

State of California  
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD  
Minutes, Meeting of September 19, 1960

\*\*\*\*\*

C O N T E N T S

<u>Item No.</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
1.	Roll Call . . . . .	1 - 2
2.	Introduction of Members and Advisory Committee . . . . .	2
3.	Approval of Minutes . . . . .	2
4.	Status of Funds . . . . .	2 - 3
5.	Recovery of Funds . . . . .	3 - 5
6.	Adoption of Fishing Piers Policy . . . . .	5 - 6
7.	Santa Cruz Public Fishing Pier . . . . .	7 - 8
8.	Inland Angling Access Program - Petaluma River . . . . .	9 - 10
9.	Coastal Angling Access Program - Shelter Cove . . . . .	10 - 12
10.	Fish Lake Public Fishing Area . . . . .	12 - 13
11.	Tulloch Reservoir Public Fishing Area . . . . .	13 - 14
12.	Stream Clearance Program . . . . .	14
13.	Santa Cruz Coastal Stream Clearance . . . . .	14 - 16
14.	Big River Stream Clearance . . . . .	16 - 18
15.	Project Evaluation, Property Acquisition and Engineering Study . . . . .	18 - 19
16.	Coastal Angling Access Program - Punta Gorda . . . . .	19 - 20
17.	Hunting Access Program - Kings Peak Access . . . . .	20
18.	Success and Terminus Reservoirs . . . . .	21
19.	Trinidad Head Access Project . . . . .	21
	Status of Funds . . . . .	22

State of California  
 WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD  
 Minutes, Meeting of September 19, 1960

Pursuant to the call of the Chairman, the Wildlife Conservation Board met in the City Hall Council Chambers in Eureka, California, on September 19, 1960. The meeting was called to order by Chairman William P. Elser at 2:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call

<b>PRESENT:</b> Wm. P. Elser	Chairman
W. T. Shannon	Member of the Board
Senator J. William Beard	Joint Interim Committee
Senator Charles Brown	" " "
Senator Ed C. Johnson	" " "
Assemblyman Frank P. Belotti	" " "
Raymond J. Nesbit	Coordinator
Chester M. Hart	Assistant Coordinator
Philip A. Douglas	Field Agent
Alma Koyasako	Secretary

<b>ABSENT:</b> John E. Carr	Member of the Board
Assemblywoman Pauline Davis	Joint Interim Committee
Assemblyman Lloyd W. Lowrey	" " "

OTHERS PRESENT:

L. T. Petersen	Division of Forestry
Darel Lingenfelter	Garberville Chamber of Commerce
Ed. H. Wagner	" " " "
William D. Brown	" " " "
Warren B. Wright	" " " "
T. Monroe Tobin	" " " "
Mario J. Machi	" " " "
Melvin Bareilles	Supervisor, Humboldt County
Elwyn L. Lindley	" " " "
Edward Peterson	" " " "
G. H. Winter	Dept. of Corrections
R. W. Madison	Humboldt County Forester
A. B. DeJarnett	Div. of Small Craft Harbors
C. F. Faist	Department of Fish and Game
A. L. Reese	" " " "
Walter S. Clark	" " " "
Earl Gibbs	" " " "
James D. Stokes	" " " "
Leo Pyshora	" " " "
George Farnham	" " " "
Alex Calhoun	" " " "
Walt Gray	" " " "

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
September 19, 1960

Carl Christensen	Senator, 3rd District
Henry Clineschmidt	Fish and Game Commission
Harold O. Hough	Fortuna
Charles E. Etten	Honeydew
Paul A. Smith	"
Harry R. Conaway	Tulare County
Ross W. Gaskill	" "
Vance V. Venables	" "
Charles Shaller	Humboldt County
James McCutcheon	" "
C. R. Heath	" "
Dr. Everett H. Watkins	No. Coast Conservation Council
Wm. Gness	Supervisor, Marin County
S. Peter Tedesco	City Manager, Santa Cruz

2. Introduction of Members and Advisory Committee

Chairman Elser introduced the Wildlife Conservation Board and Legislative Advisory Committee members and advised that Mr. Carr, Assemblywoman Davis and Assemblyman Lowrey were unable to be present because of other commitments.

3. Approval of Minutes, June 17, 1960, meeting

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR JOHNSON, SECONDED BY SENATOR BEARD, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE MINUTES OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD MEETING OF JUNE 17, 1960, BE APPROVED AS WRITTEN.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. Status of Funds

Mr. Nesbit reported that the Wildlife Conservation Board has allocated funds as follows:

a.	Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects . . . . .	\$4,279,253.11
b.	Warmwater and Other Fish Projects . . . . .	2,735,176.56
	1. Warmwater Projects . . . . .	\$2,239,151.81
	2. Other Fish Projects . . . . .	496,024.75
c.	Flow Maintenance and Stream Improvement Projects . . . . .	582,890.87
d.	Screen and Ladder Projects . . . . .	283,579.31
e.	State Game Farms . . . . .	105,644.49
f.	Other Upland Game Projects . . . . .	416,530.84
g.	Waterfowl Management Projects . . . . .	5,559,971.84
h.	General Projects . . . . .	1,214,425.28
	1. Coastal Angling Access Projects . . . . .	380,871.48
	2. Inland Angling Access Projects . . . . .	639,130.19
	3. Hunting Access Projects . . . . .	28,000.00
	4. Other General Projects . . . . .	166,423.61
	Total Allocated to Specific Projects . . . . .	\$15,177,472.30

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
September 19, 1960

\$15,177,472.30

Special Project Allocations:

Project Evaluation, Property Acquisition and Engineering Studies . . . . .	\$25,000.00
Total Allocated . . . . .	\$15,202,472.30

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

1. Colorado River Recreational Development . . . . .	\$23,219.30
2. Lake Tahoe Access Development . . . . .	30,000.00
3. Upper American River Development . . . . .	100,000.00
Total Reserves Established . . . . .	\$153,219.30

Operating Costs:

FY 47/48 thru 59/60 - Actual . . . . .	\$606,240.12
FY 60/61 - Estimated . . . . .	81,613.00
Total Actual and Estimated Operating Costs . . . . .	\$687,853.12

Recapitulation:

Allocations for Projects . . . . .	\$15,177,472.30
Special Project Allocations . . . . .	25,000.00
Reserves Established . . . . .	153,219.30
Expenses of Operation . . . . .	687,853.12
Total Expended or Obligated . . . . .	\$16,043,544.72
Total Funds Appropriated . . . . .	15,750,000.00
Appropriation Available thru 60/61 FY . . . . .	750,000.00
Int. on Surplus Money Inv. thru 59/60 FY . . . . .	434,045.68
Miscellaneous Revenue thru 59/60 FY . . . . .	32,530.07
Total Sum Available . . . . .	\$16,966,575.75
Total Expended or Obligated . . . . .	16,043,544.72
Available thru June 30, 1961 . . . . .	923,031.03

5. Recovery of Funds

- a. Inland Angling Access Program, Project No. 1013\*  
Colorado River, 6th Ave. Terminus - Riverside County

Mr. R. J. Nesbit, the Coordinator, advised that at the August 8, 1957, and the February 20, 1959, meetings, the Board considered and approved the above project. It subsequently developed that the County desired to enlarge the approved project and construct it with County funds. By resolution dated August 22, 1960, the County requested cancellation.

Total allocated	\$5,001.00
Expended for title report	26.75
Total for Recovery	\$4,974.25

The Coordinator recommended the Wildlife Conservation Board recover the balance and cancel the Colorado River, 6th Ave. Terminus access site.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
September 19, 1960

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR BEARD, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD AUTHORIZE THE RECOVERY OF \$4,974.25 AND CANCEL THE COLORADO RIVER 6TH AVENUE TERMINUS ACCESS SITE, INLAND ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1013.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. ELSER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD RECOVER THE BALANCE OF \$4,974.25 AND CANCEL THE COLORADO RIVER 6TH AVENUE TERMINUS ACCESS SITE, INLAND ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1013.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\*Project No. 1013, Inland Angling Access Program, to remain open; the above site to be canceled.

b. Inland Angling Access Program, Project No. 1013\*  
Tisdale Weir - Sutter County

Mr. Nesbit reported that the Tisdale Weir project was approved April 30, 1958, and \$2,550 was allocated for the purchase of 3.7 acres. The title report showed many exceptions. To clear these exceptions would have been very costly to the State and to the owner and would have probably required court action. Because of the encumbered title, the option taken could not be completed and became void at its termination date. The owner has notified the staff that he does not wish to renew the option.

Total allocated	\$2,550.00
Expended	<u>797.12</u>
Total for Recovery	\$1,752.88

The Coordinator informed the Board that the need for an access in this particular area continues and that the staff has been looking for another possible site in the area. He recommended the Wildlife Conservation Board recover the balance of \$1,752.88 and cancel the Tisdale Weir access site.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR BROWN, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD AUTHORIZE THE RECOVERY OF \$1,752.88 AND CANCEL THE TISDALE WEIR ACCESS SITE, INLAND ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1013.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. ELSER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD RECOVER THE BALANCE OF \$1,752.88 AND CANCEL THE TISDALE WEIR ACCESS SITE, INLAND ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1013.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\*Project No. 1013, Inland Angling Access Program, to remain open; the above site to be canceled.

6. Adoption of Fishing Piers Policy

The Coordinator reported that the Wildlife Conservation Board has accepted one fishing pier project. This was the reopening of 2,000 feet of the Berkeley Pier by replacement of decking and some underpinning. The project is an outstanding success and now provides annually approximately 150,000 man-days of fishing. The staff believed that other pier projects can be equally successful.

The Board instructed the staff to recommend a policy to guide future pier projects. This proposed pier policy was supplied to all Board members for consideration.

The Coordinator recommended the adoption of a policy on fishing piers and the continuance of this program. He felt that adoption of such a policy would provide us with the opportunity of developing good projects for the ocean fishermen, particularly in southern California.

Mr. Shannon suggested that certain wording be deleted in number 6 so that the Board's pier policy would not be misinterpreted.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR JOHNSON, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD ADOPT THE FOLLOWING POLICY ON FISHING PIERS.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

FISHING PIERS POLICY

As part of its program to provide fishermen access to the resources of the sea, the Board believes that the construction and repair of fishing piers can provide opportunity for large numbers of people who would otherwise be unable to participate in their favorite recreation.

Fishing Piers Policy - continued

Realizing that although piers can provide much fishing opportunity, they are expensive and the demand for them could soon result in exhausting all available funds, the Board adopts the following criteria to govern their construction and repair.

1. Projects for construction of new fishing piers or the repair of existing piers to provide fishing facilities will be chosen on the basis of providing the most fishing opportunity for the most people. Accordingly they will be located in areas of greatest need and potential use adjacent to concentrations of population and where fishing results will be satisfactory.
2. Proprietary interest should be held by the State.
3. The pier should provide access to good and sustained fishing and should be recommended by the Department of Fish and Game.
4. The pier, or portion thereof for which State funds are expended, should be used exclusively for fishing or activities related thereto.
5. Adequate car parking should be available within a reasonable distance.
6. No charge for pier access should be made.
7. Maintenance and operation will be undertaken by the cooperating agency and without cost to the State.
8. The design of the pier should be substantial and require minimum maintenance, but the cost of construction should relate favorably to the lineal feet of railing which would provide good fishing.
9. In the case of repair of an existing pier, the cost of construction should relate favorably to the lineal feet of railing which would provide good fishing. The cost per lineal foot of pier available for fishing should not exceed \$50.00.
10. In the case of construction of a new pier, the construction to be accomplished with a matching fund of at least 50% to be contributed by the cooperating agency, but the State's 50% should not exceed \$50.00 per lineal foot of railing available for fishing.
11. Construction costs to include pier construction and related fishing facilities such as approaches, parking, sanitary facilities, etc.

Chairman Elser introduced Senator Carl Christensen who was very warmly received by those in attendance at the meeting.

7. Santa Cruz Public Fishing Pier - Santa Cruz County, Proj. No. 139 \$49,550.00

Mr. Nesbit stated that at the June 17, 1960, meeting, the Board staff was instructed to study the feasibility of a plan to rebuild a portion of the municipal pier at Santa Cruz to be used by sportsfishermen. This study has been made, and a report was supplied to each member.

The Santa Cruz pier was built in 1913-14 to provide shipping facilities for the then thriving lumber and fishing industries. Other businesses later were located along this 80 foot wide pier. The farthest end of the pier was occupied largely by a warehouse. This building has recently been removed as this portion of the pier is structurally unsafe.

The proposal is to rebuild the end 230 feet of pier and retain this portion for exclusive use by fishermen. It would contain "fishing wells" or openings through the decking for fishing. This portion with access thereto would be leased to the State for a 25 year period. Maintenance would be by the City. In the report the City officials state: "Surely a more lucrative facility, financially speaking of course, might be the leasing of the end portion to such a commercial venture as a restaurant; however, there are many who feel strongly about the opportunity to provide for the residents and visitors to the community an easy access to ocean fishing. Santa Cruz, while actually a community of some 27,000, may swell to 75,000 during many of the weekends and through the summer months. Many of these recreation seeking visitors are from as far away points as the central valleys of our state."

Cost estimates are as follows:

Demolition	\$6,750.00
Piling replacement, including caps	8,500.00
Stringers	7,000.00
Decking and paving	13,500.00
Restrooms, Fish Cleaning Table, inc. plumbing and wiring	6,800.00
Hand Rails	2,500.00
Subtotal	<u>\$45,050.00</u>
Contingencies, inc. title report, signs, etc.	<u>4,500.00</u>
TOTAL	<u>\$49,550.00</u>

The City has agreed to do the construction under Section 1350 of the Fish and Game Code. In addition, they will provide engineering services estimated at \$11,000 as well as additional construction of such items as benches for the fishermen at an estimated cost of \$3,500. This, of course, is in addition to the annual maintenance cost provided by the City.

The Department of Fish and Game endorses this project and points out that a sustained fishery is available with jacksmelt, perch, cod, cabezon, croakers, flatfish, as well as skates, rays, and sharks being the common species caught.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
September 19, 1960

The Board has received numerous endorsements from individuals and organizations in the vicinity and from as far away as Fresno in support of this project.

$$\begin{aligned} & \rightarrow 230' + 230 + 80 = 540 \text{ lf.} \\ & \$50,000 \div 540 = \$92.59 = 1 \text{ lf.} \end{aligned}$$

The cost per lineal foot available for fishing approximates that of the very successful project at the Berkeley Pier, i.e., \$40.00 per lineal foot. Mr. Nesbit believed that per dollar of capital outlay, this promises to be one of the Board's most intensively used project. It is also in line with the policy just adopted, he added.

Mr. Peter Tedesco, City Manager of Santa Cruz, informed the Board that the City simply does not have the funds to develop this kind of project and requested the Board seriously consider the approval of the project, otherwise, the pier, no doubt, would be committed to a commercial venture.

Mr. Belotti observed that there was much enthusiasm for pier fishing and wondered if it stemmed from the fact that no fishing license was required. Mr. Nesbit informed the Board that a survey of Berkeley Pier users indicated 70% had fishing licenses or did not require licenses.

Mr. Nesbit clarified the point that since proprietary interest by the State would be held in the outer portion of the pier as well as access thereto, maintenance of the completed project by the City of Santa Cruz would include the access also. Therefore, there would be no fear that the project would be made useless because of failure to keep up the landward portion of the pier.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR BEARD, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE SANTA CRUZ PUBLIC FISHING PIER, PROJECT NO. 139; ALLOCATE \$49,550.00 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND FOR REHABILITATION OF THIS PIER SUBSTANTIALLY AS PRESENTED; AND AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY LEASE, OPERATING AND CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENTS.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. ELSER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE SANTA CRUZ PUBLIC FISHING PIER, PROJECT NO. 139; ALLOCATE \$49,550.00 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND FOR REHABILITATION OF THIS PIER SUBSTANTIALLY AS PRESENTED; AND AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY LEASE, OPERATING AND CONSTRUCTION AGREEMENTS.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Tedesco thanked the Board for its cooperation and extended an invitation in behalf of the City of Santa Cruz to visit Santa Cruz and make a first-hand inspection of the completed project.

8. Inland Angling Access Program, Project No. 1013

Petaluma River - Marin County

\$15,200.00

Mr. C. M. Hart, Assistant Coordinator, presented this inland angling access project for Board consideration. He stated this project would provide access to fishing and waterfowl hunting in Petaluma River and upper San Pablo Bay. It was proposed by the Marin Rod and Gun Club and endorsed by other local groups and the County of Marin.

He reported that the lower part of Petaluma River and the northern end of San Pablo Bay provide a sizeable area of good striped bass fishing and some waterfowl hunting. However, public access to this water area is very limited. For several years the Board staff and local sportsmen worked without success to locate a suitable access site in this locality. It was finally decided that the Highway 37 right-of-way under and adjacent to a new bridge being constructed over Petaluma River would provide the most feasible site for an access project. This location is on the west bank of Petaluma River near the town of Black Point, about one mile upstream from San Pablo Bay and approximately 12 miles north of San Rafael.

Following construction of the bridge, the Division of Highways approved the establishment of a fishing access project on the highway right-of-way. The planned development consists of a boat launching ramp, parking area, and sanitary facilities. Access to the site is available by a frontage road which passes underneath the bridge. In addition to providing boat access, the site provides some bank fishing.

Plans and cost estimates have been made by the engineering staff of the Department of Fish and Game, and have been reviewed and approved by the staff and the County of Marin.

Cost estimates are as follows:

Boat launching ramp, one lane concrete	\$4,800.00
Bank stabilization	1,000.00
Parking area, approx. 20,000 sq. ft.	6,200.00
Guard rails	800.00
Sanitary facilities	600.00
Signs, title reports and incidentals and Contingencies	1,800.00
TOTAL	<u>\$15,200.00</u>

Marin County has agreed to operate and maintain the project. The Department of Fish and Game recommends this project.

Mr. Hart recommended that this project be approved and that \$15,200 be allocated for construction.

Mr. William A. Gness, Supervisor, Marin County, stated that presently people from Novato, which is three miles from the anticipated boat ramp, must go to Petaluma, 12 miles distant, in order to launch boats on the Petaluma River. He added that the Marin Rod and Gun Club, Novato Chamber of Commerce, Black Point Improvement Club, and others who live in that vicinity have strongly endorsed the project.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR BEARD, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE PETALUMA RIVER ACCESS, INLAND ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1013; ALLOCATE \$15,200.00 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND FOR THIS PROJECT; AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY AGREEMENTS FOR INTEREST IN LAND AND FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND TO PROCEED WITH CONSTRUCTION SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. ELSER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE PETALUMA RIVER ACCESS, INLAND ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1013; ALLOCATE \$15,200.00 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND FOR THIS PROJECT; AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO EXECUTE THE NECESSARY AGREEMENTS FOR INTEREST IN LAND AND FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE AND TO PROCEED WITH CONSTRUCTION SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. William Gness expressed his thanks for the action just taken by the Board and requested the Board's presence at the dedication of this project when completed.

9. Coastal Angling Access Program, Project No. 1011 \$59,000.00  
Shelter Cove - Humboldt County

Mr. Nesbit reported that at the June 17, 1960, meeting, the staff was asked to make a study of the feasibility of a coastal angling access at Shelter Cove. Inspection trips and engineering studies were made.

Shelter Cove is located approximately 16 miles west of Garberville in Humboldt County, just north of the Mendocino County line. The road to the cove provides the only road access in a stretch of coast line nearly 50 miles long. Salmon fishing is very good and the rock fish go practically unharvested in this area. The reason for this is that it is most difficult and dangerous to launch boats through the surf.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
September 19, 1960

It has been proposed by Humboldt County and various organizations that provisions be made to permit boat access. An engineering study showed that such could be possible by the construction of a rock jetty approximately 600 feet in length. This would provide calm water for launching. In addition, a short access road and parking area is needed.

The owner of the property has agreed to deed, free of charge, the necessary property for this development.

Mr. Charles Shaller, Public Works Director of Humboldt County, advised that Shelter Cove is one of the few natural harbors in this stretch of the coast. There is excellent fishing in the area, and although it is extremely difficult to launch boats here, it is a very popular spot. Preliminary studies indicated that a protective jetty and an access road down to the beach would be required. The cost estimates presented were as follows:

Site Preparation		\$2,500.00
Access Road and Parking at Project Area		10,000.00
Selected Rock Borrow 6,500 cy @ \$3.00		19,500.00
Heavy Stone Rip-Rap 3,000 Tons @ \$9.00		<u>27,000.00</u>
TOTAL		\$59,000.00

Supervisor Melvin Bareilles, Humboldt County, and Mr. Monroe Tobin of the Garberville Chamber of Commerce both pointed out the need for developing this natural harbor and commended Mr. Mario Machi for his generosity in furnishing the required property.

Mr. Nesbit informed the Board that Humboldt County has cooperated by providing engineering services and plans to construct the access road into the area with County funds. The maintenance of the developments will then be the responsibility of the County.

Mr. Elser and Mr. Shannon questioned the adequacy of the proposed developments. They were advised that ramps were not included in the proposal since boats could be launched from the beach. Mr. Shaller stated that the purpose of the project was to provide calm water for the launching of small boats and, therefore, felt that the 600 feet rock jetty would be sufficient. He added that should the launching or berthing of larger ships was to be considered, the estimate presented might not be sufficient.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR BEARD, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD ALLOCATE \$59,000.00 FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FOR THE SHELTER COVE, COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1011, AND AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO ACQUIRE SUCH INTERESTS AS MAY BE NECESSARY AND TO CONSTRUCT FACILITIES SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
September 19, 1960

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. ELSER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD ALLOCATE \$59,000.00 FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FOR THE SHELTER COVE, COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1011, AND AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO ACQUIRE SUCH INTERESTS AS MAY BE NECESSARY AND TO CONSTRUCT FACILITIES SUBSTANTIALLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

10. Fish Lake Public Fishing Area - Humboldt County, Project No. 140 \$3,000.00

Mr. Phil Douglas, Field Agent for the Wildlife Conservation Board, reported that this proposal is a habitat improvement project for this 15 acre lake which lies in the Six Rivers National Forest, 4 miles northwest of the Weitchpec Happy Camp road. The Forest Service has provided for raising the lake level by a road fill dam. It is proposed to clear dense second growth timber as well as willows and brush in the basin. In addition, some erosion control work would be necessary to protect the face of the earthfill. All work is hand labor and is only practical through the use of inmate labor. Previous attempts to do this work with Department of Fish and Game and U. S. Forest Service labor have proven too costly. With the inauguration of the inmate labor program, this work has become feasible.

Upon the clearance of approximately 10 acres, the U.S. Forest Service will raise the water level 6 feet and thereby provide 28 surface acres. The lake is stocked with rainbows and eastern brook trout. It is heavily fished and would provide better fishing with the increased surface acreage.

Cost estimates provided by the Division of Forestry Crystal Creek Conservation Camp are as follows:

Clearing of brush and timber and erosion control work, inc. inmate transportation	\$2,082.30
Camp cooks and helpers	199.50
Supervision (Dept. of Corrections duty officers)	516.48
Subtotal	\$2,798.28
Contingencies, signs, permits, etc.	201.72
TOTAL	\$3,000.00

Mr. L. T. Petersen, Deputy State Forester, who is in charge of the conservation camp program, reported that this particular project has been checked by their field personnel from Crystal Creek Conservation Camp and that Mr. Raymond, State Forester, has approved this project.

Mr. Wes Spinney, Supervisor of the Six Rivers National Forest, advised that the Forest Service believes this is a worthwhile project. Since the high standard timber road has been built, use of the area has increased.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
September 19, 1960

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR BEARD, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD ALLOCATE \$3,000 FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FOR THE FISH LAKE PUBLIC FISHING AREA, PROJECT NO. 140, TO CARRY OUT THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. ELSER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD ALLOCATE \$3,000 FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FOR THE FISH LAKE PUBLIC FISHING AREA, PROJECT NO. 140, TO CARRY OUT THE PROJECT AS PRESENTED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

11. Tulloch Reservoir Public Fishing Area, Project No. 136 - Change in Scope

Mr. Nesbit advised that the Tulloch Reservoir project was approved by the Board on September 23, 1959, and \$117,600 was allocated for development. It was felt that insufficient money was available to provide more than a gravel with seal coat access road to the project. A very favorable bid of \$78,321 was received by the County and the project is under construction. It is the request of the County that the Board modify the scope of the project to provide plant mixed surfacing for this access road instead of the original surfacing as authorized. The great interest in this project and the anticipated use of this new reservoir seem to justify a more permanent type of road surfacing.

The Department of Fish and Game Engineering Section approves this request and points out that such surfacing would require less maintenance by the County.

If this change in scope is approved, it would be the County's plan to negotiate with the contractor for the more permanent type of surfacing, such cost to be within the project allocation.

The Coordinator recommended this change in scope, since it would provide a more suitable road for a project this size.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR BROWN, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD CHANGE THE SCOPE OF THE TULLOCH RESERVOIR PUBLIC FISHING AREA, PROJECT NO. 136, TO PROVIDE A PLANT MIX SURFACE FOR THE ACCESS ROAD.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. ELSER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD CHANGE THE SCOPE OF THE TULLOCH RESERVOIR PUBLIC FISHING AREA, PROJECT NO. 136, TO PROVIDE A PLANT MIX SURFACE FOR THE ACCESS ROAD.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

12. Stream Clearance Program

Mr. Nesbit stated that during the last three years the Board has, at several meetings, discussed the problems of stream clearance. The staff was instructed to make a study as to feasibility. This study has been completed and a report entitled "A Ten Year Stream Clearance Program" was submitted to all Board members. The staff believes a stream clearance program is needed and is now feasible.

The Department of Fish and Game has gained considerable knowledge in techniques of stream clearance from pilot projects, a labor supply is now available, and there is a cooperative attitude on the part of the landowners. A ten year program of stream clearance at a total cost of approximately \$500,000 was proposed.

Mr. Nesbit explained that the purpose of the report was to present a picture of the overall problem and that if this program is approved, it will give the staff an opportunity to present individual projects fully engineered.

Mr. Shannon, speaking in behalf of the Department of Fish and Game, stated this is an opportunity to improve and increase spawning areas for the anadromous fishes. However, each stream must be studied and the potential for fish production must be evaluated before funds are allocated. He also pointed out that such stream clearance work should be done only after it has been found that responsibility cannot be determined for removal of debris.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR BROWN, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, AS A JOINT MOTION THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD ACCEPT THE STREAM CLEARANCE PROGRAM AS OUTLINED IN THE REPORT ENTITLED "A TEN YEAR STREAM CLEARANCE PROGRAM" DATED SEPTEMBER 1, 1960. IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT EACH PROJECT WITHIN THIS PROGRAM WILL BE INDIVIDUALLY SUBMITTED TO THE BOARD FOR APPROVAL.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

13. Santa Cruz Coastal Stream Clearance, Project No. 141 \$14,500.00  
Santa Cruz County

Mr. Nesbit presented the first of the stream clearance projects which involved the ten coastal streams in Santa Cruz County. They are, from north to south: Waddell Creek, Scott Creek, Mill Creek, San Vicente Creek, Liddell Creek, Laguna Creek, Meder Creek, Soquel Creek, Aptos Creek, and Valencia Creek.

All these streams provide spawning and nursery areas to sustain steelhead runs. Larger ones such as Waddell Creek and Scott Creek also have silver salmon runs. Though these streams are small, their potential in supplying steelhead and salmon angling should not be underestimated. A winter sport fishery for steelhead and silver salmon is provided by this group of streams, mainly in the tidal areas at the stream mouths and a short distance upstream. Adjacent ocean areas sustain both sport and commercial salmon fisheries.

Surveys by Department of Fish and Game personnel show that these streams could provide approximately 50 miles of spawning and nursery waters, but that now only 8 miles are useable by steelhead and salmon. The other 42 miles of stream are blocked by a total of 378 log jams. The objective of the project is to clear these log jams so that the entire 50 miles of stream will again produce fish.

Lands on all drainages involved are in private ownership and are outside of any State or Federal parks or forest with the exception that Big Basin State Park includes some headwaters areas. Because the State Division of Beaches and Parks assumes responsibility for clearance on their lands, the stream sections in this State Park are not in the proposed project.

It will be necessary to obtain signed approval from private landowners concerned. Specific land ownership on all affected streams will be determined and landowner permission solicited.

Actual field work will be accomplished by California Youth Authority workers under direct supervision of the California Division of Forestry as provided for in a master agreement between the Department of Fish and Game and the Division of Forestry.

Wildlife Conservation Board funds will be utilized to pay the daily wages of CYA workers, equipment rental and minor purchase of materials needed. All other expenditures will be borne by other appropriate State agencies. The Department of Fish and Game will provide technical assistance on the fisheries aspects of the work.

Log jams will be removed from stream beds and burned or moved to a high enough level on the banks so that they will not re-enter the stream, with a later follow-up to evaluate results and remove remaining debris. The work schedule is estimated at two to three years for the initial clean-up, with the follow-up a year later.

The estimated cost breakdown for this project is as follows:

Labor	\$12,000
Equipment Rental	1,275
Materials	<u>1,000</u>
TOTAL	\$14,275

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
September 19, 1960

Labor cost was computed on the basis of the standard State rate of \$3.50 per inmate man-day, and removal of 150 cubic feet of wood per man-day. The log jams include an estimated total of 515,000 cubic feet.

Mr. Nesbit informed the Board that this stream clearance project was prepared by the Department of Fish and Game. He recommended the approval of this project and the allocation of \$14,500 to enable the Department to proceed with the project.

In the course of the discussion that followed, it was brought out that the cost estimates for inmate labor were based on actual work experience; however, the anticipated quantity of work on the stream clearance was an estimate.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR BEARD, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE SANTA CRUZ COASTAL STREAM CLEARANCE PROJECT, SANTA CRUZ COUNTY, PROJECT NO. 141; ALLOCATE \$14,500 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND; AND AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. ELSER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE SANTA CRUZ COASTAL STREAM CLEARANCE PROJECT, SANTA CRUZ COUNTY, PROJECT NO. 141; ALLOCATE \$14,500 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND; AND AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

14. Big River Stream Clearance, Project No. 142 \$46,600.00  
Mendocino County

Mr. Nesbit presented the second stream clearance project which involves the Big River drainage in central Mendocino County.

Big River enters the ocean near the town of Mendocino some 10 miles south of the City of Fort Bragg. The Big River system presently sustains good-sized runs of silver salmon and steelhead which are important to the recreation and economy of this area. There are both sport and commercial fisheries for silver salmon in the ocean off the mouth of the river. The lower 11 miles of the main river also provide a winter sport fishery for steelhead and silver salmon.

Big River and its tributaries once supported much larger runs of fish and could again with rehabilitation. Recent surveys by the Department of Fish and Game show that only 47 miles of stream system now are available to salmon and steelhead for spawning and nursery purposes. Carrying out this proposed project will rehabilitate an additional 60 miles of 22 streams in the drainage. Surveys located 499 log jams in the 60 miles proposed for clearance.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
September 19, 1960

Fifteen percent of the land within the Big River drainage is within the Jackson State Forest and therefore is excluded from the present project. The controlling agency, the State Division of Forestry, has assumed responsibility for stream clearance on their lands. The remaining 85% of the land is under private ownership and is the area with which the present project is concerned. Specific land ownership has been defined for the entire drainage within the stream sections concerned. Signed approval has been obtained from 16 landowners out of a total of 29 controlling stream sections involved. Work is continuing on signing up the remaining owners. Procedures will be similar to those of the Santa Cruz project.

The duration of the project is estimated at 3 years. Most of it will be accomplished within two years, with follow-up to come a year later.

The estimated cost breakdown is as follows:

Labor	\$41,300
Equipment Rental	4,300
Materials and supplies	<u>1,000</u>
TOTAL	\$46,600

Labor cost was figured on the basis of \$3.50 per inmate man-day, with 11,800 man-days estimated to remove the jams. Equipment will be rented from the Division of Forestry. Expenditures for materials and supplies will be largely for explosives necessary for blasting the larger log jams and for minor items of supply and equipment.

Mr. Nesbit recommended this project be approved and that \$46,600 be allocated from the Wildlife Restoration Fund to the Department of Fish and Game and that the Department be authorized to proceed with the project.

Mr. Elser felt some thought should be given to setting up a budget for each project because of the possibility of running out of funds.

Mr. Nesbit informed him that the stream clearance would be started at the mouth and the men would work progressively upstream. In this way, the clearance of a particular stream would be completed to the point where it would do the most good.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR BEARD, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE BIG RIVER STREAM CLEARANCE, MENDOCINO COUNTY, PROJECT NO. 142; ALLOCATE \$46,600 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND; AND AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. ELSER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE BIG RIVER STREAM CLEARANCE, MENDOCINO COUNTY, PROJECT NO. 142; ALLOCATE \$46,600

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
September 19, 1960

TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND; AND AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Nesbit informed the Board that the Department of Fish and Game has requested withdrawal, as an agenda item, of the Lower Klamath River Stream Clearance project in Humboldt County. Additional work is needed to determine responsibility and land ownership, and, therefore, the cost estimates would need to be revised.

15. Project Evaluation, Property Acquisition, and Engineering Study, Project No. 2500

Mr. Nesbit advised that at the January 5, 1956, meeting, the Wildlife Conservation Board authorized the expenditure of funds for the purpose of making project evaluation studies, property acquisition expenditures such as appraisal and title reports, and engineering studies where required. If the projects are feasible and allocations are made, this fund is reimbursed. Where projects are infeasible, the cost reflects on the total available in this revolving fund.

It has been found that a number of projects built 8 or 10 years ago have not been identified by signs providing proper credit to the Wildlife Conservation Board for the work accomplished. This is especially true of the stream flow maintenance dam projects.

It was requested by the Coordinator that authorization for Project 2500 be changed to include the expenditure of funds for the purchase of signs to be placed at various existing Wildlife Conservation Board projects. This would be a non-recurring cost inasmuch as present projects include signs within their allocations. No additional money was requested, but only the change in scope of this project.

The other alternative to purchase signs would be to reopen the completed projects, make an allocation, and then close it again with proper Wildlife Conservation Board authorization.

It was the consensus that all projects should have signs giving proper credit to the Wildlife Conservation Board and that the most expedient means would be through the use of Project 2500 funds.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR BEARD, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD CHANGE THE SCOPE OF PROJECT EVALUATION, PROPERTY ACQUISITION AND ENGINEERING STUDY, PROJECT NO. 2500, TO PROVIDE FOR SIGNS TO BE PLACED AT VARIOUS EXISTING WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD PROJECTS.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
September 19, 1960

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. ELSER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD CHANGE THE SCOPE OF PROJECT EVALUATION, PROPERTY ACQUISITION AND ENGINEERING STUDY, PROJECT NO. 2500, TO PROVIDE FOR SIGNS TO BE PLACED AT VARIOUS EXISTING WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD PROJECTS.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

16. Coastal Angling Access Program, Project No. 1011  
Punta Gorda - Humboldt County

The Coordinator advised that for many years the U. S. Coast Guard maintained a light station at Punta Gorda, some 4 miles south of the mouth of the Mattole River, and about 10 miles southwest of Petrolia in Humboldt County. The station was abandoned shortly after World War II. In April, 1960, the station which includes 22.8 acres of land, several buildings and approximately 1/3 mile of beach was turned over to the General Services Administration of the Federal Government for disposal. Also included is a road right-of-way from near the Mattole Bridge at Petrolia to the mouth of the Mattole and for four miles down the beach. The road to the mouth of the Mattole is heavily used by fishermen.

It appears that this property can be transferred to the State without charge if used for wildlife purposes. This is authorized under P.L. 537.

The northern California coast line in this vicinity has excellent fishing that is practically inaccessible to the public. Acquisition of the former Coast Guard interests in lands and rights-of-ways would make it possible for people to cross private lands to the public beach and utilize the nearly untouched fisheries resources there.

We have checked with the Division of Beaches and Parks and they "are highly in favor of this area being retained in public ownership" but that they have nothing in the way of a park project proposed there.

A letter from the General Services Administration dated August 23 required that:

"There are two important requirements relative to the submission of the application:

- (1) A notice of intent to file an application must be received at this office within 30 days and the application must be received within 60 days of the date of this letter.
- (2) It is very necessary that all the information requested in the enclosures be furnished as this will expedite the handling of your request."

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board  
September 19, 1960

On September 7, 1960, a reply was sent with the following information:

"The Wildlife Conservation Board will give the matter formal consideration at its next meeting, which will be on September 19 in Eureka. If the Board approves acquisition, an application pursuant to Public Law 537 will be made."

The County of Humboldt has expressed an interest in this acquisition and would agree to whatever maintenance would be necessary. The project is useable in its present state and, therefore, no development is recommended or anticipated at this time.

Mr. Nesbit stated the Department of Fish and Game, as well as the staff, recommends this project.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR BROWN, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE FUNTIA GORDA COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1011, AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO PROCEED WITH THE ACQUISITION IN ACCORDANCE WITH P.L. 537.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. ELSER, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE FUNTIA GORDA COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1011, AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO PROCEED WITH THE ACQUISITION IN ACCORDANCE WITH P.L. 537.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

17. Hunting Access Program, Project No. 1017  
Kings Peak Access - Humboldt County

Assemblyman Belotti requested permission to bring up a matter not on the agenda but which required clarification. He stated that the Kings Peak Hunting Access Road was approved by the Board on February 2, 1960, and \$28,000 was allocated to provide roads to this hunting area. However, since then, there have been misunderstandings and differences of opinion as to the desirability of such roads.

Mr. Nesbit stated that after this project was approved, an application was made to the Bureau of Land Management for permission to build these hunting access roads. A group subsequently contacted BLM and requested a delay in considering this permit. The present status is that no roads have been built or contracted for and no State money has been spent as no permit has been issued.

County Supervisors Melvin Bareilles and Elwyn Lindley advised the Board that the County officials and the sportsmen of Humboldt County favor this project and asked that it be pursued. The Board also reiterated its stand in favor of the project.

18. Success and Terminus Reservoirs - Tulare County

Mr. Vance Venables, County Administrator of Tulare County, introduced Mr. Harry R. Conaway, Planning Director, and Mr. Ross Gaskill from Visalia who have worked on the recreation plan for Success and Terminus Reservoirs. He briefly reviewed the anticipated use of the reservoirs by southern Californians and the need for developing these reservoirs. The County has budgeted funds for minimum developments at Success Reservoir to meet the opening in the spring of 1961. Terminus Reservoir would be finished and opened in the spring of 1962. He requested staff study and financial aid for Success Reservoir.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. ELSER, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD AUTHORIZE THE STAFF TO MAKE A FEASIBILITY STUDY OF AN ACCESS PROJECT AT SUCCESS AND TERMINUS RESERVOIRS AND REPORT BACK AT A SUBSEQUENT MEETING.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

19. Trinidad Head Access Project

Assemblyman Belotti advised that some time back the Board staff looked into the desirability of constructing a boat launching ramp at Trinidad. There was found to be opposition to this access. Now there is renewed interest in the project and Assemblyman Belotti believed, as did Senator Carl Christensen, that there would be a good possibility to proceed with this access.

The Chairman, Mr. Elser, instructed the Board staff to make a study of the proposed access at Trinidad Head, and report back to the Board as to its feasibility.

Mr. Nesbit informed the Board that a telegram was received from the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of San Luis Obispo County, extending an invitation to the Wildlife Conservation Board to hold their next regularly scheduled meeting in the City of San Luis Obispo. Mr. Nesbit requested instructions with regard to this invitation. The Chairman stated there would be no action necessary other than to thank the Board of Supervisors for their invitation.

Senator Carl Christensen expressed gratification in having a Wildlife Conservation Board meeting held in Eureka and thanked Assemblyman Belotti and others who have helped to make this possible.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Status of Funds. The amount allocated to specific projects as of the close of the meeting on September 19, 1960, aggregated \$15,383,595.17.

a.	Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects . . . . .	\$4,279,253.11
b.	Warmwater and Other Fish Projects . . . . .	2,787,726.56
	1. Warmwater Projects . . . . .	\$2,239,151.81
	2. Other Fish Projects . . . . .	548,574.75
c.	Flow Maintenance and Stream Improvement Projects . . . . .	643,990.87
d.	Screen and Ladder Projects . . . . .	283,579.31
e.	State Game Farms . . . . .	105,644.49
f.	Other Upland Game Projects . . . . .	416,530.84
g.	Waterfowl Management Projects . . . . .	5,559,971.84
h.	General Projects . . . . .	1,281,898.15
	1. Coastal Angling Access Projects . . . . .	\$439,871.48
	2. Inland Angling Access Projects . . . . .	647,603.06
	3. Hunting Access Projects . . . . .	28,000.00
	4. Other General Projects . . . . .	166,423.61
	Total Allocated to Specific Projects	<u>\$15,358,595.17</u>

Special Project Allocations:

Project Evaluation, Property Acquisition and Engineering Studies . . . . .	25,000.00
Total Allocated . . . . .	<u>\$15,383,595.17</u>

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

1. Colorado River Recreational Development . . . . .	\$23,219.30
2. Lake Tahoe Access Development . . . . .	30,000.00
3. Upper American River Development . . . . .	100,000.00
Total Reserves Established . . . . .	<u>\$153,219.30</u>

Operating Costs:

FY 47/48 thru 59/60 Actual . . . . .	\$606,240.12
FY 60/61 - Estimated . . . . .	81,613.00
Total Actual and Estimated Operating Costs . . . . .	<u>\$687,853.12</u>

Recapitulation:

Allocations for Projects . . . . .	\$15,358,595.17
Special Project Allocations . . . . .	25,000.00
Reserves Established . . . . .	153,219.30
Expenses of Operation . . . . .	687,853.12
Total Expended or Obligated . . . . .	<u>\$16,224,667.59</u>
Total Funds Appropriated . . . . .	\$15,750,000.00
Appropriation Available thru 60/61 FY . . . . .	750,000.00
Interest on Surplus Money Inv. thru 59/60 FY . . . . .	434,045.68
Miscellaneous Revenue thru 59/60 FY . . . . .	32,530.07
Total Sum Available . . . . .	<u>\$16,966,575.75</u>
Total Expended or Obligated . . . . .	16,224,667.59
Available thru June 30, 1961 . . . . .	<u>\$741,908.16</u>