

State of California
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
Minutes, Meeting of June 6, 1958

C O N T E N T S

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Roll Call.....	1
2. Status of Funds.....	2 - 3
3. Whittier Narrows Warmwater Fishing Lake.....	3 - 5
4. Relationship of Wildlife Conservation Board Access to Fishing Program and Small Craft Harbors Program...	5 - 7
5. Introduction of Members and Advisory Committee.....	7
6. Black Rock Rearing Ponds.....	8
7. Mojave River Hatchery.....	8
8. Montezuma Slough Bridge.....	8 - 13
9. Corrections of Minutes - April 30, 1958 Meeting.....	13 - 14
Status of Allocations and Funds Available Through June 30, 1958.....	15

State of California
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
Minutes, Meeting of June 6, 1958

Pursuant to the call of the Chairman, the Wildlife Conservation Board met in Room 4061, 722 Capitol Avenue, Sacramento, California, on June 6, 1958. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Weldon L. Oxley at 10:00 a.m.

1. Roll Call

PRESENT: Weldon L. Oxley

Seth Gordon

T. H. Mugford

Senator J. William Beard

Senator Charles Brown

Assemblyman Frank P. Belotti

Assemblyman Thomas M. Erwin

Assemblyman Lloyd W. Lowrey

Chairman

Member of the Board

" " " " , Acting

Joint Interim Committee

" " " "

" " " "

" " " "

" " " "

ABSENT:

Senator Ed. C. Johnson

Joint Interim Committee

OTHERS PRESENT:

William R. Fisher

Mrs. Jan Mower

San Francisco and Richmond Yacht Clubs

Lake Merritt Sailing Club, Metropolitan

Yacht Club & Pacific Inter-Club Yacht

Assn. of Northern California

Attorney, Pacific Inter-Club Yacht Assn.

J. Warren Manuel

Robert Wilber

W. J. Beverly

Theodore A. Haase

David Balmer

Everett Granucci

W. A. Jones

Val Bell

A. L. Lopes

Dugald Gillis

Luther E. Gibson

E. A. Chaix

Samuel R. Geddes

Bart Carrick

Don H. Morgan

Harry K. Grafe

John J. King

Norman P. Van Bebber

Edward Frank

Donald Thoms

Dan Regan

Stockton Yacht Club

San Joaquin Yacht Club

Grizzly Island

Solano County

Grizzly Island

Solano County

" "

" "

Secretary to Senator Gibson

State Senator, Solano County

Napa

Assemblyman

Fort Sutter Yacht Club, Sacramento

Sacramento Yacht Club, Sacramento

Senate Interim Committee on Fish & Game

Petaluma City Council

" " "

City Manager, Petaluma

Petaluma Chamber of Commerce

Commodore, Golden Gate Yacht Club,

San Francisco

Golden Gate Yacht Club, San Francisco

Frances Regan

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
June 6, 1958

Ford B. Ford	Legislative Analyst
Norman Johnson	Dir., Parks & Recreation, Los Angeles Co.
Lois A. Kirk	Division of Small Craft Harbors
Evelyn P. Nelson	Secretary, Senator Hollister
J. Kendall Masten	San Francisco & Sacramento Yacht Clubs
R. M. Wilson	Kellogg Ranch Foreman, Grizzly Island
T. A. Wright	Department of Fish and Game
W. T. Shannon	" " " " " "
L. H. Rubke	" " " " " "
C. M. Hart	" " " " " "
Wallace C. Dry	" " " " " "
Robert D. Montgomery	" " " " " "
Harry Anderson	" " " " " "
Dr. M. C. Carey	" " " " " "
W. K. Lythgoe	Grizzly Island
Ed Capps	Sacramento Bee
Lowell Burns	Capitol News Service
Mickey Burns	Pres., Associated Sportsmen
	Secretary, Associated Sportsmen

2. Status of Allocations and Funds Available Through June 30, 1958
(As of June 1, 1958)

The amount allocated to specific projects up to the close of the meeting on April 30, 1958, aggregated \$13,933,386.84.

a. Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects.....	\$4,283,822.44
b. Warmwater and Other Fish Projects.....	2,032,719.15
1. Warmwater Projects.....	\$1,692,597.57
2. Other Fish Projects.....	340,121.58
c. Flow Maintenance and Stream Improvement Projects.....	610,189.28
d. Screen and Ladder Projects.....	294,727.60
e. State Game Farms.....	105,644.49
f. Other Upland Game Projects.....	416,530.84
g. Waterfowl Management Projects.....	5,419,212.53
h. General Projects.....	745,540.51
Total Allocated to Specific Projects.....	\$13,908,386.84

Special Project Allocations:

Project Evaluation, Property Acquisition and Engineering Studies.....	\$25,000.00
Total Allocated.....	\$13,933,386.84

In addition to the specific allocations above, the following reserves have been established:

1. Colorado River Recreational Development.....	\$23,619.30
2. Lake Tahoe Access Development.....	30,000.00
Total Reserves Established.....	\$53,619.30

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
June 6, 1958

Operating Costs: FY 47/48 through 56/57 Actual \$402,574.36
FY 57/58 Estimated 81,195.00

Total Actual and Estimated Operating Costs.....\$483,769.36

Recapitulation:

Allocations for Projects..... \$13,908,386.84
Special Project Allocations..... 25,000.00
Reserves Established..... 53,619.30
Expenses of Operation..... 483,769.36
Total Expended or Obligated..... \$14,470,775.50

Total Funds Appropriated..... \$13,500,000.00
Appropriation available through 57/58 FY..... 750,000.00
Interest on Surplus Money Invested through
56/57 FY..... 233,533.11
Interest on Surplus Money Invested 57/58 FY..... 26,872.76
Miscellaneous Revenue through 56/57 FY..... 25,856.09
Miscellaneous Revenue, 57/58 FY..... 600.00
Total Sum Available..... \$14,536,861.96
Total Expended or Obligated..... 14,470,775.50
Available through June 30, 1958..... \$66,086.46

3. Whittier-Narrows Warmwater Fishing Lake, Project No. 114
(Consideration of Agreement between County of Los Angeles and State
of California)

Mr. Horn recommended the Board give favorable consideration of expanding the scope of the project by adding "as any other type of public fishing" to the agreement between the County of Los Angeles and State of California, and stated that the Los Angeles County Fish and Game Commission had passed a resolution on March 4, 1958, petitioning the State Fish and Game Commission to authorize the planting of trout in Legg Lake, and the Fish and Game Commission on April 29, 1958, enacted the following resolution:

"WHEREAS, The Fish and Game Commission at its meeting of January 8, 1954, by resolution recommended that the Wildlife Conservation Board refrain from making allocations of funds for projects which would involve future appreciable outlays for management and operation, unless funds are made available from other sources (than the Fish and Game Preservation Fund) for such purposes; and

"WHEREAS, The Wildlife Conservation Board, during the period from March 24, 1955 to December 11, 1956, allocated a total of \$500,674.37 for the 'Whittier Narrows Warmwater Fishing Lake', Project No. 114, to be developed in cooperation with the County of Los Angeles; and

"WHEREAS, The County of Los Angeles proceeded to develop a public park and related facilities, including the excavation of 11 1/2 acres (Legg Lake) as the first unit in the proposed public fishing project, which due to lack of food for fish was found to be unsuitable for the development of a warmwater fishery or to raise fingerling trout to catchable size; and

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
June 6, 1958

"WHEREAS, The County of Los Angeles purchased and stocked a goodly number of catchable trout in said initial body of water, it being found that said trout survived and furnished a considerable amount of recreation under the special bag and possession limit of two fish per day; and

"WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles has requested that the Department of Fish and Game stock 30,000 catchable trout in said lake; now, therefore, be it

"RESOLVED, That we recommend to the Wildlife Conservation Board that it approve an amendment to broaden the scope of the Whittier Narrows Project to include 'any other type of public fishing'; and be it further

"RESOLVED, That subject to the execution of the agreement between the State and the County of Los Angeles covering the WCB Project No. 114 we approve the stocking of not to exceed 30,000 catchable trout in Legg Lake at such time or times as the Department of Fish and Game shall determine, with the understanding that such fish shall be taken from the current production of the region, without increasing operating costs; and be it further

"RESOLVED, That the Department shall bring to the attention of this Commission for appropriate action all future requests to stock catchable trout in metropolitan area waters which have not been regularly stocked in the past, it being the intention of this Commission not to establish by this resolution a precedent authorizing the planting of catchable trout in any metropolitan area waters which have not been regularly stocked heretofore.

"Unanimously adopted by the Fish and Game Commission on May 29, 1958"

Mr. Gordon explained to the Joint Interim Committee members that the Department of Fish and Game has been trying to get an agreement which would be acceptable to the Department of Finance. There was a great deal of discussion in this matter, and it was suggested that the scope of the project be broadened by this Board. As soon as the project is expanded, the Department of Finance will approve the project without any further delay.

In answer to Senator Brown's question as to whether any expenditure of money would be involved to stock the lake with trout, Mr. Gordon commented that no additional funds are requested, but merely to authorize the scope of the project.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR BROWN, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN ERWIN THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD BROADEN THE SCOPE OF OPERATION OF WHITTIER NARROWS WARMWATER FISHING LAKE, PROJECT NO. 114, BY INSERTING THE FOLLOWING UNDERSCORED WORDING INTO

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
June 6, 1958

PARAGRAPH 15, LINES 4 THROUGH 6 OF THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN
THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES AND THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA:

"IF DURING THE FIRST 25 YEARS OF THE PROJECT, EITHER AS
CONTEMPLATED BY THIS AGREEMENT OR AS ANY OTHER TYPE OF
PUBLIC FISHING PROJECT, . . ."

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS REGULARLY MOVED AND SECONDED THAT THE WILDLIFE
CONSERVATION BOARD BROADEN THE SCOPE OF OPERATION OF
WHITTIER NARROWS WARMWATER FISHING LAKE, PROJECT NO.
114, BY INSERTING THE FOLLOWING UNDERSCORED WORDING
INTO PARAGRAPH 15, LINES 4 THROUGH 6 OF THE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES AND THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA:

"IF DURING THE FIRST 25 YEARS OF THE PROJECT, EITHER
AS CONTEMPLATED BY THIS AGREEMENT OR AS ANY OTHER TYPE
OF PUBLIC FISHING PROJECT, . . ."

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Norman Johnson was introduced and he expressed the county's appreciation
for the favorable action taken by the Board, and that the Chairman of the
Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors will sign the agreement on June 10,
1958.

4. Relationship of Wildlife Conservation Board Access to Fishing Program and
Small Craft Harbors Program.

This item on the Agenda was held over from the April 30, 1958 meeting. Mr.
Horn stated that recent requests received by the Board present a number of
questions as to the function of each agency. Some statements have been made
that the Small Craft Harbors Division should operate all of the launching
facilities, such as the Board has been working on for the past two or three
years; access to reservoir fishing, such as the San Diego, Isabella, Woodward;
and others the Board has approved and allocated funds for construction.

The Coordinator asked what precedence should be followed.

In one case, the Petaluma sportsmen have requested acquisition of a site
along Petaluma Creek for a boat launching access to this creek and connecting
sloughs and to San Pablo Bay. After starting a survey of this proposal, the
staff learned that Sonoma County had plans for a small craft marina at this
same site which will encompass the launching facilities to be provided by
the Board. This site is owned by the State Division of Highways, and includes
about 30 acres of land that is now surplus to their needs, and the Highway
Department desires to dispose of it. The Highway Department is willing to
sell five acres to the Department of Fish and Game, providing Sonoma County

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
June 6, 1958

purchase the remaining 25 acres. The Highway Department is holding up offering this land for public sale until the Board and Sonoma County have had an opportunity to work out possible purchase. The proposal, if acceptable to the Board, is to purchase about 5 or 6 acres and the county to secure the balance of the land. Board is to allocate funds for launching, parking and sanitary facilities. The county looks forward to a larger development of a small craft harbor at a future date, and the facilities provided by the Board would then be surrounded by the marina.

John J. King, Vice Mayor of Petaluma, concurred with Mr. Horn's statement and stated that there is a real need for boat launching and parking facilities at Petaluma Creek, and that the small craft harbor which they are planning has not gotten very far yet, and again stressed the need for launching facilities at the present time.

Assemblyman Belotti commented on the Trinidad Head proposal and said he feels that while some of these areas will eventually be developed as a small craft harbor project, the timing is such that it may be years before the situation would come to pass, and that the Board give consideration based on the merit of constructing a small boat launching ramp and not necessarily take into consideration that the areas be reserved for small craft harbors. This Board should resolve whether or not these projects are justified in getting approval of funds for development, construction, etc.

In answer to Senator Brown's question, Mr. Horn stated that both the Petaluma and Trinidad Head are very good areas, and it was his opinion that they fall within the scope of the Board's activities because they will be used principally for fishing, and both would provide access to good fishing.

In further discussions, Mr. Horn requested an interpretation of the last paragraph of the Small Craft Harbors Act which reads as follows: "All public property, real or personal, of any state agency or officer used principally or primarily in carrying out any of the functions, or acquired in connection with the exercise of any function, which function is transferred to the Division of Small Craft Harbors or to the Small Craft Harbors Commission is transferred to the division."

In this discussion, it was brought out that this question should be explored now before the Board gets involved in a legal tangle and Assemblyman Erwin suggested that an opinion be requested from the Attorney General regarding the interpretation of the last paragraph or other parts of the Small Craft Harbors Act.

The Coordinator then explained that at the present time, there are $2\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars of requests for projects and only $\frac{3}{4}$ million dollars to meet such requests, and since there was the question in the minds of the staff of what course the Board desired to take in these request, the final surveys were held in abeyance. It was Mr. Horn's feeling that the launching ramps could be built and if the county should later develop the area as a marina, it would be an improvement, so long as the marina development did not destroy the access facilities.

There was discussion as to whether there was an agreement between the Small Craft Harbors Commission and the county with reference to the repayment of funds that are loaned and for the operation and maintenance of the facility, and Mrs. Jan Mower confirmed Mr. Horn's comment that there must be an agreement since Division of Small Craft Harbors operates on a loan basis.

Mr. King introduced other representatives from Petaluma who expressed the opinion that there is a real need for launching facilities at Petaluma Creek, and that the small craft harbor development is merely in the process of planning by the county, and as he understood it, the only funds now available from Small Craft Harbors was for planning, but there has been a fund created by the Small Craft Harbors for the loan of funds to the county or city for construction of boat harbors. Such a loan must be approved by the people of the area by a 2/3 vote.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR BROWN THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD REQUEST AN OPINION FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL REGARDING THE SMALL CRAFT HARBORS ACT TO CLARIFY THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD AND THE DIVISION OF SMALL CRAFT HARBORS. FURTHER, THAT THE STAFF IS AUTHORIZED TO PROCEED WITH NEGOTIATIONS AND TO GET COST ESTIMATES ON PETALUMA CREEK AND TRINIDAD HEAD TO BE PRESENTED AT A FUTURE MEETING WHEN THE QUESTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES HAVE BEEN RESOLVED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS REGULARLY MOVED AND SECONDED THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD REQUEST AN OPINION FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL REGARDING THE SMALL CRAFT HARBORS ACT TO CLARIFY THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD AND THE DIVISION OF SMALL CRAFT HARBORS. IN THE MEANTIME, THE STAFF IS AUTHORIZED TO PROCEED WITH NEGOTIATIONS AND TO GET COST ESTIMATES ON PETALUMA CREEK AND TRINIDAD HEAD AND TO PRESENT THESE PROJECTS AT A FUTURE MEETING WHEN THE QUESTION OF RESPONSIBILITIES HAVE BEEN RESOLVED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Introduction of Members and Advisory Committee

Since several members of the Board and Joint Interim Committee were delayed, this item on the agenda was deferred until this time. Chairman Oxley then introduced the members of the Board and the Joint Interim Committee.

6. Black Rock Rearing Ponds

Senator Brown stated that he had discussed the needs of Black Rock Rearing Ponds with Mr. Janssen of Region V and requested that an investigation be made of this project. He further stated that trout production at this rearing pond could be increased by 2/3 by just putting in an aerator for the second pond. The estimated cost of this aerator is \$13,000, and commented that this will be a good investment for the Board.

In the discussion, Mr. Gordon commented that until the Boos, Allen and Hamilton Study is completed and in view of the resolution passed by the Fish and Game Commission in 1954, we should not expand any facilities at this time. He personally would be very much in favor of the study and stated that it should be presented at the proper time, and that a copy of this study should be presented to the Fish and Game Commission.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR BROWN, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN ERWIN THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD INSTRUCT THE STAFF TO MAKE A STUDY OF THE BLACK ROCK REARING PONDS AND TO SUBMIT AN ESTIMATE OF COST OF CONSTRUCTION AND INCREASED COST OF OPERATION AT A FUTURE MEETING.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS REGULARLY MOVED AND SECONDED THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD INSTRUCT THE STAFF TO MAKE A STUDY OF THE BLACK ROCK REARING PONDS AND TO SUBMIT AN ESTIMATE OF COST OF CONSTRUCTION AND INCREASED COST OF OPERATION AT A FUTURE MEETING.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Mojave River Hatchery, Project No. 39

Mr. Horn stated that in his recent trip to southern part of the State, he visited the Mojave Hatchery and found, as reported by Region V, the condition of the office and the storeroom at this hatchery are not good. There has been discussion in the regional office a year or two ago for a need for better facilities there. The only sanitary facility for the public at this hatchery is located in this building and it just isn't a good modern facility.

The staff was instructed to look into this matter and present a report at the same time that the Black Rearing Ponds are again brought before the Board.

8. Montezuma Slough Bridge--Delta Waterfowl Management Area, Project No. 550

This item on the Agenda was held over from the April 30, 1958 meeting pending an interpretation of the intent of the Legislature in passing Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6; whether the U. S. Corps of Engineers would allow

a time extension for construction of the bridge; and whether the yachting interests could get additional money for a high-level bridge.

In the meantime, the U. S. Corps of Engineers granted the Department of Fish and Game an extension of one year in which to start construction (September 28, 1959 instead of 1958).

The Resolution enacted by the Legislature also provided that funds for building a higher bridge should be available by June 1, 1958 and such funds had not been secured.

Senator Luther Gibson was introduced, and he expressed the appreciation of the County for being able to discuss the Montezuma Slough bridge. In the discussion, Senator Gibson stated he had secured an opinion from the Legislative Counsel regarding Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6 and that he sees no reason why this medium level bridge should not be built because the Legislative Counsel's opinion set forth that if funds from other than the Wildlife Restoration Funds were not available by June 1st for a higher level bridge, the medium level bridge could be built, and to date no funds have been made available. He also stated that the county is willing and able to take care of their half of the cost of construction of a medium level bridge. Mr. Jones, County Engineer, is ready to proceed and plans are ready. It was brought out that the County has its share of the cost of the bridge in its budget for the 1959-1960 fiscal year.

Assemblyman Lowrey stated that the resolution which was sent to the Legislative Counsel for interpretation contained his amendment, and it was his intention that no more State money could be allocated for this bridge without the approval of the Legislature. Assemblyman Erwin concurred with Assemblyman Lowrey on this point.

Assemblyman Geddes was then introduced and in the discussion, stated that if a higher level bridge was to be built, funds were to be available by June 1st and no additional money is available to date. It was his feeling that the bill was debated until the last day of the session, and it was an act of kindness or courtesy to allow until June 1st to raise additional money. He explained that this bridge should be built because there is an antiquated ferry system now and with the new bridge the people could get across to Grizzly Island without waiting in line.

Assemblyman Lowrey commented that the same problem on this bridge came up a few years ago and it was definitely decided at that time that a ferry would be adequate. Discussion brought out that the Department had explored other possible ways of crossing Montezuma Slough, but these plans were impractical and too costly and that was one of the reasons for the delay in filing an application for a medium level bridge with the Corps of Engineers.

In answer to Mr. Gordon's question, Mr. Jones, the county engineer, stated that the bridge contemplated in 1950 is the same design of bridge now planned. This bridge would be sufficiently high to pass a high percentage of the boats using the slough.

Question was raised as to why no action was taken since 1950 and in the discussion it was stated that the Army Corps of Engineers did not hold a hearing on this matter until 1956. After this hearing a permit was issued for a medium level bridge. Assemblyman Erwin asked whether if we proceeded to allocate the additional money to build this bridge, someone would ask the Fish and Game for reimbursement for the loss of the ferry, their business, etc. It was stated that the county owns the ferry and the entire maintenance of the bridge is to be borne by the county.

Difference in the cost from the original amount in 1950 is due to changes in economic situation and increased cost of labor, material, etc. Mrs. Jan Mower was introduced and in her discussion she said that several protests were made regarding the building of this bridge. At the April 10, 1956 hearing of the Corps of Engineers, they voiced and registered 21 protests, including dredging companies, boating associations and landowners. Regardless of this and the fact that boating is considered public recreation and since the yachting interests did not have specific data to present, the permit was approved by the Corps of Engineers. Mrs. Mower stated the yachtsmen have been consistently trying to stop the building of this proposed low level bridge. She stated that they have been making surveys and since that time, have asked the State Legislature to help stop the building of the bridge last year by introducing a bill in the Legislature that any bridge that was to be built be a high level one. In spite of the fact that in excess of 1500 letters were sent to the Legislature for support of the bill, it was not passed. The last week of the session last year, we got a resolution for a complete survey to be made by the Department of Fish and Game, and the department to indicate all of the possible recreational value, use, etc., on the slough. She indicated that the Department did make a survey and reported too much boat count, and the boating interests protested that it was not a fair boat count because the study was made during the delta vacation period when row boats and cruisers were being used, and the Legislature could not make a sound judgment. She also stated that a full year boat count be made on the use of Montezuma Slough before any bridge is approved. The resolution which was written by Senator Hollister was read by Mrs. Mower.

Mr. Gordon commented that in the Findings of Fact in the Corps of Engineers, it is stated that discussions with navigation interests (principally yachting people) were held for the purpose of developing, for the hearing and findings of fact, data which would show the actual number of trips made by each fleet unit through Montezuma Slough during each of the last five years. The yachting interests were also asked to submit information as to heights of cruisers and sailboats using the waterway. None of this information was received in spite of several efforts made by the Corps. In this discussion, Mrs. Mower stated that they did not receive adequate notice of the meeting and did not have time to prepare such a report.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
June 6, 1958

Mr. J. Warren Manuel was introduced and stated he was not appearing as a yachtman personally, but as an attorney from Oakland representing the Pacific Inter-Club Yachting Association in legal matters connected with this low level bridge. He stated that he had gone over the report of the Fish and Game Commission, the report of the Corps of Engineers and had talked to the people who have been in this business and with a number of yachting acquaintances. From these sources, it appeared to him that several things in these reports were not true. First of all, whenever these hearings were held, inadequate notices were given to the boating people and they did not have any time for proper representation. He contended the representatives of yachting did not have an opportunity to make an adequate presentation to the Army engineers, and stated that the figures in the report were unfair. In further discussion, Mr. Manuel stated that they were not interested particularly in fighting with the hunters and fishermen, but are in favor of all kinds of recreational areas, and urged in getting together to see if financing could be obtained to build a high level bridge so that full use of the area could be accomplished.

The following yachting people were introduced and expressed their feelings in opposition of the medium level bridge: William R. Fisher, Richmond and San Francisco Yacht Club; Bart Carrick, past president of Fort Sutter Yacht Club; Dan Reagan, Golden Gate Yacht Club; and J. Kendal Masten, San Francisco and Sacramento Yacht Clubs.

There was discussion as to the statistics available for the yachting boats using this slough and it was brought out that this report is in the process of being prepared. Chairman Oxley then asked whether Mrs. Mower was notified of this meeting and Mrs. Mower stated that she was not. At this point, Mr. Horn commented that he had met with Mrs. Mower and discussed this problem with her in March and again in April and advised her that this matter would come up at a future Board meeting and urged her to prepare specific data showing the use of the slough by masted boats. It was his feeling that sufficient time was allowed for such a study.

Assemblyman Lowrey presented the Chairman with a telegram which he had received in opposition of building the medium level bridge, and asked that it be incorporated as part of the minutes. He also stated that another identical telegram was received, but he did not have time to have it transcribed in time for the meeting.

"Request for balance approx \$42,500. Solano County needs from Wildlife Conservation Board to build low level bridge across Montezuma Slough in Delta will again be presented on June 6 Wildlife meeting in Sacramento. Boating people and interests of Northern California request you consider importance of keeping this used navigable and vital waterway of Calif. open for use of people of the State as outlined in constitution of Calif. Article XV Sec. 2. Boating people have never protested

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
June 6, 1958

a bridge but if such be a necessary expenditure of State money then boating people want either an opening span type or a high level type bridge to allow all boating traffic to pass under and use this waterway as in the past. Army engineers have served notice of intent to extend Fish and Game's request for a one year time extension on bridge plans so that this bridge may be given proper consideration by the legislature and you who are elected to protect the interests of the people of the State may have time to review the facts. There appears no necessity to make decision now for extra funds in view of Army engineers cooperation to direction legislature made to F & G in 1958 Senate Concurrent Res. No. 6. Boating people most willing to cooperate and work with groups concerned to gain funds for higher bridge. Montezuma Slough deemed by all boat towners as a safety route and a vital water route. Thank you for your consideration.

Mrs. Jan Mower Legislative Representative
38 Yacht and Sailing Organizations of
Northern Calif."

Dr. M. C. Carey and Mr. Edmund A. Chaix were introduced and they both spoke in favor of having the medium level bridge built across Montezuma Slough.

In further discussion, Mr. Robert Montgomery of the Department of Fish and Game was introduced and stated there is a traffic problem each year with 15 to 16 thousand hunters waiting in line anywhere from 4 to 6 hours to go on and off the island by ferry to use the recreational facility the Wildlife Conservation Board has provided. Grizzly Island Waterfowl Management Area is one of the finest hunting areas in the State and furnishes excellent crop depredation control of the lower Sacramento delta area. It is one of the functions of the Department and the Wildlife Conservation Board to prevent crop depredation.

He also stated that the department has studied this bridge construction since 1952 endeavoring to find ways to get a bridge to the island at a minimum cost and that it was delayed by the Corps of Engineers for a number of years and a meeting was finally held in April 1956. Notices of this meeting were sent out in January of that year and the Department presented their case and the yachtsmen their case in April. The yachting interests were well represented and 21 letters were registered in opposition of this bridge. After full consideration of the evidence, the Corps of Engineers issued a permit for the medium level bridge.

It was mentioned that in the Fall of 1957, the Department and the yachting people had a meeting at their request and there was an opportunity for discussion and at that time, the department requested the yachting people to

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
June 6, 1958

present any data or concrete plans for an alternate means of crossing the slough. To date no such information has been received.

Mr. Montgomery recommended that the bridge as proposed be built for the benefit of the greatest number of people in the State since 95 to 98% of the boats travelling on the slough could pass under the medium level bridge. Masted boats that could not clear the bridge could anchor in the Bay in order to escape rough waters until storms subsided.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR BROWN, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD ALLOCATE \$57,500 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO MATCH THE COUNTY'S SHARE OF BUILDING THE MEDIUM LEVEL BRIDGE ACROSS MONTEZUMA SLOUGH, DELTA WATERFOWL MANAGEMENT AREA, PROJECT NO. 550.
MOTION DID NOT CARRY.

At this point, Mr. Mugford commented that the net result of the action taken by the Advisory Committee would be to defer action and that no bridge could be constructed and the matter would again be presented to the Legislature for final determination. It was his understanding that the basic purpose of having a legislative advisory committee sit with this Board is to interpret to the Board the legislative intent. Otherwise, it is hard to understand why an administrative board sits with a joint interim committee. Since the vote of the Advisory Committee is negative, this administrative board cannot take action contrary to that vote.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MUGFORD, SECONDED BY MR. GORDON THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD DEFER ACTION ON THE MONTEZUMA SLOUGH BRIDGE, DELTA WATERFOWL MANAGEMENT AREA, PROJECT NO. 550, UNTIL THERE IS A FULL MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTERIM COMMITTEE, AS WELL AS THE MEMBERS OF ALL THREE PRINCIPALS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD PRESENT AT THE MEETING.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

It was commented by Mr. Gordon that this matter is not dropped and that Mr. Mugford has stated the situation properly and we will wait until some of these problems are resolved.

9. Corrections of Minutes - April 30, 1958 Meeting

The Coordinator requested that the following allocations in the motions made and passed by the voting members be changed because of typographical errors:

1. Item No. 5 - Coastal Angling Access Program, Project No. 1011
 - a. Nick's Cove, page 5.

The allocation of \$33,000 should be changed to \$33,100.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
June 6, 1958

2. Item No. 5, Pages 6 and 7

Coastal Angling Access Program, Project No. 1011

b. Fields Landing Angling Access

The allocation of \$27,500 should be changed to \$27,250.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. GORDON, SECONDED BY MR. MUGFORD THAT THE MINUTES OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD MEETING OF APRIL 30, 1958, BE CORRECTED BY CHANGING \$33,000 TO \$33,100 IN THE ALLOCATION TO NICK'S COVE, AND \$27,500 BE CHANGED TO \$27,250 IN THE ALLOCATION TO FIELDS LANDING ANGLING ACCESS, BOTH PROJECTS UNDER COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1011, AND THAT THE MINUTES OF THAT MEETING BE APPROVED AS AMENDED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 12:00 noon.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. MUGFORD, SECONDED BY MR. GORDON THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD DEFER ACTION ON THE MONTICLOSA BRIDGE, DELTA WATERFOWL MANAGEMENT AREA, PROJECT NO. 100, UNTIL THERE IS A FULL MEMBERSHIP OF THE INTERIM COMMITTEE, AS WELL AS THE MEMBERS OF ALL THREE PRINCIPALS OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD PRESENT AT THE MEETING.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

It was commented by Mr. Gordon that this matter is not dropped and that Mr. Mugford has stated the situation properly and we will wait until some of these problems are resolved.

Corrections of Minutes - April 30, 1958 Meeting

The Coordinator requested that the following allocations in the minutes made and passed by the voting members be changed because of typographical errors:

1. Item No. 2 - Coastal Angling Access Program, Project No. 1011
a. Nick's Cove, page 5.

The allocation of \$33,000 should be changed to \$33,100.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
June 6, 1958

Status of allocations and funds available through June 30, 1958.
(As of June 6, 1958 Board action)

The amount allocated to specific projects up to the close of the meeting on June 6, 1958, aggregated \$13,933,386.84.

a. Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects.....	\$4,283,822.44
b. Warmwater and Other Fish Projects.....	2,032,719.15
1. Warmwater Projects.....	\$1,692,597.57
2. Other Fish Projects.....	340,121.58
c. Flow Maintenance and Stream Improvement Projects.....	610,189.28
d. Screen and Ladder Projects.....	294,727.60
e. State Game Farms.....	105,644.49
f. Other Upland Game Projects.....	416,530.84
g. Waterfowl Management Projects.....	5,419,212.53
h. General Projects.....	745,540.51
Total Allocated to Specific Projects.....	<u>\$13,908,386.84</u>

Special Project Allocations:

Project Evaluation, Property Acquisition and Engineering Studies.....	\$25,000.00
Total Allocated.....	<u>\$13,933,386.84</u>

In addition to the specific allocations above, the following reserves have been established:

1. Colorado River Recreational Development.....	\$23,619.30
2. Lake Tahoe Access Development.....	30,000.00
Total Reserves Established.....	<u>\$53,619.30</u>

Operating Costs:

FY 47/48 through 56/57 - Actual.....	\$402,574.36
FY 57/58 - Estimated.....	81,195.00
Total Actual and Estimated Operating Costs.....	<u>\$483,769.36</u>

Recapitulation:

Allocations for Projects.....	\$13,908,386.84
Special Project Allocations.....	25,000.00
Reserves Established.....	53,619.30
Expenses of Operation.....	483,769.36
Total Expended or Obligated.....	<u>\$14,470,775.50</u>
 Total Funds Appropriated.....	 \$13,500,000.00
Appropriation available through 57/58 FY.....	750,000.00
Interest on Surplus Money Invested through 56/57 FY.....	233,533.11
Interest on Surplus Money Invested 57/58 FY....	26,872.76
Miscellaneous Revenue through 56/57 FY.....	25,856.09
Miscellaneous Revenue, 57/58 FY.....	600.00
Total Sum Available.....	<u>\$14,536,861.96</u>
Total Expended or Obligated.....	14,470,775.50
Available through June 30, 1958.....	\$66,086.46