

The Resources Agency of California
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
Minutes, Meeting of November 15, 1963

* * * * *

C O N T E N T S

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Page No.</u>
1. Roll Call	1
2. Approval of Minutes	2
3. Status of Funds	2 - 3
4. Recovery of Funds	3 - 4
5. Yurok Stream Clearance, Humboldt and Del Norte Cos. . .	4 - 5
6. Point Loma Pier	5 - 9
7. Butte Creek Salmon Barrier, Butte County	9 - 11
8. Oxnard Coastal Angling Access, Ventura County	11 - 14
9. Beale Air Force Base Surplus Property, Yuba County . . .	15
10. Samoa Peninsula Surplus Property, Humboldt County . . .	15
11. Imperial Beach Pier	15
12. Criteria used in the Program of the Wildlife Conservation Board	16
13. WCB Program Report	17 - 18
14. Election of Chairman - 1964	18
Status of Funds	19

The Resources Agency of California
WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD
Minutes, Meeting of November 15, 1963

Pursuant to the call of the Chairman, the Wildlife Conservation Board met in the California Room, Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco, California, on November 15, 1963. The meeting was called to order by Chairman Jamie H. Smith at 2:50 p.m.

1. Roll Call

PRESENT: Jamie H. Smith Chairman
W. T. Shannon Member

Senator Aaron W. Quick Joint Interim Committee
Assemblyman Frank P. Belotti " " "
Assemblyman Wm. E. Dannemeyer " " "
Raymond J. Nesbit Executive Officer
Chester M. Hart Assistant Executive Officer
John Mahoney Field Agent
Alma Koyasako Secretary
June Fisher Account Clerk

ABSENT: Senator John C. Begovich Joint Interim Committee
Senator Vernon L. Sturgeon " " "
Assemblywoman Pauline Davis " " "
Daniel Luevano Member, Vice Hale Champion

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mr. Lloyd A. Lee John A. Blume & Assoc. Engrs.,
S.F.
J. K. MacDonald Supervisor, Ventura County
T. M. Volk Harbor Manager, Ventura County
J. A. Reynolds Dept. of Fish and Game
Gertrude Woods Oakley Ventura County
Capt. A. A. Oakley " " "
Harold Bissell Dept. of Fish and Game
B. W. Shackelford Pacific Gas & Electric Co.
Fred Biagini " " " "
W. C. Dry Dept. of Fish and Game
A. G. Rutsch " " " "
Doug. Collier Associated Sportsmen of Calif.
Robert Wynn City of Imperial Beach
Jack D. Shelver " " " "
Henry Clineschmidt Fish & Game Commission
Charley Martin San Diego
Alex Calhoun Dept. of Fish and Game
Robert D. Montgomery " " " "
L. T. Petersen Div. of Forestry
Joseph W. Rom Council of Ventura Co. Boat Clubs
Wm. P. Elser Fish and Game Commission
Wm. Dillinger Dept. of Fish and Game

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 15, 1963

2. Approval of Minutes

IT WAS REGULARLY MOVED AND SECONDED THAT THE MINUTES OF THE WILD-
LIFE CONSERVATION BOARD MEETING OF AUGUST 8, 1963, BE APPROVED
AS WRITTEN.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. Status of Funds

The amount allocated to projects as of the close of the meeting on August 8,
1963, aggregated \$18,357,997.85.*

a. Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects		\$4,448,194.04
b. Fish Habitat Development and Improvement Projects		2,485,331.80
1. Reservoir Construction or Improvement	\$1,416,508.19	
2. Stream Clearance and Improvement	180,516.01	
3. Stream Flow Maintenance Dams	457,603.32	
4. Marine Habitat	62,498.39	
5. Fish Screens and Ladder Projects	368,205.89	
c. Angling Access Projects		4,585,691.06
1. Coastal Access	619,173.74	
2. River, Stream and Bay Access	1,046,746.24	
3. Lake, Reservoir and Salton Sea Access	1,696,255.64	
4. Piers	1,223,515.44	
d. Game Farm Projects		146,894.49
e. Game Habitat Development and Improvement Projects		5,992,395.67
1. Waterfowl Areas	5,539,864.83	
2. Other Game	452,530.84	
f. Hunting Access		386,193.71
g. Miscellaneous Projects		288,297.08
Total Allocated to Specific Projects		\$18,332,997.85

Special Project Allocations:

Project Evaluation, Property Acquisition and Engineering Studies		25,000.00
Total Allocated		\$18,357,997.85

*\$668,190.00 allocated under Public Works Acceleration Program -
50% reimbursable to State. (\$334,095.00)

Operating Costs:

FY 47/48 thru 61/62 Actual	\$746,856.86	
FY 62/63 Estimated	86,678.82	
FY 63/64 Estimated	79,289.00	
Total Actual and Estimated Operating Costs		\$912,824.68

Recapitulation

Allocations for Projects	\$18,332,997.85
Special Project Allocations	25,000.00
Expenses of Operation	912,824.68
Total Expended or Obligated	<u>\$19,270,822.53</u>
Total Funds Appropriated	\$18,000,000.00
Approp. made available July 1, 1963	750,000.00
Int. on Surplus Money Inv. thru 6/30/63	653,234.58
Miscellaneous Revenue thru 62/63	130,297.04
Miscellaneous Revenue 63/64	410.00
Total Sum Available	<u>\$19,533,941.62</u>
Total Expended or Obligated	19,270,822.53
Available thru June 30, 1964	\$ 263,119.09

Mr. Nesbit, the Executive Officer, explained that in addition to the \$263,119.09 available through June 30, 1964, additional sums in the form of reimbursement from the Federal Government under the Accelerated Public Works Program will become available within a period of six months.

4. Recovery of Funds

Kings Peak Access

The Wildlife Conservation Board at its meeting of February 2, 1960, approved and allocated \$28,000 for the development of better access to the Kings Peak area. Subsequent to this allocation the Bureau of Land Management took a greater interest in the area and were able to allocate funds under their accelerated public works program for access roads. The federal development includes the previously approved plans of the WCB for the project, and there is no necessity for keeping this project on the books.

Mr. Nesbit recommended that this project be canceled without prejudice and the allocation of \$28,000 be recovered.

The projects listed below have been completed and the unused balances were available for recovery.

Fish Springs Hatchery

Total allocation	\$462,954.59
Expenditures	460,610.15
Balance for recovery	<u>\$ 2,344.44</u>

Big River Stream Clearance

Total allocation	\$ 46,600.00
Expenditures	19,510.97
Balance for recovery	<u>\$ 27,089.03</u>

Lower Butte Creek Waterfowl Management Area

Total allocations	\$1,343,563.08
Expenditures	1,319,302.75
Balance for recovery	\$ 24,260.33

Colorado River - 26th Avenue

Additional balance for recovery	\$ 83.92
---------------------------------	----------

Mr. Nesbit suggested the above projects be closed or canceled and the unexpended balances totaling \$81,777.72 be recovered and restored to the Wildlife Restoration Fund.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR QUICK, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD CLOSE THE COMPLETED PROJECTS AND CANCEL WITHOUT PREJUDICE THE KINGS PEAK HUNTING ACCESS PROJECT AND RECOVER THE UNEXPENDED BALANCES AS SET FORTH.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. SMITH, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD CLOSE THE FOLLOWING PROJECTS AND RECOVER THE UNEXPENDED BALANCES:

	Balance
Fish Springs Hatchery	\$2,344.44
Big River Stream Clearance	27,089.03
Lower Butte Creek WMA	24,260.33
Colorado River - 26th Avenue	83.92

CANCEL WITHOUT PREJUDICE THE FOLLOWING PROJECT AND RECOVER THE UNEXPENDED BALANCE:

Kings Peak Hunting Access	\$28,000.00
---------------------------	-------------

ALL OF THE SUMS TOTALING \$81,777.72 ARE TO BE RESTORED TO THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. Yurok Stream Clearance, Humboldt and Del Norte Counties \$19,500.00

Mr. Nesbit presented this proposed project as part of the WCB stream clearance program approved by the Board in September of 1960.

The streams proposed for clearance are all tributaries of the lower 30 miles of the Klamath River and enter the river from the south. The seven streams proposed for rehabilitation are Mettah and Tectah Creeks where most of the clearance will take place and Johnson, Tarup, Omagar, Surpur, Saugep Creeks. A total of 21½ miles of streams would be cleared under the proposal. Saugep Creek and portions of Tarup and Omagar Creeks are in Del Norte County. The remaining streams are in Humboldt County

Detailed investigations made by the Department indicate that responsibility cannot be determined for cleanup of logging debris in the areas proposed for clearance.

Clearance work would be carried out by inmate labor under the supervision of the Division of Forestry from Forestry's Alder Creek Conservation Camp near Orick.

Cost estimates prepared by the Department of Fish and Game are as follows:

Labor and travel	\$15,769.00	
Equipment rental	1,275.00	
Materials and supplies	800.00	
Contingencies	1,656.00	
	<u>\$19,500.00</u>	Total

Mr. Nesbit recommended that the project be approved and that \$19,500 be allocated from the Wildlife Restoration Fund to the Department of Fish and Game and that the Department and staff be authorized to proceed with the project.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR QUICK, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE YUOK STREAM CLEARANCE PROJECT, HUMBOLDT AND DEL NORTE COUNTIES; ALLOCATE \$19,500 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. SMITH, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE YUOK STREAM CLEARANCE PROJECT, HUMBOLDT AND DEL NORTE COUNTIES; ALLOCATE \$19,500 TO THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT. PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

6. Point Loma Pier, San Diego \$145,000.00

A request made by the Governor's Office to have the Point Loma Pier proposal heard early in the program was relayed to the Chairman; therefore, Mr. Smith ordered that this item now be considered.

Mr. Nesbit related that at the March 15, 1962, meeting, the Board instructed him "to proceed without delay with necessary negotiations to attempt to develop a fishing pier project at Point Loma."

Following these instructions Mr. Nesbit took an option to purchase the pier from the contractor at a cost of \$147,000. This option is still valid, although the contractor can now cancel it at his pleasure.

During the summer of 1962, three evaluations were made of the feasibility of converting the pier to public fishing use. The engineers studying the structure and making independent reports were Moffatt and Nichol, Engineers, Long Beach; Wallace Dry, Chief Engineer, Department of Fish and Game; and William S. Krooskos, Consulting Civil Engineer, San Diego. All reports indicated that the structure could be economically converted and that it would have a satisfactory life of from 30 to 50 years, depending upon the type of protection. All engineers commented on the necessity of structural conversion for both strength and utility. Informal estimates for conversion of the trestle to a sturdy fishing pier range from \$250,000 to \$300,000. All engineers agreed that additional studies and plans will be required to finalize such an estimate.

The pier access and approach is located on land purchased by the City of San Diego from the United States Government. The U. S. Navy placed certain restrictions in the deed. One of these is to the effect that the property could be used only for the purpose for which the land was conveyed. This purpose does not include fishing and recreation. It is under this authority that the Navy has opposed the conversion of this project to a fishing and recreation development. Local Navy officials have expressed a desire to retain such restrictions in the deed. City of San Diego officials have expressed their reluctance to take an active part in pursuing the Point Loma Pier conversion. There is some concern that it might adversely affect the considerable Navy activities in the San Diego area. Under Secretary of Navy Paul B. Fay, Jr., has denied this to be the case.

After considerable expression of dissatisfaction of the Navy's position by Southern California sportsmen, San Diego residents, and area newspapers, the Under Secretary met with interested persons in San Diego on January 17, 1963. This meeting was sponsored by the Greater San Diego Sports Association, who has vigorously supported the pier idea. Secretary Fay revealed plans of the Navy to place a pier structure about one-half mile north of the trestle and agreed to permit public fishing from this proposed Navy structure. The existing Point Loma trestle was then to be dismantled. This appeared to satisfy the sportsmen and various proponents of the fishing pier. On September 27, 1963, however, in a letter to Mr. Wm. Elser and to Governor Brown, the Under Secretary suggested the state and city proceed with the original idea since the Navy plans had been discarded. When it was revealed that the only possibility of getting fishing access to Point Loma fishing waters was through the conversion of the steel trestle, interest was again renewed in the trestle project.

Mr. Nesbit stated that the City of San Diego has not yet given an official expression of willingness to cooperate in this project. They are desirous of having the various responsibilities delineated before they make such an expression. While the WCB has a definite policy of 50-50 cost participation on the construction of new piers, no such policy is practical for pier conversion. No doubt this is because of the large contributions made in the basic structures. For example the City of San Diego has already spent in excess of one million dollars for this pier.

It was the Executive Officer's recommendation that the pattern of local and WCB participation which has been set by such conversions as at Santa Cruz, Tiburon, Berkeley, and Monterey, be followed for the Point Loma project. The following specific delineation of responsibilities were suggested.

The City would:

1. Provide the state the right to obtain the pier at surplus value from the contractor by amending its contract.
2. Request Department of Interior to issue amendment to patent conveyed to City.
3. Provide road access.
4. Provide adequate paved parking for at least 200 cars with additional overflow parking.
5. Provide necessary concession buildings compatible with fishing use.
6. Provide engineering review and assistance during design and construction phases of the reconversion.
7. Maintain the structure and its appurtenances for a 20-year period.

The State would:

1. Obtain the contractor's rights by exercising or renegotiating our option.
2. Convert the pier to make suitable for fishing and recreational use along with structural stability.

It was Mr. Nesbit's recommendation that the Board instruct staff as to what negotiations should be pursued. If funds are provided to exercise this option or a renegotiated one, there should be the contingency of approval of the project by the San Diego City Council before the expenditures of any funds. Also, there should be funds provided for an engineering study to plan the conversion design and specifications. Mr. Nesbit estimated that \$20,000 would be required to provide the necessary engineering studies, plans and specifications. He mentioned there is a possibility of securing matching funds from the Federal Government under the Accelerated Public Works Program.

Chairman Smith requested that Mr. Elser, former Chairman of the Wildlife Conservation Board and presently a member of the Fish and Game Commission, give his recommendations on this proposal.

Mr. Elser related that he became closely associated with the project at the time he was chairman of the Board. Governor Brown, he stated, has been and is very much interested in the project and has carried a great share of the load in the negotiations which were carried on at the top levels in Washington. It was Under Secretary of the Navy Fay's recommendation that the Board proceed with the exercising of the option to purchase the Point Loma Pier. Previously, all discussions in the City of San Diego had been with the City Manager -- this proposal has not been taken to the City Council. It was Mr. Elser's recommendation that a definite proposal should now be made to the City Council through the City Manager's office. He believed this project to be a very worthy one.

In answer to Mr. Shannon's question relative to the present value of the trestle, Mr. Nesbit advised that independent appraisals have been secured and that estimates are well below the present option price. The option taken two years ago was for the salvage value placed on the trestle by the contractor-owner of the structure and did not result from an independent appraisal. Mr. Nesbit expressed the opinion that the option should be renegotiated.

Mr. Belotti questioned the \$20,000 required for engineering plans and specifications and asked if the City of San Diego would be willing to make a contribution in this regard. Mr. Elser advised that the \$20,000 would be used to develop plans for converting the trestle to a public fishing pier, and that the City has expended over one million dollars to construct the trestle, as well as contributing \$80,000 for the necessary access road.

Mr. Charles Martin, representing the San Diego sportsmen, expressed the interest of the California Wildlife Federation and the California Sportsmen in this proposal. He advised that President Cecil Phipps worked actively in 1962 to secure this pier for public fishing.

Mr. Elser emphasized that Mr. Nesbit must be able to appear before the San Diego City Council and advise them of the commitment of the Board and be in a position to ask if they will cooperate in this venture. He further related that the San Diego city officials realize that this would be a very fine thing for the people. However, they do come in contact with Navy personnel in San Diego who would just as soon not see this converted to a public fishing pier as it adjoins a Navy installation. Senator Quick, however, noted that the proposal had been approved by the Under Secretary of the Navy in Washington, D. C.

In answer to Assemblyman Dannemeyer's question relative to the need for stabilizing a pier constructed for vehicular traffic, Mr. Elser replied that the funds necessary for conversion would be used for decking, cathodic protection, railing, sanitary facilities, and other work necessary to make the structure permanent. This was confirmed by Mr. Nesbit.

Mr. Shannon felt that this is a fine opportunity to secure a pier in the best fishing area on the coast of California and suggested the Executive Officer be authorized to negotiate for the purchase of the pier, allocating the necessary funds for this purpose as well as the \$20,000 for the engineering plans, provided the City agrees to the conditions set forth. There was discussion on the basis of the negotiation price for the purchase of the pier, and it was generally agreed that it should be within the present salvage value but less than the present option price.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR QUICK, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER BE AUTHORIZED TO RENEGOTIATE THE OPTION FOR THE PURCHASE OF THE POINT LOMA TRESTLE AND THAT THE BOARD ALLOCATE \$125,000 FOR THE PURCHASE OF THIS PIER AND \$20,000 ADDITIONAL FOR SECURING DESIGN AND PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE CONVERSION OF THE TRESTLE TO A PUBLIC FISHING PIER. THE EXPENDITURE OF THESE FUNDS IS CONTINGENT UPON AGREEMENT BY THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO TO ACCEPT THE CONDITIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES AS PREVIOUSLY SET FORTH.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. SMITH, THAT THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER BE AUTHORIZED TO RENEGOTIATE THE OPTION FOR PURCHASE OF THE POINT LOMA TRESTLE AND THAT THE BOARD ALLOCATE \$125,000 FOR THE PURCHASE OF THIS PIER AND \$20,000 ADDITIONAL FOR SECURING DESIGN AND PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE CONVERSION OF THE TRESTLE TO A PUBLIC FISHING PIER. THE EXPENDITURE OF THESE FUNDS IS CONTINGENT UPON AGREEMENT BY THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO TO ACCEPT THE CONDITIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES AS PREVIOUSLY SET FORTH.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Elser thanked the Board for the action taken. Mr. Smith praised Mr. Elser for the fine work he has done in furthering this project.

7. Butte Creek Salmon Barrier, Butte County \$10,000.00

Butte Creek is tributary to the Sacramento River and is one of the best spawning streams for spring run king salmon in the Central Valley. This is due largely to releases of water through the Pacific Gas and Electric Company's Centerville Powerhouse which originate from upstream storage and are transported to the powerhouse via canals. The flow in the stream below the powerhouse is relatively stable, of sufficiently low temperatures to hold salmon over the summer and contains adequate spawning gravels. The stream above the Centerville Powerhouse in marked contrast to the lower section is subject to natural flow fluctuations, having almost no flow in the summer and is deficient in spawning gravels. During the spring runoff period of higher flows, salmon numbering from 200 to 2,000 in recent years, have entered this stream section and have subsequently perished during the summer due to low flows and high water temperatures.

The Department has been negotiating with the Pacific Gas and Electric Company for some time in an effort to solve the problem. The solution agreed upon has been the placement of a barrier above the Centerville Powerhouse designed to stop salmon migration and restrict them to suitable waters downstream.

Plans for the 96 feet wide and 8 feet high structure have been prepared by P.G.&E. engineers and have been approved by the Department. P.G.&E. has agreed to pay half the costs, up to \$10,000, and has further agreed to construct the barrier utilizing its own crews to keep the cost at a minimum. Therefore, the allocation request is for a sum of \$10,000 or one-half the total estimated cost of the barrier.

The estimated costs of the project as prepared by Pacific Gas and Electric Company are as follows:

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 15, 1963

Excavation and riprap	\$4,970.00
Steel posts, 8,325 lbs. @ .50	4,160.00
Flashboards and spacers	880.00
Reinforcing steel, 936 lbs. @ .20	190.00
Concrete, 100 cu. yds. @ \$45	4,500.00
Right-of-way	100.00
Subtotal	\$14,800.00
Contingencies, 20%	2,980.00
Overhead	2,220.00
TOTAL	\$20,000.00

Mr. Nesbit recommended that the project be approved and that \$10,000 be allocated from the Wildlife Restoration Fund to the Department and that the Department and staff be authorized to proceed with the project. There is a good flow in the spring when salmon goes up the stream; however, during the summer low flows, salmon are stranded in pools and die due to insufficient water and high temperatures. This has been a problem every year. By building this barrier, salmon die-offs, such as indicated in pictures which were displayed, could be prevented.

Mr. Shannon advised that the Department had attempted to have P.G.&E. take full responsibility for this construction; however, according to the attorneys, P.G.&E. may not have any legal responsibility for mitigation of these fish losses. The Company, though, in a public relations gesture, has agreed to match funds for construction of this salmon barrier.

Assemblyman Dannemeyer believed that the loss of fish life should be remedied and that we should not forego any legal recourse we might have to compel P.G.&E. to this mitigation. He asked if we have legal counsel's opinion relative to the company's responsibility in this regard.

Mr. Shannon replied that such opinion had been requested and the attorneys agree that the proposal presented here is the best way to resolve the problem. Assemblyman Dannemeyer wondered if this proposal would set a precedence, and Mr. Shannon assured him that this would not be the case.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR QUICK, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE BUTTE CREEK SALMON BARRIER, BUTTE COUNTY, ON A COOPERATIVE BASIS WITH THE PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, ESTIMATED TO COST \$20,000, THE STATE TO SHARE EQUALLY THE ACTUAL COST, NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000; AND THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND \$10,000 FOR THIS PURPOSE; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED.

The following amendment to the foregoing motion was offered by Assemblyman Dannemeyer:

THE APPROVAL OF THIS PROJECT IS WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND DOES NOT AFFECT ANY RIGHT OR LEGAL RECOURSE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA MAY HAVE AGAINST THE PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY IN THE MITIGATION OF FISH LOSSES IN THE STREAM UNDER CONSIDERATION.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. SMITH, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE BUTTE CREEK SALMON BARRIER, BUTTE COUNTY, ON A COOPERATIVE BASIS WITH THE PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, ESTIMATED TO COST \$20,000, THE STATE TO SHARE EQUALLY THE ACTUAL COST, NOT TO EXCEED \$10,000; AND THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND \$10,000 FOR THIS PURPOSE; AND AUTHORIZE THE STAFF AND THE DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME TO PROCEED WITH THE PROJECT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PLANNED. THE APPROVAL OF THIS PROJECT IS WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND DOES NOT AFFECT ANY RIGHT OR LEGAL RECOURSE THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA MAY HAVE AGAINST THE PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY IN THE MITIGATION OF FISH LOSSES IN THE STREAM UNDER CONSIDERATION.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

8. Oxnard Coastal Angling Access, Ventura County

The County of Ventura has requested consideration of a WCB coastal angling access in conjunction with the county harbor being developed near Oxnard. The Ventura County Harbor is adjacent to the Port Hueneme Naval Base and about $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Oxnard. Phase development of the harbor is being carried out, with construction of service facilities just getting under way. The Corps of Engineers and U.S. Navy have expended \$7,000,000 on this development as a combination small craft harbor and beach erosion project, and will handle entrance channel dredging for an indefinite period.

The County of Ventura has spent \$3,000,000 for land acquisition, engineering, shoreline protection, harbor roads and utilities. The County plans future development on a pay-as-you-go basis, primarily on a lease-concessionaire arrangement.

Because of the sport fishing potential for small boats, the County has proposed that development include public launching facilities under the WCB program. In addition to the harbor waters themselves, the development offers more than a mile of rock jetties and breakwater for reef-type inshore fishing. This location also provides the shortest passage to Anacapa Island, approximately 11 miles offshore, and thence to the other Santa Barbara Channel Islands, which have a practically unexploited sport fishing potential.

For the proposed WCB project, the County has agreed to provide a free lease to the State on a site of approximately 2.3 acres, carry out initial site preparation at an estimated cost of \$10,000, and operate and maintain the completed development free to the public. The WCB facilities would replace a free public ramp that the new harbor development has made inoperative.

Minutes of Meeting, Wildlife Conservation Board
November 15, 1963

The nearest existing launching ramp is at the Ventura Marina 7 miles to the north, which is a City of Ventura project with a Small Craft Harbors loan. Launching here is on a fee basis, but fees have not been collected at all times. The distance from this harbor to Anacapa Island is nearly 50% greater than from the proposed WCB site.

The proposed project is within easy driving distance, mostly less than an hour, of an estimated 7,000,000 people in the counties of Ventura, Santa Barbara, and Los Angeles. More than 65,000 boats are registered in these 3 counties, of which a high percentage are trailerable.

Plans and cost estimates for the project have been prepared by Fish and Game engineering section, and reviewed and approved by staff and the County.

Cost estimates are as follows:

Excavation and grading	\$3,000.00
Launching ramps	16,170.00
4 lane concrete, loading floats, and riprap	
Parking area and roadway	12,240.00
Paving approx. 1 acre	
Sanitary facilities	15,450.00
Restroom, septic tank, water and electric service, lighting	
	<hr/>
Subtotal	\$46,860.00
Contingencies, signs	5,640.00
	<hr/>
TOTAL	\$52,500.00

Mr. Nesbit recommended the approval of this project and allocation of funds for its development. He advised there are a number of people interested in the project present who wished to be heard.

Mr. J. K. MacDonald, Supervisor of Ventura County, who headed the delegation from Ventura County, introduced Captain and Mrs. Oakley; Mr. Tom Volk, Harbor Manager; Mr. Joseph Rom, representing the Council of Ventura County Boat Clubs; and Captain Reynolds of the Department of Fish and Game. He strongly endorsed the project, which he felt would be a wonderful thing for the fishermen and other small boat owners of Ventura County and surrounding areas. He stated, however, there have been discussions with Mr. Hugo Fisher, Resources Agency Administrator, relative to a protest by the General Manager of the Ventura Port District, Mr. William Kerrigan. He expressed the hope that this small issue would not prevent approval of the project.

Mr. Nesbit stated that the staff had received no opposition to this project. He did, however, read a copy of a letter written by Mr. Kerrigan to the Chief, Division of Small Craft Harbors, which expressed some concern relative to the no charge policy for WCB access projects. This letter, he stated, was the issue alluded to by Mr. MacDonald.

Mr. MacDonald informed the Board that the Ventura Port District Commission is constituted of two persons appointed by the Board of Supervisors, two appointed by the City Council of Ventura, and the fifth member selected by the other members. It was a great surprise to him to find this letter had been written, since this issue was not discussed with the Board of Supervisors. He believed that the Ventura Port District Commission should have brought their opposition to its constituting body. He felt there was a great need for this facility, and, in fact, the Board of Supervisors had been criticised for not providing it. He added that the public is 100% behind the project; Senator Robert J. Lagomarsino and Assemblyman Burt M. Henson have added their support to this proposal.

Mr. Thomas Volk, Harbor Manager from the Ventura County Harbor, pointed out that the policy of the WCB in locating ramps no closer than five miles apart had been adhered to in this proposal. He further stated there is a time factor involved since it was necessary to determine how to proceed on the adjoining parcels which are to be developed in conjunction with the launching facilities. These projects would be left in a nebulous state unless a determination were made at this time. Mr. MacDonald stated a month's delay would not hurt these negotiations.

Mr. Smith commented that the Board can meet at any time at the call of the Chair, if there were something critical to consider.

In answer to Mr. Belotti's question, Mr. MacDonald emphasized that the merit of the project has not been questioned, but only whether a charge should be made for the use of the launching facility.

Mr. Shannon advised that this matter was not brought to his attention until the last minute. He felt there was a problem in Ventura County itself which needs to be resolved, and this can be accomplished with a little time. He made a motion that the Wildlife Conservation Board go on record as being in favor of the project, but that action be held up until the next meeting of the Board, which meeting can be called at the discretion of the Chair, at which time the Board can act upon it.

Mr. Lloyd A. Lee, who was the resident engineer for the John A. Blume and Assoc. Engineers of San Francisco, which firm did the engineering design and feasibility study on the Ventura County marina project, presented his testimony to clarify some points and to help resolve the problems. He stated he was requested to attend this meeting to monitor it, since Mr. Kerrigan could not be present. The Ventura Port District is comprised of the City of Ventura and adjacent cities and is governed by a Board of Commissioners. Specifically, the district constructed the project with a \$900,000 loan from Small Craft Harbors; in addition, they received approval of a general obligation bond issue of \$4,750,000. The district has constructed 541 berths, 9 launching ramps, with restroom and floats. The district charges \$1.25 for launching. He mentioned that it has not been possible to collect this at all times, as was indicated in the agenda. The district must pay out for the bonds and state loans, and any deficiencies must be met by the taxpayers in the port district. Repayment of the state loan was not in jeopardy.

Mr. Lee was questioned by Chairman Smith as to whether this sort of competition had been taken into consideration in the feasibility study, and it was brought out that every harbor in the state was taken into consideration in the study.

Since there had been no objections received by the staff, Mr. Nesbit asked if there was sufficient publicity with regard to this agenda item. Mr. MacDonald verified that there was wide coverage and that the citizens of the area were well-informed.

Assemblyman Belotti asked if a postponement of this proposed project had been requested. Mr. Nesbit replied that Mr. Hugo Fisher, Administrator of the Resources Agency had stated he was approached by the chairman of the Small Craft Harbors Commission who raised the question whether the Oxnard proposal might be in competition with the Ventura marina 7 miles away. Since this question involved two commissions in the Resources Agency, it was Mr. Fisher's request that the Wildlife Conservation Board agenda item be held over for further consideration at a later meeting.

Mr. Smith said he would like to have a special meeting to resolve this problem giving all interested persons an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. MacDonald felt that the only issue that could be considered would be the economic feasibility of the port district, not of the county harbor.

Mrs. Gertrude Oakley of Ventura Co. expressed her hope that some action could be taken today, since the people there have fought to get this facility.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR QUICK, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD CONSIDER THE PROPOSED OXNARD COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS PROJECT AT A SPECIAL MEETING WITHIN 30 DAYS FROM THIS DATE IN THE CITY OF VENTURA. THE COUNTY OF VENTURA, IN THE INTERIM, IS TO MEET WITH THE VARIOUS AGENCIES INVOLVED IN AN ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE ANY DIFFERENCES.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Joseph W. Rom from Ventura representing the Council of Ventura County Boat Clubs protested the delay. He informed the Board the seven boat clubs which the council represents are all in favor of the proposal. However, the Chairman stated that in fairness to the Port District, the Small Craft Harbors Commission, and Mr. Hugo Fisher, it would be advisable to provide them an opportunity to voice their opinions.

Mr. Shannon favored the project, but stated that since there appears to be some facts or elements not known to the Board at this time, a postponement is in order.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. SMITH, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD CONSIDER THE PROPOSED OXNARD COASTAL ANGLING ACCESS PROJECT AT A SPECIAL MEETING WITHIN 30 DAYS FROM THIS DATE IN THE CITY OF VENTURA. THE COUNTY OF VENTURA IN THE INTERIM IS TO MEET WITH THE VARIOUS AGENCIES INVOLVED IN AN ATTEMPT TO RESOLVE ANY DIFFERENCES.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Smith thanked all who attended the meeting from Ventura County and expressed the desire of the Board to do what is right, and that it was felt the Board can only do so by allowing this postponement.

9. Beale Air Force Base Surplus Properties, Yuba County
10. Samoa Peninsula Surplus Properties, Humboldt County

Mr. Nesbit stated that the General Services Administration did not make the appraisal price available to the Board staff on these two surplus properties; therefore, these two agenda items were tabled.

11. Imperial Beach Pier \$4,000.00

Mr. Nesbit announced that the Imperial Beach Pier will be completed during the following week and a dedication is planned for Saturday, November 23, at 12:00 noon. A large crowd is expected at this dedication. The pier will become a major attraction in the south San Diego metropolitan area.

The City and the WCB have matched funds for pier construction on a 50-50 basis in accordance with the policy for new construction. Several change orders to the contractor have been necessary to properly complete the project. These change orders have provided for additional water lines for fire protection on the pier, some additional electrical work for lighting and the addition of 4 bearing piles and 8 fender piles to facilitate and provide more safety features in the fishing boat loading float at the south end of the pier.

The above change orders have amounted to approximately \$8,000.00. To complete the state obligation under the 50-50 matching funds concept, an additional allocation of \$4,000.00 is required.

It was Mr. Nesbit's recommendation that \$4,000 be allocated to complete the Imperial Beach Pier.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR QUICK, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE MODIFICATIONS NECESSITATED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE IMPERIAL BEACH PIER, AND ALLOCATE THE SUM OF \$4,000 ON A MATCHING FUND BASIS WITH IMPERIAL BEACH TO COVER ONE-HALF THE ADDITIONAL COSTS INCURRED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PIER.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. SMITH, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE MODIFICATIONS NECESSITATED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE IMPERIAL BEACH PIER, AND ALLOCATE THE SUM OF \$4,000 ON A MATCHING FUND BASIS WITH IMPERIAL BEACH TO COVER ONE-HALF OF THE ADDITIONAL COSTS INCURRED IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE PIER.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

12. Criteria used in the Program of the Wildlife Conservation Board

Mr. Nesbit explained that a statement of criteria to be used on projects which might be considered under the forthcoming State Beach, Park, Recreational, and Historical Facilities Bond Act, if approved, was desired by Administrator Fisher, who must make judgments on these projects. Criteria presently used were suggested as follows:

Criteria used in the Program
of the
Wildlife Conservation Board

1. Projects shall be considered in accordance with the needs of the wildlife resources of the state relative to preservation, production and utilization.
2. Each project shall be so managed and controlled that the public shall have access to and use of the area for all compatible recreational purposes.
3. A Department of Fish and Game recommendation shall be requested before WCB consideration. This recommendation shall relate to the needs of the resource relative to protection, production, or utilization.
4. Leasing of land from public agencies shall be accomplished without obligation of future annual lease payments.
5. Project design and construction shall be of high quality, and in all instances where local government accepts the operation and maintenance, local standards will be met.
6. Land for project purposes shall be acquired on a willing sale basis. Only under unusual conditions and when authorized by the WCB will condemnation be considered.
7. Public use projects shall be of sufficient size to permit regional use and to provide as far as is practical for high use periods.
8. Access developments, both hunting and fishing, shall be aimed at maintaining the aesthetic qualities of the site.
9. Public access projects shall be provided where inadequate access exists.
10. Access projects provided by the WCB program shall be free to the public except that local government, when authorized by the Board, may make charges for additional services and facilities they provide.

IT WAS MOVED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, SECONDED BY SENATOR QUICK,
AS A JOINT MOTION, THAT THE CRITERIA SUBSTANTIALLY AS OUTLINED
ABOVE BE USED IN THE PROGRAM OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD.
PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

13. WCB Program Report \$8,500.00

At the August 10, 1962, meeting, the Board authorized staff with the assistance of a special consultant, to prepare a WCB program report. The report was mainly to review the accomplishments of the program to date, and to project a 5-year program.

As time permitted during the past 15 months, the staff has worked on this report. The special consultant, Mr. Cronemiller, completed the research and compilation work for which he was hired, and his limited term employment has been terminated.

Recent developments have affected the original objectives of the report. As part of the State Development Plan related to natural resources, the State Office of Planning, in conjunction with the Department of Fish and Game, now plans to develop a Fish and Game Program Plan, in part with Federal aid funds available for such purposes. It appears that for proper coordination of objectives, responsibilities and effort, it would be desirable for your staff to work with the Department to include the WCB's future program in this overall plan.

The more important immediate need for WCB planning and program projection has developed from the Parks and Recreation Bond issue of 1964.

The report presented today in outline form is aimed at providing information and procedures for those many citizens who are interested in the regular program accomplishments and procedures. It also will provide the public with information relative to what program might be expected if the Bond Issue passes and \$5 million is allocated to the WCB.

The Bond Committee is anxious to have this report to assist in providing the public with information relative to the use of Bond funds. Beaches and Parks is preparing a somewhat similar report to provide the public with their proposed program. Director Shannon has provided staff with assistance from the Department's Conservation Education Section.

An issue of 10,000 copies of the report is planned. The estimated cost is \$8,500.

Mr. Nesbit recommended the Board approve the report as presented and allocate \$8,500 needed for its publication.

IT WAS MOVED BY SENATOR QUICK, SECONDED BY ASSEMBLYMAN BELOTTI, THAT THE JOINT INTERIM COMMITTEE RECOMMEND THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE PROGRAM REVIEW ENTITLED "REPORT OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD, 1947 - 1963"; ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND THE SUM OF \$8,500 FOR ITS PUBLICATION; AND THE STAFF IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO PROCEED WITH THE PUBLICATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE REPORT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PRESENTED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. SMITH, THAT THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD APPROVE THE PROGRAM REVIEW ENTITLED "REPORT OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD, 1947-1963"; ALLOCATE FROM THE WILDLIFE RESTORATION FUND THE SUM OF \$8,500 FOR ITS PUBLICATION; AND THE STAFF IS HEREBY AUTHORIZED TO PROCEED WITH THE PUBLICATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF THE REPORT SUBSTANTIALLY AS PRESENTED.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

14. Election of Chairman - 1964

IT WAS MOVED BY MR. SHANNON, SECONDED BY MR. SMITH, THAT IN ACCORDANCE WITH PREVIOUS PRACTICE OF THE BOARD, MR. HENRY CLINESCHMIDT BE ELECTED CHAIRMAN OF THE WILDLIFE CONSERVATION BOARD AT THE TIME HE BECOMES PRESIDENT OF THE FISH AND GAME COMMISSION.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Status of Funds

The amount allocated to projects as of the close of the meeting on November 15, 1963, aggregated \$18,463,220.13.*

a. Fish Hatchery and Stocking Projects		\$4,445,849.60
b. Fish Habitat Development and Improvement Projects		2,487,742.77
1. Reservoir Construction or Improvement	\$1,416,508.19	
2. Stream Clearance and Improvement	172,926.98	
3. Stream Flow Maintenance Dams	457,603.32	
4. Marine Habitat	62,498.39	
5. Fish Screens and Ladder Projects	378,205.89	
c. Angling Access Projects		4,734,607.14
1. Coastal Access	619,173.74	
2. River, Stream and Bay Access	1,046,662.32	
3. Lake, Reservoir and Salton Sea Access	1,696,255.64	
4. Piers	1,372,515.44	
d. Game Farm Projects		146,894.49
e. Game Habitat Development and Improvement Projects		5,968,135.34
1. Waterfowl Areas	5,515,604.50	
2. Other Game	452,530.84	
f. Hunting Access		358,193.71
g. Miscellaneous Projects		288,297.08
Total Allocated to Specific Projects		<u>\$18,429,720.13</u>

Special Project Allocations:

Proj. Evaluation, Property Acq. & Eng'ing Studies	\$25,000.00
Program Report	8,500.00
Total Allocated	<u>\$18,463,220.13</u>

*\$668,190.00 allocated under Public Works Acceleration Program -
50% reimbursable to State. (\$334,095.00)

Operating Costs:

FY 47/48 thru 61/62 Actual	\$746,856.86	
FY 62/63 Estimated	86,678.82	
FY 63/64 Estimated	<u>79,289.00</u>	
Total Actual and Estimated Operating Costs		\$912,824.68

Recapitulation:

Allocations for Projects	\$18,429,720.13
Special Project Allocations	33,500.00
Expenses of Operation	912,824.68
Total Expended or Obligated	<u>\$19,376,044.81</u>
Total Funds Appropriated	\$18,000,000.00
Approp. made available 7/1/63	750,000.00
Int. on Surplus Money Inv. thru 6/30/63	653,234.58
Miscellaneous Revenue thru 62/63	130,297.04
Miscellaneous Revenue thru 63/64	885.00
Total Sum Available	<u>\$19,534,416.62</u>
Total Expended or Obligated	19,376,044.81
Available thru June 30, 1964	<u>\$158,371.81</u>