

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
MINUTES, MEETING OF AUGUST 24, 1952

C O N T E N T S

<u>Item No.</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
1.	Consulting Engineer Position to be Discussed at Next Meeting	1
2.	Black Rock Rearing Ponds, Hot Creek Hatchery and Fish Springs Hatchery to be surveyed.	2
3.	Approval of Minutes.	2
4.	Status of Funds as of July 1, 1952	3
5.	Estimate of Additional Funds Required.	3-10
	Tahoe Hatchery, Discussion and Agreement Regarding	5
	Hume Lake Dam Repair and Level Maintenance, Discussion and Agreement Regarding.	6
	Grizzly Creek Dam, Discussion and Agreement Regarding.	6
	Bixby Slough Public Fishing Area, Discussion and Agreement Regarding.	6-7
	Cedar Creek Stream Management Station, Discussion and Agreement Regarding.	7-8
	Imperial Valley Waterfowl Management Area (Expansion) Discussion and Agreement Regarding	8-9
	Upper San Joaquin and Madera Waterfowl Management Areas to be Restudied.	9-10
	Summary.	10
6.	Restudy of Overall Long-Range Fish and Game Program Suggested.	10-11
7.	American River Hatchery, Funds Allocated for Acquisition of Site for .	11-13
8.	Mendocino National Forest Stream Improvement and Flow Maintenance Program Contract Extension Denied.	13-15
9.	Unobligated Balances and Status of Allocations as of August 24, 1952 .	15
10.	Resolutions Regarding Field Agent Roland E. Curtis	16
11.	Date for Next Meeting.	16

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
MINUTES, MEETING OF AUGUST 24, 1952

Pursuant to the call of the Chairman, the Wildlife Conservation Board met at the Mt. Shasta Hatchery, Mt. Shasta, California, on August 24, 1952. The meeting, held in conjunction with rededication ceremonies for this recently rehabilitated hatchery, was called to order by Chairman Denny at 10:40 A.M.

PRESENT:	Paul Denny	Chairman
	Seth Gordon	Member
	Assemblyman Thomas M. Erwin	Joint Interim Committee
	Assemblyman Lloyd W. Lowrey	" " "
	Assemblyman Frank P. Belotti*	" " "
	Everett E. Horn	Wildlife Projects Coordinator
ABSENT:	James S. Dean	Member
	Senator George J. Hatfield	Joint Interim Committee
	Senator Ben Hulse	" " "
	Senator Charles Brown	" " "

Others Present:

Walter T. Shannon	Department of Fish and Game
Earl Leitritz	Bureau of Fish Conservation
Charles W. Deterding	Sacramento County Executive
Ancil Hoffman	Sacramento County Board of Supervisors
George Spaulding	Tri-County Planning Commission
Robert Beckus	Assembly Interim Comm. on Fish and Game
A. Alan Post	Legislative Budget Committee

1. Consulting Engineer Position to be Discussed at Next Meeting

Assemblyman Erwin asked whether the minutes of the June 27, 1952 Board meeting included an item pertaining to the employment of a consulting engineer.

Mr. Horn replied in the affirmative and read the item in question. In reply to Chairman Denny's question, Mr. Horn advised that he had been trying to negotiate the loan of a Bureau of Reclamation engineer on a part-time basis, but that nothing definite had been worked out to date.

Assemblyman Erwin remarked that the Department of Fish and Game already had the services of an engineer loaned to them by the Department of Public Works. He stated that because Mr. Dean was not present he did not want to bring the matter up at this meeting, but intended to bring it up for further discussion at the next meeting.

* Successor to Assemblyman Lester T. Davis, deceased.

2. Black Rock Rearing Ponds, Hot Creek Hatchery and Fish Springs Hatchery to be Surveyed

The coordinator informed the Board that Messrs. Helm, Elliger, and Leitritz would accompany him to the Owens Valley on August 26 to make a survey of the above hatcheries.

Assemblyman Erwin reported that the Assembly Interim Committee on Fish and Game had requested a survey to determine the feasibility of expanding these three hatcheries because the sportsmen of southern California are complaining that very few fish are planted in their section of the State. In response to questions from Chairman Denny and Assemblyman Lowrey, Mr. Erwin stated that there was plenty of water available in southern California this year, and that in years when there was not sufficient water the fish could be planted in the Sierras.

Mr. Gordon asked if the sportsmen of southern California would be willing, since capital investment funds were getting low, to have attempts to establish the San Gabriel Hatchery discontinued and instead use this allocation for expansion of the Black Rock Ponds and the Hot Creek and Fish Springs Hatcheries.

Assemblyman Erwin said he wouldn't want to commit himself on that matter at the present time. He expressed the belief that these three hatcheries could be expanded for a nominal amount to produce perhaps a million more catchable fish.

Mr. Gordon advised he would be agreeable to transferring the funds allocated for the San Gabriel Hatchery to the expansion of these three hatcheries, but observed that the Department of Fish and Game is getting to the point where it does not have funds to operate all the hatcheries at full capacity.

Assemblyman Erwin stated it was up to the Department to come before the Legislature with its recommendations as to the money which should be budgeted for operating costs.

By motion regularly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted by the members of the Board and the Joint Interim Committee it was agreed that, in the event the survey presently proposed proves the feasibility of expanding production facilities at Black Rock Rearing Ponds, Hot Creek Hatchery, and Fish Springs Hatchery, the coordinator and appropriate staff members of the Department of Fish and Game are hereby ordered to make further studies to determine the cost of expanding said hatchery facilities, the increase in operating costs which would result from such expansion, and to report their findings to the Board with a recommendation as to possible sources for the funds required.

3. Approval of Minutes

It was regularly moved and seconded that the reading of the minutes of the Wildlife Conservation Board meeting of June 27, 1952 be dispensed with and said minutes approved as written. Passed unanimously.

4. Status of Funds as of July 1, 1952

The Board was informed that the amount allocated to specific projects up to the close of the meeting of June 27, 1952 aggregated \$9,525,150, made up as follows:

a. Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects (16)	\$4,118,023
b. Warmwater and Other Fish Projects (9).	134,500
c. Flow Maintenance and Stream Improvement Projects (17).	404,953
d. Screen and Ladder Projects (13).	404,603
e. State Game Farm Projects (4)	105,644
f. Other Upland Game Projects (4)	441,077
g. Waterfowl Management Projects (11)	3,806,310
h. General Projects (4)	<u>110,040</u>

Total (78 projects). \$9,525,150

In addition to the specific allocations above, the following reserves have been established: (1) Mendocino National Forest Stream Improvement and Flow Maintenance Program - \$15,000, and (2) Colorado River Recreational Development - \$50,000.

Effective July 1, 1952, an additional \$1,000,000 was appropriated to the Wildlife Restoration Fund (Ch. 1401, Stats. 1951), increasing the total accountability to \$11,000,000. Operating expenses 47/48 F.Y. - 50/51 F.Y. totaled \$129,152. Operating expenses budgeted for the 51/52 F.Y. total \$51,209, and for the 52/53 F.Y., after Budget Revision WL-2, \$51,142.

The unobligated balance available for expenditure is \$1,178,347.

5. Estimate of Additional Funds Required

The Board was informed that a review of proposed projects for which cost estimates are available and the status of funds indicates the necessity of carefully considering future action and fund allocations. The current unobligated balance available for expenditure is \$1,178,347. An additional \$1,000,000 will be appropriated to the Wildlife Restoration Fund on July 1, 1953. This would make a total of \$2,178,347 available to the Board for expenditure.

The coordinator reported that the estimated additional funds required to complete high priority projects already approved by the Board total \$2,964,500 (see list "a" below). Since the estimated funds to complete these projects exceed the funds available for expenditure, it is apparent that adjustments in project priorities will be necessary or additional appropriations will be required.

Mr. Horn said it is also apparent that completion of those projects included in lists "b" and "c" will have to await the availability of additional funds.

a. High Priority Projects for Which Board Has Made Previous Allotments

Equipment for Moccasin, Darrah Springs, and San Gabriel	
Hatcheries @ \$30,000 each	\$ 90,000
San Gabriel Hatchery (\$227,000 allocated).	250,000
Tahoe Hatchery, if expanded (\$240,000 allocated; Div. of	
Arch. est. \$474,000; \$28,000 expended for land)	262,000

Estimated addl. funds for waterfowl management areas	300,000
Hume Lake Dam Repair and Level Maint. (\$5,000 allocated for removal of silt and debris and dam inspection	62,500
Grizzly Creek Dam (\$5,000 allocated for foundation preparation & material), if Army Air Force does not construct, may require	100,000
Colorado River Recreational Development (\$50,000 reserved) . . .	250,000
Coastal Angling Access Program (\$50,000 allocated to initiate) .	350,000
Bixby Slough Public Fishing Area	100,000
Cedar Creek Stream Management Station (\$125,000 allocated) . . .	30,000
Imperial Valley Waterfowl Management Area (expansion).	650,000
San Antonio Creek Public Fishing Area (\$20,000 allocated; later withdrawn without prejudice to project. Army indicated project may now be possible.)	20,000
Upper San Joaquin Waterfowl Management Area (\$533,190 allocated; \$472,630 transferred to other projects. Present balance \$60,560.)	500,000

TOTAL, Estimated Additional Funds Required for High
Priority Projects for Which Board Has Made Allotments . . \$2,964,500

b. Projects For Which Board Has Allocated Funds For Engrg. Studies*

Turlock Reservoir Subimpoundment (\$1,000 allocated).	\$125,000
Elizabeth Lake Canyon Creek Public Fishing Area (\$1,000 allocated for engrg.)	10,000
Chilao Campground Public Fishing Area (\$2,000 allocated)	25,000
Charlton Flats Public Fishing Area (\$8,000 allocated).	50,000
Sand Creek Dam (\$3,000 allocated for engrg.)	10,000
Chiquito Lake Level Maintenance (\$3,500 allocated)	20,000
Saulter Creek Dam (\$3,000 allocated for engrg.).	12,000
Lake Earl Waterfowl Management Area (\$5,000 allocated)	<u>400,000</u>

TOTAL, Estimated Addl. Funds Required for Projects For
Which Board Has Allocated Funds For Engrg. Studies. . . . \$652,000

c. Proposed Projects Not Yet Submitted To Board For Action**

Deadman Creek Dam: Amount requested for engineering survey. . . \$	2,500
Est. max. cost of construction for a concrete dam, if some other type of construction employed could be built for much less	100,000
Big Meadow Creek Dam: Amount requested for engrg. survey. . . .	2,500
No estimate of cost available, perhaps.	20,000
Running Springs Dam: Amount requested for engineering	2,500
No estimate of cost available, perhaps.	\$25,000 - 50,000

* Excepting Hume Lake, which is included in the high priority projects.

** The class "c" list is not complete. Tentative proposals for some warm-water fish projects have not reached a stage where a good estimate is possible--hence no figure is included. Numerous No. 2 and 3 priority projects have been omitted.

Humboldt Bay Waterfowl Area,	400,000
Pit River Waterfowl Management Area.	545,000
Warmwater Fish Projects (proposed survey by staff engineer and fisheries biologists in cooperation with Bureau of Fish Conservation).	_____?

TOTAL, Estimated Addl. Funds Required For Proposed Projects Not Yet Submitted to Board For Action.	<u>\$1,122,500</u>
---	--------------------

Summary

Total Additional Funds Required for Class "a" Projects	\$2,964,500
Total Additional Funds Required for Class "b" Projects	652,000
Total Additional Funds Required for Class "c" Projects	<u>1,122,500</u>

Grand Total.	<u>\$4,739,000</u>
----------------------	--------------------

The individual items in list "a" were then discussed, and agreement was reached on the following:

Tahoe Hatchery

The coordinator advised that it seemed desirable to further suspend action on the Tahoe Hatchery pending Board decisions regarding the proposed American River Hatchery.

During the discussion which ensued it was generally agreed that if a choice had to be made between the Tahoe Hatchery and one on the American River the latter would be preferable for the following reasons:

1. Tahoe can be operated for only part of the year, while the proposed American River Hatchery could be operated all year around.
2. It will be necessary to pump water from the lake for rearing ponds at Tahoe, while gravity flow water will be available for the American River Hatchery.
3. Costs of delivering feed to Tahoe are considerably higher, since it must be trucked in; delivering feed to the American River Hatchery would entail only a short haul from the railroad.

Assemblyman Erwin expressed the belief that the Tahoe Hatchery should be abandoned in favor of the proposed American River Hatchery, and Assemblymen Belotti and Lowrey concurred.

Mr. Gordon was of the opinion that it would be better to hold up such a decision in view of the absence of the Senate members of the Interim Committee.

At Chairman Denny's suggestion it was informally agreed that the Department of Fish and Game, through Mr. Gordon, be requested to hold up the Tahoe Hatchery expansion until the proposal for a hatchery on the American River had been further studied.

Meeting recessed at 11:10 A.M. for rededication of
Mt. Shasta Hatchery; reconvened at 12:10 P.M.

Hume Lake Dam Repair and Level Maintenance

Assemblyman Lowrey cited the lack of sanitary facilities at Lake Pillsbury and the desirability of making certain that adequate facilities would be provided at Hume Lake.

At Mr. Gordon's suggestion it was informally agreed that when the Board takes action to allocate funds to repair the dam a proviso be included for the Forest Service to provide adequate sanitary facilities.

Grizzly Creek Dam

The Board allocated \$5,000 to this project on June 27, 1952 for any required foundation preparations and purchase of necessary materials, contingent upon execution of a lease of lands between the Pacific Gas and Electric Company and the U. S. Forest Service. The 3904th U. S. Air Force Command has offered to construct the dam at no cost to the State.

Mr. Horn reported that to date the lease has not been obtained from P.G.&E. In the event it cannot be secured in time for the Air Force to do the work, it is estimated that \$100,000 of Wildlife Board funds would be required to construct the dam. (Estimate made without benefit of engineering studies.)

Mr. Gordon questioned the urgency of this project, stating that if it became necessary for the Board to provide funds for its construction it should be classed as a second priority project. He expressed doubt that the benefits to be derived would justify expenditure of \$100,000 of the Board's funds.

It was informally agreed that if plans for the Army Air Force to build the Grizzly Creek Dam were not consummated and it became necessary for the Board to consider an allocation of \$100,000 for construction costs the Grizzly Creek Dam should be considered a second priority project.

Bixby Slough Public Fishing Area

Mr. Horn informed the Board that there was a continuing local demand for the Board to allocate \$100,000 for the Bixby Slough project. This amount was previously reserved for the project, but was withdrawn in June, 1951, without prejudice to the project, due to the urgent need for funds to complete the Moccasin Creek Hatchery.

The coordinator reviewed the conditions which must be met before this project can be assured. He stated that the City of Los Angeles Department of Recreation and Parks has expressed willingness to assume operation and maintenance of the area. Also, that the pollution problem will be cleared if adequate fresh water to maintain necessary levels is secured and drainage provided. The question of an adequate supply of fresh water to maintain proper levels for fishlife in the slough should be answered very soon. The matter of provision of adequate drains to dispose of flood waters entering the slough is included in a bond issue to be voted upon in November.

It was recommended that if these last two conditions with respect to adequate fresh water and drainage could be satisfactorily cleared the Board should consider allocating funds for its part in the project.

In accordance with the advice of members of the Board and the coordinator, it was moved by Assemblyman Erwin, seconded by Assemblyman Lowrey that the Joint Interim Committee recommend to the Board that if the originally specified conditions were satisfactorily met the Board would consider allocating \$100,000 for the Bixby Slough Public Fishing Area, Project No. 83. Passed unanimously.

Thereupon, by motion regularly made, seconded and unanimously adopted by the members of the Board, it was agreed that the Wildlife Conservation Board realizes its moral obligation to consider the allocation of \$100,000 for the Bixby Slough Public Fishing Area, Project No. 83, and will do so at the first opportunity after being advised by the coordinator that the remaining conditions with reference to an adequate supply of fresh water and provision of adequate drainage have been met.

Cedar Creek Stream Management Station

In response to questions from Chairman Denny, Mr. Leitritz stated that the Bureau of Fish Conservation was not committing itself to the establishment of a hatchery at Cedar Creek in the true sense of the word. The primary objective of the project was to establish a headquarters for stream improvement and clearance and fish rescue work. It was planned to be used as a base from which to redistribute rescued fish and the ponds were to be used as holding ponds rather than rearing ponds.

Assemblyman Erwin stated that \$125,000 had been allocated for a hatchery at Cedar Creek. He said that the site had already been acquired and that upon receipt of a cost estimate of \$462,000 from the Division of Architecture it had been agreed that the project should be restudied. He pointed out that fish rescue work in the northern part of the State had been neglected and that the project should include fish rescue ponds in addition to a hatchery.

In response to questions from Assemblyman Lowrey, Chairman Denny advised that the policy of the Fish and Game Commission and of the Department of Fish and Game was against establishment of hatcheries on coastal streams for migratory fish. He advised that the Bureau of Fish Conservation held such hatcheries to be impractical and maintained that such fish as steelhead would do a better job of spawning under natural conditions.

Mr. Leitritz substantiated Mr. Denny's remarks, stating that the efficiency of artificial propagation over natural propagation is not what many people have been led to believe. He said that establishment of a hatchery for anadromous fish like salmon and steelhead would necessitate interfering with the natural reproductive processes of the fish -- taking eggs from fish that would otherwise spawn alone.

Assemblyman Belotti advised that the people of the area were of the opinion that it was intended to establish a regular hatchery at Cedar Creek and that the funds had been earmarked for that purpose and not for fish rescue work. He added that the local people were agreed on the necessity for stream clearance work, but felt that the Department did not favor a hatchery merely because rising prices for labor and material had increased the estimated cost of construction to an amount they considered excessive.

August 24, 1952
WCB Minutes

Mr. Denny assured Mr. Belotti that it was not a question of cost but of whether it is a good program.

Mr. Belotti stated he appreciated that it is a matter of policy on a statewide basis, but pointed out that the Assembly Interim Committee on Fish and Game had made an investigation and recommended that a hatchery was practical.

Mr. Gordon expressed the belief that it was a mistake to ever call the project a hatchery, because it was never the intent of the Commission and Department that it would be a regular hatchery like Fall Creek. He stated that the \$125,000 appropriation was put in the 1947/48 F.Y. budget. In the meantime the Fish and Game Commission has adopted a policy stating that hatcheries for anadromous fish cannot be justified and that what is needed is stream improvement and clearance and fish rescue work. He advised that when the \$462,000 cost estimate was received it was agreed that the Cedar Creek project should be restudied. The recommendation made as a result of the studies was for a stream management station or stations. The Board's staff and the special consultants on fisheries temporarily employed by the Board concurred in this recommendation.

In response to further questions from Assemblyman Lowrey as to just what a stream management station would consist of, the coordinator suggested that the staff of the Board and of the Department of Fish and Game make a joint study of the matter with the Interim Committee and submit a clear cut report as to just what facilities should be included in the proposed project.

It was moved by Assemblyman Belotti, seconded by Assemblyman Lowrey, that the Joint Interim Committee recommend to the Board that a complete study of the proposed project at Cedar Creek be made and that a report be submitted specifying just what facilities should be included in said project. Passed unanimously.

Thereupon, by motion regularly made, seconded and unanimously adopted by the members of the Board, it was agreed that the staff of the Wildlife Conservation Board and the Department of Fish and Game and the Assembly Interim Committee on Fish and Game collaborate in making a complete study of the proposed project at Cedar Creek and submit a report to the Board specifying just what facilities should be included in said project.

Imperial Valley Waterfowl Management Area (Expansion)

The Board was informed that the totally unexpected rise in the level of the Salton Sea during the past year has flooded all but about 800 acres of the Department's Imperial Valley Waterfowl Management Area. Of these 800 acres only 400 are now suitable for raising of cultivated duck foods. Available information indicates that it will require about 40 years for the Salton Sea to recede to the level of July, 1951.

This project was one of the original seven key waterfowl areas designated by the Board and is strongly supported by the agricultural interests because the management program has been successful in lessening crop losses caused by waterfowl depredations. The public shooting areas, which have been popular with sportsmen, have also been greatly reduced in size.

The coordinator stated that due to the seriousness of the situation the matter of securing additional lands to replace the flooded area had been explored. He stated that a suitable area of about 6000 acres which will not be in danger of flooding had been located. He requested the Board to give serious consideration to the necessity of securing a substitute area for the lost lands and of keeping in mind the need for \$650,000 or more for acquisition. In the meantime the studies would be continued so that the Board could be furnished with a complete report and cost estimate on a specific area.

It was moved by Assemblyman Erwin, seconded by Assemblyman Belotti that the Joint Interim Committee recommend to the Board that the matter of securing a substitute area to replace the lands in the Imperial Valley Waterfowl Management Area flooded by the rise of the Salton Sea be studied further and a report submitted to the Board.

AYES: Assemblymen Erwin and Belotti

NOT VOTING: Assemblyman Lowrey

Motion carried.

Thereupon, by motion regularly made, seconded and unanimously adopted by the members of the Board, it was agreed that the importance of securing a substitute area to replace the lands in the Imperial Valley Waterfowl Management Area flooded by the rise of the Salton Sea is hereby acknowledged. It was further agreed that the coordinator be requested to continue his studies and submit a report to the Board.

Upper San Joaquin Waterfowl Management Area

The Board allocated \$533,190 for this project, \$447,630 of which was later transferred to the Darrah Springs Hatchery and \$25,000 to the Delta Waterfowl Management Area. The present balance in the project account is \$60,560.

The coordinator stated that at the time these funds were transferred it was felt that the Upper San Joaquin project could most judiciously be spared from the seven key areas. He informed the Board that since then the picture has changed. The U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service has acquired the Merced Waterfowl Refuge, and is presently seeking more land to round it out. This Federal refuge is in the general vicinity of the Board's proposed Madera Waterfowl Management Area.

Mr. Horn stated that both the Madera and Upper San Joaquin Management Areas would be supplied with water by pumping from wells, but that the outlook is for a lesser pump lift at Tupman than at Madera. The Tupman area would provide more readily accessible public shooting for southern California sportsmen.

The old headquarters building at the Tupman Elk Refuge was damaged by the earthquake and other causes, and is no longer usable. Kern County is willing to accept and care for the elk herd on another area, thus preserving the remnant of this herd. This would free the 1000 acres now used for elk for far more productive sportsmen use.

The coordinator observed that it might be desirable to transfer \$500,000 of the \$621,000 allocated for the Madera area to the Upper San Joaquin (Tupman) unit and proceed with the development of the latter.

Assemblyman Lowrey pointed out that it would probably cost from \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year to pump water for the Upper San Joaquin project.

Mr. Gordon expressed the belief that the coordinator and assistants should be requested to restudy the two areas and report their findings to the Board. Chairman Denny so ordered.

Summary

In closing his report on additional funds required, Mr. Horn reiterated that the current unobligated balance available for expenditure is \$1,178,347, with another \$1,000,000 to be appropriated to the Wildlife Restoration Fund on July 1, 1953. Additional funds required for projects listed in group "a" total \$2,964,500. Since this figure exceeds the amount available for expenditure, it will be necessary for the Board to establish priorities to complete projects already underway or on which it has acted.

The coordinator remarked that, with the exception of the Lake Earl Waterfowl Management Area, nothing would be lost in holding the projects listed in group "b" after the engineering studies are completed. Most of the projects in this group are located on public land and will always be available.

The coordinator advised that the group "c" list of projects was incomplete and might require as much as \$3,000,000.

Assemblyman Lowrey asked to be recorded as objecting as strongly as is possible to warmwater fish projects being placed in a list of desirable but not "Class One" projects, since he felt warmwater fish projects rated as high in priority as any other type on the list.

Mr. Horn explained that the three listings of group "a", "b", and "c" were not intended to reflect priorities. The group "a" list included high priority projects to which the Board has already committed itself by allocating or reserving funds. Projects listed in group "b" were those for which the Board had made allocations for engineering studies. The group "c" list was made up of projects which have not as yet been submitted to the Board for action. The warmwater fish projects are now being studied and are considered of a high order of priority.

It was informally agreed that further discussion and action with regard to the matter of additional funds required to complete approved high priority projects be put over to the next meeting.

6. Restudy of Overall Long-Range Fish and Game Program Suggested

During the early part of the discussion regarding additional funds required Assemblyman Lowrey requested the thinking of the members of the Board and the Joint Interim Committee with regard to asking the coordinator to resurvey all wildlife resources under jurisdiction of the Department of Fish and Game. A long-range program could then be set up to meet the needs. He expressed the

belief that the urgent needs relating to trout and waterfowl were now pretty well provided for and that it would be well to determine what other needs must be met in a long-range program and how much it would cost.

Mr. Horn stated a similar suggestion was contained in the report furnished to the Board and Joint Interim Committee as a supplement to the item regarding additional funds required. He advocated a reexamination and study of the overall statewide development necessary to bring the fish and game resources of the State to their highest value, and development of a master plan or action program of procedure.

It was generally agreed by all those present that this was a sound approach. However, at the suggestion of Assemblyman Erwin, it was agreed to delay action to a future meeting when the Senate members of the Joint Interim Committee and Mr. Dean could be present.

7. Funds Allocated for Acquisition of Site for American River Hatchery -
Project No. 103 \$40,000(a)

The Board was informed that two sites have been proposed for this project. One, known locally as Nigger Bar, is located about midway between the Folsom and Nimbus dam sites; the other is below the Nimbus dam site.

Development of the Nigger Bar site would require at least two and possibly three outlets in Folsom Dam, and approximately 12,000 feet of pipe line to bring the water to the hatchery site. While no firm estimates are available, it is believed that the outlets in the dam and the pipe line would probably cost from \$300,000 to \$500,000. Also, in obtaining 50 c.f.s. of water in this manner for hatchery use the Bureau of Reclamation would be losing hydroelectric power revenue at the rate of approximately \$3,000 per month, or \$36,000 per year.

Construction of a hatchery at the site located below Nimbus Dam would be less costly, since water could be taken from Nimbus Reservoir by gravity flow. This could be done with a very much smaller loss of revenue to the Bureau of Reclamation and without requiring costly outlet structures in the way of control gates and extension pipe lines.

Another method would be to pump water from Nimbus Reservoir for hatchery use. This would require an expenditure for power as well as a standby pumping unit in case of power failure.

The Nimbus Dam, located about 6 miles below Folsom Dam, will be the terminus of all migratory fish. These two dams will close off approximately 70 percent of the spawning area to salmon and steelhead. A program has been outlined with the Bureau of Reclamation and the Fish and Wildlife Service which would provide for maintaining the runs of salmon and steelhead below the Nimbus Dam through egg taking operations and hatchery facilities. Since the egg collecting station would of necessity have to be located below the Nimbus Dam it would be more economical from a maintenance

standpoint to operate the hatchery in conjunction with the egg taking station. Otherwise the eggs would have to be hauled to the hatchery by truck, and the young salmon and other migratory fish raised at the hatchery would have to be trucked from the hatchery to below the dam and released in the American River. It would not be practical to release them into the Nimbus Reservoir and expect them to go down through the electric turbines and pass safely into the stream below.

Since the proposed hatchery is to be a combination salmon and trout hatchery it can be expected that the Bureau of Reclamation and Wildlife Service will participate only to the extent of the proposed salmon and steelhead operations. Any trout hatchery or rearing ponds for catchable fish would be in addition to salmon and steelhead operations and would of course be the sole responsibility of the Department of Fish and Game.

The coordinator advised that under Public Law 732 when a fisheries resource is destroyed or damaged in this manner by construction of a dam compensation is made from the project funds. Conferences have revealed that the present evaluation of fishery losses which would be caused by Folsom and Nimbus Dams would not be adequate to compensate for a hatchery served by a pipeline, which would be required should the site below Folsom Dam be selected. It has been agreed that further study should be made to more accurately determine the value of the resource which would be lost through construction of these dams.

In response to Chairman Denny's question, Mr. Leitritz informed the Board that studies and negotiations with the Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies were still underway. However, present indications were that the site below the Nimbus Dam would be best because the cost of construction and operation would be less than if the hatchery were located below Folsom Dam.

It was suggested that because work on both dams is already underway the Board should allocate sufficient funds to permit acquisition of a site for the proposed hatchery as soon as the studies to determine which of the possible sites is most feasible have been completed.

The Board was informed that the only available estimate of acquisition cost was for the site at Nigger Bar, below Folsom Dam. A figure of \$40,000 had been quoted for the 40 acres available there. The Bureau of Reclamation owns some land below the Nimbus Dam, but what portion of this land could be used for a hatchery remains to be determined.

In accordance with the advice of members of the Board and the coordinator, it was moved by Assemblyman Lowrey, seconded by Assemblyman Erwin, that the Joint Interim Committee recommend to the Board that \$40,000 be allocated for purchase of a site for the American River Hatchery, Project No. 103, with the understanding that determination and selection of the most feasible site be made by the Department of Fish and Game. Passed unanimously.

Thereupon, by motion regularly made, seconded and unanimously adopted by the members of the Board, it was agreed that \$40,000, or as much of that sum as may be required, be allocated to the Department of Fish and Game from the Wildlife Restoration Fund

for acquisition of a site for the American River Hatchery, Project No. 103, the exact site to be determined by the Department of Fish and Game after further study, and with the understanding that if any lands purchased for the hatchery site are later found to be unsuitable they shall be sold and the funds recovered.

Chairman Denny commented that since the sale of State lands was quite complicated it might be well to consider taking an option on the site.

Assemblyman Lowrey stated that the most feasible and least costly site should be chosen for the proposed hatchery. He observed that such a choice should not be influenced by a desire to please the aesthetic interests of the citizens in the community or by political pressure.

The coordinator announced that three representatives of the Tri-County Planning Commission were present: Messrs. Ancil Hoffman, Charles Deterding, and George Spaulding. Chairman Denny welcomed these gentlemen to the meeting.

Mr. Hoffman, Chairman of the Commission and member of the Sacramento County Board of Supervisors, stated the Commission is very much interested in the plans for a hatchery on the American River and wishes to assist in any way it can. He asked whether the Department was contemplating construction of two hatcheries.

Mr. Gordon replied that it apparently would be feasible to construct a hatchery to raise both salmon and trout. Some people felt the federal government should build and operate their own hatchery; others favored a combination hatchery under joint operation. He felt that the Bureau of Reclamation was sympathetic and willing to participate in a joint operation.

Mr. Deterding, Sacramento County Executive, expressed the gratitude of the Tri-County Planning Commission and of Sacramento County at the Board's action in allocating funds for acquisition of a hatchery site. He stated he felt sure they would be satisfied with the location finally selected, and were anxious to have the site acquired so that they could make plans for other facilities relating to it.

Mr. Gordon stated he wished to add that Mr. Dean had expressed his willingness to go along with the idea of the Board allocating funds for acquisition of a site, but was not willing to be committed to building a hatchery until there were funds available for it.

8. Mendocino National Forest Stream Improvement and Flow Maintenance Program Contract Extension Denied

The Board previously allocated a total of \$10,000 for this project and set up a reserve of \$15,000. The project proposed experimental plantings, particularly on Thomes, Grindstone, Big and Little Stony creeks, to reestablish streamside cover destroyed by severe floods during the winter of 1937-38. The \$10,000 allocation was to cover the cost of the first year's work. An additional \$15,000 was reserved, subject to specific approval by the Board at a later date, if after the first growing season the results from the experimental plantings were promising.

Experimental planting and surveys have been under way for the last year under supervision of the University of California. Severe damage to equipment and plantings was caused by floods during the past winter.

The Board was informed at its June 27 meeting that Dr. Needham, of the University of California at Berkeley, had submitted a request for continuation of this program for another three years. Consideration of this request was put over to the present meeting so that the Board could have the benefit of Assemblyman Lowrey's advice.

The coordinator reported that some discussion had been held with regard to changing the type of stream improvement to be undertaken. However, Dr. Needham decided to stand on his original request for a three-year extension, because he felt that a minimum of three additional years would be required in order to accomplish the original objectives of the project as set forth in the service contract.

Members of the Board and Joint Interim Committee were provided with copies of Dr. Needham's letter to Director Seth Gordon, dated June 13, 1952, recommending the three-year extension. In his letter Dr. Needham advised that continuity of program and personnel could be obtained only by the recommended extension. It was felt, that since the growth of plants must be observed, little of significance could be accomplished in a shorter time. Due to the nature of the investigation even three years are far too short to determine the ultimate value of such work, though it should be sufficient to demonstrate the feasibility and costs of such improvement work.

The coordinator stated that he had inspected the project on August 13, in company with Assemblyman Lowrey, Messrs. Leitritz and Shapovalov, of the Bureau of Fish Conservation, and Doctors Mason and Needham, of the University of California. Following later discussions, it was concluded that since such research should be carried on on a long-time basis it would be best to use the \$15,000 reserve for other purposes.

Chairman Denny asked if it would be possible to carry on this study with Dingell-Johnson funds. Mr. Leitritz replied that this type of study would qualify, but that the State's Dingell-Johnson funds were already obligated for other programs.

Mr. Gordon stated he felt there are other projects of higher priority that will show results sooner. He remarked that there has been a feeling on the part of the Board and the Joint Interim Committee that any projects that entailed long-time study should not be handled with Board funds.

Assemblyman Lowrey advised that in terms of accomplishment he would rather see the money put into warmwater fish projects. He stated he knew that personnel employed on the project had worked hard, but even so were getting negative results.

In accordance with the advice of Assemblyman Lowrey, it was moved by Assemblyman Erwin, seconded by Assemblyman Belotti, that the Joint Interim Committee recommend to the Board that the Mendocino National Forest Stream Improvement and Flow Maintenance Program, Project No. 12, be discontinued at the

expiration of the present contract on October 1, 1952, and that no additional funds be appropriated for the project at this time. Passed unanimously.

Thereupon, by motion regularly made, seconded and unanimously adopted by the members of the Board, it was agreed that the Board would not allocate additional funds to the Department of Fish and Game out of the Wildlife Restoration Fund to extend the service contract with the University of California for experimental work on the Mendocino National Forest Stream Improvement and Flow Maintenance Program, Project No. 12; and that the present contract be allowed to expire on its termination date of October 1, 1952.

It was further agreed that the \$15,000 previously reserved for this project might properly be used for other stream improvement work on the west side of the Sacramento Valley or elsewhere in the Mendocino National Forest and that said reserve be held intact pending the results of further studies.

Chairman Denny observed that there was continual pressure on the Department to build hatcheries on coastal streams and to stock them. It was his feeling that it would be spending money wisely to improve these coastal streams, and that when satisfactory results had been obtained through stream improvement the pressure to build hatcheries would decrease.

Assemblyman Lowrey advised that a project had been suggested for a stocking trail on the middle fork of Stony Creek which seemed worthwhile to him.

Chairman Denny requested Mr. Lowrey to submit details to the coordinator prior to the next meeting.

9. Unobligated Balances and Status of Allocations as of August 24, 1952

With the foregoing actions the total unobligated balance in the Wildlife Restoration Fund is approximately \$1,138,347.

The total current allocations to various classifications of projects are as follows:

a. Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects (17)	\$4,158,023
b. Warmwater and Other Fish Projects (9).	134,500
c. Flow Maintenance and Stream Improvement Projects (17).	404,953
d. Screen and Ladder Projects (13).	404,603
e. State Game Farm Projects (4)	105,644
f. Other Upland Game Projects (4)	441,077
g. Waterfowl Management Projects (11)	3,806,310
h. General Projects (4)	<u>110,040</u>
Total (79 projects).	\$9,565,150

In addition to the specific allocations above, the following reserves have been established: (1) Mendocino National Forest Stream Improvement and Flow Maintenance Program - \$15,000, and (2) Colorado River Recreational Development - \$50,000.

10. Resolutions Regarding Field Agent Roland E. Curtis

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted by the members of the Board and the Joint Interim Committee.

WHEREAS, Roland E. Curtis, who is now on his final vacation, has announced his intention to retire, effective October 1, 1952, after having served most competently as Field Agent for the Wildlife Conservation Board since July 1, 1951; and

WHEREAS, The Board and Joint Interim Committee deeply appreciate the commendable manner in which he has performed the duties assigned to him as Field Agent, and his fine personal qualities; and

WHEREAS, Prior to becoming the Board's Field Agent Mr. Curtis served as a member of the special team investigating waterfowl projects and rendered invaluable assistance to his co-workers and to the Board in their efforts to develop a long-range waterfowl management program for the State of California;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, That the members of the Wildlife Conservation Board and the Joint Interim Committee hereby express their sincere regret at losing Mr. Curtis's services, and extend to him their best wishes for many happy years spent in the pursuit of his favorite avocations; and be it further

RESOLVED, That these resolutions be made a part of the permanent record of the proceedings of this body, and a copy thereof be delivered to Roland E. Curtis.

11. Date for Next Meeting

It was agreed that the next meeting of the Board shall be held upon the call of the Chair.

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