

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
MINUTES, MEETING OF JULY 12, 1950

C O N T E N T S

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Approval of Minutes of Board Meeting of May 18, 1950	1
2. Report on CALIFORNIA'S FISH AND GAME PROGRAM	2
3. Status of Funds.	2
4. Withdrawals of Allocations and Balances.	2
5. Owens Valley Pheasant Development Project, Cancellation of	3-4
6. Lower Butte Creek Waterfowl Management Area (Addition to Gray Lodge), Approval of Alternate Tract for	4-10
7. Delta Waterfowl Management Area (Grizzly Island)	
a. Tentative Allocation of Funds for Access Bridge.	10-11
b. Additional Allocation for Graveling Roads.	12-13
8. Madera Waterfowl Management Area, Alternate Tract for.	13
9. Fish Springs Rearing Ponds, Status of.	13-14
10. Coachella Valley Warmwater Fishing Areas, Time limit imposed	14-15
11. Colorado River, Preliminary Report	15-16
12. Iron Gate Regulatory Dam	16-17
13. Resolutions re Special Consultant Everett E. Horn.	17-18
14. Consolidation of Board's Offices and Files	18
15. Date for Next Meeting.	18

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
MINUTES, MEETING OF JULY 12, 1950

Pursuant to the call of the Chairman, the Wildlife Conservation Board met in Room 367 of the State Building, Civic Center, San Francisco, on July 12, 1950. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Hastain at 10:15 A.M.

PRESENT:	Harvey E. Hastain	Chairman
	E. L. Macaulay	Member
	Senator Ralph E. Swing	Joint Interim Committee
	Senator George J. Hatfield	" " "
	Assemblyman Thomas M. Erwin	" " "
	Assemblyman Lloyd W. Lowrey	" " "
	Assemblyman Lester T. Davis	" " "
	Seth Gordon	Consultant
	C. R. Knight, Jr.	Field Agent
ABSENT:	James S. Dean	Member
	Senator Ben Hulse	Joint Interim Committee

The following persons were present and participated in the deliberations as required:

Hon. Louis G. Sutton	Member of the Senate
Hon. George Miller, Jr.	" " " "
Wm. J. Silva	Fish and Game Commission
Ralph W. Scott	Deputy Attorney General
Alan C. Taft	Bureau of Fish Conservation
Ben Glading	Bureau of Game Conservation
R. E. Curtis	" " " "
David Selleck	" " " "
L. F. Chappell	Bureau of Patrol
R. E. Reedy	Adm. Asst., Division of Fish and Game
Charles Mann	Public Information Office
Harrison Call	Attorney, Corning
Herschel Vaught	Chico Chamber of Commerce
C. H. Bohrmann	Associated Sportsmen
Ernest E. Hatch	Gridley
George Custer	Dist. Council No. 1, Associated Sportsmen
Claus Hulen	Gridley
William Jones	Road Commissioner of Solano County
Lloyd Johnson	Yreka, Northern California Sportsmen

Numerous representatives of the press, sportsmen's groups, and others, were also in attendance.

1. Approval of Minutes

It was regularly moved and seconded that the reading of the minutes of the Wildlife Conservation Board meeting of May 18, 1950 be dispensed with and said minutes approved as written. Passed unanimously.

2. Report on CALIFORNIA'S FISH AND GAME PROGRAM

The consultant reported that unfilled requests for copies of the above report now totaled 732. He stated that it was difficult to determine how many additional copies would be needed because the requests had not crystallized to a point where a definite recommendation could be made. The State Printer, who is holding type for the report, had quoted prices for reprints at \$2,700 for 5,000 copies and \$4,500 for 10,000 copies.

In response to Senator Hatfield's suggestion, Senator Swing and Assemblyman Erwin stated that they would be able to supply the new members of the Legislature with copies of the report. Senator Swing further stated that several hundred copies remaining in the Senate's supply would be turned over to the Board to take care of unfilled requests.

It was informally agreed to defer consideration of ordering additional copies to the next Board meeting.

3. Status of Funds

The Board was informed that the amount allocated to specific projects up to the end of June, 1950, with the saving on the Delta Waterfowl Project deducted, was \$8,275,201, made up as follows:

(a) Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects (18)	\$2,613,800
(b) Warmwater and Other Fish Projects (6).	164,500
(c) Flow Maintenance and Stream Improvement Projects (14).	450,000
(d) Screen and Ladder Projects (14).	387,500
(e) State Game Farm Projects (4)	106,000
(f) Other Upland Game Projects (5)	487,150
(g) Waterfowl Management Projects (9).	4,001,251
(h) General Projects (4)	65,000
Total (74 projects).	\$8,275,201

At the beginning of the May 18 meeting, the unobligated balance available (after adding the \$340,000 saved on the Delta Waterfowl Project, and deducting the \$100,000 reserved for Bixby Slough) was \$924,300. During that meeting the Board approved specific allocations aggregating \$382,000 and reserved \$20,000 additional for the Mendocino National Forest Stream Improvement and Flow Maintenance Program. The Board also deferred action on two items (Lower Butte Waterfowl Management Area \$73,625 and bridge for the Delta Waterfowl Project \$135,000), leaving a balance of \$313,675, which amount, with the exception of necessary administrative expenses, was set aside pending a report on the possible needs along the Colorado River.

4. Withdrawals of Allocations and Balances

The Board was informed that while the \$340,000 saving on the purchase of land for the Delta Waterfowl Area had been returned to the unobligated balances in the Wildlife Restoration Fund through routine budgetary procedure, the Department of Finance recommends that hereafter the Board formally act to recover such balances in the same manner as allocations are withdrawn or transferred. Deputy Attorney General Scott agrees that this procedure would remove any question of doubt.

5. Cancellation of Owens Valley Pheasant Development Project

The consultant stated that on August 25, 1949, the Board approved an allocation of \$51,150 (to be matched in part by Federal-Aid Funds) to initiate the development of a pheasant and quail restoration program in Owens Valley, Inyo County, between Bishop and Owens Lake. Other important fish and game development projects in the valley were held in abeyance to determine, through this pilot project, the degree of cooperation that might be expected in the State's efforts to increase recreational opportunities in that region.

The Board was advised that the Fish and Game Commission proceeded in good faith to purchase equipment, etc., pending negotiation of satisfactory agreements with the Bureau of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles for the use of limited areas for this project. In view of the Bureau's published statements concerning recreational opportunities afforded by the City of Los Angeles on its holdings in the valley, it was assumed that every possible cooperation would be forthcoming. However, due to opposition from cattle-grazing lease holders, many of whom are not residents of the region, which was not offset by determined interest on the part of sportsmen and other residents of the Los Angeles Region, the principal beneficiaries of such a development program, the negotiations failed.

The consultant advised that if the many thousands who are, or should be, concerned with such recreational developments make their wishes more fully known it may be possible to re-open negotiations later, when some of the current leases expire. However, by that time the presently available funds will likely be utilized elsewhere, and consideration might have to await additional appropriations.

In accordance with action of the Fish and Game Commission at its meeting of June 27, 1950, it was recommended that the Board withdraw the unobligated balance in the said allocation of \$51,150, amounting to approximately \$44,000, cancel the project, and restore said sum to the working balance of the Board.

It was moved by Senator Hatfield, seconded by Assemblyman Davis, that the Joint Interim Committee recommend to the Board that the unobligated balance of the sum allocated to Owens Valley Pheasant Development, Project No. 521, be withdrawn and restored to the Wildlife Restoration Fund and that said project be canceled.

AYES: Senators Swing and Hatfield; Assemblymen Erwin, Davis, and Lowrey

NOES: None

Passed unanimously.

Thereupon, by motion regularly made, seconded and unanimously adopted by the members of the Board, it was agreed that, in view of the inability of the Fish and Game Commission to negotiate with the City of Los Angeles for the use of essential small parcels of land, and in accordance with the action of the Fish and Game Commission at its meeting of June 27, 1950, the unobligated balance of the \$51,150 allocated to the Fish and Game Commission from the Wildlife Restoration Fund on August 25, 1949 for Owens Valley Pheasant Development, Project No. 521,

amounting to approximately \$44,000, be and is hereby withdrawn and restored to the Wildlife Restoration Fund, and that said project be canceled.

Senator Hatfield requested that Mr. Glading submit to the members of the Board and Committee a detailed report as to what equipment was purchased with the amount already expended out of the \$51,150 allocated to this project, and where and for what purpose this equipment was being used. He also requested the consultant to investigate the propriety of the Fish and Game Commission reimbursing the Wildlife Restoration Fund in the amount of the equipment purchased.

Senator Hatfield pointed out that he did not question that the equipment was purchased in good faith; it was his intent to protect the Fund, which had been set up for certain restricted purposes.

Mr. Glading asked if the Division of Fish and Game would not be justified in using the equipment already purchased for the minor portion of the Owens Valley project consisting of development work for quail and chukars on Forest Service and public domain lands in the surrounding hills.

Mr. Gordon stated that the equipment might well be used in connection with the \$375,000 quail habitat development project covering all of California south of U. S. Hwy. 40.

Senator Swing suggested that reply to Mr. Glading's question be delayed until his report was received, and Senator Hatfield concurred.

In reply to Chairman Hastain's question, Mr. Glading stated that quite a large area of public domain lands exist in the Inyo and White Mountains, but, unfortunately, the sites suitable for development are limited. Whereupon Mr. Hastain expressed the opinion that since the public feeling apparently is such that a comprehensive project is not feasible no further special development work should be undertaken in the area.

6. Lower Butte Creek Waterfowl Management Area (Addition to Gray Lodge). . \$73,625

The consultant stated that the Board at its meeting of May 18 deferred consideration of a recommendation to increase the allocation of funds to the above project by \$73,625, in order to purchase 3,734 acres which have been offered for sale. This would increase the total for land purchase to \$519,625 to cover the asking price, which with the \$91,036 set up for equipment and buildings increases the grand total to \$610,661.

He further stated the owners of these lands desire definite advice from the Board now, in order that they may consider offers from duck clubs and others if the Board is not interested in their property; that those who would be partly surrounded by the proposed addition to the Gray Lodge Refuge would rather have the State proceed on that basis than to consider an exchange or sale of their lands; that later the proposed boundary lines can likely be further improved; and that a few small interior plots might have to be taken by condemnation if exchanges cannot be consummated.

None of the offered lands are of highest agricultural quality; all are capable of development for waterfowl and pheasants. Their wildlife value is well established by the use now made of them in an undeveloped state. Seventy-two per cent of the land is entitled to water service, part by gravity and part by low lift pumping. The ground water situation is good so that pumping from wells will be practical.

The consultant advised that communications recommending the Lower Butte project had been received from the Associated Sportsmen and Organized Sportsmen of California, as well as local groups, and that a number of their representatives were present and wished to present their views.

Senator Louis G. Sutton, Eighth Senatorial District, stated he was present to support public shooting grounds, and favored the enlargement of the Gray Lodge Refuge for that purpose. If the refuge was not to be enlarged to provide public shooting, it was his belief that the Board should take the responsibility of finding comparable shooting grounds elsewhere for the benefit of the unattached hunters.

Mr. Harrison Call, Attorney of Corning, representing landowners offering willing sales and sportsmen of the area in which the project is located, stated the group he represented had violently opposed the acquisition of the project by condemnation. Since the alternate area presently under consideration was made up of lands offered for sale, those same people were now just as strongly in favor of the project as they were formerly opposed. The Chico Rod and Gun Club and others listed on the petition presented to the Board, with a membership of almost 1,500, unanimously favored the expansion of the Gray Lodge Refuge.

Mr. Call asserted that during the eight years he served as a member of a duck damage committee very little damage was found near game management or refuge areas, but that considerable damage had been found adjacent to private gun clubs which were not properly managed.

He declared that the people he represented could not be prohibited from selling their land to a buyer willing to pay the price. If the State did not buy it, private gun clubs and others would, and the unattached shooter whose needs had long been ignored would suffer.

Assemblyman Erwin pointed out that the ratio of fishing license sales to hunting licenses was about two to one. He stated that the estimated cost of the Fish Springs Hatchery had been increased by \$190,000, and that probably every hatchery would almost double in price. He believed the available money should be spent to complete projects to which there was no objection and which would do the greatest good for the greatest number. Since there had been continual opposition to the Gray Lodge expansion project he did not like to see funds allocated to it.

In reply to Senator Hatfield's question, Mr. Gordon stated that the \$180,000 presently allocated to the Fish Springs Hatchery was believed more than sufficient to construct the necessary operating ponds, and it could later be determined what additional funds would be necessary. He pointed out that Gray Lodge is positively one of the key units in the state, and when there are no ducks anywhere else in California there would be ducks there. Therefore, this project should either be expanded into an efficient operating unit to accomplish the three objectives of the waterfowl management program or the present refuge discontinued entirely.

Assemblyman Lowrey asked if any investigation had been made of Sherman Island, which was transferred to Fish and Game in 1944 for public shooting grounds. Mr. Gordon replied it was felt that this island would not lend itself to the multiple purpose program developed under the Lea Bill. Mr. Hastain advised that the Commission had heard numerous presentations regarding this island. They learned it was necessary to have 1,000 to 1,500 decoys to bring the birds in after they had been lured down to a level where they could see the decoys. Also, that the heavy fogs were a hazard. Mr. Glading added that about 80% of the island is now covered with salt water and that the cost of reclaiming it would be excessive. He stated that the part not under water is open for public shooting.

Mr. Herschel Vaught, of Chico, representing the Chico and Butte County Chambers of Commerce and the Chico Rod and Gun Club, presented a petition favoring expansion of the Gray Lodge Refuge containing names of some 1,000 residents of Butte County, some 700 of them from the immediate neighborhood of the proposed project. He stated that the Upper Butte Creek area had been willingly abandoned when the people opposed condemnation, and at that time a verbal agreement was made that the farmers would not oppose the Lower Butte area.

Mr. Vaught called attention to the fact that when the Butte Creek flood control project is completed the only land left for waterfowl will be the 2,500 acres on Gray Lodge. He declared if some of the lost land was not replaced and it rained early in the season the farmers would be begging for aid.

In reply to complaints made last year that the refuge was not being farmed, Mr. Vaught stated that the Commission now had \$27,000 worth of farm implements on the area and raised 400 acres of millet and rice this year. Six hundred tons of feed were available for the birds and there must be a place to feed them.

Mr. Charles H. Bohrmann, Gridley, Chairman of the Engineering Committee of the Associated Sportsmen, further explained the loss of waterfowl habitat that will occur when the Butte Creek flood control project is completed. He expressed the belief that the sportsmen of California would accept the expansion of Gray Lodge into a multi-purpose area in lieu of the waterfowl lands lost by the clearance and leveeing of Butte Creek, and hoped the Board would approve the project. In that event it would not be necessary for the sportsmen to try to stop the reclamation project.

In reply to Senator Swing's questions, Mr. Bohrmann stated that while the project was labeled flood control in his opinion it would reclaim thousands of acres of marginal land without cost to the owners, and that to his knowledge the Army Engineers had not held a hearing on the project.

Mr. Glading advised that the flood control project has been under review by the Sacramento office of the Fish and Wildlife Service and in general they confirmed the statements made by Mr. Bohrmann. It was deemed locally, apparently, that flood control is of more benefit than wildlife. It was Mr. Glading's understanding that Fish and Wildlife is recommending some modification of the original plans (installation of low level dams to hold water levels); however, the lands flooded in the past will be dry.

Mr. Bohrmann reported that a representative of the Corps of Engineers informed him there is no provision in the project funds for consideration of wildlife.

Chairman Hastain requested Mr. Glading to look into this matter and inform the Commission of his findings at the San Diego meeting.

Mr. Ernest E. Hatch, landowner less than a mile north of Gray Lodge, stated he represented 33,000 acres of farming land. In his opinion the Spaulding Ranch, Gray Lodge, Butte Sink, Colusa, and Sutter waterfowl areas were located too close to one another. He criticized the farming methods employed on Gray Lodge by the Fish and Game Commission.

Mr. Hatch urged that the Board investigate the crops produced in the past 10 years on the lands up for willing sale, declaring that there must be a reason why they haven't produced more. He stated the people of the area would not stand by while the Board acquired land that would not fulfill the purpose. Also, that if the project goes through the 33,000 acres he represented would be closed to outside hunting. He reiterated that if the Lower Butte Creek project were approved he and those he represents would resort to litigation to stop the project.

Mr. George W. Custer, Chairman of District Council No. 1, Associated Sportsmen of California, asserted that if the particular area Mr. Hatch mentioned was closed to the sportsmen they could hunt pheasants in an area just adjacent thereto, near Richvale, where 37,000 acres were now open to hunting upon payment of a nominal fee.

Senator George Miller, Jr., Seventeenth Senatorial District, pointed out that the proposed project almost completely surrounded some farmers who did not wish to sell their lands. The use of their land would be limited, since it was impossible to herd from the inside out.

He stated that the lands now in the Gray Lodge Refuge should be fully developed before additional land was acquired. Also, that the farmers in the area had not been convinced that Gray Lodge was helpful to them and, as a matter of fact, accusations of bad faith are being made. They would not be convinced unless it is demonstrated that the area will accomplish what is claimed.

Senator Miller concurred with the point Mr. Erwin raised, and asserted it was possible that the funds available would not complete the job which the Legislature anticipated.

Mr. Claus Hulen, farmer of Gridley, contradicted the statements that the land offered for sale would not produce crops. He stated he had produced 45 sacks of barley to the acre, last year 27, and this year 20, and had raised as high as 50 sacks of rice to the acre.

Assemblyman Davis reported that since the last Board meeting he had made three trips to the Gray Lodge area, one by plane and two by car, to acquaint himself with the project. He stated that while he is convinced that those opposing the project are sincere he is also convinced that the willing sale lands will make a worthwhile project. Mr. Davis said he had found that what Harrison Call said about that area is true.

As a contrast, he told those present that the Waterfowl Subcommittee, of which he is Chairman, had just completed a field trip in the northern counties. The landowners in Modoc County had expressed their willingness to sell lands in

the heart of their choice farming territory for a waterfowl management area. They made it clear that while they did not need additional lands for public shooting they were willing to aid the waterfowl program for the benefit of people outside of their county, and also approved using these lands for a place to herd waterfowl when duck damage starts.

Assemblyman Lowrey, in reply to Senator Hatfield's question, stated he was opposed to the Lower Butte Creek project because he represented the voters of his district and they did not want the project. While the project is not in his district it is just across the river, and some of his constituents own lands on both sides of the river. He claimed the project would impose additional restrictions on the farmers providing food for the nation. Mr. Lowrey suggested that the Board acquire lands in the Yolo Bypass adjacent to the Sacramento River or in Solano County.

In reply to Senator Hatfield's question, Mr. Gordon stated that the enlargement of the Gray Lodge Refuge would very definitely not increase crop depredation, that it would do exactly the opposite. With reference to claims that the refuge was a bad neighbor, he called attention to the fact that the Fish and Game Commission last year made it possible for neighbors south of the refuge to get water via a new ditch over the refuge, and that the neighbors have materially expanded their rice acreage. He also pointed out that under the present law Federal areas acquired prior to the Lea Act are not open to public shooting, and that the only projects in that whole area that will have public shooting will be Gray Lodge, Butte Sink and the Federal area now being purchased.

Mr. Glading admitted that Gray Lodge in its present state, and particularly in the way it was handled in past years, has been somewhat of a hazard in the area. It was a duck club when purchased and not considered farming land. It was bought to serve as a refuge in the heart of a shooting area. However, it is now necessary that crop production and public shooting be provided on the area.

Mr. Glading said that while the lands offered for sale were not Grade I, but were fair land, he sincerely believed that crop depredation would be reduced.

Assemblyman Erwin reported that he was in favor of the program, but that various members of the Legislature had contacted him regarding projects approved and found that more funds were needed to complete them. Almost half of the \$9,000,000 was being spent on waterfowl management projects and that phase of the program would be completed. But the fish hatcheries, which should have been completed years ago, exist only on paper and construction costs will be higher than original estimates.

Mr. Erwin stated it would be difficult to obtain money to complete the program at the next session of the Legislature and that he didn't want to see worthwhile projects like the Fish Springs Rearing Ponds and Whittier Hatchery left uncompleted.

Chairman Hastain explained that it had been determined early in the program that replacement of some of the rapidly disappearing duck habitat was of utmost importance, and that a major portion of the Board's funds should be expended for that purpose. He stated that the birds would continue to follow their established flyways and if no management areas were provided for them they

would obtain all their food from the farmers' crops. It would be shortsightedness on the Board's part not to make provision to minimize crop damage, as it has been proven over a period of several years that it can be done.

Mr. Gordon concurred in Mr. Hastain's explanation and reiterated that the waterfowl situation was critical; that if waterfowl needs were not taken care of now it could not be done later. He stated that until all the estimates were received from the Division of Architecture it was impossible to determine whether all the approved projects could be completed. However, if estimates exceeded those originally made, funds could be shifted from projects less urgent, and where no further damage to the natural resources would occur. He pointed out that engineering studies on flow maintenance and stream improvement projects take time. It was his belief that there was enough money available to take care of the essential fish hatchery installations. The consultant stated he would rather see action deferred on a project like Tupman than abandon the Lower Butte Creek area which was considered one of the key waterfowl units from the start.

Senator Swing agreed with Mr. Erwin that the construction of certain hatcheries authorized by the Legislature had been delayed for years and that the public wants them to be completed and put in operation.

Assemblyman Lowrey stated he had assumed that all the projects were approved in good faith, and now it appeared that so-called less important projects might be withdrawn. He maintained that stream improvement is necessary, and in the long run would probably be more valuable in wildlife conservation than other types of projects.

Mr. Gordon explained that if the estimates submitted by Architecture overrun the allotments and it was necessary to use funds allocated to a project which will not deteriorate within the life of the Board the sensible thing to do is to let that project ride temporarily and take care of those that cannot be deferred. He stated that the Board had made certain commitments before the present study was started which it is now obligated to carry through to completion.

It was moved by Senator Swing, seconded by Assemblyman Davis, that the Joint Interim Committee recommend to the Board that funds heretofore allocated to the Fish and Game Commission from the Wildlife Restoration Fund to acquire lands, equipment and facilities for the Lower Butte Creek Waterfowl Management Area, Project No. 548, and the authority to purchase the necessary land granted to the Public Works Board, be utilized to acquire the lands now designated for said project, and the allocation for this project be increased by \$73,625. Upon polling the members of the Committee the vote was as follows:

AYES: Senators Swing and Hatfield; Assemblymen Davis and Erwin

NOES: Assemblyman Lowrey

Motion carried.

Thereupon, by motion regularly made, seconded and unanimously adopted by the members of the Board, it was agreed that the

sum of \$537,036 previously allocated to the Fish and Game Commission from the Wildlife Restoration Fund to acquire lands, equipment and facilities for the Lower Butte Creek Waterfowl Management Area, Project No. 548, and the authorization given the Public Works Board to acquire the required land, be utilized to acquire the lands now designated for said project; and that an additional \$73,625 be allocated to the Fish and Game Commission from the Wildlife Restoration Fund for this purpose, thereby increasing the grand total allocated for the Lower Butte Creek Waterfowl Management Area to \$610,661.

7. Delta Waterfowl Management Area (Grizzly Island) \$102,500

- a. Bridge (\$67,500). The consultant stated that at the last meeting the Board deferred a recommendation that \$135,000 be allocated for a bridge, 200' long by 14' wide, over Montezuma Slough, at a point to be determined, with a center pivot, hand-operated span, 15' above tidewater for clearance of small craft. The Division of Highways, in the absence of complete engineering data, estimated the cost at \$130,000.

In the meantime, representatives of the Board and the Division of Fish and Game appeared before the Board of Supervisors of Solano County and explained the urgency of maintaining both present ferries until a suitable bridge could be built. It was also suggested that the County of Solano, in order to be relieved of rather heavy future ferry maintenance expenses, might be willing to join with the State in financing a bridge at a suitable location.

Representatives of the Division of Fish and Game have gone over the possibilities with Mr. William Jones, Road Commissioner for Solano County, and, conditional upon proper approvals, it was tentatively agreed to join in the construction of a bridge from the mainland to Grizzly Island at or near the site of the present north ferry; the County to maintain a suitable road to the proposed bridge and aid in the improvement of the roadway from the bridge to the State property.

It was therefore recommended that the sum of \$67,500 be allocated from Board funds toward the construction of the proposed bridge.

Mr. Jones informed the Board that the exact amount of money the proposed bridge would be worth to Solano County had not as yet been determined. He believed the economic savings to the County would be substantial if the bridge were constructed at the north end where there were numerous resident farmers. In that event, the need for a ferry on the south end, where there are only a few farmers, is questionable. If the bridge were located elsewhere the County might still have to maintain one ferry. The County was willing to cooperate to the extent of the amount of money saved.

(Mr. Jones introduced Supervisor Morrison, Messrs. Lawler, Thompson, and Bell, and presented communications from the Fairfield-Suisun Chamber of Commerce, Suisun City, and the

City of Fairfield endorsing the construction of the proposed bridge at the site of the present Grizzly Island Ferry.)

In reply to Senator Hatfield's questions, Mr. Jones stated that the bridge might be constructed by the Board or its representatives, and the County would probably build the approaches and roads. He could not say whether the County could build the bridge, as Senator Hatfield suggested, because of their present heavy work load, but believed it would probably be necessary to have an outside engineer do the job.

Mr. Glading expressed the belief that it would be wise to get estimates from the Bridge Department of the Division of Highways to determine the construction costs more accurately.

In reply to Mr. Hastain's question, Mr. Gordon stated that he recommended that the Board make a specific offer at the present meeting to match the County, thereby enabling them to explore the entire problem more fully.

It was moved by Senator Hatfield, seconded by Assemblyman Davis, that the Joint Interim Committee recommend to the Board that the sum of \$67,500 be tentatively allocated to the Fish and Game Commission from the Wildlife Restoration Fund for the construction of an access bridge to the Delta Waterfowl Management Area, Project No. 550, conditional upon engineering data from the Division of Highways and satisfactory arrangements with the County of Solano to match the above sum on a 50-50 basis, the total cost not to exceed \$135,000, all arrangements to be subject to the final approval of the Board. Upon polling the members of the Committee the vote was as follows:

AYES: Senators Swing and Hatfield; Assemblymen
Erwin, Lowrey, and Davis

NOES: None

Passed unanimously.

Thereupon, by motion regularly made, seconded and unanimously adopted by the members of the Board, it was agreed that a sum not to exceed \$67,500 be tentatively allocated to the Fish and Game Commission from the Wildlife Restoration Fund for the construction of an access bridge to the Delta Waterfowl Management Area, Project No. 550, conditional upon satisfactory arrangements with the County of Solano to match the above sum on a 50-50 basis, the total cost not to exceed \$135,000, the consultant and/or representatives of the Fish and Game Commission being directed to secure engineering data and negotiate with the County of Solano and to submit a report to the Board for final action.

Mr. Jones was assured that the above action would not bind the County in any way in the event they found that it was uneconomical for them to participate in the construction of the proposed bridge to the extent of \$67,500.

- b. Graveling Roads (\$35,000). At the last meeting the Board provided \$18,000 for the construction of 200 double blinds, in order to accommodate hunters this fall. Attention was also called to the fact that approximately 25 miles of roadway on the Delta project must be graveled to expedite administration and to make it possible for hunters to traverse the roads during wet weather.

The consultant advised that at that time it was felt that the estimated cost of this roadway work (\$41,250) could be completed with Federal-Aid funds during the succeeding 12-18 months. While this is still true, it would be the part of wisdom to expedite the graveling of the roads in order to have the project ready for proper operation this fall. It was recommended that this sum be so allocated.

He called attention to the fact that some feel it might be desirable for the Division of Fish and Game to maintain a shuttle truck service rather than to permit hunters to use their own cars to reach points near assigned blinds. While such a plan would have certain advantages, other problems would probably offset the advantages.

Mr. Glading reported that the roads on Grizzly Island are in very poor shape and are largely levee roads on a very slick, adobe-like mud. As soon as the rains begin they are untravelable except with 4-wheel drive vehicles.

In reply to questions from Messrs. Davis and Hatfield, Mr. Jones advised that the main County road on the island, which passes through the State's property, is in bad shape. He stated the County would maintain this road once it was properly built. Mr. Jones said \$35,000 would not be sufficient to gravel 25 miles of road, since the gravel must be brought to the island by barge, but he did not believe it would be necessary to gravel that mileage.

Mr. Glading explained, in response to Senator Hatfield's question, that personnel for the Delta project are hired under the Pittman-Robertson program and that funds for the project would be set aside from time to time. He stated that an initial allocation of Board funds was requested to get the project into operation this year, and believed that future maintenance could be provided out of Fish and Game and P-R monies.

In reply to Assemblyman Davis' question, Deputy Attorney General Scott expressed the belief that money for the roads could be considered part and parcel of the project as well as the acquisition of it.

It was moved by Senator Hatfield, seconded by Senator Swing, that the members of the Joint Interim Committee recommend to the Board that the additional sum recommended be allocated to the Fish and Game Commission from the Wildlife Restoration Fund for the graveling of roads on the Delta Waterfowl Management Area, Project No. 550.

AYES: Senators Swing and Hatfield; Assemblymen
Erwin, Lowrey, and Davis

NOES: None

Passed unanimously.

Thereupon, by motion regularly made, seconded and unanimously adopted by the members of the Board, it was agreed that an additional \$35,000 be allocated to the Fish and Game Commission from the Wildlife Restoration Fund for the graveling of roads on the Delta Waterfowl Management Area, Project No. 550.

8. Alternate for Madera Waterfowl Management Area

The consultant advised that the Madera area, one of the seven major waterfowl projects approved by the Board, is an extremely important unit; first, because it will serve to alleviate crop depredation in an important rice growing area, and second, due to its location near the larger cities of the San Joaquin Valley.

The tract originally selected has advantages in water supply and accessibility. So far as known, no other area that carries riparian rights is available. Unfortunately, the landowners concerned objected to selling, and neighboring landholders opposed the project. Indications are, therefore, that efforts to acquire the original site would involve prolonged litigation, and an alternate tract should be agreed upon.

Mr. Gordon reported that two alternates located near the original tract had been under study, as indicated in the status report prepared for the members of the Board and the Joint Interim Committee prior to the meeting, also on maps presented to the meeting. Those making the study are now willing to concentrate on the second of the two proposed alternates, provided the Board and the Fish and Game Commission are willing to accept the burden of drilling wells and sustaining pumping costs.

Senator Hatfield stated it was his understanding that at the time the original allocation was made (March 19, 1949) no particular site was specified, and that the Board's attitude was that representatives of the Board and of the Fish and Game Commission would collaborate in selecting the particular lands to be acquired.

There being no objections, it was informally agreed that representatives of the Board and the Commission should proceed with negotiations to select and acquire a suitable alternate to the originally selected site for the Madera Waterfowl Management Area.

9. Fish Springs Rearing Ponds - Project No. 37, Inyo County

The consultant reported that \$135,000 was allocated to this project on March 19, 1949, and an additional \$45,000 on January 26, 1950, raising the total provided for this project to \$180,000. The Division of Architecture has presented a preliminary estimate to the Fish and Game Commission aggregating \$370,000. However, it was believed the sum presently allocated to the project is more than sufficient to construct the necessary operating ponds, roadways, etc., and that after the contract is let for the ponds it will be possible to determine more accurately the additional amount required.

Mr. Taft stated that Architecture had been requested to proceed with the construction of ponds, roads, and fences. He pointed out that it was felt that

the ponds could not be successfully or fully operated without the other facilities needed for the project, consisting of a meat and refrigeration building for fish food, six houses with domestic water supply and electricity systems, and a garage and shop.

Mr. Taft felt that the preliminary estimate submitted by Architecture was high. Since the Bureau of Fish Conservation had no engineering service available they had originally estimated the construction cost of the entire plant at \$180,000 on the basis of similar types of work elsewhere.

Commissioner Wm. J. Silva concurred in the consultant's suggestion that work be initiated with the money now available. It could then be determined how much could be constructed with the present funds, and how much additional money would be needed. He thought some of the prices on the estimate were ridiculous, for example, concrete at \$95 a cubic yard, and believed the present allocation was almost sufficient to complete the project as planned.

Chairman Hastain expressed the opinion that it was unnecessary for the Board to take action on additional funds for the Fish Springs project at the present time.

The consultant was requested to obtain information as to the savings made on various projects that might be reverted to the Wildlife Restoration Fund, which would in turn be available for use on the Fish Springs Rearing Ponds, and submit a report to the Board.

10. Coachella Valley Public Fishing Areas - Project No. 74, Riverside County

The consultant advised that under date of January 26, 1950, the Board provided \$32,500 for the development of three or four warmwater fishing ponds or lakes in natural basins or eroded areas in the Coachella Valley. At that time the plan contemplated a long-term lease of the sites to the Fish and Game Commission, with reasonable assurance of water for a sufficient period of years to justify the development. It was also contemplated that a proper local public agency would be willing to take over the housekeeping responsibilities of these projects for the Fish and Game Commission under a suitable agreement.

So far the project is merely hanging fire, and apparently those who have made tentative promises to do certain things are hesitating to go ahead. Mr. Gordon stated that the delays were partly due to difficulties over which these people had no control. He suggested that the Board consider the wisdom of withdrawing funds and utilizing them elsewhere unless assurances can be obtained at an early date that the project will be consummated.

Senator Swing stated there seemed to be considerable doubt about the appropriation for this project because of all the problems. He said there were three different agencies to deal with, and the question arose as to who would have control of the project when completed. Under the Act, when a project is completed it must be turned over to the Fish and Game Commission for operation.

It was moved by Senator Swing, seconded by Senator Hatfield, that unless satisfactory arrangements can be made before August 1, 1950 to consummate the Coachella Valley Public Fishing Areas, Project No. 74, in accordance with the conditions outlined at the time the project was presented to the

Board for approval, January 26, 1950, the \$32,500 allocated for said project be withdrawn and reverted to the Wildlife Restoration Fund.

AYES: Senators Swing and Hatfield; Assemblymen Erwin, Lowrey, and Davis

NOES: None

Passed unanimously.

Thereupon, by motion regularly made, seconded and unanimously adopted by the members of the Board, it was agreed that unless satisfactory arrangements are made by August 1, 1950 to consummate the Coachella Valley Public Fishing Areas, Project No. 74, in accordance with the conditions outlined at the time the project was presented to the Board for approval on January 26, 1950, the \$32,500 allocated for said project shall be and is hereby withdrawn and reverted to the Wildlife Restoration Fund.

11. Preliminary Report on Colorado River

The members of the Board and the Joint Interim Committee were presented with typewritten preliminary reports on the Colorado River by Messrs. Everett Horn and R. E. Curtis.

The consultant pointed out that since the Colorado River recreational problems have many interstate ramifications it would be wise to explore fully the possibility of getting all the State and Federal agencies concerned to join in the development of a long-range plan, as suggested by Mr. Horn. He further proposed that a conference be arranged at a convenient time and place for a full discussion, and stated that it might later be found desirable to set up a suitable interstate agency to supervise proper planning and development of the full potentialities of this unusual area. He concurred fully with Horn's recommendation that it would be well to consider the lower river basin as an ecological unit, and develop and manage it on that basis.

One suggestion the Board might wish to consider with regard to the development of the Colorado River was that some sort of inexpensive working headquarters could be provided at several points for the Division of Fish and Game. This would probably involve only \$20,000 or \$22,000, and would provide operational bases for enforcement work, surveys, etc.

Mr. Gordon stated that the amount of money which could be spent on the Colorado River without getting the various agencies together is very limited, and he thought the Board should at least attempt to arrange the suggested conference. The agencies involved would be the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada, and the Bureau of Reclamation, the Indian Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the National Park Service, and the Fish and Wildlife Service, all agencies of the Federal Department of the Interior. Of all these, the U. S. Bureau of Reclamation is now the agency with the major share of the administrative control.

Mr. Knight reported that the Bureau of Reclamation had all of the lands to the nearest section line over one mile on each side of the river withdrawn, so that there is no public domain in the common sense. At the present time they

are making a survey to determine just which lands they control. The Bureau's Office of River Control feels the primary purpose of these lands is recreation, and expects to contact various agencies in the near future to determine their final use for that purpose. If these contacts do not produce results the Office of River Control will take charge independently of other agencies. He informed the Board that the Indian agencies are now most anxious to cooperate in wildlife management on their lands. They have expressed willingness to do the necessary development work and maintain wildlife areas, install guzzlers, etc. A daily charge of fifty cents per day per person using such Indian lands was suggested to provide operating funds.

Mr. Knight further reported the Southern Pacific Company lands in the region have been withdrawn from public sale, but that company has expressed willingness to cooperate for the benefit of wildlife. He said he would compile the information he has collected for presentation to the Board at the next meeting.

Chairman Hastain expressed the belief that arranging a joint conference of the agencies concerned in development of the Colorado River would come within the province of the Board, and said he would be glad to assume that responsibility.

Senator Swing pointed out that later some legislation would probably be required to set up a group or commission empowered to represent the State of California in fulfillment of any joint plan that might be agreed upon.

It was informally agreed that Chairman Hastain shall be empowered to issue an invitation for the suggested conference, either as Chairman of the Board or as President of the Fish and Game Commission as he deems best.

The consultant was requested to secure further information on the suggestion regarding operational quarters for the Division of Fish and Game in the Colorado River area, and present a report at the next meeting.

12. Iron Gate Regulatory Dam - Project No. 60, Siskiyou County

The consultant informed the Board that while the State of California, at the request of the Fish and Game Commission, has filed suit against the California-Oregon Power Company, Senator Randolph Collier had requested permission to present information to the Board concerning the above project.

Mr. Lloyd Johnson, of Yreka, stated Senator Collier was unable to be present and had requested him to present his views to the Board. Mr. Johnson reported that in an article in LIFE magazine the Klamath River was rated No. 1 among the nine best fishing streams in the world. He declared that tourist pressure this year is greater than in any previous year, and that the proposed Iron Gate regulatory dam was of vital importance to preserve the salmon and steelhead runs in the Klamath as well as to reduce hazards for the fishermen. Fourteen lives have been lost because of the fluctuation in the flow of the Klamath caused by the Copco dams.

Mr. Johnson commended the Division of Fish and Game for the fine fish screen program they have developed in the Klamath region, but added that the fish must also have suitable stream conditions for survival. He claimed the surge

is tearing up the bottom of the river and destroying marine life on which the fish feed. Stream temperatures also fluctuate violently. During the recent hot weather weather temperatures were so high that only spiny-ray fish could survive in portions of the river.

Senator Collier wished the Board to consider how funds for the project would be provided in the event the State lost the pending suit. Mr. Johnson pointed out that the sportsmen were not concerned with who was going to pay for a regulating dam, but with the fact that one will be built. He asked the Board to give consideration to this project before its funds were exhausted.

Deputy Attorney General Scott advised that the suit was instituted in the first part of July, and an early trial was being sought. He anticipated that this would be by fall of this year. Mr. Scott expressed the belief that the State had a good case, but added that it would be ruined if the Board appropriated money for a portion of the cost of the proposed regulatory dam.

Senator Swing was of the opinion that it was important to get a trial before the first of the year. He said he would like to have the opportunity to take some kind of action on this project while still a member of the Board.

Chairman Hastain asked Mr. Johnson to convey the thinking of the members of the Board to Senator Collier; that it was deemed best to refrain from any Board action until the pending suit was decided in order to avoid prejudicing the case.

13. Resolutions re Special Consultant Everett E. Horn

Mr. Gordon informed the Board that Mr. Everett E. Horn, of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, who has served as special consultant on waterfowl since the studies got underway, has been promoted to a new position in Washington, D.C., with the section on River Basin Studies, beginning August 1.

The members of the Board and the Joint Interim Committee received this information with mixed feelings, appreciation of the fact that Mr. Horn's knowledge and experience have been recognized by his superiors, and regret that he would no longer be stationed in California. The following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

WHEREAS, The U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, in June, 1943, at the behest of the organized farmers and State officials, assigned Mr. Everett E. Horn, to the difficult task of devising ways and means for relieving waterfowl depredations to farm crops throughout California, then amounting to upwards of two million dollars a year; and

WHEREAS, Through Mr. Horn's capable efforts notable progress was made in solving this troublesome problem to the satisfaction of landowners and sportsmen alike, and the working relationships between the Service, the California Fish and Game Commission, and the farmers have been greatly improved; and

WHEREAS, The Service graciously released Mr. Horn to work exclusively for the Wildlife Conservation Board during the period from December 1, 1948 to June 30, 1949, to head up a

task force looking toward the development of a series of recommended waterfowl management projects for the Board's consideration, and has also permitted him to devote a large part of his time thereto in the interim; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Horn's knowledge of wildlife management needs and his ability to work harmoniously with various groups have been recognized by his superiors, resulting in his assignment to important new duties in Washington, D. C., beginning August 1, 1950;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the Members of the Wildlife Conservation Board and the Joint Interim Committee hereby convey their deep appreciation to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and especially the Director, Honorable Albert M. Day, for the fine cooperation extended to the Board in the development of a long-range waterfowl management program for California; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That the Members of the Board and the Joint Interim Committee most heartily commend Mr. Horn for the splendid job he has done and wish him every success in his new assignment; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, That these resolutions shall be made a part of the permanent record of the proceedings of this body, copies thereof to be forwarded to the Honorable Albert M. Day, Director of the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service and to Mr. Everett E. Horn.

14. Consolidation of Board's Offices and Files

The consultant expressed the belief that it would be advantageous to consolidate the Board's files, some of which are in Sacramento and some in San Francisco. He advised that additional space was being made available to the Division of Fish and Game in San Francisco, and that this city was a more convenient location from which to contact the Forest Service and other agencies in connection with the Board's work.

It was informally agreed that in the interest of more efficient operation the staff and files of the Board may be consolidated in San Francisco, and the headquarters of Miss Hansen, the Board's secretary, changed from Sacramento to San Francisco, if space permits.

15. Date for Next Meeting

It was informally agreed that the next meeting of the Board be held upon the call of the Chair, preferably during the early part of October.

There being no further business the
meeting adjourned at 1:50 P.M.