

Resources Agency of California
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
Minutes, Meeting of November 9, 1961

* * * * *

C O N T E N T S

<u>Item No.</u>		<u>Page No.</u>
1.	Roll Call	1
2.	Introduction of Members and Advisory Committee	2
3.	Approval of Minutes, June 8, 1961, Meeting	2
4.	Status of Funds as of June 8, 1961	2 - 3
5.	Recovery of Funds	3 - 7
6.	Inland Angling Access Program - Lake Tahoe Access	7 - 9
7.	Coastal Angling Access Program - Gazos Creek Access	9 - 11
8.	Inland Angling Access Program - Colorado River, 26th Ave.	11 - 13
9.	WCB Policy on Fishing Piers	13 - 15
10.	Mission Bay Public Fishing Pier	15 - 16
11.	Los Angeles Public Fishing Pier	16 - 18
12.	Fish Springs Hatchery	18 - 20
13.	Imperial Beach Pier	20 - 21
14.	Highway 48 Bridge	21
	Status of Funds	22

Resources Agency of California
 WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
 Minutes, Meeting of November 9, 1961

Pursuant to the call of the Chairman, the Wildlife Conservation Board met in the Assembly Hall of the old State Office Building, 217 West First Street, Los Angeles, California, on November 9, 1961. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Jamie H. Smith at 1:45 p.m.

1. Roll Call

PRESENT: Jamie H. Smith
 W. T. Shannon
 Daniel Luevano

Chairman
 Member
 Member

Senator Charles Brown
 Senator Ed C. Johnson
 Senator Aaron W. Quick
 Assemblywoman Pauline L. Davis
 Assemblyman Frank P. Belotti
 Assemblyman Lloyd W. Lowrey

Joint Interim Committee

" " "
 " " "
 " " "
 " " "
 " " "

Raymond J. Nesbit
 Chester M. Hart
 John Mahoney
 Alma Koyasako

Coordinator
 Assistant Coordinator
 Field Agent
 Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

L. M. "Lee" Backstrand
 Eddie Bruce
 Clarence Inman
 N. R. Shade
 C. W. Perry
 Robert L. Wynn
 Elmo G. Peterson
 Ben Hagar
 Phil Roedel
 W. C. Dry
 Murray Smith
 Fritz Mangold
 Ed Rossez
 Gordon Locke
 J. W. Buckelew, Jr.
 Edw. H. Walker
 Geo. A. Gruber
 C. T. Worsley
 R. C. Richter
 George V. Berkey
 LeRoy Kamrar
 Mrs. Hazel T. Evensen
 Tyler Suess
 Sim Jarvi
 E. W. Anacker

Senator, 37th District
 So. Council of Conservation Clubs
 L.A. Recreation and Parks
 Ocean Fish Protective Assn.
 Imperial Beach Chamber of Commerce
 City Mgr., Imperial Beach
 Moffatt & Nichol Engrs.
 Business Mgr., Mission Bay Park
 Department of Fish and Game
 " " " " "
 " " " " "
 Sports Council, Inc.
 Ocean Fish Protective Assn.
 " " " "
 Palo Verde Valley C. of C.
 Riverside County Parks Supt.
 Inland Council Conservation
 Assist. Co. Surveyor, Riverside Co.
 Department of Water Resources
 Supervisor, Riverside County
 Bureau of Reclamation
 Riverside County Planning Comm.
 Planning Director, Riverside Co.
 Supervisor, Angeles Nat'l Forest
 L.A. City Recreation and Parks

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

2. Introduction of Members and Advisory Committee

Mr. Jamie H. Smith, Chairman, introduced the members of the Wildlife Conservation Board and the Legislative Advisory Committee.

3. Approval of Minutes, June 8, 1961, Meeting

Mr. R. J. Nesbit, Coordinator, recommended that minutes of the June 8, 1961, meeting be approved. The Board duly approved the minutes as published and distributed.

4. Status of Funds as of June 8, 1961

The amount allocated to specific projects as of the close of the meeting on June 8, 1961, aggregated \$15,963,129.88.

a. Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects		\$4,308,670.38
b. Warmwater and Other Fish Projects		3,144,986.09
1. Warmwater Projects	\$2,434,151.81	
2. Other Fish Projects	710,834.28	
c. Flow Maintenance and Stream Improvement Projects		632,221.53
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		5,613,177.84
h. General Projects		1,433,319.40
1. Coastal Angling Access Projects	484,071.48	
2. Inland Angling Access Projects	761,603.06	
3. Hunting Access Projects	28,000.00	
4. Other General Projects	159,644.86	
Total Allocated to Specific Projects		<u>\$15,938,129.88</u>

Special Project Allocations:

Project Evaluation, Property Acquisition and Engineering Studies		25,000.00
Total Allocated		<u>\$15,963,129.88</u>

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

1. Colorado River Recreational Development		\$23,219.30
2. Upper American River Development		100,000.00
Total Reserves Established		<u>\$123,219.30</u>

Operating Costs:

FY 47/48 thru 60/61 Actual	\$679,240.39	
FY 61/62 - Estimated	79,932.00	
Total Actual and Estimated Operating Costs		<u>\$759,172.39</u>

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

Recapitulation:

Allocations for Projects	\$15,938,129.88
Special Project Allocations	25,000.00
Reserves Established	123,219.30
Expenses of Operation	759,172.39
Total Expended or Obligated	<u>\$16,845,521.57</u>

Total Funds Appropriated	\$16,500,000.00
Appropriation Available thru 61/62 FY	750,000.00
Int. on Surplus Money Inv. thru 60/61 FY	498,968.26
Miscellaneous Revenue thru 60/61 FY	65,957.76
Miscellaneous Revenue 61/62 FY	20.00
Total Sum Available	<u>\$17,814,946.02</u>
Total Expended or Obligated	<u>16,845,521.57</u>

Available thru June 30, 1962 \$969,424.45

5. Recovery of Funds

Mr. Nesbit announced that eleven projects or access sites have been completed and the unused balances totaling \$83,627.95 are available for recovery. He explained that heretofore project accounts to be closed were listed showing only the balances available for recovery. He felt this would be an opportune time to bring the Board members up-to-date on the completed projects and reviewed the following projects for their information.

Eagle Lake Trout Preservation, Project No. 133

Total allocation	\$38,809.62
Expenditures	<u>36,173.66</u>
Balance for recovery	\$ 2,635.96

This project to preserve and restore the distinctive Eagle Lake trout population has been completed with great success. The weir and egg collecting station on Pine Creek was completed in 1958 and operated successfully in 1959, 1960, and 1961. Trout reared from the eggs collected survived and grew rapidly when restocked in Eagle Lake. With this evidence of success, the four rearing ponds authorized in the project were completed at Crystal Lake Hatchery in January of 1961. These ponds now provide rearing capacity to accelerate rehabilitation of the Eagle Lake fishery. Fishing already has improved considerably, with fair numbers of sizable trout caught, and improvement should continue.

Imperial Valley Waterfowl Management Area, Project No. 536

Total allocations	\$1,338,238.00
Expenditures	<u>1,276,286.79</u>
Balance for recovery	\$ 61,951.21

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

This is one of the four key waterfowl management areas acquired and developed by the Board. Acquisition of this area near Wister was authorized by the Board in 1953, as a replacement for the State waterfowl area that was inundated by the rise of Salton Sea. A total of 5,563 acres was purchased at a cost of \$960,052.42. Development of the area, including land leveling, domestic water system, shops and other buildings, and equipment has been carried out at an additional cost of \$316,234.37.

This is the main public waterfowl shooting area available to Southern California sportsmen, accommodating approximately 5,000 - 6,000 hunters per season who take an average bag of about 10,000 waterfowl. The area also provides important waterfowl wintering habitat, as well as crop depredation control. Food crops grown on the waterfowl area serve to feed the ducks and geese and prevent depredation on crops in the rich agricultural area of Imperial Valley.

The acquisition and development project authorized by the Board has been completed and the balance listed above is available for recovery.

Delta Waterfowl Management Area, Project No. 550

Total allocations	\$1,112,940.17
Expenditures	<u>1,101,578.37</u>
Balance for recovery	\$ 11,361.80

Located on Grizzly Island in Solano County, this is one of the key waterfowl management areas acquired and developed by the Board. Acquisition of approximately 8,600 acres of land was completed in 1950 at a cost of \$659,929.42. Initial development as authorized by the Board has been completed at a cost of \$313,650.75, including levees, tidegates, land leveling, roads, buildings, and equipment. An access bridge over Montezuma Slough was completed last year on a cost-sharing basis with Solano County at a cost to the Wildlife Restoration Fund of \$127,998.20.

With access limited by the old ferry system, the area has serviced approximately 15,000 waterfowl hunters per year and the annual bag has been as high as 50,000 waterfowl. Undoubtedly new records for hunting, fishing and other recreational use of the area will be established as a result of access by the new bridge.

Coastal Angling Access Program, Project No. 1011

Point Vicente, Los Angeles County

Total allocation	\$34,529.00
Expenditures	<u>34,529.00</u>
Balance for recovery	\$ 0.00

This cooperative project with Los Angeles County to provide badly needed access to the ocean in the Palos Verde area for surf fishermen and skin divers has been completed. Development of the site leased from the County

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

includes parking area, sanitary facilities, foot ramp to the beach, and guard rails. The total allocation has been expended and the County has put additional money into the project. Although there is no recovery of funds, action to close the project accounts is needed.

Ocean Park, Santa Barbara County

Total allocation	\$22,662.00
Expenditures	22,380.11
Balance for recovery	\$ 281.89

This coastal access at Surf has been completed in cooperation with Santa Barbara County. Development of the site leased from the County includes launching ramp, floating dock, sanitary facilities, and parking area.

Elkhorn Slough, Monterey County

Total allocation	\$33,000.00
Expenditures	32,932.01
Balance for recovery	\$ 68.99

Access to Elkhorn Slough south of Watsonville has been completed in cooperation with the Moss Landing Harbor District and the County of Monterey. Development of the site leased from the Harbor District includes launching ramp, access road, parking area.

Miller Park (Nick's Cove), Marin County

Total allocation	\$46,737.00
Expenditures	45,119.59
Balance for recovery	\$ 1,617.41

This coastal access is located on the northeast shore of Tomales Bay in cooperation with Marin County on land leased from the County. Development, including launching ramp, rock jetty, loading floats and parking area, has been completed.

Crescent City Citizen's Pier, Del Norte County

Total allocation	\$63,764.83
Expenditures	63,588.35
Balance for recovery	\$ 176.48

This project, including parking area, boat launching and sanitary facilities, has been completed in cooperation with the Crescent City Harbor District on land leased from the District.

North Beach, Crescent City, Del Norte County

Total allocation	\$13,128.65
Expenditures	12,702.85
Balance for recovery	\$ 425.80

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

This coastal access, also known as Pt. St. George, is located 5 miles northwest of Crescent City, and is operated and maintained by Del Norte County. Purchase and development of the site of approximately 2 acres has been completed, including access road, parking area, and pathway to beach.

Inland Angling Access Program, Project No. 1013

Boyd Pumps, Sutter County

Total allocation	\$22,500.00
Expenditures	17,506.11
Balance for recovery	\$ 4,993.89

Development of this access site on the Feather River 6 miles south of Yuba City has been completed in cooperation with Sutter County. Facilities consist of launching ramp, parking area, sanitary facilities and domestic well, on land leased from the Levee District.

Klamath Glen, Del Norte County

Total allocation	\$12,480.00
Expenditures	12,365.48
Balance for recovery	\$ 114.52

This access to the Klamath River for salmon and steelhead fishermen has been completed at Klamath Glen, 4 miles upstream from the town of Klamath. Development is in cooperation with the County of Del Norte on land leased from the County and includes a launching ramp, parking area, and related facilities.

The Coordinator recommended that the balance of funds totaling \$83,627.95 be recovered and returned to the Wildlife Restoration Fund and that accounts for the completed projects or access sites be closed.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR BROWN, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN LOWREY, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD CLOSE THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS AND RECOVER THE UNEXPENDED BALANCES AS FOLLOWS:

<u>Project No.</u>	<u>Name of Project</u>	<u>Balance</u>
*1011	Nicks Cove Access	\$1,617.41
*1011	Elkhorn Slough Access	68.99
*1011	Ocean Park Access	281.89
*1011	Crescent City, Citizens Pier Access	176.48
*1011	North Beach, Crescent City Access	425.80
*1011	Point Vicente Access	0.00
*1013	Boyd Pumps Access	4,993.89
*1013	Klamath Glen Access	114.52

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

*Project No. 1011, Coastal Angling Access Program and Project No. 1013, Inland Angling Access Program, to remain open. The above access sites completed.

133	Eagle Lake Trout Preservation Project	\$2,635.96
536	Imperial Valley Waterfowl Management Area	61,951.21
550	Delta Waterfowl Management Area	11,361.80
	TOTAL	\$83,627.95

ALL OF THESE SUMS TOTALING \$83,627.95 ARE TO BE RESTORED TO THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Jamie Smith introduced Senator Lee Backstrand of Riverside County who had just arrived at the meeting.

6. Inland Angling Access Program, Project No. 1013 \$16,000.00
Lake Tahoe Access, Placer County

Mr. Nesbit reported that at the June 8, 1961, meeting the Board approved a development plan for this fishing access. The project is cooperative with Placer County and will provide needed public access to the north end of Lake Tahoe. An allocation of \$49,300 was made for development consisting essentially of an access road, parking area, boat launching ramps, and sanitary facilities.

The project is located on a parcel of approximately 9 acres remaining from 11½ acres purchased in 1951 for \$27,126, for planned expansion of the later abandoned Tahoe fish hatchery. Approximately 2 acres of this parcel were transferred this year to the U. S. Coast Guard for a station now being constructed.

When bids for construction were received in August, it became evident that the planned development could not be carried out for the sum allocated. Low bids were \$48,437 for the road, parking area and ramp, and \$14,929 for the sanitary facilities, for a total of \$63,366. The increased cost evidently was a combination of a longer haul and resulting higher cost than anticipated for suitable fill material and a low engineering estimate.

The Board members were polled by telephone and post card, and approval was given to proceed with the ramp, parking area and road in order to take advantage of the present low water conditions which are favorable for construction. These facilities were to be built from the allocation made at the June 8th meeting, with the sanitary facilities to be deleted and considered for an additional allocation at this meeting.

In addition to the sanitary facilities, it is considered that a loading dock and floats are needed to facilitate loading and unloading of passengers and equipment from boats. These facilities will make loading operations easier and safer, and serve to relieve congestion on the heavily-used launching ramps. The dock and floats would be similar in design and function to those of other WCB projects.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

Plans have been prepared by the Department of Fish and Game engineering section and have been reviewed by your staff. Cost estimates are as follows:

Sanitary facilities (1 permanent type)	\$10,000
Loading dock - 140' x 6'	3,360
Floats, ladders, misc.	1,100
Contingencies	1,540
Total	<u>\$16,000</u>

The Coordinator recommended that official action be taken to confirm the approval given in August to delete the restrooms from the facilities to be constructed with the \$49,300 allocation of June 8, 1961. He further recommended that the development of sanitary facilities and loading dock and floats be approved and that the additional sum therefor of \$16,000 be allocated from the Wildlife Restoration Fund for the project.

Mr. Luevano asked about the procedure followed by the staff in developing plans and cost estimates for projects and further requested an explanation for the changes in the estimate and the plans which have been made on this project.

Mr. Nesbit explained that the change or difference in the estimate was due largely to the fact that necessary fill material was not available in the lakebed as was anticipated. This resulted in a longer haul and consequently a more expensive project. Labor in the Lake Tahoe area is hired out of the union halls in Reno which run costs up higher than in other areas. These additional costs were not anticipated initially.

Mr. Nesbit further advised that plans for projects are either drawn by the Department of Fish and Game engineering section or are reviewed by them in cases where the plans are drawn by the engineers of local government. The plans in this instance were changed to include additional facilities. The Coast Guard had originally included in their planning the loading dock; however, they, too, had underestimated their costs, and the loading dock was deleted from their plans. Inasmuch as such loading docks were included in other access areas, and it was deemed to be a desirable feature for this access because of the heavy use during certain times of the year, plans were modified to include the loading dock in the WCB project.

In answer to Mr. Luevano's question relative to inclusion of an inflation factor in the cost estimates, Mr. Wallace Dry, Chief Engineer, Department of Fish and Game, advised that the period between the allocation of funds and the letting of the job is not long enough to consider an inflation factor in WCB projects. Both Assemblywoman Davis and Assemblyman Lowrey commented on the expeditious manner in which Wildlife Conservation Board projects are constructed, making the consideration of an inflation factor unnecessary.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN LOWREY, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD REAFFIRM THEIR TELEPHONIC AND MAIL VOTE APPROVING THE DELETION OF THE RESTROOM FROM THE FACILITIES TO BE CONSTRUCTED WITH THE \$49,300 ALLOCATION OF JUNE 8, 1961, FOR THE LAKE TAHOE ACCESS, PLACER COUNTY, INLAND

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1013; APPROVE THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE RESTROOM AND OTHER FACILITIES SET FORTH AND ALLOCATE THE SUM OF \$16,000 THEREFOR; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. LUEVANO, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD REAFFIRM THEIR TELEPHONIC AND MAIL VOTE APPROVING THE DELETION OF THE RESTROOM FROM THE FACILITIES TO BE CONSTRUCTED WITH THE \$49,300 ALLOCATION OF JUNE 8, 1961, FOR THE LAKE TAHOE ACCESS, PLACER COUNTY, INLAND ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1013; APPROVE THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE RESTROOM AND OTHER FACILITIES SET FORTH AND ALLOCATE THE SUM OF \$16,000 THEREFOR; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

7. Coastal Angling Access Program, Project No. 1011
Gazos Creek, San Mateo County

Mr. Nesbit informed the Board members that at the June 8, 1961, meeting. the Board allocated \$21,600 for acquisition and development of this proposed coastal angling access project, contingent upon the successful negotiation for the property with the Division of Highways for a price not to exceed \$10,000. The parcel of land in question consists of 5.94 acres on Highway 1 at the mouth of Gazos Creek and the ocean in southern San Mateo County. This land is part of a 6.77 acre parcel purchased in May of 1958 by the Division of Highways for \$10,000. The highway right-of-way utilized 0.83 acre of this purchase and the remainder was declared surplus.

A Department of Finance appraiser in May of 1961 appraised the 5.94 acres at \$24,000. This single appraisal is the only specific evidence available to date that the parcel has increased some $2\frac{1}{2}$ times in fair market value over a three year period.

The Board on June 8th authorized the staff to negotiate with the Division of Highways at a price not to exceed \$10,000, which was considered would fairly recompensate Highways for their acquisition costs.

In the 1961 session of the State Legislature, Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 76 was passed. This requested the Division of Highways to negotiate with the Wildlife Conservation Board and the Department of Fish and Game for lease or sale of the parcel at a mutually agreed upon price, and that Highways not otherwise dispose of the land before April 1, 1962.

On July 28, 1961, Highways offered to lease the parcel at \$1,440 per year for five year periods with option for renewal. Highways reserved the right to make rental adjustments at the end of each five year period. Rate increases

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

were implied, as the rental rate was based on 6% of what was considered the current fair market value. The Coordinator pointed out to Highways that leases with such fees and without an assured amortization period were not suitable for WCB development purposes.

On August 1, 1961, the Coordinator directed a letter to the Division of Highways inquiring if they would and could sell the parcel for \$10,000. By letter dated October 18, 1961, with attached attorney's opinion dated September 25, 1961, the staff was informed that sale by the Division of Highways at other than the "fair market value" was illegal.

The Coordinator recommended that the Board request the Department of Finance to permit two qualified independent appraisers to be hired to assist in establishing a fair market value, and that the project be reconsidered after such appraisals are made.

Assemblyman Lowrey recommended the Board make an urgent request of the Department of Finance to permit the hiring of two appraisers.

Mr. Luevano pointed out that the Board is faced with several issues. One of them is the question of the source of the attorney's opinion. He expressed the belief that the Board is not bound by a Division of Highways opinion and that an attorney general's opinion could be requested as to the legality of sale at other than fair market value.

Mr. Smith felt that a determination should be made as to (a) whether the Div. of Highways is forced to sell at the top market value and (b) whether the appraisal is a sound one.

Mr. Luevano brought out that the Department of Finance was requested by the Wildlife Conservation Board and the Division of Highways to make an appraisal of the property in question. He stated that their appraisal indicated a value of \$24,000. Mr. Nesbit stated it was his belief that the appraiser did not actually locate the boundary and that appraisal was predicated upon the assumption that four building lots could be located on this property. The Department of Fish and Game engineers had questioned this assumption. Mr. Nesbit agreed to have the property boundaries staked out before any re-appraisals are made.

Discussion followed as to the procedure to be followed in determining the fair market value after the two independent appraisals are made. Mr. Luevano suggested the Department of Finance appraisal be considered as one of three appraisals and that a mean of the three be taken for the fair market value. Mr. Nesbit advised this has been done on other projects -- purchases were made on the average of the appraisals.

Assemblyman Belotti expressed the thought that an attorney general's opinion is in order and that eventually some legislative changes should be made to the effect that in cases where there is a transfer of property between various State agencies, the transfer should be made on the basis of its original cost.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

Assemblywoman Davis asked if the Department of Finance would choose the appraisers in this case, and Mr. Nesbit advised that the Department of Finance does not choose the appraisers but does have the power to approve those to be hired. Mr. Luevano assured the Board that the Department of Finance will cooperate with whatever appraisers the Board or its coordinator selects.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN LOWREY, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD REQUEST THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE TO PERMIT TWO QUALIFIED INDEPENDENT APPRAISERS TO BE HIRED TO APPRAISE THE PROPERTY AND TO COLLABORATE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE APPRAISER TO DETERMINE THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF THE PROPERTY FOR THE GAZOS CREEK ACCESS, SAN MATEO COUNTY, COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1011.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. LUEVANO, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD REQUEST THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE TO PERMIT TWO QUALIFIED INDEPENDENT APPRAISERS TO BE HIRED TO APPRAISE THE PROPERTY IN QUESTION AND TO COLLABORATE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE APPRAISER TO DETERMINE THE FAIR MARKET VALUE OF THE PROPERTY FOR THE GAZOS CREEK ACCESS, SAN MATEO COUNTY, COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1011.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN LOWREY, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE COORDINATOR REQUEST AN ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OPINION, AND ASSEMBLYMAN LOWREY REQUEST A LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S OPINION AS TO THE LEGALITY OF A TRANSFER OF PROPERTY FROM ONE STATE AGENCY TO ANOTHER AT THE ORIGINAL PURCHASE PRICE.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Inland Angling Access Program, Project No. 1013 \$29,658.75
Colorado River - 26th Avenue, Riverside County

Mr. Nesbit explained that the Colorado River is one of the great recreational areas in the southwestern United States. Fishing is especially popular along certain stretches of the river and adequate access facilities are not now available. On August 8, 1957, the Board approved three Colorado River fishing access projects and subsequently allocated \$15,900 for their development in cooperation with the County of Riverside. At that time the projects were planned to provide only minimum facilities and gravel ramps. Construction with inmate labor from Riverside County was intended. These facilities were never constructed because of land title, inadequate funding, and other problems. The County did, however, develop the 6th Avenue site as a county project. This site was then subsequently dropped as a State project, and a recovery of \$4,974.25 was made on September 19, 1960. The 26th Ave. Terminus and the 38th Ave. Terminus projects remained active.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

Land title has been a problem at all three sites, but it is now believed that a lease from the county to the State for the land needed for development at 26th Avenue would be acceptable to the Department of Finance.

The 26th Avenue site is 7.7 miles downstream from the U.S. 60-70 highway bridge across the Colorado River. The project would provide both fishing and hunting access to this popular reach of the river, and has been recommended by the Department of Fish and Game. Warmwater fishing is especially popular in the vicinity.

Cost estimates and plans have been prepared by Riverside County and reviewed by staff and the Department of Fish and Game engineering staff. These plans now provide for a development adequate to service present and projected usage. The project plans and estimates are as follows:

Site clearance - clearing, grading	\$1,200.00
Parking area and roadways	6,120.00
Ramp - concrete, 2 lane	11,650.00
Riprap and bank protection and fencing area	12,600.00
Floating dock and walkways	1,630.00
Restrooms and utilities	5,400.00
Contingencies, including title reports, signs, etc.	<u>1,900.00</u>
	Total \$40,500.00

The County has agreed to maintain the area if developed and keep it open to the public free of charge.

Mr. Nesbit continued that since 1957 the Board staff has come to realize better, bigger projects than were envisioned at that time are required. He felt that if the 6th Avenue Terminus access project were built as planned in 1957, it would now prove to be inadequate. It is unfair to turn over to the county the operation and maintenance of a project that is not adequate. It was his recommendation that the Board approve the redesigned and enlarged project as presented and cancel the projects as previously approved. It was further recommended that the \$10,841.25 remaining be reallocated for this project along with \$29,658.75 from the Wildlife Restoration Fund.

Supervisor George Berkey of Riverside County was introduced. Mr. Berkey stated that Riverside County has recognized the desirability of an access at 26th Avenue and accordingly built roads and maintained minimum facilities there. In anticipation of the WCB meeting, the Board of Supervisors passed the following resolution:

"WHEREAS, there is a pressing need on the part of hunters, fishermen and boaters for development of public facilities for their use and convenience on the Colorado River, and

"WHEREAS, there is pending before the Wildlife Conservation Board a proposal of Riverside County for development of a site at 26th Avenue to provide access to the Colorado River primarily for the benefit of these people; now therefore,

"BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Riverside, State of California, in regular session assembled on October 23, 1961, that this Board of Supervisors has reviewed the plans and cost estimates now filed with the Wildlife Conservation Board for development of the 26th Avenue Inland Angling Access Area, and urges the WCB to approve such plans and to appropriate funds to implement the completion of the project."

Next, Senator Lee Backstrand was introduced. He stated he was appearing in behalf of this access project to reinforce the report of the staff. He felt there was no other group beside this Board who knew better the great need for recreational facilities, particularly water recreation, such as fishing, in this particular area. He called attention to the fact that Riverside County has agreed to the upkeep and maintenance of not only the access facilities, but the access road as well, and has constructed the 6th Avenue site with their own funds.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR QUICK, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN LOWREY, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE REVISED COST ESTIMATE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE COLORADO RIVER 26TH AVENUE TERMINUS ACCESS; AUTHORIZE THAT THE \$10,841.25 BALANCE OF FUNDS PREVIOUSLY ALLOCATED FOR ACCESS FACILITIES AT 26TH AVENUE AND 38TH AVENUE BE USED FOR THE 26TH AVENUE ACCESS; FURTHER, ALLOCATE \$29,658.75 FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FOR INLAND ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1013, FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACCESS FACILITIES AT COLORADO RIVER, 26TH AVENUE TERMINUS; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. LUEVANO, SECONDED BY MR. SHANNON, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE REVISED COST ESTIMATE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE COLORADO RIVER 26TH AVENUE TERMINUS ACCESS; AUTHORIZE THAT THE \$10,841.25 BALANCE OF FUNDS PREVIOUSLY ALLOCATED FOR ACCESS FACILITIES AT 26TH AVENUE AND 38TH AVENUE BE USED FOR THE 26TH AVENUE ACCESS; FURTHER, ALLOCATE \$29,658.75 FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FOR INLAND ANGLING ACCESS PROGRAM, PROJECT NO. 1013, FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ACCESS FACILITIES AT COLORADO RIVER 26TH AVENUE TERMINUS; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

9. WCB Policy on Fishing Piers

Chairman Smith announced the receipt of a letter from Governor Brown relative to the WCB program of participating in the construction of fishing piers.

The letter, which was read to the group by the Chairman, stated that the Governor endorses the fishing pier program and recommended WCB participation in the construction of the three piers on the agenda of the meeting; namely, the Mission Bay, Los Angeles, and Imperial Beach piers. Chairman Smith expressed appreciation and gratification of the fact that we have a Governor who takes an interest in the fisherman.

Mr. Nesbit advised that this agenda item is to consider an amendment to the fishing pier policy adopted previously by the Board. He stated that although piers can provide much fishing opportunity, they are expensive and could soon exhaust all available funds. With this in mind, he continued, the Board adopted a policy on new pier construction on September 19, 1960. The basic concept of this policy was for the WCB and the local agency to each contribute 50% toward the construction of the pier and the auxiliary facilities, with the WCB expenditure not to exceed \$50.00 per lineal foot of rail space.

The Board staff has had three detailed applications under this policy and has reviewed them carefully. It appears that the limitation of \$50.00 per lineal foot is too restrictive. In some instances it might not provide for adequate auxiliary facilities, such as parking, or it might result in the construction of a project insufficient to do the proper job.

In view of this, the Coordinator suggested that the \$50 per lineal foot restriction be eliminated. Each project would then be evaluated according to its merits and engineering feasibility, together with the financial limitations of the Board program.

Mr. Nesbit recommended the adoption of the suggested new policy which reflects this and several minor changes. He clarified the point raised by Assemblyman Lowrey with respect to discontinuance of the \$50 per lineal foot ceiling. He stated that although there will be no ceiling placed on such projects, each one would be considered on its own merits, subject to final review and approval by the Board members and the advisory group.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, SECONDED BY SENATOR BROWN, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE ADOPTION OF THE REVISED PIER POLICY.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. LUEVANO, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD ADOPT THE FOLLOWING REVISED POLICY RELATIVE TO PUBLIC FISHING PIERS:

Wildlife Conservation Board Policy On
Fishing Piers

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

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.

1. Projects for construction of new fishing 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 space for 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. The construction of approved fishing pier project facilities shall be accomplished with a matching fund of which at least 50% shall be contributed by the cooperating agency.
10. Approved project facilities shall include the fishing pier and other new developments related specifically to its public usage for fishing, such as approaches, parking and sanitary facilities.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

10. Mission Bay Public Fishing Pier, San Diego County

Mr. Nesbit stated that the City of San Diego has proposed as a WCB project a fishing pier in Mission Bay. The location for the pier was chosen to afford the most convenient public access and provide the best fishing.

Mr. Nesbit advised that within the past few days the Corps of Engineers has questioned the proposed fishing pier as planned as it could be an impedance to the navigation of sailboats in these waters. He further advised that the

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

City of San Diego has asked that this item be deleted from the agenda without prejudice to the project until the negotiations with the Corps of Engineers have been completed.

Mr. Ben Hagar, Business Manager for the Mission Bay project, representing the City of San Diego, was introduced. He stated that the City understands the problem involved and they are optimistic that it can be resolved. He requested that this project be held in abeyance until the next meeting of the Board, which he was advised would probably be some time in March during the Budget Session when most of the legislative members would be in Sacramento.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR JOHNSON, SECONDED BY MR. LUEVANO, BY JOINT MOTION, THAT THE PROPOSED MISSION BAY PUBLIC FISHING PIER PROJECT BE HELD IN ABEYANCE UNTIL RESOLUTION OF THE PROBLEMS RELATING TO CORPS OF ENGINEERS REQUIREMENTS.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

11. Los Angeles Public Fishing Pier, Los Angeles County \$400,000.00

Mr. Nesbit expressed the opinion that the Board policy of matching funds with local government for the construction of new fishing piers will afford an opportunity to provide the fishing public with a much needed recreational facility. In addition, the vast resources of the sea will be better utilized. He felt that Southern California with its large populations and its limited water resources faces a real problem of providing adequate recreational opportunities for the sports fisherman. To his knowledge, no new fishing piers have been constructed for many years in Southern California and several have been demolished as they became unsafe for continued use.

The City of Los Angeles Board of Recreation and Park Commissioners expressed an interest in the WCB pier policy. WCB Chairman, Jamie Smith, arranged with George Hjelte, General Manager of the City Recreation and Parks Department, to have the subject of fishing piers brought before the Commission on August 10, 1961. Representing the WCB were Chairman Smith and Coordinator Ray Nesbit. At that meeting the Commission instructed its staff to prepare plans for a pier as a cooperative project with the WCB. During subsequent inspection trips with various staff members, the pier location was chosen.

The proposed pier location is at the foot of Washington Boulevard in the Venice - Playa Del Rey area. This site is owned by the city. This area, upon the completion of the Santa Monica Freeway will be within 25 minutes of Central Los Angeles, 15 minutes of West Los Angeles and only 30 minutes from the San Fernando Valley via the Sepulveda Freeway. These areas contain over 2,300,000 persons. City officials estimate the pier will receive nearly 1/2 million man days of fishing use per year.

The area at the foot of Washington Boulevard presently has parking for 325 cars and can be expanded to 1,000 cars. The area is also served by buses.

Preliminary pier plans have been drawn by City Engineers, but it is proposed that final plans be prepared by professional pier engineers. The pier is to be "T" shaped. The approach from the beach to the "top of the T" would be approximately 1200 feet long and 16 feet wide. The "top of the T" would run

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

parallel to the beach, 1200' from shore and in 25' of water. This would be the main fishing platform. It would be 1000' long, 40' wide and would contain protected fishing wells through the decking.

Auxiliary facilities would include enlarged parking area, sanitary facilities, fish cleaning tables, benches, lighting and various safety and service features. While a concession building may be placed on the pier, it is not included as a matching fund item. Preliminary cost estimates indicate a total cost of approximately \$800,000 for the project.

The City of Los Angeles has agreed to maintain this project and keep it open free to the public.

The Department of Fish and Game recommends this project and points out that common species of fish to be caught in this area are kelp bass, sand bass, several species of perch, as well as various other species in lesser numbers. An artificial reef will be planned for the pier after designs have been completed. The Coordinator recommended this be considered at a later meeting and that the reef not be a part of the matching fund project.

The Ocean Fish Protective Association, the California Wildlife Federation, and other sportsmen's organizations have endorsed the proposal.

Mr. Nesbit recommended that \$400,000 be allocated to the Department of Fish and Game to be used as a matching fund with \$400,000 to be set aside by the City of Los Angeles for this project, and that any unused balances be returned in equal amounts to the two agencies. He then introduced the representative from the Los Angeles City Department of Recreation and Parks, Mr. William Frederickson.

Mr. Frederickson, Superintendent of Recreation, stated he has been instructed to present this project to the Board for its approval and endorsement. There are three problems with which the Los Angeles people are faced in creating additional recreational opportunities -- the expanding population, the increase in the number interested in fishing, and the reduction of the number of available fishing facilities. He elaborated on these three problems, emphasizing the fact that although present license sales number 322,500 in the county, the figure does not show the actual number of fishermen because pier fishermen and children under 16 do not need licenses. It was mentioned that attendance by fishermen at the Los Angeles City Recreation and Parks Department facilities (beach fishing, Crowley Lake, and two smaller city lakes) showed an increase of 40% in the past 10 years, further attesting to the increased participation in fishing recreation. The area surrounding Los Angeles does not have convenient and easily accessible fresh water fishing. Although many fishermen travel to the High Sierras, they are over six hours away; the Colorado River is over 4½ hours away by car; and the several man-made lakes and reservoirs which are within 2½ hours drive offer but limited shore fishing. The City must look for additional fishing recreation facilities in the form of pier fishing.

With the help of slides, he indicated the existing piers in Santa Monica Bay, the location of the proposed pier, as well as the parking area. It was his estimation that 2500 people would be able to fish on the proposed pier at one time.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN LOWREY, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE LOS ANGELES PUBLIC FISHING PIER, PROJECT NO. 147; ALLOCATE \$400,000 FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND, WHICH SUM IS TO BE MATCHED BY THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, TO PROVIDE FOR THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE PIER AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. LUEVANO, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE LOS ANGELES PUBLIC FISHING PIER, PROJECT NO. 147; ALLOCATE \$400,000 FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND, WHICH SUM IS TO BE MATCHED BY THE CITY OF LOS ANGELES, TO PROVIDE FOR THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE PIER AND APPURTENANT FACILITIES; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Frederickson, in behalf of the City of Los Angeles, thanked the Board for approval of this project.

12. Fish Springs Hatchery, Project No. 37, Inyo County

Mr. Nesbit advised that at the June 8, 1961, meeting, the Board approved the drilling of wells for a supplemental water supply at the Fish Springs Hatchery and allocated \$30,000 therefor. The hatchery in Owens Valley was built by the Wildlife Conservation Board and completed in 1952. In 1957 the Board approved an expansion of the aerator system. The early expenditures and the June 8th allocation total \$453,454.59 in Wildlife Restoration Funds for this project.

The original water for the hatchery was from springs that have practically ceased to flow as a result of the recent drought years. In May of 1961 about 100,000 subcatchable trout died when the water supply became inadequate and water temperatures too high.

Fish Springs is one of the Department of Fish and Game's most economical hatcheries and produces more than 1 million catchable and subcatchable trout. These are stocked in the Inyo-Mono area which receives heavy use from the southern California area fishermen.

At the June 8th meeting the Board approved the request to drill two 20-inch wells approximately 200 feet deep aimed at supplying a continuous flow of 8 c.f.s. or more from each well, with gasoline standby engines, pump houses and required pipeline.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

In view of the non-consumptive hatchery use of the water and its later becoming available to the City of Los Angeles, the City agreed to install pumps, motors, auxiliary right-angle drives and to supply electrical service and energy when pumped water is required for aqueduct needs. The City is now pumping for such purposes and will continue until the drought conditions terminate. The Department of Fish and Game was to furnish power at other periods.

The two wells have been drilled. One is an excellent producer while the other is clearly of insufficient yield. There is need for two good wells for the hatchery supply, both for volume for total production needs and insurance that the required water supply will not be lost through failure of one well system.

The logs of these and other wells in this vicinity, as well as the geologic features of the area, have been examined by a geologist from the Department of Water Resources.

Mr. Nesbit reported that additional information from the Department of Water Resources, has been obtained, and cost estimates of the several alternatives reviewed, keeping in mind the hatchery water requirements as expressed by the Department. He advised that the Department of Fish and Game engineering section has recommended a course of action in which the Board staff concurs. He asked Mr. Dry, Chief Engineer, Department of Fish and Game, to report on his findings and recommendation.

Mr. Dry reported that the first of the two wells drilled at the hatchery was test pumped at 5600 g.p.m. Unfortunately, the second well drilled produced only 150 g.p.m. He informed the group that the deepening of the well from 200 feet to 400 feet would cost an estimated \$12,500. He asserted that it would be possible to drill a new well for \$9,500. It was his recommendation that the unsatisfactory well be abandoned and a new well drilled. The location of this new well would be determined by new geophysical data to be obtained by the Department of Water Resources. By use of a map he indicated the probable location of the new well. Incidental benefits for this new well and location would be shorter delivery pipeline and the salvage and reuse of some casing.

Assemblyman Lowrey brought up the point that the domestic well, well #1, and probably the proposed well locations might be too close to each other and affect the aquifer. Should this happen, would it cause some trouble with the property owners in the vicinity? He was advised by Mr. Dry that the drawdown from well #1 would not affect the aquifer in the proposed well due to the insignificant drawdown of only 3.5 feet at the rate 5600 g.p.m. and the rapid recovery rate. He also advised that the hatchery grounds and surrounding area is City of Los Angeles property and that the Department is leasing from the City.

There was discussion relative to the adequacy of the existing lease. It was the consensus of the Assembly members that a renewal clause should be contained in the lease. Senator Brown and Mr. Shannon pointed out that the hatchery itself is a one-half million dollars investment which was expected to be amortized in 25 years, the term of the existing lease. The \$9,500 investment would be easily amortized in the 13 years remaining in the lease.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR BROWN, SECONDED BY SENATOR JOHNSON, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE DRILLING OF A NEW WELL AT THE FISH SPRINGS HATCHERY, PROJECT NO. 37, INYO COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$9,500 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROVIDE FOR THE DRILLING AND CASING OF THIS NEW WELL; PERMIT THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS DERIVED FROM SALVAGE AND REUSE OF SALVAGE MATERIALS IN THE NEW WELL; AND AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED AS OUTLINED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. LUEVANO, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD AUTHORIZE THE DRILLING OF A NEW WELL AT THE FISH SPRINGS HATCHERY, PROJECT NO. 37, INYO COUNTY; ALLOCATE \$9,500 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROVIDE FOR THE DRILLING AND CASING OF THIS NEW WELL; PERMIT THE EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS DERIVED FROM SALVAGE AND REUSE OF SALVAGE MATERIALS IN THE NEW WELL; AND AUTHORIZE THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED AS OUTLINED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN LOWREY, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYWOMAN DAVIS, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE COORDINATOR BE INSTRUCTED TO ATTEMPT TO SECURE A RENEWAL CLAUSE FOR THE FISH SPRINGS HATCHERY PROPERTY LEASE.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. LUEVANO, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD HEREBY INSTRUCT THE COORDINATOR TO ATTEMPT TO SECURE A RENEWAL CLAUSE FOR THE FISH SPRINGS HATCHERY PROPERTY LEASE AND REPORT BACK AT A LATER DATE.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

13. Imperial Beach Pier, San Diego County

Mr. Nesbit introduced Mr. Robert L. Wynn, City Manager, City of Imperial Beach, who had requested an opportunity to present to the Board members a preview of the Imperial Beach Pier. Mr. Wynn advised that the City of Imperial Beach has requested and received a feasibility report from Moffatt and Nichol, an engineering firm. He asked that the Board staff be authorized to study the pier proposal as a possible project to be presented to the Board at a future meeting. The total cost of the pier was estimated to be \$250,000 -- \$125,000 of which would be raised by the City for its share of the cost.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR QUICK, SECONDED BY MR. SHANNON, AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE STAFF BE AUTHORIZED TO STUDY THE REQUEST OF IMPERIAL BEACH FOR A COOPERATIVE PIER PROJECT IN LINE WITH THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD PIER POLICY.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 9, 1961

Assemblywoman Davis advised Mr. Wynn that the motion just passed must not be construed by the City of Imperial Beach as approbation of the project by the Board.

14. Highway 48 Bridge, Vallejo, Solano County

Assemblyman Lowrey requested that the Coordinator be authorized to investigate the feasibility of acquiring for a fishing pier project the old bridge in Vallejo which is to be abandoned by the Division of Highways, upon completion of the new highway and bridge. It was his understanding that the State Division of Highways is building a new highway and bridge just north of Mare Island across the Napa River. He felt that the bridge might work into a worthwhile fishing pier project with a minimum of expense to the Wildlife Conservation Board.

The Chairman requested the Coordinator to look into this possible project and report back at a future meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Status of Funds

The amount allocated to projects as of the close of the meeting on November 9, 1961, aggregated \$16,334,660.68.

a. Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects	\$4,318,170.38 ✓
b. Warmwater and Other Fish Projects	3,542,350.13
1. Warmwater Projects	\$2,434,151.81
2. Other Fish Projects	1,108,198.32
c. Flow Maintenance and Stream Improvement Projects	632,221.53
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	5,539,864.83
h. General Projects	1,471,299.17
1. Coastal Angling Access Projects	481,500.91 ✓
2. Inland Angling Access Projects	802,153.40 ✓
3. Hunting Access Projects	28,000.00 ✓
4. Other General Projects	159,644.86
Total Allocated to Specific Projects	<u>\$16,309,660.68</u>

Special Project Allocations:

Project Evaluation, Property Acquisition and Engineering Studies	25,000.00 ✓
Total Allocated	<u>\$16,334,660.68</u>

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

1. Colorado River Recreational Development	\$23,219.30
2. Upper American River Development	100,000.00
Total Reserves Established	<u>\$123,219.30</u>

Operating Costs:

FY 47/48 thru 60/61 Actual	\$679,240.39
FY 61/62 - Estimated	79,932.00
Total Actual and Estimated Operating Costs	<u>\$759,172.39</u>

Recapitulation:

Allocations for Projects	\$16,309,660.68
Special Project Allocations	25,000.00
Reserves Established	123,219.30
Expenses of Operation	759,172.39
Total Expended or Obligated	<u>\$17,217,052.37</u>
Total Funds Appropriated	\$16,500,000.00
Appropriation Available thru 61/62 FY	750,000.00
Int. on Surplus Money Inv. thru 60/61 FY	498,968.26
Miscellaneous Revenue thru 60/61 FY	65,957.76
Miscellaneous Revenue 61/62 FY	20.00
Total Sum Available	<u>\$17,814,946.02</u>
Total Expended or Obligated	<u>17,217,052.37</u>
Available thru June 30, 1962	\$597,893.65