted .....                      | \$15,000 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation ..... | 15,000   |
|  | <hr/>    |
| Reduction .....                            | None     |

**ANALYSIS**

In accordance with Chapter 1478, Statutes of 1951, the Division of Water Resources was directed to make an investigation and report on the water supplies of the Putah Creek Cone and adjacent areas in the Counties of Yolo and Solano. The act appropriated \$50,000 for the project, and of this amount \$19,107 was expended in the Fiscal Year 1951-52, \$25,000 is estimated to be expended in the current fiscal year, leaving an estimated balance of \$5,893 available in 1953-54. The division has requested that an additional \$15,000 be appropriated, making a total of \$20,893 available to continue the investigation during 1953-54.

The original appropriation contained no provision for matching state and local funds. However, it is our understanding that this investigation is largely of concern to the University of California at Davis and that there is predominant state interest involved.

We, therefore, recommend approval as submitted.

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

ITEM 255 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 845  
Budget line No. 71

*For Support of Santa Margarita Watershed Investigation From the General Fund*

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Amount requested .....                                | \$60,000 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year ..... | 40,000   |
|   | <hr/>    |
| Increase (50.0 percent) .....                         | \$20,000 |

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Amount budgeted .....                      | \$60,000 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation ..... | 60,000   |
|  | <hr/>    |
| Reduction .....                            | None     |

**ANALYSIS**

The sum of \$5,000 was allocated from the Emergency Fund during the Fiscal Year 1951-52 for an investigation of the Santa Margarita Watershed. Of this amount, \$1,146 was expended during that year. Item 262.5,

Chapter 3, Statutes of 1952, provided \$150,000 “for surveys and investigations of the water resources of the Santa Margarita Watershed including but not limited to hydrography, hydroeconomics, the use and distribution of water for agricultural and other beneficial purposes, including consideration of both surface and underground water conditions, and the availability of natural situations for reservoirs or reservoir systems for gathering and distributing flood or other waters \* \* \*.” Only \$40,000 of the 1952 appropriation is estimated to be expended during the current fiscal year. The division has requested \$60,000 to continue the investigation during Fiscal Year 1953-54.

Inasmuch as the outcome of the controversy between the Federal Government and local water users in the Santa Margarita Watershed may have an important influence on the question of the right of the Federal Government to appropriate water from California streams, this water resource investigation appears to be of more than purely local significance. We recommend, therefore, that the investigation be continued as a state-supported activity and that the amount requested be approved.

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

ITEM 256 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 834  
Budget line No. 54

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

|   |          |
|---|----------|
| Amount requested -----                                | \$27,808 |
| Estimated to be expended in 1952-53 Fiscal Year ----- | 27,265   |
| <hr style="width: 100%;"/>                            |          |
| Increase (2.0 percent) -----                          | \$543    |

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

|  |          |
|--|----------|
| Amount budgeted -----                      | \$27,808 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation ----- | 27,808   |
| <hr style="width: 100%;"/>                 |          |
| Reduction -----                            | None     |

**ANALYSIS**

The Watermaster Service is supported by equal contributions from the State and the benefitted areas. The moneys collected from the watermaster service areas are placed in the Watermaster Service Fund and appropriated therefrom. It will be noted that for the Fiscal Year 1953-54 the budget provides for an appropriation of \$30,946 from the General Fund for support of this activity, and for only \$27,808 from the Watermaster Service Fund. This is explained by the fact that the contributions to the State Employees' Retirement Fund are made entirely from the Watermaster Service Fund, and the one-half of the support cost assigned to the Watermaster Service Fund is reduced by a corresponding amount.