

CAPITAL OUTLAY

STATE CONSTRUCTION BOND ACT PROGRAM

The following items appear as part of Section 2.5 of the Budget Bill since they constitute expenditures from bond funds which are not included as part of the expenditure total shown in the Budget. However, the individual items appear in the Governor's printed Budget interpolated in the midst of the items payable from the Capital Outlay and Savings Fund. Bond fund items have a three-year fiscal life the same as items payable from the Capital Outlay and Savings Fund and savings from individual projects are reverted to the augmentation item for this fund.

ITEM 446 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1027
Budget line No. 17

**FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT,
MEN'S COLONY, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$11,500,000 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation..... | 11,300,000 |
| | \$200,000 |
| Reduction | \$200,000 |

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for the initial construction of new permanent facilities at the California Men's Colony near San Luis Obispo. The project would provide for a domiciliary capacity of 1,200 inmates, but with certain central facilities such as laundry, boiler plant, kitchen, etc. which will be designed to handle the ultimate capacity of 2,400. Also, some of the central facilities will, upon completion, take over their parallel function in the existing temporary facilities which now house 1,200 inmates. Upon completion of the initial facility, the total capacity of the institution in both permanent and temporary buildings would be 2,400. At such time as the balance of the permanent facilities are funded and completed, the temporary facilities would either be abandoned or might conceivably have to be continued in service if the additional space is required.

This project was first included in the five-year plan on the basis of \$8 million in the 1957-58 Fiscal Year and \$3,390,000 in the 1958-59 Fiscal Year, or a total of \$11,390,000 for an initial capacity of 1,200 inmates. As first presented for inclusion in the 1957-58 Budget the estimate was upgraded to 16 million dollars for the same facilities that were contemplated in the five-year plan, however, with a somewhat increased scope. Subsequently, through intensive review of the items contained in the program, this was reduced to the amount shown in the budget. This is on the assumption that the first phase actually can be separated into two phases because of the fact that certain buildings are of such simplicity that they can be built in less time than the main buildings and, hence will not need to be funded until 1958-59 Fiscal

Capital Outlay

State Construction Bond Act Program—Continued

Year. This means that the total cost for the initial development for 1,200 inmates will eventually exceed 16 million dollars with the additional amount being funded in the 1958-59 Budget.

The reduction of \$200,000 which we have recommended is based on the fact that the legislature in 1956 provided \$200,000 for the construction of utilities and services as an initiation of the program. In developing the present estimate this \$200,000 was overlooked and was duplicated in the estimate.

The buildings to be provided in the first phase will be as follows: four housing units for 300 inmates each, an administration building, a warehouse and commissary building, power house and boiler plant, hospital clinic and dining building, classroom and dining building, kitchen weekly commissary, canteen and industrial office building, laundry building, industries building, seven guard towers, main entrance gatehouse, and minor auxiliary facilities. Also, there would be extensive site grading, paving and drainage, a fence around the entire institution with sallyport, and outdoor recreational facilities. It should be pointed out that the ultimate facility, that is the one of 2,400-capacity, will probably average at least \$10,000 per inmate. Approval of this item is recommended.

ITEM 447 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1079
Budget line No. 42

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT,
CHICO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PRO-
GRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$1,589,240 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | <u>Inadequate estimates</u> |
| Reduction | Indeterminate |

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for the construction of two residence halls, each having a capacity of 202 students on the basis of two per bedroom. We have made comments concerning the residence hall program at the beginning of our capital outlay analysis and we will not reiterate them at this point. However, we would like to point out that the cost of these residence halls will approximate between \$3,950 and \$4,000 per student exclusive of furnishings. It is our contention that this cost is too high and needlessly so, that it is possible to reduce this cost so that the State's share would ultimately be less than 50 percent of the total. That is to say, that the amount that could be amortized from student fees would then represent more than a 50 percent share of the cost.

Capital Outlay

State Construction Bond Act Program—Continued

ITEM 448 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1083
Budget line No. 45

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT, FRESNO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PRO- GRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$1,494,250 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | Inadequate estimates |
| Reduction | Indeterminate |

ANALYSIS

This project is similar to the one in item 447 preceding but it will be noted that it is almost \$100,000 less in cost for two residence halls. The difference primarily is in reduced site development and utilities services. The plan is precisely the same for all of the residence halls and price variations are primarily differences in site development.

We have expressed certain criticisms of the design which have not as yet been resolved. *Consequently, we can make no recommendation at this time concerning the cost.*

ITEM 449 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1089
Budget line No. 56

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT, HUMBOLDT STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$790,500 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | Inadequate estimates |
| Reduction | Indeterminate |

ANALYSIS

Same comments as prior item.

ITEM 450 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1094
Budget line No. 54

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT, LONG BEACH STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$749,160 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | Inadequate estimates |
| Reduction | Indeterminate |

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for a single residence hall and we make the same comments as in Items 447 and 448.

Capital Outlay

State Construction Bond Act Program—Continued

ITEM 452 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1103
Budget line No. 51

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT, SACRAMENTO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$1,496,300 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | Inadequate estimates |
| Reduction | Indeterminate |

ANALYSIS

This would provide for two residence halls and the same comments apply as to Items 447 and 448.

ITEM 453 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1116
Budget line No. 62

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT, SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$650,900 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | Inadequate estimates |
| Reduction | Indeterminate |

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for a single construction project on this campus to house student activities. It was originally included in the five-year plan under the schedule for residence halls and student activities buildings at \$631,000. It is presently designed as a combination one- and two-story reinforced concrete building having a gross area of 26,900 square feet at a "building cost" of \$16.80 per square foot and a "construction cost" of \$19.37 per square foot.

This project would represent the first step to be taken by the State in providing specifically for student unions on the various campuses. San Jose was chosen as the first such campus primarily because it did not have the site available for residence halls, whereas it does have some space available, on the existing campus, for the student's activities building which would be considerably smaller than two residence halls. *With respect to the cost of the project, we have raised certain questions in its design which have not yet been satisfactorily resolved and consequently we can make no recommendation as to the appropriate amount to be funded.*

With respect to the justification for the project as a whole, we feel that it represents a serious policy question which must be decided by the Legislature since the total cost of buildings of this type would equal an appreciable amount of academic capacity.

Capital Outlay

State Construction Bond Act Program—Continued

ITEM 454 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1107
Budget line No. 62

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT, SAN DIEGO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$2,300,350 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | Inadequate estimates |
| Reduction | Indeterminate |

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for the construction of three residence halls. The same comments apply to these as will be found in Items 447 and 448.

ITEM 455 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1112
Budget line No. 51

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT, SAN FRANCISCO STATE COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$2,261,600 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | Inadequate estimates |
| Reduction | Indeterminate |

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for the construction of three residence halls and the same comments apply as in Items 447 and 448.

ITEM 456 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1121
Budget line No. 68

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT, CALIFORNIA STATE POLYTECHNIC COLLEGE, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$5,456,700 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | Inadequate estimates |
| Reduction | Indeterminate |

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for the construction of four residence halls on the San Luis Obispo Campus and three residence halls on the Kellogg-Voorhis Campus. The same comments apply as in Items 447 and 448.

Capital Outlay

State Construction Bond Act Program—Continued

ITEM 457 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1145
Budget line No. 29

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$2,116,700 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | Inadequate estimates |
| Reduction | Indeterminate |

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for two construction projects and two planning projects as follows:

- A. Prepare working drawings for residence hall unit no. 2 at Berkeley—\$98,000.

This represents the State's share of the cost of preparing plans for a residence hall unit to house 800 students. The total cost of the plans will be approximately \$174,300 with the difference being made available from the University Contract Overhead Fund. The project was included in the five-year plan and scheduled for funding in 1959-60 at a cost of \$140,000 to be shared equally. Construction funding was scheduled for the following year, 1960-61. We have seen no sketches or preliminary plans on the project but it is our understanding that the university has agreed to conform, more or less, to the over-all approach made on state college residence halls. The projected cost at the time it was included in the five-year plan would have been \$4,000 per student but we believe that the subsequent approach as made by the university would result in a cost of \$5,000 per student. This seems to us to be too high a cost.

- B. Prepare working drawings for residence hall unit no. 2, Los Angeles—\$98,000.

Same comments apply as above.

- C. Construct parking structure, San Francisco—\$1,073,000.

This represents the State's share of a total state and university expenditure of \$1,468,100 with the balance coming from the University Contract Overhead Fund. In turn, the total represents two-thirds of the cost of the facility with the other third coming from nonstate and nonuniversity funds.

The project will provide a multilevel structure to store 750 cars for the use of clinical patients, visitors, professional staff, and other employees and students. The total cost, including outside funds, would be in excess of \$2,200,000 which would mean a cost per car space of over \$2,900. This is an unusually high cost which could not ever be justified commercially, except at very high parking rates. We have no indication as to whether parking fees

State Construction Bond Act Program—Continued

will be assessed in the use of this structure and if they are what use will be made of the revenues. *We suggest that an important policy decision is involved here and since we have not seen complete details on the project we can make no recommendation with respect to the cost.*

D. Construct residence hall unit no. 2, Santa Barbara—\$847,700.

This project was included in the five-year plan for funding in the 1959-60 Fiscal Year at a total cost of \$1,573,000 to be shared equally by the State and university. The facility was for 400 students. As now proposed the cost would be \$1,600,000 with the State's share as indicated and the balance of \$752,300 coming from the University Contract Overhead Fund. We would question whether the population growth at this campus has been so rapid as to justify moving the project ahead two years. Beyond that, since we have seen no actual plans for the project, other than the assumption that it would reproduce the existing residence hall, we have no way of making a recommendation as to cost.

ITEM 458 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1187
Budget line No. 16

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$1,106,000 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | 1,106,000 |
| Reduction | None |

ANALYSIS

This item represents the augmentation required to construct the Neuropsychiatric Institute as part of the medical center on the Los Angeles Campus. The increased cost comes about primarily as a result of the change in concept of the project by which a number of beds were eliminated in favor of additional laboratory facilities in order to permit more extensive research work and the teaching of research techniques. We have gone over this project in great detail and we believe that the cost is in keeping with the character of the design which is intended to reproduce that of the existing medical center buildings. Approval is recommended.

ITEM 459 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1210
Budget line No. 29

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT, NAPA STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$2,553,000 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | Inadequate estimates |
| Reduction | Indeterminate |

Capital Outlay

State Construction Bond Act Program—Continued

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for the construction of a complete juvenile residence and treatment unit at the hospital at a cost of \$2,533,000. The project was originally included in the five-year plan at a cost of \$1,329,750 to provide a facility with a capacity of 150 juvenile patients, containing its own administration area, isolation and dining room building, dormitories and educational buildings.

As now designed the project would have facilities for 192 juvenile patients and would be very similar in scope to the juvenile unit recently completed and activated at Camarillo State Hospital. However, the physical design is considerably different based on experiences with the new unit at Camarillo.

The design would provide 94,873 gross square feet of building area at a "building cost" of \$17.65 per square foot and a "construction cost" of \$22.61 per square foot. The disparity between these two figures is primarily the result of extensive site development and utilities work that must be provided for the facility which is somewhat removed from the main building area. While there appears to be justification for the project as a whole, we have raised a number of important technical questions as to the design and the costs which have not as yet been resolved. *Consequently, we cannot at this time make any recommendations with respect to the cost.*

ITEM 460 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1223
Budget line No. 44

FOR MAJOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT, FAIRVIEW STATE HOSPITAL, FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FUND

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|----------------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$1,297,400 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | Inadequate estimates |
| Reduction | Indeterminate |

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for a single project of construction of two ward buildings at \$1,297,400. The project was originally included in the five-year plan at a cost of \$1,200,000 for 280 beds in four wards. As now designed there will be two buildings of two wards each, totaling 280 beds, and providing a gross building area of 57,680 square feet at a "building cost" of \$16.37 and a "construction cost" of \$18.90 per square foot. Capacity in hospitals for the mentally defective is still needed and consequently we believe there is ample justification for this project in principle. However, we have raised a number of important questions with respect to the design and the costs which as yet have not been resolved. *Consequently, we cannot at this time make any recommendation with respect to the cost.*

Capital Outlay

State Construction Bond Act Program—Continued

ITEM 461 of the Budget Bill

Budget page 1016
Budget line No. 59

**FOR CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT OF STATE PUBLIC WORKS
PROJECT IN AUGMENTATION OF CURRENT AVAILABLE APPROPRI-
ATIONS FOR CONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENTS, AND EQUIPMENT
FOR STATE AGENCIES FROM THE STATE CONSTRUCTION PRO-
GRAM FUND**

RECOMMENDATIONS

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Amount budgeted | \$1,316,010 |
| Legislative Auditor's recommendation | 1,316,010 |
| Reduction | None |

ANALYSIS

This item would provide for augmentation of the foregoing projects which are payable from the State Construction Program Fund in the same manner that projects payable from the Capital Outlay and Savings Fund have augmentation provisions. The amount requested represents approximately 3 percent of the total project estimates and, if anything, may prove to be inadequate. However, it is most unlikely that demands would be made on this augmentation within the fiscal year even to the amount proposed so that there is no danger of its being insufficient. Approval is recommended.