

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
MINUTES, MEETING OF OCTOBER 13, 1953

C O N T E N T S

<u>Item No.</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
1.	Approval of the Minutes	2
2.	Status of Funds	2
3.	Lower Butte Creek Waterfowl Management Area, Project No. 548	2
4.	Bixby Slough, Project No. 83	5
5.	Hume Lake Dam Repair and Level Maintenance, Project No. 100	8
6.	Salton Sea Fisheries, Project No. 108	11
7.	Coastal Angling Access, San Luis Obispo County, Project No. 1011.	11
8.	Buena Vista Lagoon Waterfowl Refuge, Project No. 510 . . .	15
9.	Recovery of Funds - Completed Projects	18
10.	Tahoe Hatchery, Project No. 25	19
11.	Other Business	20
12.	Unobligated Balances and Status of Allocations as of October 13, 1953	26
13.	Date for Next Meeting	27

WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
MINUTES, MEETING OF OCTOBER 13, 1953

Pursuant to the call of the Chairman the Wildlife Conservation Board met in Room 432, State Capitol, Sacramento, California, on October 13, 1953. The meeting was called to order by Chairman William J. Silva at 1:50 P.M.

PRESENT: William J. Silva
Seth Gordon
James S. Dean

Chairman
Member of the Board
Member of the Board

Senator Charles Brown
Senator George J. Hatfield

Joint Interim Committee
" " "

Assemblyman Frank P. Belotti
Assemblyman Thomas M. Erwin

Joint Interim Committee
" " "

Everett E. Horn

Wildlife Projects Coordinator

ABSENT: Senator Ben Hulse
Assemblyman Lloyd W. Lowrey

Joint Interim Committee
" " "

OTHERS PRESENT:

Walter T. Shannon
Harry Anderson
William J. Harp
Robert Calkins
Alexander Calhoun
Kramer Adams
Chester Woodhull
William Dillinger
Ralph W. Scott
Hon. Ralph R. Cloyed
George Hjelte

Department of Fish and Game
" " " " "
" " " " "
" " " " "
" " " " "
" " " " "
" " " " "
" " " " "

John Backus
E. A. Bailey
Mr. J. C. Clark
Mrs. J. C. Clark
F. Cronemiller
George D. Difani

Department of Justice
Member of the Assembly
Los Angeles Dept. of Recreation
and Parks
University of Southern Calif.
Nevada City, California
Carlsbad, California
Carlsbad, California
U. S. Forest Service
Legislative Representative,
Organized Sportsmen
Sportsmen's Council of Central
Calif.
Assembly Interim Comm. on Fish
and Game
Engineer
Bell Aircraft Corporation
Visalia, California
Region II
" "
" "

G. W. Philpott

Rupert H. Ingram

G. A. Grober
Arthur L. Fornoff
Mark Lee
Robert Montgomery
J. C. Fraser
Allen Pollitt

1. Approval of the Minutes

IT WAS REGULARLY MOVED AND SECONDED THAT THE READING OF THE MINUTES OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD OF JUNE 11, 1953, BE DISPENSED WITH AND SAID MINUTES BE APPROVED AS WRITTEN.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

2. Status of Funds

The Board was informed that the amount allocated to specific projects up to the close of the meeting of June 11, 1953, aggregated \$9,882,902 made up as follows:

a. Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects (17)	\$4,216,023
b. Warmwater and other Fish Projects (11)	190,020
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)	4,009,642
h. General Projects (4).	<u>110,940</u>

Total (81 Projects). \$9,882,902

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; (2) Colorado River Recreational Development, \$50,000.

Effective July 1, 1953, an additional \$1,000,000 was appropriated to the Wildlife Preservation Fund (Ch. 1401, Stats. 1951), increasing the total accountability to \$12,000,000. This constitutes the total amount appropriated for this fund.

Operating expenses 47/48 - 50/51 fiscal years totaled \$129,152. Fiscal year 51/52 - \$35,370; 52/53 - \$36,009 (subject to adjustment). Budgeted for 53/54 - \$57,933. Total for 47/48 - 53/54 - \$258,464.

The unobligated balance available for expenditure is approximately \$1,820,000.

3. Lower Butte Creek Waterfowl Management Area, Project No. 548

Mr. Horn reported that on March 19, 1949, the Board allocated \$537,036 for land acquisition, equipment, and buildings for this project. On July 12, 1950, an additional \$73,625 was allocated to meet the asking price for parcels of land offered as willing sales. The total allocation was \$610,661. Of this sum \$91,000 was for equipment and buildings (minutes of July 12, 1950, Board meeting, Pages 4-10). This project was held up pending the outcome of a suit brought by Ernest Hatch and others against the State of California in the Superior Court of California at Sacramento. Following the delay occasioned by this suit, land prices had increased and it was evident that

additional funds would be required to complete the project as proposed. The Department of Finance and the Division of Public Works and Acquisition was advised to proceed with acquisitions and that the Board would take appropriate action when additional money was required.

The Public Works Board at the June, 1953, meeting approved acquisition of an additional parcel requiring \$67,170, and to meet this sum it was necessary to utilize part of the \$91,000 allocated for equipment and buildings. The Department of Fish and Game is now in need of the equipment. Under date of August 28, 1953, Mr. H. C. Vincent, Jr., of the Department of Finance advised as follows:

"In order to complete the acquisition of the remaining eight parcels in this project (assuming this can be done in conformity with the policy established by action of the Wildlife Board on April 16, 1953) it is estimated that an additional \$220,000 will be required."

In addition to this \$220,000, the \$91,000 for equipment and buildings should be restored making a total additional allocation of \$311,000.

Mr. Horn recommended to the Wildlife Board that an additional \$311,000 be allocated out of the unallocated balance of the Wildlife Preservation Fund.

Senator Hatfield stated that as far as the \$91,000 is concerned, he had no objection. However, he thought that the question of the \$220,000 for the additional eight parcels of land brought up a matter that should be discussed at this time. Senator Hatfield said that at the June meeting he brought up the subject which was referred to the Attorney General as to whether or not the Fish and Game Commission and the Director of Fish and Game were authorized, under the Wildlife Conservation Board Act, to acquire the property without condemnation. Senator Hatfield said that this question was investigated and he was sent a copy of the report, which indicated that this procedure was lawful and legal. He felt the proper procedure would be to secure an option to purchase thus indicating that the owner would sell, and then we could proceed to acquire the properties without being in danger of the owners changing their minds. Senator Hatfield further stated that he thought the Fish and Game Commission should be requested to see what they can do about securing options on properties that are offered for sale.

Mr. H. C. Vincent, Jr., from the Department of Finance briefly discussed the acquisition of the properties. He explained that Mr. Horn had pointed out in his discussion the delays that had occurred after the Board had initially approved the project. At the time of the suit the Board was informed of the probable increased cost of acquisition of these lands. Mr. Vincent further said that the estimate that they had prepared for an additional \$220,000 was their best estimate for purchasing the remaining parcels.

Senator Hatfield stated that we had no option or commitment to show that the owners of these remaining parcels would sell at this price, and that he didn't want to get involved in another affair like the Noble suit.

Assemblyman Erwin expressed the opinion that we will just have to condemn to get these remaining lands.

Senator Hatfield expressed the opinion that a conclusion should be made whether or not to use an option.

Mr. Dean said that he didn't think it could be determined except on each individual case.

Senator Hatfield stated that at the time we started out with the Noble property Mr. Noble wanted to sell and we could have obtained an option from him at that time. Later Noble changed his mind and we got into a bad situation. He further stated that he didn't want to change acquisition procedure but wanted to utilize the services of the Department of Finance, technical examiners, and the balance of it. He also stated that he did not think it was good business for us to get ourselves in a jackpot like we did in the Noble case.

Assemblyman Erwin stated that when we agreed to purchase the Noble property it was his understanding that there was nothing else available, and that just a short time ago he was notified that another piece of property had been found in the Noble area. Why hadn't it been explored before?

Mr. Silva stated that he thought he could enlighten Assemblyman Erwin on this matter. He further said that he quite concurred in what Senator Hatfield said in that some of us from this Department could have obtained options on the Noble property. He said that in addition to the Noble tract the other pieces of property that we looked at, and we looked at several, were small and disconnected. The properties now available are far from being adjacent to the Noble tract. He further stated that there are other properties available now and this has changed the situation considerably.

Mr. Horn advised that at the time the Noble tract was presented to the Board for consideration, the tracts now offered were not for sale. Following the difficulty with expansion of Grey Lodge, only willing sales were sought. Since the outcome of the suit for the San Luis Island area, the owners of several properties have made offers of willing sale, whereas they had refused to sell previously.

Senator Hatfield asked Mr. Horn if he thought their asking price was too high. Mr. Horn replied that it was his opinion that all of their asking prices were high.

Assemblyman Erwin stated that he concurred with Senator Hatfield in that we should secure an option for the purchase of additional property.

Senator Hatfield stated that he wanted the Attorney General to state what action, if any, should be taken and what the form of the action should be in order that the Fish and Game Commission could be supplied with the money to go ahead and take the option. In other words, to follow through now, to find out what can and should be done.

Assemblyman Erwin said that he thought this was a function of the Interim Committee.

Ralph W. Scott, Deputy Attorney General, stated that he wouldn't want to state at this minute the steps that should be taken, but that he thought it would be a good point to ask of the Attorney General.

MOVED BY SENATOR HATFIELD AND SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN ERWIN THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD THAT WE APPROVE THE AMOUNT REQUESTED; AND IT IS FURTHER RECOMMENDED THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD REQUEST THE ATTORNEY GENERAL TO GIVE US AN OPINION OF THE STEPS PLUS THE FORMS OF ANY RESOLUTIONS THAT WOULD BE NECESSARY TO FULLY AUTHORIZE AND IMPLEMENT THE FISH AND GAME COMMISSION WITH THE POWER TO OBTAIN AN OPTION EITHER BY THIS BOARD OR BY THE CONSULTANT ON PROPERTIES TO BE ACQUIRED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. DEAN AND SECONDED BY MR. GORDON THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE ALLOCATION OF \$311,000 FOR LOWER BUTTE CREEK WATERFOWL MANAGEMENT AREA; AND THAT AN OPINION BE REQUESTED OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STEPS NECESSARY TO AUTHORIZE THE FISH AND GAME COMMISSION WITH THE POWER TO OBTAIN AN OPTION.

4. Bixby Slough, Project No. 83

Mr. Horn reported that this project, to develop Bixby Slough, also called Machado Lake in Los Angeles County, was first proposed as a public fishing area by the San Pedro Chapter of the Izaak Walton League of America on November 22, 1949.

Dr. Eichmeyer, in his report of February 21, 1950, commented upon the water quality and the presence of a dump, and other pollution factors and did not rate it high as a potential fishing lake in its existing state.

Mr. Horn further reported that the Board on April 4, 1950, established a tentative reserve of \$100,000 for the acquisition of some 130 acres of land in Bixby Slough, to round out an area already purchased by the City of Los Angeles. This allocation was conditioned upon satisfactory agreements being worked out with the City of Los Angeles, Department of Recreation and Parks, to maintain the area, and assurance from the City that it would supply the required fresh water, and from the County that it would install a suitable flood drain, and that the pollution situation would be cleared up.

During the next 15 months negotiations continued, but the City of Los Angeles did not meet the requirements set up by the Board and Department of Fish and Game.

On June 6, 1951, the Board withdrew the reserve of \$100,000 and restored it to the Wildlife Restoration fund.

Sporadic interest in the proposed project continued with the following conditions being set forth by the Department of Fish and Game as necessary for creating a successful fish habitat.

1. Provide an adequate supply of fresh water to maintain a prescribed level.

2. Provide adequate flood control to care for seasonal runoff.
3. Elimination of the existing dump, pollution area, and rotary mud digging operations.
4. Establish a definite operating and maintenance agency.

The continued interest in the project was called to the Board's attention on August 24, 1952, and the following motion unanimously adopted:

"... 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."

Subsequently, at the November, 1952, election, bonds were voted for a flood control program in Los Angeles County that included Bixby Slough.

The following action has been taken by various City of Los Angeles Departments:

1. Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners, November 20, 1952, agreed to assume the obligation and cost of operation and maintenance of the lake and maintain a constant water level, if the lake is transferred to the City of Los Angeles for maintenance.
2. Samuel B. Morris, General Manager and Chief Engineer of the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, by letter dated May 4, 1953, to Mr. George Hjelte, General Manager, Department of Recreation and Parks, states water will be furnished to maintain the level - "limited only by the result of extreme emergencies or lack of adequate water supply."
3. Mr. Floyd Aldrich, City Engineer, advised Mr. Hjelte by letter of May 25, 1953, that the Bixby Slough Flood Control Project No. 78 had been placed in the first priority for construction during 1953. Also, the City Council of Los Angeles was advised by a letter of August 17, 1953, that the Bureau of Engineering assured the drain would be constructed during this fiscal year at a cost of about \$800,000.
4. Department of City Planning, Office of Zoning Administrator, by letter of October 29, 1951, sets forth conditions for handling dumping of rubbish that appears satisfactory to accomplish adequate pollution control. The Department of Fish and Game has stated the pollution problem would be adequately solved from a fisheries standpoint, by the measures to be taken.

A meeting of all interested agencies was held in the office of Mr. John Gibson of the City Council in Los Angeles, August 10, 1953, in which it developed that all of the requirements set forth by the Board had been met. The City of Los Angeles is proceeding with acquisition of additional lands, and will purchase all lands from the lake shore to surrounding highways, thus providing proper operational control of the lake.

Senator Hatfield stated that he objected to the statement made by Mr. George Hjelte, General Manager, Department of Recreation and Parks, City of Los Angeles, that water would be furnished to maintain the level - "limited only by the result of extreme emergencies or lack of adequate water supply". Senator Hatfield stated that he could understand the "limited only by the result of extreme emergencies" but he did not like the statement "or lack of adequate water supply", and it seemed to him that it was an open door through which you could drive a team of horses.

Mr. Silva said that Mr. George Hjelte was present and asked Senator Hatfield if he would like to ask him any questions.

Mr. Hjelte explained that the City is dependent upon nature for its water supply, and that they provide water for four other lakes within the City. He further said that through the years he has personally never known the Water Department to say there was not enough water. The Water Department cannot guarantee that there will always be water.

Mr. Dean made the comment that he could not get excited over the clause, but that we had to go on good faith that Los Angeles is going to have an adequate water supply.

Senator Hatfield further said that he was not satisfied with Paragraph two and that it seemed to him that it left the door wide open.

Mr. Dean explained that there was no contract that we were going to enter into with the City of Los Angeles.

Assemblyman Belotti asked what would happen if the City of Los Angeles had a lack of water supply, and Mr. Hjelte replied that they would have to have a rationing of water. He further stated that the Water Department has agreed to maintain this lake at a constant level of elevation 15, and that their problem has been to dispose of the excess water. In the past, there has been too much water rather than too little to maintain a specific level.

Senator Hatfield asked the Interim Committee members and the members of the Board if they were recommending the allocation of \$100,000 to purchase 130 acres of land in Bixby Slough, and that when that land is purchased it be turned over to the City of Los Angeles to operate. He further asked if that wouldn't be in some form of an agreement?

Mr. Gordon stated that when we first got into consideration of this project we understood that the City of Los Angeles would be willing to negotiate an interagency agreement, and that all we would offer to do would be to buy this much land and then the City would take over.

Mr. Dean stated that such a situation wouldn't bother him because various Departments of Los Angeles City government operate similar projects all over the City. All we would do is to start them out on it.

Assemblyman Erwin mentioned the fact that there is something comparable to this in the City of San Bernardino.

Mr. Hjelte inquired if the agreement was one similar to that entered into between the cities or counties and the Division of Beaches and Parks, and stated that, if so, the contract could be drawn in a few weeks.

Mr. Horn remarked that it was his understanding that the Recreation and Park Commission had entered into an agreement with the Department of Fish and Game to operate and maintain these facilities and had agreed to provide drainage, water, etc. Mr. Hjelte replied that this was correct.

Mr. Dean asked if Senator Hatfield wanted to try the option method, and Senator Hatfield replied that this would be a good place to try an option. Mr. Dean thought that there would be a lot more criticism in the option method as to whether you got the right price.

MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN ERWIN AND SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD THAT THE ITEM IN THE AMOUNT OF \$100,000 BE APPROVED FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE 130 ACRES IN BIXBY SLOUGH; AND THAT AN AGREEMENT BE ENTERED INTO WITH THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES PRIOR TO THE PURCHASE OF THE 130 ACRES OR AS MUCH AS WILL BE NECESSARY.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. DEAN AND SECONDED BY MR. GORDON THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE ALLOCATION OF \$100,000 FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE 130 ACRES IN BIXBY SLOUGH; AND THAT AN AGREEMENT BE ENTERED INTO WITH THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES PRIOR TO THE PURCHASE OF THE 130 ACRES.

5. Hume Lake Dam Repair and Level Maintenance, Project No. 100

Mr. Horn explained that in accordance with instructions of the Wildlife Board at the April 16, 1953, meeting an opinion was requested of the Attorney General concerning the legality of expending Wildlife Preservation Funds for the repair of this Federal property. Further, in compliance with the instructions of the Board at the June 11, 1953, meeting the Attorney General was requested to elaborate upon his opinion, Number 53/119, rendered June 9, 1953. These opinions were forwarded to members of the Board and the Legislative Interim Committee for their consideration. A suggested lease agreement was reviewed by the Attorney General and found to meet his requirements. The project is, therefore, again referred to the Board to take such action as they deem wise and further consideration of this expenditure and the benefits to be derived therefrom.

Mr. Horn called the Board's attention to cost estimates made by the Division of Water Resources for the construction of dams to create fishing lakes in other locations in southern and central California. These estimates are as follows:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Surface Acres</u>	<u>Cost of Dam</u>	<u>Cost Per Surface Acre</u>
Charlton Flat Dam	16	\$ 60,000	\$ 3,750
Saulter Creek Dam	7	\$ 55,000	7,057
Chilao Flat Dam	3	\$ 38,000	\$11,666
Elizabeth Lake Canyon, Site 1	9	\$190,000	\$21,111
Elizabeth Lake Canyon, Site 2	4	\$160,000	\$40,000
Holcomb Creek Dam, Site #2	10	\$210,000	\$21,000
Deep Creek Site	17	\$125,000	\$ 7,352
Sand Creek Dam	13	\$100,000	\$ 7,692

It will be recalled that Hume Lake Dam will maintain a 83 surface lake at a cost of \$75,000 or \$904 per surface acre, which is very markedly below any of the other proposals that have been presented.

Mr. Horn further explained that intense interest has been expressed by the people of the San Joaquin Valley in this project, and we have received a great many communications from organizations and individuals all urging that the Board approve the project and allocate the required funds should the Attorney General's opinion be favorable. From the standpoint of cost and benefits to be secured from this type of project in comparison with the other proposals listed above, we would recommend that this project be given favorable consideration.

Members of the Interim Committee and Board Members agreed that the cost to construct the dam was reasonable enough for that part of the State.

Senator Hatfield objected to Paragraph six of the agreement to be entered into by the Department of Fish and Game and the U. S. Forest Service which is quoted below:

"Upon abandonment, termination, or cancellation of this agreement, the Department shall remove within a reasonable time all structures and improvements except those owned by the United States, and shall restore the site, unless otherwise agreed upon in writing or in this agreement. If the Department fails to remove all such structures or improvements within a reasonable period, they shall become the property of the United States, but that will not relieve the Department of liability for the cost of their removal and the restoration of the site."

It was Senator Hatfield's opinion that it was one of those Federal agreements where we were spending all the money, and he did not think that it was good bargaining.

Mr. Gordon explained that we did not plan any sizable installation on the property, but only intend to repair the dam.

Mr. F. P. Cronemiller of the U. S. Forest Service went into detail concerning the agreement and explained that the stipulation referred to in Paragraph six which is quoted above did not refer to the dam. Mr.

Cronemiller further stated that if it was agreeable to Senator Hatfield that particular clause could be removed from the agreement or changed so that it doesn't apply a contingent liability upon the State of California.

Mr. Ralph W. Scott, Deputy Attorney General in the State Department of Justice, explained that the clause mentioned above which Senator Hatfield was objecting to applied to any additional buildings that the State might construct on the property but that it did not refer to the improvements of the dam.

Mr. G. W. Philpott of the Sportsmen's Council of Central California explained that the sportsmen in his area are all in favor of this project and have given their wholehearted approval of it. He further stated that Hume Lake is one of their most popular lakes and that it supplied good fishing about six months out of the year.

Mr. Mark Lee from Visalia was present at the meeting and spoke in behalf of the Visalia Chamber of Commerce, the Tulare County Chamber of Commerce, the Central Sierra Chamber of Commerce and other organizations stating that they have all approved the project. Mr. Lee further stated that it is their estimate that 70 to 75 per cent of the people that go into the Hume Lake area go there for fishing; that they have 110 cabin owners in the area; and that very definitely this is a source of recreation to all people of the Valley. Mr. Lee also said that he had been going up there since 1932, and that the people of the Valley are in favor of the project.

Mr. E. A. Bailey from Nevada City also appeared and spoke in behalf of friends of his family living in Los Angeles. He said that his friends had cabins on this lake and they had asked him to speak in favor of this project.

Mr. Horn explained that during the past three to four months we have received a stack of letters and telegrams three inches in thickness requesting this project and there has not been one objection.

Assemblyman Erwin remarked that he was willing.

MOVED BY SENATOR HATFIELD AND SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN ERWIN THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD THAT THE COORDINATOR'S RECOMMENDATION BE APPROVED AND THAT \$72,500 BE ALLOCATED FOR THIS PROJECT PROVIDED THE AGREEMENT WITH THE FOREST SERVICE IS AMENDED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. DEAN AND SECONDED BY MR. GORDON THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE ALLOCATION OF \$72,500 FOR THE REPAIR OF HUME LAKE DAM PROVIDED THE AGREEMENT WITH THE FOREST SERVICE IS AMENDED.

Mr. Silva wanted it to go on record that the members of the Board and the Interim Committee Members were duly influenced by the sportsmen in that part of the State in their action approving this project.

6. Salton Sea Fisheries, Project No. 108

Mr. Horn explained that at the April 16, 1953, meeting of the Wildlife Conservation Board \$40,520 was approved for continued and expanded studies and further development work seeking the creation of a sport fishery in Salton Sea, Imperial County. At that meeting it was requested that a reserve fund of \$46,000 to continue the study for two additional years be set up at a later date. The outcome of the San Luis Island condemnation suit was not known at that time and it was felt that it would be better to await until after July 1, 1953, before setting aside any further reserves. It is recommended that the \$46,000 now be set up as a reserve for two succeeding years of work on Salton Sea and that definite allocation of approximately \$23,000 per year be made by the Board for each of the two following years, if the results of each preceding year justifies continuance of the project. Present results are very encouraging.

Assemblyman Erwin asked the Department what success they have been having with anchovies and if other fish have been making progress.

Alex Calhoun, Chief of the Inland Fisheries Branch, explained that the program has been going on for a number of years. However, he has not been in very close contact with it but he has reviewed it in the past. He stated that the status of the anchovy is undetermined, and that one of the purposes of this project would be to follow them. Mr. Calhoun further stated that a small croaker was brought in from the Gulf of Mexico and some of the fish had reached a length of ten inches. He said that this spring, as he recalled in May, an expedition went down to the Gulf, secured 100 bass-type and other fish and planted them in Salton Sea in the hope that these fish would spawn in the sea. They are a top game fish. However, this is a long range study, and the objective is to put it on a firm basis.

Mr. Silva inquired if they had planted any small fish or shrimp? Mr. Calhoun explained that they had brought in clams and oysters, but in the way of forage fish he frankly did not know. The main point was to get the forage fish; they are an extremely delicate fish.

MOVED BY SENATOR HATFIELD AND SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN ERWIN THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD THAT THE COORDINATOR'S RECOMMENDATION BE APPROVED AND THE SUM OF \$46,000 BE SET UP AS A RESERVE FOR TWO SUCCEEDING YEARS OF WORK ON SALTON SEA.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. DEAN AND SECONDED BY MR. GORDON THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE ALLOCATION OF \$46,000 TO BE SET UP AS A RESERVE FOR TWO SUCCEEDING YEARS OF WORK ON SALTON SEA.

7. Coastal Angling Access, San Luis Obispo County, Project No. 1011

Mr. Horn explained that at the April 16, 1953, meeting of the Board two proposals from San Luis Obispo County were presented for consideration; one creating an access road to Morro Bay was estimated to cost \$24,824,

and one in the vicinity of Cayucos was estimated to cost \$12,472. This proposal was held over to the next meeting with instructions to the coordinator to confer with the County Planning Director to see if the estimates could be revised. On August 18, 1953, Mr. Melvin G. Bakeman, Planning Director, wrote us setting forth revised estimates that had been accepted by both the County Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors. These revised estimates are as follows:

Cayucos (Musio Range)

Acquisition of right of way 2.32 acres at \$1500	\$ 3,480
5912 square yards grading and graveling and finishing	<u>4,446</u>
TOTAL	\$ 7,926

Morro Bay (Dermazen and Martin)

Right of way acquisition 1.1 acres at \$1800 plus	
4.0 acres at \$250	\$ 2,980
12,850 square yards grading and graveling at 75	
cents per square yard	<u>9,650</u>
TOTAL	\$12,630

The total for these two proposals is \$20,556.

The County Planning Commission eliminated the hard surfacing and substituted gravel or red rock surface for both the access road and the parking areas. The County is willing to accept this cheaper construction upon the condition that there will be no objection to their further improving the road by hard surfacing at a later date at their expense.

Mr. Horn further explained that inasmuch as San Luis Obispo County has accepted this project in good faith, has met all the requirements of the Board, and has expended considerable time and funds in making the preliminary surveys and estimates it is recommended that \$8,000 be allocated for the Cayucos access from the \$50,000 allocated by the Board for the Coastal Angling Access project.

The Morro Bay access leads to a State Park and it is possible the Game Commission would prefer to complete their meeting with the Park Commission at San Diego October 22, 1953, before any action be taken by the Board on such a project.

Mr. Silva remarked that he did not have any comment to make right now. However, we failed to get additional money for the Wildlife Preservation Fund at the last session of the Legislature, and we have approved projects that must be completed. He further said that he questioned the advisability of additional allocations of this kind until we are sure that we are going to complete those projects underway at the present time. He also said that he thought we should look at this Coastal Angling Access project pretty thoroughly.

Senator Hatfield asked Mr. Horn if the \$8,000 which he was asking for this project would come out of the \$1,820,000 or out of the \$50,000 reserved

by the Board. Mr. Horn stated that he would have to go back to the records to make a positive statement.

Assemblyman Erwin stated that he was acquainted with Morro Bay, and he thought we should approve the project if we could since it would seem to him to be money well spent. He said there was all kinds of fish life to be found there.

Mr. Gordon stated that he found that the \$9,882,902 specific allocations, plus the \$50,000 in reserve for Colorado River, plus the \$15,000 for Mendocino National Forest, would make a grand total of \$10,982,902; and that the difference between that would have to cover expenditure of employment, personnel, etc.

Mr. Dean remarked that this \$50,000 was set up very early in the program, and that he personally opposed it from the very beginning. He thought that if you tried to take care of all the access roads it would be an impossibility and that it was either a local problem or one for Beaches and Parks. He said he would not vote against it, but that he wanted to go on record that he thought it was a bad mistake to ever get into this field of access roads.

Senator Hatfield remarked that he agreed with Mr. Dean.

Senator Hatfield inquired if the \$50,000 in reserve was only for the entire Cayucos access and he also inquired if Morro Bay was in the same situation. Mr. Horn replied that the \$50,000 was for access statewide, and that Cayucos and Morro Bay were in the same situation. Senator Hatfield then inquired how many counties were in the same situation and how many counties there were in which there may be some moral obligation.

Mr. Horn replied that San Luis Obispo is the only county that has conducted any engineering studies and has expended any money for such surveys, though Marin and other counties had done considerable exploratory work.

Mr. G. W. Philpott from the Sportsmen's Council of Central California spoke in behalf of the sportsmen in that area.

MOVED BY SENATOR HATFIELD AND SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD THAT THE COORDINATOR'S RECOMMENDATION BE APPROVED AND THAT \$8,000 BE ALLOCATED FOR THE CAYUCOS ACCESS FROM THE \$50,000 RESERVED BY THE BOARD FOR THESE ACCESS ROADS; AND THAT ACTION UPON THE MORRO BAY ACCESS BE CONTINUED UNTIL AFTER THE MEETING OF THE FISH AND GAME COMMISSION WITH THE BEACHES AND PARKS COMMISSION IN SAN DIEGO ON OCTOBER 22, 1953; AND THAT ALL OF THE BALANCE OF THE \$50,000 ALLOCATED BY THE BOARD FOR ACCESS ROADS BE REVERTED TO THE UNALLOCATED BALANCE OF WILDLIFE PRESERVATION FUNDS.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assemblyman Erwin remarked that there was a reserve fund for Mendocino County that he had more or less agreed upon. Mr. Horn advised that there

was a reserve of \$15,000 to carry on the stream flow improvement work in Mendocino County but it did not involve an access proposal.

Mr. George D. Difani, Legislative Representative, Organized Sportsmen, said that he wanted to call attention to the fact that Marin County from the inception of this program had cooperated with this Board, and that he was sure that the Marin Board of Supervisors should be present to look after their interests in Marin County, before the Board took any action that would deny that County such projects. He further said that they have done considerable work on an access project and while it isn't far enough along to be considered here, it should receive future consideration. He thought the Board would be running up against severe criticism if that County group were not advised before the Board took action.

Mr. Silva remarked that the action of the Board is not one of adopting a policy but is simply acting on a project, and it would not preclude anyone from coming in and presenting a program. Mr. Silva also stated that they had a meeting with Beaches and Parks next Thursday to discuss such problems as this and he thought that out of that meeting might come some constructive plan of procedure to follow.

Mr. Difani stated that his reason for standing up is because Senator Hatfield mentioned moral obligation, and Mr. Horn had stated that this is the only one that we had a moral obligation.

John Backus from the University of Southern California stated that he was also speaking in behalf of the Izaak Walton League and the Los Angeles County Fish and Game Commission. He stated that they had a rather serious access program involving a number of access points and they would like very much to have them considered by this Board. They had been going along on the assumption that the Board would consider them.

Mr. Silva stated that at a subsequent time such a project could be considered.

Senator Hatfield stated that we should put all the cards on the table. The Wildlife program started out with an appropriation of three million dollars a year of race track money for three years and subsequently with the assistance of Mr. Dean, Senator Brown, and Senator Hatfield a bill was passed adding another three million dollars to the fund. The present Governor is going to insist on economy, and I think you ought to be frank that the chances will not be good to get any more money for the Wildlife Preservation Fund. In other words, this \$1,820,000 is the last of it, and I think we should be honest. We are already committed to most of it. Assemblyman Erwin concurred with Senator Hatfield's thinking.

John Backus stated that he realized that this beach access is a problem of considerable magnitude; however, time is of the essence as it is in most places and they were under the impression that a certain sum of money was available. He also said that he was under the further understanding that this project could be submitted at today's meeting.

Mr. Horn stated that the Los Angeles County request for this project was brought up sometime ago with a board selection of areas along the coast

of the Palos Verdes estates. Recent correspondence with Dr. Backus indicated that they couldn't get any agreement with the Palos Verdes Corporation for sale of the property. However, Dr. Backus came into the office today and gave me figures of cost based on the assessed valuation of the property. Dr. Backus further advised that representatives of the Palos Verdes Corporation had stated they would only relinquish their land if it were condemned. Additional work should be done to arrive at a firm estimate of cost before this acquisition could be recommended.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. DEAN AND SECONDED BY MR. GORDON THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE ALLOCATION OF \$8,000 FOR THE CAYUCOS ACCESS FROM THE \$50,000 PREVIOUSLY ALLOCATED BY THE BOARD FOR THESE ACCESS ROADS. IN VIEW OF THE CHANGED SITUATION WHICH HAS COME ABOUT BECAUSE OF THE PROSPECTIVE FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR BEACHES AND PARKS, ACTION UPON THE MORRO BAY ACCESS BE CONTINUED UNTIL AFTER THE MEETING WITH THE BEACHES AND PARK COMMISSION IN SAN DIEGO ON OCTOBER 22, 1953; AND THAT ALL OF THE BALANCE OF THE \$50,000 ALLOCATED BY THE BOARD FOR ACCESS ROADS BE REVERTED TO THE UNALLOCATED BALANCE OF THE WILDLIFE PRESERVATION FUND.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Coordinator's comment:

The Board on November 28, 1951, allocated \$50,000 for a statewide Coastal Angling project (Page 7 of 11/28/51 Minutes). Thus, this \$50,000 is included in the \$9,882,902 which is the total of allocations set forth under the "Status of Funds" in the Agenda for the October 13, 1953, meeting.

The action taken by the Board on October 13, 1953, provides \$8,000 out of the \$50,000 previously allocated. The balance of \$42,000 is deducted from the "previously allocated" and restored to the unallocated balance.

8. Buena Vista Lagoon Waterfowl Refuge, Project No. 510, San Diego County

Mr. Horn reported that on March 26, 1952, the Board unanimously accepted this project and allocated \$75,620 for its construction.

The motion passed by the Board is as follows:

"In accordance with the advice of Messrs, Dean and Gordon, it was moved by Senator Hatfield, seconded by Assemblyman Lowrey, that the Joint Interim Committee recommend to the Board that \$75,620 be allocated to the Buena Vista Waterfowl Refuge, Project No. 510, with the understanding that only such sum as needed will be expended at this time to acquire the land and to develop an adequate supply of fresh water."

"Passed unanimously."

"Thereupon, by motion regularly made, seconded and unanimously adopted by the members of the Board, it was agreed that \$75,620

be allocated to the Department of Fish and Game from the Wildlife Restoration Fund for the Buena Vista Waterfowl Refuge, Project No. 510, only \$19,000 of which is to be expended at the present time for acquisition of the required lands and test drilling and development of a well or wells for an adequate supply of fresh water; that the State Public Works Board is hereby authorized to acquire any property needed; and that the Department of Fish and Game is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for test drilling and development of the fresh water supply and completion of the project; it being understood that expenditure of Board funds will be limited to facilities important to wildlife and that any other improvements or facilities desired by the County of San Diego shall be made at the expense of said County, and that after acquisition and development of the project the administration thereof shall be turned over to the County for operation and maintenance in accordance with an interagency agreement to be jointly executed by the Department of Fish and Game and the County of San Diego."

Mr. Horn further explained that a geological survey made by the Division of Water Resources developed certain information. Water Resources estimated it would cost \$6,000 to make a complete survey of water conditions and advised such an expenditure is not warranted.

Many expressions have been received from residents and legislators of the area, generally stating the information set forth by Water Resources is incorrect.

Mr. Horn further stated that the problem should be resolved. A complete water survey, as presented by Water Resources could be made, or the cleaning out and testing of the old Holmes Oil Well could be done to determine the quantity of water that can be secured from that source. Land acquisition, can well await the water development results, since a line of take of property must be established by survey, and that will depend upon water levels that can be maintained.

Assemblyman Ralph R. Cloyd spoke in behalf of this project. He stated that all they are asking is that the well be tested for water. He further said that the Holmes well drilled to a depth of 3200 feet. At 1400 feet, water started flowing over the top of the well. He also said that Mr. and Mrs. Clark were both here at the meeting as well as the engineer under whose supervision the well was drilled.

Assemblyman Erwin remarked that he knew the Audubon Society of Southern California was in favor of this project, and that Mrs. Clark is here to represent that organization.

Senator Hatfield asked Mr. Horn if he recommended a definite amount of money be allocated for purposes of making the testing of the well.

Mr. Horn replied that Mr. Grober, the engineer under whose supervision the well was dug, suggested that \$3,000 would do it.

Assemblyman Erwin suggested that we recommend \$5,000 be authorized and any portion thereof that is necessary be used for test pumping the well.

Senator Hatfield asked who would make the test and if the \$3,000 is allocated and the test is made and the report indicated that the well did not produce an adequate amount of water, would the proponents of the project be satisfied?

Assemblyman Cloyed replied that they would be satisfied with the results.

Mr. Horn suggested that if \$3,000 is going to be too little, authorize the \$5,000 that Assemblyman Erwin has mentioned and take such portion of it as is necessary to make an adequate test.

Senator Hatfield stated that he was willing to go along and take the recommendation of the coordinator and he thought the thing to do was to go ahead and have the test made. Assemblyman Erwin agreed that the well should be tested and that \$5,000 be authorized for the Fish and Game to contract for opening the well and test pumping it.

MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN ERWIN AND SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD THAT THE COORDINATOR'S RECOMMENDATION BE ACCEPTED AND THAT A SUM NOT TO EXCEED \$5,000 BE USED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME UNDER CONTRACT TO TEST THE WELL.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. DEAN AND SECONDED BY MR. GORDON THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE ALLOCATION OF A SUM NOT TO EXCEED \$5,000 TO BE USED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT FOR TESTING THE WELL.

Mrs. J. C. Clark from Carlsbad spoke in behalf of this project. She explained that this project will be used for a bird sanctuary and that it is already a feeding and resting ground for waterfowl.

Mr. G. A. Grober also appeared in behalf of this project. He said that he would be very happy to engage somebody to take this well over and clean it out; that they had two to three good contractors and that he knew about how much it would cost; that he didn't have any axes to grind, and that he was only at the meeting because he had the community's interest at heart. He also said that he would be very happy to offer his services in any way possible.

Senator Hatfield remarked that he understood they proposed to have a parking area and other facilities and further said that the Wildlife Board had nothing to do with the development of any parking or recreational facilities and that this would have to come from another source. Mrs. Clark replied that they did intend to have a parking area but that they wanted the County to take over that.

Mr. Silva stated that he wasn't a member of the Board when this proposition was proposed, but that he has received numerous telegrams from sportsmen and individuals opposing any money spent on this project. However, he said he was not thoroughly informed of the project.

Mrs. Clark inquired if the Vista Rod and Gun Club and the Federated Sportsmen's Clubs had reversed their previous stand.

Mr. Silva stated that he has received some severe criticism of this project; however, he would not oppose the project as he was not on the Board when the project was approved.

9. Recovery of Funds - Completed Projects

Mr. Horn reported that the following W.C.B. projects have been completed or withdrawn, and the accounts cleared and closed during the period June 27, 1952, thru September 30, 1953. Balances as indicated remaining in the unallocated accounts of these projects are available for recovery and return to the Wildlife Restoration Fund.

(a) FISH HATCHERY AND STOCKING PROJECTS

<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Balance for Recovery</u>
2-part 1	Deep Creek Stocking Trails	\$ 735.00
38	Fillmore Hatchery	606.92
Total (a)		\$ 1,341.92

(b) WARMWATER AND OTHER FISH PROJECTS

<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Balance for Recovery</u>
77	Lindo Lake Public Fishing Area	\$ 849.26
94	Turlock Reservoir Subimpoundment	14.02
89	Chilao Campground Public Fishing Area	1,472.53
88	Charlton Flats Public Fishing Area	7,349.32
91	Elizabeth Lake Canyon Public Fishing Area	1,000.00
Total (b)		\$10,685.13

(c) FLOW MAINTENANCE AND STREAM IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Balance for Recovery</u>
12	Mendocino National Forest Stream Improvement and Flow Maint.	\$ 201.85
97	Saulter Creek Dam	2,725.61
98	Sand Creek Dam	2,638.40
99	Chiquito Lake Level Maintenance	2,906.40
Total (c)		\$ 8,472.26

(d) FISH SCREEN AND LADDER PROJECTS

<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Balance for Recovery</u>
44-5	Deer Creek Fish Screens	\$ 3,277.19
3	Daguerre Point Fish Ladder	8,635.66
62	Canyon Creek Fish Ladder	<u>10,000.00</u>

Total (d) \$21,912.85

(f) OTHER UPLAND GAME PROJECTS

<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Balance for Recovery</u>
515	Doyle Winter Range	\$ <u>168.28</u>

Total (f) \$ 168.28

(h) GENERAL PROJECTS

<u>Project Number</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Balance for Recovery</u>
1010	Delta Fish and Game Operations Base	\$ <u>448.68</u>

Total (h) \$ 448.68

TOTAL, available for recovery all projects \$43,029.12

It is recommended these funds be recovered and returned to the unallocated balance of the Wildlife Restoration Fund.

MOVED BY SENATOR HATFIELD AND SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN ERWIN THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE VOTING MEMBERS OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD THAT THE COORDINATOR'S RECOMMENDATION BE APPROVED AND THAT THE \$43,029.12 BE RECOVERED AND RETURNED TO THE UNALLOCATED BALANCE OF THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. DEAN AND SECONDED BY MR. SILVA THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE COORDINATOR'S RECOMMENDATION AND THAT THE \$43,029.12 BE RECOVERED.

10. Tahoe Hatchery, Project No. 25

MOVED BY SENATOR HATFIELD AND SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN ERWIN THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE VOTING MEMBERS OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD THAT ACTION ON THIS PROJECT BE CONTINUED UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING SO THAT SENATOR JOHNSON COULD BE PRESENT.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. DEAN AND SECONDED BY MR. SILVA THAT ACTION ON THIS PROJECT BE CONTINUED UNTIL THE NEXT MEETING.

Mr. Horn remarked that a notice of today's meeting was sent to Senator Johnson.

11. Other Business

a. Fish Hatchery Problems

1. Hot Creek Expansion

Mr. Horn explained that in keeping with the allocation of \$3,000 for engineering studies at Hot Creek Hatchery granted by the Board at the June 11, 1953, meeting such studies had been made by Wallace Dry, Department of Fish and Game Engineer. The coordinator requested this survey to consider the maximum expansion possible from both the physical and biological point of view, and then draw up a master plan based upon these possibilities. As certain phases of expansion became necessary, construction could be undertaken. Each such segment would fit into the whole plan, and orderly development to full capacity secured without waste.

Mr. Dry estimated it would require an additional \$209,000 for complete development.

Full expansion at this time does not seem in the best interest. Many problems of distribution, operating funds, etc., remain to be worked out by the Department in placing its expanded catchable trout program in operation statewide.

Mr. Horn further explained that Hot Creek Hatchery supplies eyed eggs to other hatcheries. The present egg take from Hot Creek brood stock exceeds 12,000,000 eyed eggs in the fall of the year. It is impossible to eye 12 million eggs in the 64 troughs now available and have the quality of eggs necessary.

An additional hatchery building of fifty hatchery troughs and four to six circular redwood tanks is highly desirable.

This hatchery is isolated, and no living facilities for personnel are available nearby. It is essential that two additional residences be erected near the new hatchery building.

New brood ponds near the new hatchery building are essential to efficient operation. Cost of these facilities are estimated by Mr. Dry as follows:

New Hatchery Building	\$60,000
New Brood Ponds	11,000
Two New Residences	25,000
Total	<u>\$96,000</u>

Senator Hatfield inquired if these estimates could be considered as firm or if as in the case of other hatcheries additional funds would be required because the estimates were too low.

Mr. Horn stated that so far Mr. Dry's estimates are very close to the bids that are secured and close to the actual cost.

Senator Hatfield said that he wanted to make sure of this. Senator Brown remarked that he thought the estimates were high enough.

Mr. Gordon remarked that we now have an engineer who is a working engineer, and that these are his estimates.

Assemblyman Erwin inquired how much of an increase in production of trout will result if this expansion plan is authorized.

Mr. Alex Calhoun explained that this expansion is aimed primarily at providing more facilities for hatching eggs and producing eggs for the whole Region, rather than increasing the output of catchable trout at Hot Creek.

Mr. Horn explained that \$96,000 will not cover all the expansion that is possible.

Assemblyman Erwin and Senator Brown remarked that we should approve the \$209,000 and complete the whole thing and get maximum results from money spent.

Mr. Silva remarked that he was not going to be very popular with the sportsmen, but as a businessman he thought you should lay the facts on the table and look at them. Here we are going along with an expansion program and we know that the Department is running into the red. How are we going to get additional money? Mr. Silva further said that he thought that the time was coming when the "champagne" appetite of California sportsmen may raise the price of hunting and fishing licenses, that the State cannot keep providing these services with its "beer" pocketbook, and that California sportsmen must face the fact that they are getting more than they are paying for. He further said that the Legislature is either going to have to put up more money, which he did not think they would, or the sportsmen would have to pay more. Mr. Silva remarked that he has been wanting to say this publicly for a long time.

Senator Hatfield stated that he wanted to know what Mr. Horn's recommendation was before he voted.

Mr. Horn said that he was not in favor of the allocation for \$209,000, but that he would recommend that \$96,000 be allocated for the lower hatchery, new brood ponds, and residences. Mr. Horn also said that he would recommend that only these emergency things that are needed for keeping up production be done now; and that the whole hatchery and catchable trout program be thoroughly studied to develop a sound statewide program for completion.

Assemblyman Erwin remarked that it was his understanding that the cheapest fish you can produce were at Hot Creek.

Senator Hatfield suggested that they should go along with the recommendation of the coordinator.

MOVED BY SENATOR BROWN AND SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN ERWIN THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE VOTING MEMBERS OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD THAT THEY ACCEPT THE COORDINATOR'S RECOMMENDATION AND THAT \$96,000 BE ALLOCATED FOR EXPANSION AT HOT CREEK HATCHERY.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. GORDON AND SECONDED BY MR. DEAN THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE COORDINATOR'S RECOMMENDATION AND THAT \$96,000 BE ALLOCATED FOR HOT CREEK HATCHERY.

2. Fish Planting Bases

Mr. Horn discussed briefly the proposed fish planting bases requested by Region II of the Fish and Game. As the new hatcheries in the northern part of the State come into production, there will have to be some facilities for the distribution of the fish produced and for hauling them in quantities from the hatcheries to waters where they will be planted. These planting bases consist of portable-type ponds or holding basins to which the fish can be hauled from the hatcheries in large tankers. The fish would then be picked up by small tank trucks and transported to the streams for planting.

Mr. J. C. Fraser from Region II explained these planting bases in greater detail. He stated that the construction of the large hatcheries in Region I has created a tremendous problem of distribution. There are large areas in the central part of the State which are a long distance from the hatchery supply of fish. People in these areas are demanding that they have some of these fish planted in local waters. To supply fish to these areas large tanks are now used to haul the fish down to the general area, but it is not economical to transfer the fish directly into the streams from the large tankers. In order to transfer the fish from the large tankers into the small tankers some kind of transfer ponds or holding ponds are desirable. Mr. Fraser further said that last year they distributed around 100,000 catchables and that they were very hard-pressed to do that. With Darrah Springs Hatchery coming into production this spring the problem will be more acute.

Senator Hatfield was disturbed over the fact that Wildlife Conservation Funds had been used for buying automobiles and trucks.

Mr. Dean remarked that he thought that these planting bases were more in connection with the distribution of fish and not the production of fish.

Assemblyman Erwin suggested that the Boards of Supervisors would be the proper agency to contact concerning such an expenditure.

Mr. Robert Montgomery from Region II replied that they had contacted some of the County Board of Supervisors, with and through sportsmen's groups, seeking use of county fine money for these bases. However, the Boards contacted were opposed to spending money for this type of development. Mr. Montgomery thought that these troughs were an essential part of a hatchery because without them proper distribution of the fish in the streams would be very difficult.

Assemblyman Erwin suggested that if the supervisors did not want to provide these facilities it would be best to sell the idea to the Fish and Game Commission. Assemblyman Erwin also stated that he did not think this was a proper project for the W.C.B.

It was Senator Hatfield's opinion that it was not the function of the Wildlife Conservation Board to provide money for facilities which had been refused through the proper budgetary process.

Mr. Anderson remarked that as far as the operating equipment for these hatcheries the funds for the trucks have come out of the same funds which set up the hatcheries.

Senator Hatfield remarked that if he had known any of the Wildlife Preservation Funds had been used for purchasing trucks he would have "hit the ceiling".

Assemblyman Belotti asked what the coordinator's recommendation was, and Mr. Horn replied that this project was placed on the agenda because of the apparent emergency presented in it. However, he thought there was a very dire need to take a good look at some of these proposals. It would be highly beneficial to study out the overall State requirement of hatcheries and catchable trout distribution. By hasty, piecemeal development it could become a "Frankenstein", but by careful, long-range planning and expenditure it could be an excellent, smoothly-functioning machine.

Senator Hatfield remarked that this was not the first time that he has voiced his objection that they were getting away from the budgetary process. He was personally willing to concede the emergency; however, such proposals should go through the budgetary process, and he was frankly shocked to know that money has been used to purchase trucks.

3. Mojave Hatchery Expansion

Mr. Horn explained that at the present time Region V has presented a request for three residence buildings; two of them were included in the original eight as the project was first planned but they have never been built. This is a request for two three-bedroom and one two-bedroom dwellings. The cost is estimated at \$50,000.

Senator Hatfield requested Mr. Horn's recommendation, and Mr. Horn replied that he would recommend this item be approved.

MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN ERWIN AND SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE VOTING MEMBERS OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD THAT \$50,000 BE ALLOCATED FOR THREE RESIDENCE BUILDINGS AT MOJAVE RIVER HATCHERY.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. DEAN AND SECONDED BY MR. GORDON THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE ALLOCATION OF \$50,000 FOR THREE RESIDENCE BUILDINGS AT MOJAVE.

b. Request for Helicopter for Marine Patrol

Mr. Horn explained that at the last session of the Legislature Assembly Bill 2335 was passed and became Chapter 1689 of the California Code which reads as follows:

"1472. The board may purchase such boats, aircraft or equipment as it deems necessary for the use of the department for improvement and protection of marine fisheries."

According to proponents of this bill, the purpose was to make the purchase of a helicopter from Wildlife Preservation Funds a legal expenditure. Region V of the Department of Fish and Game and the Ocean Fish Protective Association have reported very favorably and request the purchase of a helicopter either from Wildlife Preservation Funds or from budget items. This equipment is proposed for use over waters of Southern California for:

- (1) Marine patrol to prevent violations and apparent violators.
- (2) Fish scouting.
- (3) Sea lion census.
- (4) Sport angling and commercial fishing intensity studies.

Senator Hatfield objected to this proposal stating that it should go through the regular budgetary process.

Assemblyman Erwin stated that he introduced Assembly Bill 2335 in the Legislature, and that such legislation was given him by a group of sportsmen who maintain commercial fisheries are being ruined. They have made a very careful study of it, and he further thinks that they have written to most members of the Board. Assemblyman Erwin stated that he was told that present at today's meeting would be individuals very familiar with what a helicopter can do and what it would cost to purchase and operate one. He also said that he definitely has to go along with the request, and that regardless of whatever action the rest of the Board members take he was going to vote for a helicopter. Assemblyman Erwin also said that through the years practically no money has been allocated for ocean fishery projects and no additional help has been given to the protection of ocean fish.

Mr. George D. Difani spoke in behalf of the Ocean Fish Protective Association. He stated that everyone is familiar with the fact that the people who buy license to fish in the ocean don't get much consideration from the Fish and Game Preservation Fund. He also said that Mr. Fornoff from the Bell Aircraft Corporation was here to discuss the helicopter, and that the patrol people in the Department realize the equipment for patrol isn't doing the job. Mr. Difani further stated that the salt water anglers are anxious that the Board give serious consideration to this item which amounts to about \$50,000 and he hoped we would give Mr. Fornoff a few minutes to explain the helicopter and its operation.

Mr. Silva remarked that it isn't a matter of whether we are in sympathy with the use of a helicopter for marine patrol, but it is a matter of the

Board not handling projects of this kind, and that he thought he was voicing the sentiment of the Board. So far as listening to Mr. Fornoff on the matter, he thought it was perfectly all right but that he didn't think it was a question of what the helicopter is, or what it can do, but what was the policy of the Board.

Mr. Difani asked if the Legislature passes a bill of this type and made it possible for the money to come from the Wildlife Board would that have a bearing on members of the Board, on whether they would allocate money for the project covered by such legislative action?

Mr. Dean remarked that it wouldn't with him.

Assemblyman Erwin stated that he was prepared to make a motion in favor of this item. However, in view of the discussion he would like to suggest to Mr. Difani and others interested in this project, that they go through the proper budgetary channels, and that he would like Mr. Difani to report back to his group to this effect.

c. Doane Lake, San Diego County, Project No. 58

Mr. Horn explained that the Wildlife Board approved the above project and allocated \$25,000 on August 25, 1949, to construct flow maintenance dams on various San Diego County streams. A series of surveys failed to disclose suitable dam sites. The Board cancelled the project and recovered the \$25,000 on June 6, 1951. Since that time a probable dam site on Doane Creek in Doane Valley on Palomar Mountain has been studied. The existing Doane Lake was formed in 1942 by an earth-filled dam creating an artificial lake averaging ten feet in depth with a surface area of $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres. The State has stocked this lake with trout since 1943. The 1953 allotment was 15,000 catchable rainbows. Debris has partly filled the lake so that it now averages six feet in depth with considerable shoal area, that has grown up to tules and sage pond weed, thus, cutting down the fishing value.

Doane Lake is reported to be the only trout lake in San Diego County and is the only water in the County sustaining trout fishing throughout the year. There are eleven other trout waters that are suitable for planting prior to July 1 and then only during suitable water years. In 1953 only six streams in the entire County were suitable for planting.

Doane Lake is located in the Palomar Mountain State Park and the entire area is leased to San Diego County for a twenty years period. It is estimated that 3,000 anglers fish in Doane Lake each week. During a 25 week season this lake accommodates 7,500 fishermen.

Mr. Horn stated that it is proposed that Project Number 58 be reopened and \$6,000 allocated to:

- (1) Deepen the marginal area of Doane Lake to remove existing vegetation and inhibit future growth.
- (2) Construct a new impoundment for fishing about 300 feet upstream from the present lake. This will require an earth-filled dam 15.6 feet high with a crest length of 30 feet and crest width of 10 feet with a concrete spillway. This would create an additional one acre surface area with a maximum depth of 12.6 feet.

Operation and maintenance costs would be borne by San Diego County. The cost to the Department of Fish and Game would be the annual stocking with catchable trout.

MOVED BY SENATOR HATFIELD AND SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN ERWIN THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND TO THE VOTING MEMBERS OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD THAT THE COORDINATOR'S RECOMMENDATION BE ACCEPTED AND THAT THE SUM OF \$6,000 BE ALLOCATED FOR THIS PROJECT.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. DEAN AND SECONDED BY MR. GORDON THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE ALLOCATION OF \$6,000 FOR THIS PROJECT.

Assemblyman Belotti mentioned the fact that he had received a communication concerning the Ballard Reservoir in Adin, California, and that the owners were asking for assistance in reconstructing the dam so that the water can be used to maintain fish life and also used for sportsmen.

Mr. Horn informed Assemblyman Belotti that he had an appointment with Mr. Albaugh concerning the Ballard Reservoir.

Mr. Dean read a letter from Raymond Williamson concerning the Noble property. Senator Hatfield suggested that the Board should be perfectly willing to consider a proposed negotiation if the heirs of Mr. Noble desire to take the initiative, and that we should be willing to listen to it. Mr. Silva remarked that he would like to hear what the proposition is, while Mr. Dean stated that we should wait and see if they have a proposition.

Mr. Horn advised the Board that several owners of properties in the Lower San Joaquin Valley had offered their lands as willing sales to the State, since the Board voted on June 11, 1953, to abandon the San Luis Island tract. The coordinator requested the wishes of the Board in this matter.

Mr. Silva instructed Mr. Horn to prepare and submit a report on these properties.

12. Unobligated Balances and Status of Allocations as of October 13, 1953

With the foregoing actions, the total unobligated balance in the Wildlife Restoration Fund is approximately \$1,223,500. The total current allocations to various classifications of projects is as follows.

a. Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects (17)	\$4,360,681
b. Warmwater and other Fish Projects (11)	279,335
c. Flow Maintenance and Stream Improvement Projects (18). .	474,981
d. Screen and Ladder Projects (13)	382,690
e. State Game Farm Projects (4).	105,644
f. Other Upland Game Projects (4).	440,909
g. Waterfowl Management Projects (11).	4,320,642
h. General Projects (4).	<u>68,491</u>

Total (82 Projects) \$10,433,373

In addition to specific allocations above, the following reserves have been established: (1) Mendocino National Forest Stream Improvement and Flow Maintenance Program, \$15,000; (2) Colorado River Recreational Development, \$50,000; (3) Salton Sea Fisheries Project, \$46,000.

13. Date for Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held at the call of the Chair.
The meeting adjourned at 5:25 P.M.

Helen McCarthy
Helen McCarthy
Secretary